Linguistic and legal continuity in 6th to 8th century Coptic documents

A comparative study of Greek and Coptic legal formulae in Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt

Samuel Peter Cook

B.Comm. *Western Sydney University*, 2009

MRes, *Macquarie University*, 2015

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Ancient History,

Faculty of Arts

Macquarie University, Sydney

May, 2019

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

(Signed)_____ Date: 01/05/2019
Samuel Cook

Summary

The study aims to investigate linguistic and legal continuity in Coptic legal documents of the 6th to 8th centuries. Drawing on theoretical frameworks from the fields of papyrology and contact linguistics, the study presents a comparison of a selection of Greek and Coptic legal formulae common across multiple genres of legal documents. Through this, it aims to investigate the extent to which the language of pre-existing Greek legal formulae is replicated in later Coptic documents, and whether this replication results in contact-induced grammatical change.

Chapter one provides a historical background to the study focusing on language contact, language use, and multilingualism in Egyptian law and administration from the Late Period to the Early Islamic period, as well as an overview of the aims of the study and the corpus of material used. Chapter 2 focuses on the field of contact-linguistics, providing a discussion on current theoretical frameworks on contact-induced grammatical change and their application to the study of Greek-Egyptian language contact. Chapter 3 focuses on methodological issues encountered in the study of language use in legal papyri. After examining past work on the issue of linguistic and legal continuity in Egyptian documents, a discussion is provided on some of the unique methodological issues faced when using papyri for linguistic study.

Chapters 4 and 5 present an analysis and comparison of particular Greek and Coptic legal formula selected for the study. Chapter 4 discusses formulae which commonly appear in the opening clauses of the documents. Chapter 5 presents Coptic formulae which appear in the closing of documents. Chapter 6 provides an overall synthesis and discussion of the findings of the data, and the significance of these results for our understanding of the development of Coptic legal formulae in Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt.

Contents

LIST OF TABLES ..... **IV**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **V**

ABBREVIATIONS ..... **VI**

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1. AIMS 1
1.2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: LANGUAGE USE, LANGUAGE CONTACT, AND ADMINISTRATION IN EGYPT 2
1.2.1. The Late Period: Early Greek settlements and Persian occupation *3*
1.2.2. Alexander and the Ptolemies *5*
1.2.3. Roman Period and the decline of Demotic documents *8*
1.2.4. The Byzantine Period and the rise of Coptic *11*
1.2.5. The Islamic conquest and the Early Islamic period *14*
1.2.6. Conclusion *16*
1.3. THE STUDY 17
1.3.1. The corpus *17*
1.3.2. Outline of the study *24*

CHAPTER 2: EGYPTIAN AND GREEK FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CONTACT LINGUISTICS **27**

2.1. LANGUAGE CONTACT AND CONTACT-INDUCED GRAMMATICAL CHANGE 28
2.1.1. Terminology *30*
2.1.2. Types of contact-induced grammatical change *34*
2.1.3. Constraints on contact-induced grammatical change *44*
2.1.4. Contact-induced vs. language internal-change *51*
2.1.5. Contact linguistics: a summary *54*
2.2. GREEK AND EGYPTIAN: A TYPOLOGICAL COMPARISON 55
2.2.1. Nouns and nominal morphology *58*
2.2.2. Verbs and verbal morphology *64*
2.2.3. Syntax – verbal arguments *70*
2.2.4. Clause chaining – subordinate clauses and argument clauses *72*
2.2.5. Greek and Egyptian typology: a summary *78*
2.3. CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE IN EGYPTIAN 79
2.3.1. Grammatical MAT borrowing: morphology *81*
2.3.2. Structural PAT borrowing *84*
2.3.3. Functional PAT borrowing *93*
2.3.4. Contact-induced change in Coptic: a summary *96*

CHAPTER 3: JURISTIC PAPYROLOGY AND THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE: THEORY AND METHODOLOGY **97**

3.1. COPTIC DOCUMENTS FROM A PAPYROLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE 97
3.1.1. Coptic juristic papyrology: an overview *97*
3.1.2. Legal continuity: Reichtsrecht, Volksreicht, and "Coptic law" *100*
3.1.3. Linguistic continuity: Coptic and Demotic legal formulae *104*
3.1.4. Linguistic continuity: Coptic and Greek legal formulae *109*
3.2. PAPYRI AND THE STUDY OF LINGUISTICS: METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS 112

3.2.1. Linguistic concerns: Standard vs. non-standard language ... *112*
3.2.2. Genre: "Literary" vs. "non-literary" ... *114*
3.2.3. Archaeological concerns: preservation and publication of papyri ... *116*
3.3. METHODOLOGY: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA ... 116
3.3.1. Selection of formulae ... *117*
3.3.2. Analysis of formulae ... *118*

CHAPTER 4: OPENING FORMULAE ... 124

4.1. APPOINTMENT OF HYPOGRAPHEUS (HYP) ... 124
4.1.1. History and distribution ... *125*
4.1.2. Forms of the Coptic HYP formula ... *126*
4.1.3. Analysis of the Coptic HYP formula ... *127*
4.1.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic HYP formulae ... *138*
4.1.5. CONCLUSION ... 153
4.2. APPOINTMENT OF WITNESSES (AOW) ... 154
4.2.1. History and distribution ... *154*
4.2.2. Forms of the AOW formula ... *155*
4.2.3. Analysis of the AOW formula ... *156*
4.2.4. Comparison to the Coptic HYP formulae ... *161*
4.2.5. Conclusion: a Greek connection? ... *167*
4.3. FREE-WILL FORMULA (FRW) ... 168
4.3.1. History and distribution ... *168*
4.3.2. Forms of the Coptic FRW formula ... *169*
4.3.3. Analysis of the Coptic FRW formula ... *172*
4.3.4. Relationship to Greek FRW formula ... *191*
4.3.5. Conclusion ... *212*
4.4. OATH FORMULA (OTH) ... 213
4.4.1. History and distribution ... *213*
4.4.2. Forms of the Coptic OTH formula ... *215*
4.4.3. Analysis of the Coptic OTH formula ... *218*
4.4.4. Relationship to Greek OTH formula ... *229*
4.4.5. Conclusion ... *246*
4.5. CONCLUSION ... 246

CHAPTER 5: CLOSING FORMULAE ... 248

5.1. SECURITY FORMULA (SCR) ... 248
5.1.1: History and distribution ... *249*
5.1.2. Forms of the Coptic SCR formula ... *249*
5.1.3. Analysis of the Coptic SCR formula ... *251*
5.1.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic formulae ... *264*
5.1.5. Conclusion ... *273*
5.2. KYRIA CLAUSE (KYR) ... 274
5.2.1. History and distribution ... *274*
5.2.2. Forms of the Coptic KYR formula ... *275*
5.2.3. Analysis of forms of the Coptic KYR formula ... *276*
5.2.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic KYR formulae ... *287*
5.2.5. Conclusion ... *299*
5.3. SUBSCRIPTION FORMULA (SUB) ... 299
5.3.1. History and distribution ... *300*
5.3.2. Forms of the Coptic SUB formula ... *301*
5.3.3. Analysis of the Coptic SUB formula ... *303*
5.3.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic SUB formulae ... *313*
5.3.5. Conclusion ... *325*

5.4. CONCLUSION 326

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 328

6.1. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS: DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE FORMULAE IN THE STUDY 329
6.1.1. Regional distributions 329
6.1.2: Diachronic distributions 332
6.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF COPTIC LEGAL FORMULAE 334
6.2.1. The Coptic HYP formula and its relationship to Greek 334
6.2.2. Aphrodito and the development of the Coptic FRW formula 337
6.2.3. The development of Coptic legal formulae: summary 341
6.3. LINGUISTIC CONTINUITY IN GREEK AND COPTIC FORMULAE 342
6.3.1. Replication 343
6.3.2. Reinterpretation 352
6.3.3. Innovation 357
6.3.4. Summary 362
6.4. CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGE IN COPTIC LEGAL FORMULAE 363
6.4.1. Enclitic conjunctions and pragmatic structures 363
6.4.2. The SCR formula and the use of prepositions 366
6.4.3. Summary 368
6.5: CONCLUSION 369

BIBLIOGRAPHY 372

APPENDIX A: CORPUS 399

APPENDIX B: COPTIC FORMULAE ATTESTATIONS 408

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Coptic texts in the corpus by provenience and genre 24
Table 2.1: Gender and number in Early Egyptian - √sn 59
Table 2.2. Comparison of Coptic constructions with switch-reference and coreference 86
Table 3.1: Sample of the categorisation of legal formulae (SUB Formula) 120
Table 4.1: Forms of the Coptic HYP formula in the corpus 126
Table 4.2: Opening of the Coptic HYP.6 and Greek formulae 152
Table 4.3: Forms of the Coptic AOW formula 155
Table 4.4: Dating of the Coptic AOW formulae 166
Table 4.5: Forms of the Coptic FRW formulae within the corpus 170
Table 4.6: Coordinated nouns in the Greek and Coptic FRW formula 'core' 206
Table 4.7: Correspondence of elements in the Greek and Coptic core 208
Table 4.8: Forms of the Coptic OTH formulae within the corpus 216
Table 4.9: Objects of the verb of swearing in the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae 236
Table 4.10: Structure of Greek and Coptic OTH formulae with non-finite verbal clause 240
Table 5.1: Forms of the Coptic SCR formulae within the corpus 250
Table 5.2: Determiners in the Greek and Coptic SCR formula 269
Table 5.3: Comparison of the statement of security in Greek and Coptic 270
Table 5.4: Comparison of the statement of composition in Greek and Coptic 272
Table 5.5: Forms of the Coptic KYR clause in the corpus 275
Table 5.6: Forms of the Coptic SUB formulae within the corpus 301
Table 5.7: Clauses of asking and writing in Greek and Coptic 320
Table 5.8: Subordinate clause of illiteracy in Greek and Coptic 322
Table 6.1: Geographic distribution of Coptic formulae in the study 329
Table 6.2: Diachronic points of contact for the Greek and Coptic formulae 332
Table 6.3: (= Table 4.2): Opening of the Coptic HYP.6 and Greek formulae 336
Table 6.4 (= Table 4.6): Correspondence of elements in the Greek and Coptic FRW 'core' 344
Table 6.5 (= Table 4.10): Greek and Coptic OTH formulae with non-finite verbal clause 346
Table 6.6 (= Table 5.3): Statement of security in Greek and Coptic SCR formula 347
Table 6.7 (= Table 5.4): Statement of composition in Greek and Coptic SCR formula 348
Table 6.8: Statement of asking and writing in the Greek and Coptic SUB formula 349
Table 6.9 (= Table 5.8): Subordinate clause of illiteracy in Greek and Coptic SUB formula 350
Table 6.10 (= Table 5.7): Clauses of asking and writing in Greek and Coptic 355
Table 6.11 (= Table 6.6): Statement of security in Greek and Coptic SCR formula 366

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I'd like to thank my supervisory team: Dr Malcolm Choat (Macquarie University) for his mentorship over the last three years of this thesis, Dr Jennifer Cromwell (Manchester Metropolitan University) whose comments and expertise were invaluable and who inspired my love of Coptic legal documents, and Dr Trevor Evans (Macquarie University) who first introduced me to the language of Greek papyri.

A big thank you to my husband, William Peralta (University of Edinburgh), not only for his continued love and support, but for his assistance with linguistic matters and with proofreading.

I would like to thank Dr Felicity Meakins, Dr Francesco Gardani, and Dr Martin Haspelmath for the training the provided in contact linguistics and typology as part of the 2017 COEDL Summer School, and the opportunity to discuss my work. Many thanks also to Dr Tonio Sebastian Richter, Dr Dylan Burns, Dr Frederick Kruger, and the whole team at the DDGLC project for allowing me to use their database in Berlin.

I could not have completed this Ph.D without the support of my friends and colleagues. In particular I would like to thank Dr Rachel Yuan-Collengridge, Dr Koorshi Dosoo, Dr Gareth Wearne, Dr Marie Legendre, Lauran Dundlar, Natalie Aiken, Richard Bott, Zachary Thomas, Matthew Wilkins, Emma Marshall, and Katie Shead for their assistance with various matters and for the helping me work through some of my ideas.

Thank you to all my friends and family for your support over the last three years. I could not have reached this point without you.

And finally, bu toil leam taing a thoirt dha na caraidean agam ann an Dùn Èideann airson an taic a thug iad dhomh anns na sia mìosan gu ruige seo.

Abbreviations

1 – 1st person
2 – 2nd person
3 – 3rd person
ABST – abstract nominal prefix
ACC – accusative
ACT – active
ADH – Adhortative (future III)
ADV – adverbialiser
AOR – Aorist
ATTR – attributive marker
CIRC – circumstantial convertor
CNJV – Conjunctive
CNJ – conjunction
DAT – dative
DEM.ADJ – demonstrative adjective
DEF – definite article
DEM.ART – demonstrative article
DEM.PRN – demonstrative pronoun
DIR.OBJ – direct object marker
DTC – deictic article
ENCL – enclitic conjunction (post-positive particle)
ERG - ergative
F – feminine
FNL – Finalis
FOC – focalising/second tense convertor
FUT – Future
GEN – genitive (Greek)
IMP – imperfect
IND – indicative
INDF – indefinite article
INDF.PRN – indefinite pronoun
IND.OBJ – indirect object marker
INDP – independent pronoun
INF – infinitive
INFL.INF – inflected infinitive
INTS.PRN – intensive pronoun (ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲉⲙⲙⲟ=)
LOC – locative
M – masculine
MID – middle voice
N – neuter
NEG – negative
NEG.EXT – negative existential predicate (ⲙⲛ-)
NEG.ADH – negative Adhortative (Future III)
NOM – nominative
NOML – nominaliser
PASS – passive
PERF – Perfect
PFRM – performative
PL – plural
POSS – possessive/genitive marker (Coptic)
POSS.ART – possessive article
POSS.PRN – possessive pronoun
PRIV – privative marker
PRS – Present
PTC – participle
QUAL – qualitative/stative
REL – relative convertor
REL.PRN – relative pronoun
REP – reported speech
SBJ.INV – subject inversion marker (ⲛⲥⲓ)
SG – singular
SUBJ – subjunctive

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since interest in Coptic legal papyri began in the mid-19th century, scholars have sought to identify its relationship to the wider context of law in Late Antique Egypt. First appearing towards the end of the 6th century, and reaching the height of production in the 7th and 8th centuries following the Islamic conquest of 641 CE, these documents emerged within a well-established legal framework which had functioned almost exclusively in Greek for several centuries. While research has shown that administrative legal practices remained relatively consistent in the early years following the Islamic conquest (see 1.2), the linguistic continuity between pre-conquest Greek and pre- and post-conquest Coptic texts requires further investigation. In particular, a large-scale comparative study of Greek and Coptic legal formulae has yet to be undertaken.

1.1. Aims

The present study draws upon theoretical frameworks from the fields of papyrology and contact linguistics to investigate legal and linguistic continuity in Greek and Coptic legal texts of the Byzantine and Early Islamic periods. Through a comparative study of legal formulae, it aims to examine the extent to which development of language use in Coptic legal texts was influenced by pre-existing Greek documents. Within the study, the following questions are addressed:

1. To what extent do Coptic legal formulae reflect the content and language of their Greek counterparts?
2. Do Coptic legal formulae exhibit any signs of contact-induced language change as a result of underlying Greek patterns?
3. What do these results reveal about the development of Coptic legal formulae within scribal contexts in Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt?

Central to the question of linguistic continuity in Greek and Coptic documents is the notion of contact-induced language change. However, the extent of contact-induced grammatical change in Egyptian is relatively understudied and highly debated (see Chapter 2). This is particularly true in the case of the Coptic of legal and administrative documents, which remain largely overlooked from a linguistic perspective in comparison to their literary counterparts.[1] As such, the present study also aims to provide non-literary evidence to aid ongoing discussions on contact-induced grammatical change in Egyptian.

1.2. Historical background: language use, language contact, and administration in Egypt

From the end of the 26th dynasty (525 BCE) to the beginning of the Islamic Period (641 CE), Egypt underwent a series of regime changes as a result of conquests by neighbouring empires. Each conquest instigated a new set of social and cultural transformations, as well as transformations to the economic and legal administration of the country. In particular, the new conquerors brought with them their own languages, which were established as prestigious languages of an elite ruling minority but which filtered down to the rest of Egyptian society with different levels of intensity. In order to understand the social and linguistic environment in which Coptic legal documents appeared, as well as the level and intensity of Greek language contact within the domain of law, it is necessary to provide an overview of these conquests and the social and administrative changes they instigated, beginning with the earliest settlements of Greeks in Egypt.

[1] Cromwell and Grossman, "Condition(al)s of Repayment: P. CLT 10 Reconsidered," 149; see also Richter, "Zur Sprache thebanischer Rechtsurkunden: Auffällige Konstruktionen im Bereich der Zweiten Tempora."

1.2.1. The Late Period: Early Greek settlements and Persian occupation

Extended contact between Greeks and Egyptians first began not as conquest, but rather as settlements of minority communities of Greeks under the Saite Pharaohs of the 26th Dynasty. In the 7th century BCE, during the reign of Psammetichos I, the first Greek colony was established at the port of Naukratis by Melisian traders.[2] The earliest Greek occupation of the site is dated by archaeological remains to at least 660 BCE.[3] Naukratis became a centre for seaborne trade, regulated by Egyptian officials and occupied by both Greek traders and the Egyptian inhabitants who maintained the local infrastructure.[4]

Almost contemporaneous with the establishment of Naukratis was the settlement of Ionian and Carian mercenaries by Psammetichos I in the coastal city of Pelusium. The pharaohs of the Late Period often relied on the strength of foreign mercenaries to assist in border protection and foreign

---

[2] For studies on Ancient Naukratis, see the British Museum project on the site and its extensive bibliography: https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/online_research_catalogues/ng/naukratis_greeks_in_egypt.aspx. See also Bergeron, "Pots and People: Greek Trade and Votive Rituals at Naucratis"; Thomas and Villing, "Naukratis Revisited 2012: Integrating New Fieldwork and Old Research"; Höckmann and Kreikenbom, *Naukratis*; Carrez-Maratray, "Le 'Monopole de Naucratis' et La 'Bataille de Péluse': Rupture ou continuité de la présence grecque en Égypte des Saïtes aux Perses"; Möller, *Naukratis*; Bowden, "The Greek Settlement and Santuaries at Naukratis: Herodotus and Archaeology"; Coulson, *Ancient Naukratis*; von Bissing, "Naukratis: Studies in the Age of the Greek and Egyptian Settlements at Naukratis"; Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*; von Bissing, "Forschungen zur Geschichte und kulturellen Bedeutung der griechischen Kolonie Naukratis in Ägypten"; von Bissing, "Naukratis"; Cook, "Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt"; Smith, *Naukratis*.

[3] Matthews and Roemer, 'Introduction: The Worlds of Ancient Egypt – Aspects, Sources, Interactions', 12; Petrie, 'The Egyptian Bases of Greek History', 273; Herodotus writes that Naukratis was given to Greek traders by Amasis II, who ruled from c. 570 – 526 (Histories 2.178.1), however it is possible that Herodotus simply associated this event with the wrong pharaoh. See Bowden, 'The Greek Settlement and Santuaries at Naukratis: Herodotus and Archaeology', 27; Cook, 'Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt', 233; von Bissing, 'Naukratis', 39–49.

[4] Bowden, 'The Greek Settlement and Santuaries at Naukratis: Herodotus and Archaeology', 36–37; Möller, *Naukratis*, 215.

campaigns, and similar settlements (not only of Greeks and Carians but also later of Jewish and Aramean garrisons) were formed in strategic positions across Egypt.[5] In the century following their initial settlement, Amasis II relocated these mercenaries to Memphis, where they formed two minority groups: the Hellenomemphites and the Caromemphites.[6] The settlement of mercenaries at this site was instrumental to the consolidation of Saite power in the Delta.[7]

This long-term yet restricted contact is thought to have had minimal impact on the Egyptian language as a whole. At most, such contact would have resulted in minor lexical transfers between the native Egyptian-speaking and newly settled Greek-speaking communities.[8] In the case of the Hellenomemphites and Caromemphites, evidence suggests that by the time of the conquest of Alexander, the Greek community in Memphis had adapted to the dominant Egyptian society: learning their language and customs while still preserving a separate identity.[9] Torallas Tovar suggests that, in the case of Naukratis, it was possible that a local 'pidgin' would have developed in order to facilitate communication between Greek and Egyptian merchants.[10] However, there is no written evidence to confirm this theory.

Following the defeat of the Egyptian army at Pelusium in 525 BCE, Egypt became a province of the Persian empire, interrupted only by a period of Egyptian independence in the middle of the 4th century BCE. With the new ruling elite came a new governing language, namely Aramaic.

---

[5] Spalinger, 'Psammetichus, King of Egypt'; Kaplan, 'Cross-Cultural Contacts among Mercenary Communities in Saite and Persian Egypt'.

[6] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 255; Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*; Cook, 'Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt'.

[7] Manning, *The Last Pharaohs*, 22; Spalinger, 'Psammetichus, King of Egypt', 137.

[8] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 254.

[9] Torallas Tovar, 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt', 19.

[10] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 255.

However, the use of Aramaic under Persian occupation was limited. Aramaic letters and legal documents were composed in Aramaic-speaking communities within Egypt, particularly in Elephantine but also in Hermopolis.[11] On the other hand, provincial administration continued to be carried out in Demotic under Egyptian scribes and officials, with Aramaic used primarily at the highest level of administration in the capital.[12] There is some evidence from this period of Aramaic loanwords entering into Demotic, particularly terms relating to the economy and the legal system.[13] Nevertheless, the linguistic impact of Aramaic on the Egyptian language was minimal.[14]

1.2.2. Alexander and the Ptolemies

In the initial years following the conquest of Egypt by the Macedonian king Alexander in the early 4th century BCE, administration remained fairly consistent with pre-conquest practices. While Greek supplanted Aramaic at the highest level of administration, the lower levels of administration continued to function in Demotic.[15] Egyptian officials in the initial phase of Macedonian rule occupied much the same position as they had under the Persians. Collaboration with the literate priesthood and associated scribal class was crucial for the establishment of legitimacy in new

---

[11] For the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, see Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*; Botta, *The Aramaic and Egyptian Legal Traditions at Elephantine*; Muffs, *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine*; Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*; *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 37ff; for the Hermopolis papyri, see Porten and Greenfield, *The Aramaic Papyri from Hermopolis*; Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 23ff.

[12] Clarysse, 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', 186.

[13] Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 41; Briant, *Histoire de l'Empire Perse*, 426; Azzoni and Lippert, "An Achaemenid Loanword in the Legal Code of Hermopolis: ʒbykrm"; Vittmann, "Semitisches Sprachgut im Demotischen."

[14] Manning, *The Last Pharaohs*, 151; Depauw, *The Demotic Letter*, 292; Ritner, 'Third Intermediate Period Antecedents of Demotic Legal Terminology'.

[15] Clarysse, 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', 186; Thompson, 'Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt', 70; Clarysse, 'The Use of Demotic in the Ptolemaic Administration', 79.

regimes and consequently the Ptolemies, as the Persians had done before them, relied on these scribes to maintain provincial administration.[16]

Nevertheless, the conquest of Alexander instigated a socio-linguistic shift within Egypt. From its initial position as a minority language of a particular social group, Greek was now the language of the ruling elite. The prestige associated with Greek was an early catalyst which led to the its spread among the lower levels of Egyptian administration. Evidence points to a sharp increase in the number of Egyptian scribes being trained in Greek from the reign of Ptolemy II onwards.[17] Thompson suggests that Greek may have been adopted autonomously by scribes and priests in order to maintain a prestigious position within the newly emerging administrative system under the Ptolemies.[18]

Changes to the Egyptian legal system also contributed to the spread of Greek into local administration as well as private law. One influential change, introduced in 146 BCE, was a requirement that all Demotic documents be registered in Greek in the *grapheion*.[19] The interpretation of this stipulation has been debated. One school of thought suggests that registration of documents in the *grapheion* was obligatory.[20] Other scholars propose that if it was not compulsory, it was at least a very common practice.[21] Lewis suggests that registration in the *grapheion* was not obligatory, but those documents which were registered may have had a higher

[16] Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 50.

[17] Thompson, 'Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt', 75.

[18] Thompson, "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt,"73–74.

[19] Thompson, "Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt," 82; Lewis, "The Demise of the Demotic Document," 279.

[20] Kramer, *CPR XVIII*, 25.

[21] Yiftach-Firanko, "Who Killed the Double Document in Ptolemaic Egypt?," 214–15; Boswinkel and Pestman, *Les archives privées de Dionysios, fils de Kephalas*, 177.

legal standing, and as such registration was more advantageous.[22] In any case, from 113 BCE until the end of the Ptolemaic period, virtually every document composed in Egypt had a note regarding registration in the *grapheion*.[23] Consequently, the demand for scribes who could write in Greek, as well as the advantages which Greek literacy conferred, would have increased.

The rise of Greek literacy and the production of Greek documents may also have been influenced by the court system. For Greek-speaking officials to judge a case, legal documents in Demotic required translation. Mairs notes that there are several references within papyri documenting court cases in which Demotic documents in Greek translation were produced as evidence.[24] Although few in number, there are also several examples of Demotic documents with corresponding Greek translations, such as P. BM. 262 from Roman Soknopaiou Nesos in the Fayum, as well as P. Choach. Survey 12 and 17 from late Ptolemaic Thebes, contained in the archive of the Theban choachytes.[25] Since it was necessary to create Greek translations of Egyptian legal documents for such official judicial purposes, this would have increased demand for scribes who were literate not only in Demotic, but also in Greek.

---

[22] Lewis, 'The Demise of the Demotic Document', 279.

[23] Yiftach-Firanko, 'Who Killed the Double Document in Ptolemaic Egypt?', 214.

[24] Mairs, "κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν: Demotic-Greek Translation in the Archive of the Theban Choachytes," 211 who cites the example of P.Tor. Choach. 12, Col. 5, 3-4 - "…he said that the house belonged to him, in accordance with copies of Egyptian contracts which he had deposited, translated into Greek" (φήσας εἶναι αὐτῶν τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ καθ' ἃ παρέκειτο ἀντίγραφα συγγραφῶν Αἰγυπτίων, διηρμηνευμένων δ' Ἑλληνιστί).

[25] For P. BM 262, see Schentuleit, "Satabus aus Soknopaiu Nesos: aus dem Leben eines Priesters am Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit"; Schentuleit, "Die spätdemotische Hausverkaufsurkunde P. BM 262: ein bilingues Dokument aus Soknopaiu Nesos mit griechischen Übersetzungen"; for P. Choach. Survey 12 and 17, see Mairs, "κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν: Demotic-Greek Translation in the Archive of the Theban Choachytes."

The spread of Greek and bilingualism among the population of Egypt was more pronounced in some areas than in others. Change took place more quickly in areas where new Greek populations were settled, particularly the Fayum, but also in the Herakleopolite and Oxyrhynchite nomes.[26] Torallas Tovar suggests that, in the Fayum, intermarriage between newly settled Greek and native Egyptian populations, as well as the accessibility of both Greek and Egyptian education, would have led to a situation in which very few monolingual speakers existed.[27] Conversely, areas away from these increasingly "Hellenised" sites, particularly in the south, were less affected by the Greek language. Evidence suggests that Thebes, which functioned more or less as a semi-autonomous district into the Ptolemaic period and which broke away from Ptolemaic rule for a period of twenty years, had much higher levels of monolingual speakers than the administrative centres in Lower Egypt.[28] However, the spread of bilingualism increased under new changes brought about by Roman rule.

1.2.3. Roman Period and the decline of Demotic documents

As was the case with previous conquests, the initial period under Roman rule did not have an immediate effect on the administration of Egypt. Latin, the language of the new conquerors, held only a peripheral position in Egyptian society: mainly employed for edicts concerning Roman magistrates or the Roman army, documents related to citizens within the *ius civile*, private correspondences between Roman citizens, and, particularly in the fourth century, a small number

[26] Manning, *The Last Pharaohs*, 139; Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 108–10; Torallas Tovar, 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt', 29.

[27] Torallas Tovar, 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt', 29.

[28] Torallas Tovar, "Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt," 30. On the Theban revolt, see Manning, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*, 164–71.

of legal papyri relating to court proceedings.[29] Bagnall estimates that only around one percent of papyri from the Roman period were written in Latin.[30] Egyptian administration continued to be undertaken in Greek and, progressively less, Demotic.

During the Roman occupation of Egypt, the number of documents produced in Demotic declined rapidly. Already at the beginning of the Roman period, Demotic had virtually disappeared from administrative practices.[31] Aside from the practices introduced in the Ptolemaic period, further changes to administration under Roman rule contributed to the decline and eventual disappearance of Demotic documents. The previously separate systems of Demotic notaries and Greek contract scribes were amalgamated under the jurisdiction of the *grapheion*, which assumed responsibility for both Greek and Demotic contracts.[32] All contracts, including those in Demotic, were required to have subscriptions in Greek written by the contracting parties – or an amanuensis/*hypographeus* (Greek: ὑπογραφεύς) for those who were illiterate – leading some scholars to suggest that it became more practical and convenient to write the entire contract in Greek.[33]

---

[29] Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 231; see also Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 543–623; Kaimio, "Latin in Roman Egypt," 27; Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und verwaltung Aegyptens unter roemischer Herrschaft*, 132–86.

[30] Bagnall, *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*, 22; see also Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 527.

[31] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 256; Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 237. See also Depauw, 'Autograph Confirmation in Demotic Contracts'; Lewis, 'The Demise of the Demotic Document'.

[32] Muhs in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 111.

[33] Clarysse, 'Bilingual Papyrological Archives', 71; Rowlandson, 'Administration and Law: Graeco-Roman', 248; Muhs, 'The Grapheion and the Disappearance of Demotic Contracts in Early Roman Tebtynis and Soknopaiu Nesos', 98.

Changes to the accessibility of Greek and Demotic education under Roman rule may also have contributed to the decline of Demotic. Demotic education was intrinsically linked to the temples, not only spatially but also in terms of the privileged class of priests and officials who were trained there.[34] During the Roman period, the institution of the Egyptian temple gradually weakened as a result of lack of financial support from the imperial government, the seizing of temple land by Augustus, and a decline in the construction of new temples.[35] As a result, Demotic became restricted almost entirely to religious contexts, and the opportunities for education in the Demotic script would have been limited.

Conversely, Greek education was more widely available. There is some papyrological evidence to suggest that Greek was taught alongside Demotic in the temples, for example, the large number of Greek, Demotic and bilingual ostraca found in educational contexts in the temple of Medinet Madi in the Fayum, dated to the first two centuries CE.[36] However, Greek education also took place in

[34] Maehler, 'Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten', 192; Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 22; Fewster, 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt', 226; Muhs, 'The Grapheion and the Disappearance of Demotic Contracts in Early Roman Tebtynis and Soknopaiu Nesos', 94.

[35] Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 267.

[36] Clarysse, "Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek," 187–88; For studies on the bilingual ostraca of Medinet Madi, see Rutherford, "Bilingualism in Roman Egypt? Exploring the Archive of Phatres of Narmuthis"; Menchetti and Pintaudi, "Ostraka Greci e Bilingui da Narmuthis (II)"; Menchetti and Pintaudi, "Ostraka Greci e Bilingui da Narmuthis"; Menchetti, *O. Narm. Dem. III*; Bresciani and Pintaudi, "Textes démotico-grecs et greco-démotiques des ostraca de Medinet Madi : un problème de bilinguisme"; for school exercises in the Medinet Madi ostraca, see Pintaudi and Sijpesteijn, "Ostraka di Contenuto Scolastico Provenienti da Narmuthis"; Pernigotti, "Qualche Osservazioni sugli Ostraka di Medinet Madi."

schools, in the gymnasium, and privately in the home.[37] Education in Greek schools was available not only to the Greek population, but also to Egyptians – both within major urban centres and within provincial villages.[38]

The end of the Roman period was characterised by the dominance of Greek in almost all written domains. Demotic continued to be used until the mid-5th century, the last recorded use being an inscription at Philae dated to 452 CE.[39] However, by this time it had become entirely restricted to the religious sphere, and consequently there was no longer any means by which Egyptians could write in their native language outside of the temple. Letters were required to be written in Greek, even if both parties required an interpreter.[40] This situation continued until the emergence of the Coptic writing system.

1.2.4. The Byzantine Period and the rise of Coptic

Early attempts at writing Egyptian in the Greek alphabet had already begun as early as the Ptolemaic period. One famous example, P. Heidelberg 414, displays a list of Egyptian words for tools and animals written with Greek letters accompanied by a Greek translation, most likely as an aide for Greek speakers in the pronunciation of native Egyptian terminology.[41] Other more

---

[37] Clarysse, 'Some Greeks in Egypt', 51; Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 100. See also Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 25–26; Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, 17–20; Maehler, 'Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten', 191–202.

[38] Torallas Tovar, 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt', 31; Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 259; Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, 20.

[39] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 77; Lewis, 'The Demise of the Demotic Document', 276.

[40] Depauw, *The Demotic Letter*, 299; Clarysse, 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', 201.

[41] Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the 'Language of the Hijra'," 411; for further examples of early experimentations using the Greek script to write Egyptian, see Quack, "How the Coptic Script Came About," 42–55.

extensive Egyptian texts written in the Greek alphabet, referred to as "Old Coptic" or "Proto-Coptic", were composed in the first few centuries CE.[42] Among these are astrological texts and horoscopes, magical texts, and texts related to the native polytheistic religious beliefs.[43]

The standardised alphabets of the various Coptic dialects emerged in the late 3rd to early 4th centuries CE.[44] Among the earliest Coptic texts from this period are letters related to private and business matters between individuals.[45] As noted by Clackson, many of these letters appear in bilingual or multilingual archives, and most originate from monastic contexts.[46] The oldest literary texts also appear at this time, consisting primarily of Coptic translations of Greek religious texts.[47] The close association with religious literature has led some scholars to believe that the Coptic script developed as a method to aid the spread of Christianity to the Egyptian-speaking community.[48] However, as outlined above, there were a number of factors which led to the

---

[42] Depuydt, "Coptic and Coptic Literature," 733; Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the 'Language of the Hijra'," 412; Clackson, "Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri," 76; on the distinction between "Old Coptic" and earlier attempts to render Egyptian in Greek letters, see Quack, "How the Coptic Script Came About," 55–57.

[43] For specific examples see Quack, 'How the Coptic Script Came About', 58–74; Love, *Code-Switching with the Gods*; Satzinger, 'An Old Coptic Text Reconsidered: PGM 94ff'; Satzinger, 'The Old Coptic Schmidt Papyrus'; Griffith, 'The Old Coptic Magical Texts of Paris'.

[44] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 84; Kasser, 'Alphabets, Coptic'.

[45] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 135. See also Richter, 'Coptic Letters'; Clackson, 'Papyrology and the Utilization of Coptic Sources', 23.

[46] Clackson, 'Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri', 89.

[47] Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the 'Language of the Hijra'," 405; On the history of Coptic literature, see Depuydt, "Coptic and Coptic Literature"; Emmel, "Coptic Literature in the Byzantine and Early Islamic World."

[48] Torallas Tovar, 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt', 35; Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 238; Quaegebeur, 'De La Préhistoire de l'écriture Copte', 132.

disappearance of the Demotic script as a vehicle for the Egyptian language, and it is more plausible that the development of a more or less standardised Coptic script arose to fill this absence.[49]

While Coptic of the 3rd and 4th centuries was employed for private communications and for literature, legal and administrative texts continued to be composed in Greek. It is not until the end of the Byzantine period that Coptic began to be used for such purposes. The earliest Coptic legal texts are dated to the late 6th century, composed in Aphrodito by the famed bilingual notary and poet Dioscorus.[50] From around 600 CE, Coptic became the main language in use for legal documents in western Thebes, a trend which continued well into the Islamic period.[51] However, legal texts in Coptic from the pre-conquest period are relatively rare, and Coptic administrative texts do not appear until the early 8th century. The majority of Coptic documents were not composed until after the Islamic conquest of 641 E.

Despite the appearance of Coptic within the domain of law and administration, Greek still appeared to maintain a more prestigious position. Coptic was limited to the language of private representation in epigraphy, law, and business, rather than matters involving the state.[52] For example, Clackson notes that within the Patermouthis archive from Aswan, the Coptic texts (dated to the late 6th century) relate to family affairs, while the Greek texts (which span from the late 5th

[49] On the various factors leading to the development of the Coptic script, see Quack, 'How the Coptic Script Came About'.

[50] For the early Coptic documents of Dioscorus, see Fournet, Richter, and Förster, "Une misthôsis copte d'Aphrodité (P.Lond. Inv. 2849)"; Fournet, "Sur les premiers documents juridiques coptes"; Bagnall and Worp, "Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito."

[51] On the use of Coptic in Western Thebes, see Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?'; Richter, 'Coptic Legal Documents, with Special Reference to the Theban Area', 132ff; Wilfong, 'Western Thebes in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries'.

[52] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 135.

to the early 7th centuries) pertain to external business matters.[53] The linguistic environment of Egypt became more complex following the Islamic conquest and the introduction of Arabic as the language of the ruling elite.

1.2.5. The Islamic conquest and the Early Islamic period

Administration in the years immediately following the Islamic conquest in 641 CE remained largely consistent with pre-conquest practices. Church officials and bishops continued to play a central role in the legal and economic administration of Egypt, with officials only replaced in the highest levels in the capital of Fusṭāṭ.[54] Greek remained the dominant language of administration and the legal system, attested in papyrological records until the end of the 8th century.[55] Coptic strengthened its emerging position as a language of law. The majority of Coptic legal texts were produced in the seventh and eighth centuries.[56]

Despite the apparent continuity of Egyptian administrative practices, the conquest had an immediate effect on the linguistic landscape of Egypt. Arabic, which was of both functional and symbolic importance to Islamic rule, was introduced alongside Greek and Coptic within several years of the conquest.[57] The earliest Arabic documents from Egypt were composed in 643: P. Berol.

---

[53] Clackson, 'Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri', 99.

[54] Sijpesteijn, 'New Rule over Old Structures: Egypt after the Muslim Conquest', 188. See also Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim Rule', 444; Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*; Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IVe au VIIIe siècle*; Papaconstantinou, ''What Remains behind': Hellenism and Romanitas in Christian Egypt after the Arab Conquest', 449.

[55] Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim Rule', 446; Sijpesteijn, 'Multilingual Archives and Documents in Post Conquest Egypt', 105.

[56] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 338.

[57] Sijpesteijn, 'Seals and Papyri from Early Islamic Egypt', 178–79; Sijpesteijn, 'Multilingual Archives and Documents in Post Conquest Egypt', 105; Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim

15002, a fragment of an Arabic demand note of unknown provenience, and SB VI 9576, a bilingual Greek/Arabic receipt written in Herakleopolis.[58] Furthermore, Greek papyri from the post-conquest period contained new terms and phrases influenced by Arabic idioms and expressions, as well as technical terms of non-Egyptian Byzantine origin.[59] As such, despite the relative continuity between pre- and post-conquest administrative practices, there is evidence that already in the Early Islamic period the effects of Arabic on the linguistic landscape of Egypt were visible.

A few centuries after the conquest, Arabic began to spread beyond the higher levels of administration. From the 8th century there is a noticeable increase in official and private documents written in Arabic. The 9th and 10th centuries saw the development of Sunni schools of law, in which authors from Egypt and the literature they produced in Arabic played a key role in codifying Islamic jurisprudence.[60] Both Greek and Coptic continued to be used down to the lowest levels of administration until at least the 8th century CE.[61] From the 10th century onwards, the Christian

---

Rule', 446. Arabic documents from the 7th century, however, remain rare; see Younes and Bruning 'Arabic Documents from the First Two Islamic Centuries' for a list of dated Arabic documents from the 7th to 9th centuries.

[58] Sijpesteijn, "The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim Rule," 446; see also Sijpesteijn, "Seals and Papyri from Early Islamic Egypt"; Sijpesteijn, "Multilingual Archives and Documents in Post Conquest Egypt," 106. On SB VI 9576, see Rāġib, "Un papyrus arabe de l'an 22 de l'hégire."

[59] Sijpesteijn, 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim Rule', 447; for further examples, see Worp, 'Town Quarters in Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Early Arab Egypt'; Gonis, 'Five Tax Receipts from Early Islamic Egypt'.

[60] On the importance of Egypt and Egyptian authors to the development of Islamic law, see El Shamsy, 'The First Shāfiī'; Brockopp, 'Early Islamic Jurisprudence in Egypt'.

[61] Sijpesteijn, 446. The latest Greek document currently known is CPR XXII 21, dated 796/7 CE: Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, xxvi. However, two Greek texts have recently been re-edited by Berkes which he dates to the 9th century - SPP III(2), dated to 812 CE, and CPR II 224, dated to 825 CE; see Berkes, 'The Latest Identified Greek Documentary Text from Egypt'. Richter also notes that there are rare examples of Coptic legal documents which can be dated from the 9th to the mid-11th centuries, such as the Teshlot archive, dated between 1022 and 1063: Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the 'Language of the Hijra'," 421 n. 94.

community in Egypt appears to have increasingly used Arabic for the composition of legal documents.[62] Coptic continued to be used in letter writing until the early 11th century, at which point Arabic was adopted as the language of the Christian community.[63]

There is no evidence of widespread trilingualism among scribes and notaries of the Islamic period. Only one text exists in which a single scribe writes in all three languages - CPR XII 17, written in 789-90 CE[64] – and as such the existence of Greek-Arabic or Greek-Coptic-Arabic training is uncertain.[65] However, unlike the long period of Greek rule which resulted in widespread bilingualism, the prestige and influence of Arabic resulted in the end of the production of new material in Coptic, and the disappearance of Coptic as an everyday spoken language. The latest Coptic literary texts were produced in the 14th century, although copying of texts continued after this point, and Coptic remains a liturgical language of the Coptic Orthodox church to this day.[66]

1.2.6. Conclusion

Throughout the history of regime change and language contact in Late Period and Late Antique Egypt, several patterns emerge. Administrative and linguistic changes arising from the conquest of Egypt by successive empires were initially limited to the highest levels of governance, while

---

[62] Richter, 'Greek, Coptic, and the "Language of the Hijra"', 421.

[63] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 80; Oréal, 'Contact linguistique'.

[64] Berkes and Younes, 'A Trilingual Scribe from Abbasid Egypt?'.

[65] Berkes and Younes, 'A Trilingual Scribe from Abbasid Egypt?', 99; Richter, 'Language choice in the Qurra papyri', 215; Clackson and Sijpesteijn, 'A Mid-Eighth-Century Trilingual Tax Demand to a Bawit Monk'.

[66] Richter, "Greek, Coptic, and the 'Language of the Hijra,'" 420; for the decline in Coptic, see in particular Ayad, "The Death of Coptic?" in which she discusses the inaccuracies in the use of the term "language death" to describe the decline of Coptic text production; see also Papaconstantinou, "Why Did Coptic Fail Where Aramaic Succeeded? Linguistic Developments in Egypt and the Near East after the Arab Conquest"; MacCoull, "The Sudden Death of Coptic Culture."

the lower levels of administration, particularly outside of the capital, maintained a certain level of continuity. Greek and Arabic were the only languages to spread to all levels of society, with Arabic leading to the decline and eventual disappearance of the Egyptian language outside of liturgical use.

Greek alone is unique in instituting a period of relatively widespread bilingualism. However, despite its highly visible impact on the Egyptian language, it is important to note that Greek exerted its pressure unevenly across different social classes, textual registers, and geographical regions. Consequently, the effect of Greek on the Egyptian language was not homogenous, but rather dependent on various external and internal factors. These points are vital in understanding the extent to which Greek may have affected language use in the domain of private law of the 6th to 8th centuries.

1.3. The Study

1.3.1. The corpus

The present study draws upon a corpus of 208 Coptic documents dated from the 6th to 8th centuries. The texts originate from several important sites across Egypt: Aphrodito, Elephantine/Aswan, the Fayum, the Hermopolite nome, and Thebes. In order to limit the corpus, texts were selected from a number of important publications and series which provide a valuable cross-section of published documents: the CPR series, O. Crum ST, O. Medin. Habu Copt., P.CLT, P. Hermitage Copt., P.KRU, P. Lond. IV and V, P. Mon. Apollo, P. Ryl. Copt., and SB Kopt. I-IV.[67] One further text,

[67] Of the volumes, only texts from CPR IV and XXXI met the criteria for the selection of material. For the criteria used to build the corpus, see below and 3.2.3.

P. Lond. inv. 2849 (British Library Pap. 2849)[68] which belongs to the archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodito, has also been included in this study since very few other Coptic papyri have been published from this archive (see below).

a) Dating

In order to limit the corpus, only Coptic documents dated between the 6th and 8th centuries are included. As stated previously, the majority of Coptic legal texts were composed in the 7th and 8th centuries (see 1.1.4), therefore this period provides adequate data for the study. Furthermore, discussions around Islamic law in the 9th and 10th centuries resulted in the development of Sunni law codes which affected the legal landscape of the Islamic empire and its provinces (see 1.1.5). With the decreasing amount of legal texts written in Coptic after the 8th century, and the increasing influence of Arabic and Islam on law in Egypt, this period is less relevant to observing linguistic relationships between Coptic legal texts and their Byzantine Greek counterparts.

The dates provided for the texts, outlined in Appendix A, are taken primarily from Trismegistos unless otherwise stated. For the texts of Djême in Thebes, many of the dates have been provided by Cromwell's recent publication of the dossier of Aristophanes son of Johannes, some of which challenge previous dates outlined on Trismegistos.[69] These updated dates have been indicated where relevant. Recent discussions on the Greek and Coptic texts of Aphrodito and their dates by Bagnall and Worp have also been utilised for dating the corpus.[70] Where other sources have been used to provide new dates not listed on Trismegistos, these have been indicated, both in the body of the study and in Appendix A.

[68] Fournet, Richter, and Förster, 'Une Misthôsis Copte d'Aphrodité (P.Lond. Inv. 2849)'.

[69] Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 37ff.

[70] Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito'.

Within the corpus, the earliest securely dated text is P. Lond. V 1709, written in Aphrodito between 566 and 568 CE. The latest text with an absolute date is P.KRU 99, written October 5, 790 CE. A further four texts are dated broadly from the 8th to the 9th centuries: P. Ryl. Copt. 128, P. Ryl. Copt. 196, SB Kopt. I 50 from the Hermopolite nome; and P.KRU 100 from Thebes. However, since the date range for these texts largely overlaps with the temporal parameters of the corpus, they have been included in this study. Many of the texts in the corpus have only a broad date, which in some cases spans up to two centuries. Furthermore, there is very little data available from the 6th and early 7th centuries in comparison to the wealth of material written later in the 7th and 8th centuries. This has important implications for the analysis of the results of this study (see 3.2.3).

b) Genre

The texts within the corpus belong to the domain of "private" law: that is, contracts written between individuals, as opposed to matters between the individual and the state, or court proceedings.[71] These texts can be further categorised into the following sub-genres based on their content and designation by the editor:

- Debts and loans
- Deliveries, orders, and payments
- Disputes and settlements
- Child donations and other donation certificates
- Leases and rents
- Sales documents
- Receipts
- Testaments
- Contracts related to work or sailing expeditions

[71] See also the use of the term 'private law' in Boud'hors, 'Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts', 427.

- Other; including securities, guarantees, sureties, marriage documents, and divorce documents.

c) Provenience

For the purposes of this study, the term "provenience" will be used to refer to the location in which the text was written, while the term "provenance" refers to its acquisition history. The provenience of texts in the corpus is largely taken from Trismegistos.[72] However, it should be noted that the location in which a text was written is not always clearly portrayed. For example, P.KRU 105 is listed on Trismegistos as found and written in "Memnoneia - Djême (Thebes west), Deir el-Bahari, Monastery of Apa Phoibammon".[73] However, this document details the donation of land for the monastery itself, and thus the inclusion of the monastery as the location in which the text was written is inaccurate. Similarly, while many of the monastic wills and child donation documents published in P.KRU are listed as found and written in both Djême and the monastery with which they are associated, it is unclear whether these were drawn up in the village or in the monastery itself. For these texts, Djême has been listed as the provenience.

As stated previously, the corpus comprises texts which were written in the following five locations:

The Fayum

As one of the original major Greek settlements in Egypt, the Fayum oasis is a major source of Greek papyri from the Roman and Later Roman periods. However, while a large collection of Coptic texts has been discovered at the oasis, many of the published examples are highly damaged

[72] www.trismegistos.org

[73] www.trismegistos.org/text/39659 (accessed April 27, 2019)

and therefore could not provide reliable data for the study.[74] Furthermore, as noted by Boud'hors, almost no Coptic documentary material appears in the Fayum before the mid-8th century.[75] As such, Fayumic documents mainly appear towards the latter end of the time period allowed for this corpus. Consequently, relatively few Coptic documents from the Fayum are used in this study, all published in CPR IV and SB Kopt. II. These texts are written in the Fayumic dialect, creating a point of cross-dialectical comparison for the study.

The Hermopolite Nome

The Hermopolite nome, like the Fayum Oasis, has provided a wealth of Greek documentary material due to its long history of Greek settlement. Coptic texts from this region were gathered from CPR IV, P. Ryl. Copt., and SB Kopt. I-II. Many of these texts are broadly attributed to the Hermopolite nome and lack a more precise provenience. However, several texts are known to have been written in Hermopolis. Furthermore, a small section of Coptic documents from this region contained within the corpus are related to the administration of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit, published in P. Mon. Apollo by Clackson and Delattre.

Aphrodito (Kom Ishqaw)

The village of Aphrodito in the Antaiopolite nome is famous for the 6th century bilingual archive of the poet and notary Dioscorus.[76] For the most part, the Coptic material of the Dioscorus archive

---

[74] On Coptic documents from the Fayum, see Boud'hors, 'Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts'; Boud'hors and Calament, 'Pour Une Étude Des Archives Coptes de Medinet El-Fayoum (P.Louvre E 10253, R 6893, E 6867 et E 7395)'.

[75] Boud'hors, 'Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts', 433.

[76] On the archive of Dioscorus (TM Arch id: 72), see Vanderheyden, 'Les lettres coptes des archives de Dioscore d'Aphroditê (VIe sièecle; Égypte)'; Vanderheyden, 'Les lettres coptes des archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité'; Fournet and Magdelaine, *Les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte*; van Minnen,

is unpublished. Furthermore, those texts which have been published, including some which have been edited in the last few decades, are highly fragmentary and were therefore unusable for the corpus. Consequently, only two Coptic documents from the archive of Dioscorus are included in this study: P. Lond. V 1709, a settlement dated between 566 and 568 CE, and P. Lond. inv. 2849, a lease dated to 580 CE. Neither of these texts were composed by Dioscorus himself. The remainder of the Coptic texts from Aphrodito were published in P. Lond. IV and dated to the 8th century. These documents are part of the Basilios archive, and form part of the dossier of the senior official Theodoros written to the *demosios logos* (ⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ).[77]

Thebes

Thebes is by far the best source for Coptic legal material. As such, almost 73% of the corpus comes from this region. This has important implications for the analysis of the results of this study (see 3.2.3). The material from the region comes from one of two contexts: either from a village context, written by scribes in Djême for members of the community, or from a monastic context, written in relation to matters concerning the surrounding monasteries such as those of Apa Paul, Apa Phoibammon, Saint Marcus, and Deir el-Rumi. Theban texts for this study were drawn from SB Kopt. II-IV, O. Medin. Habu Copt, P. CLT, and P.KRU (many of the latter being republished in SB Kopt. II).

Elephantine and Aswan

The island of Elephantine and the nearby site of Aswan (ancient Syene) are notable for their modest collection of documentary material spanning several periods of Egyptian history.

'Dioscorus and the Law'; Fournet, 'Du nouveau dans les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité'; MacCoull, *Dioscorus of Aphrodito*; MacCoull, 'The Coptic Archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodito'.

[77] On the Basilios archive (TM Arch id: 124) and the texts of Theodoros, see Richter, 'Language Choice in the Qurra Dossier'.

Discovered in this area are legal texts not only in Demotic, Greek, Coptic and Arabic, but also in Late Egyptian Hieratic, Aramaic, and Latin. In particular, of Aswan is home to an important

bilingual archive, that of Patermouthis son of Menas, spanning from c. 493-613.[78] The archive covers the legal matters of the family of Patermouthis over several generations, starting with Iakobos, the father-in-law of Patermouthis.

However, very few Coptic documents are attested in this region. While the Patermouthis archive contains many well-preserved Greek texts, only several Coptic texts appear within it, and these are highly fragmentary. As such, only one Coptic text from attributed to this archive appears in the corpus: O. Crum ST 96. The remainder of the Coptic legal material from Elephantine and Aswan consists of 15 ostraca, many of which are short debt instruments. [79] A number of these have been included in the study, published in SB Kopt. I and O. Crum ST.

d) Summary

Table 1.1. outlines the distribution of the corpus in terms of location and genre. A complete list of texts used in this study is shown in Appendix A, which includes their date, provenience, genre, and the scribe who wrote them.

[78] On the Patermouthis archive (TM Arch id: 37), see Dijkstra, 'New Light on the Patermouthis Archive from Excavations at Aswan When Archaeology and Papyrology Meet'; Clackson, 'Papyrology and the Utilization of Coptic Sources', 28–29; Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 389–98; Clackson, 'Four Coptic Papyri from the Patermouthis Archive in the British Library'; Farber, 'Family Financial Disputes in the Patermouthis Archive'; Husson, 'Houses in Syene in the Patermouthis Archive'; Farber and Porten, 'The Patermouthis Archive: A Third Look'; Bell, 'Syene Papyri in the British Museum', 160–74.

[79] On these ostraca, see Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 570–72; texts E4-E17, E19.

Table 1.1: Coptic texts in the corpus by provenience and genre

	Aphrodito	Elephantine and Aswan	Fayum	Hermopolite Nome	Thebes	***Total***
Debts/Loans	-	*7*	*4*	*10*	*25*	**46**
Delivery/Payment	*1*	-	*2*	*3*	*1*	**8**
Dispute/Settlement	*1*	-	-	-	*24*	**25**
Donation; Child	-	-	-	-	*24*	**24**
Donation; Other	-	-	-	-	*10*	**10**
Lease/Rent	*1*	-	*2*	*7*	*1*	**11**
Receipt	-	*1*	-	*9*	*5*	**15**
Sale	*1*	-	*1*	*2*	*33*	**38**
Testament	-	-	-	*1*	*11*	**12**
Workers/Sailors	*4*	-	*1*	*6*	*1*	**12**
Other	-	-	-	*5*	*6*	**11**
Total	**8**	**8**	**10**	**43**	**141**	**210**

1.3.2. Outline of the study

The present study draws upon theoretical frameworks not only from the field of juristic papyrology, but also from the field of contact linguistics. Chapter 2 presents the theoretical frameworks from contact linguistics used to inform the analysis of data in this study, as well as providing a linguistic background to the Egyptian and Greek languages, a discussion of their typological differences, and evidence for Greek contact-induced change in Coptic. The use of papyri for such a linguistic study presents unique challenges and methodological issues which are not encountered in the study of modern languages. These are discussed in Chapter 3, along with the current state of research on linguistic and legal continuity in Coptic documents, and an outline of the methods used to analyse and present the data in this study.

The data is outlined and analysed in Chapters 4 and 5. These chapters present a focused examination of particular Coptic legal formulae contained within the corpus, and a comparison of these formulae to their Greek counterparts. The formulae examined in this study are divided into two categories, based on their position within Coptic documents. Chapter 4 discusses formulae which commonly appear in the opening clauses of the document (although these may also be repeated in the closing statements). Chapter 5 presents Coptic formulae which appear in the closing of documents. Chapter 6 provides an overall synthesis and discussion of the findings of the data, and the significance of these results for our understanding of law and scribal practices in Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt.

1.3.3. Glossing and Terminology

The glossing used in this study follows the guidelines of the Leipzig Glossing Rules, developed by the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.[80] The abbreviations used are outlined at the beginning of this study. However, certain conventions and terminology should be drawn to attention:

Zero articles: The "zero article" in Coptic, discussed in more detail in 2.2.1, is indicated in the Coptic text by the symbol, and glossed as Z.ART.

Adhortative: The term "Adhortative" (ADH) is used as a method of glossing and referring to the Future III.

[80] https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf

Convertors: While the class of Coptic convertors are used to modify verbal and non-verbal clauses, rather than being part of the system of verbal conjugation themselves, for simplicities sake constructions such as the circumstantial conversion of a Present clause will be termed the "circumstantial Present", and so forth.

Enclitic conjunctions: The term "enclitic" conjunction is used to refer to Greek "particles" or "discourse markers".[81]

Infinitives: For the purposes of glossing, borrowed Greek verbs are treated like any other infinitive in Coptic, and are glossed as INF.

Possessive/genitive: In order to avoid confusion in cases of code-switching within legal formulae, the Coptic genitive/possessive marker is glossed as POSS, while the Greek genitive case is glossed as GEN.

[81] For a discussion of this terminology, see Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'.

Chapter 2: Egyptian and Greek from the perspective of contact linguistics

In order to examine the role of Greek on the development of language use in Coptic legal texts, it is necessary to investigate the presence or absence of contact-induced grammatical change. The notion that the grammatical systems of one language may be influenced by another is a relatively recent concept. In the latter half of the 20th century, research in the burgeoning field of contact linguistics yielded a number of theoretical models and frameworks describing the processes involved in contact-induced grammatical change, and the internal and external pressures which facilitate it. Over the last few decades, these concepts have been increasingly applied to the study of Greek-Egyptian contact.

The present chapter examines Greek-Egyptian language contact from the perspective of contact linguistics. Section 2.1 provides an overview of the history of contact linguistics, its theoretical frameworks, and its methodological issues. Section 2.2 presents a brief typological comparison of Egyptian and Greek, highlighting the differences between the two languages and areas in which these differences may result in contact-induced grammatical change. Section 2.3 discusses the current state of research on contact-induced grammatical change in Egyptian, focusing particularly on morphology, syntax, and discourse. By applying the theoretical frameworks outlined in this chapter to the study of Coptic legal documents, it is possible to gain a clearer understanding of the interplay of Greek and Egyptian outside of the literary register, as well as the processes behind the transmission of law and legal practices across two different linguistic systems.

2.1. Language contact and contact-induced grammatical change

Contact-induced change can be defined as the process through which linguistic material from a model language (M) is adopted into a replica language (R).[1] This is most commonly seen in the form of loanwords, or "lexical borrowing". The term "lexical borrowing" is itself uncontroversial, referring to the transfer of items of vocabulary from language (M) to language (R).[2] On the other hand, contact-induced grammatical change (also referred to as "grammatical borrowing", "structural borrowing", "grammatical interference", and a number of other terms discussed below) is much broader, covering all other aspects of language.

The notion that elements of a language other than vocabulary can be affected by language contact is relatively recent. Late 18th and early 19th scholarship was dominated by the theories of scholars such as Sapir, Meillet, Whitney, and Tesnière who suggested that the core structures of a language could not be affected by external factors.[3] Sapir, whose work is deemed to have been particularly influential within North American scholarship, identified two types of language elements – "superficial" elements which could be borrowed from one language into another (such as vocabulary), and a "deeper kernel" (morphology) which was resistant to both internal and external

[1] On the terms 'model language' and 'replica language', see Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, 2.

[2] Haspelmath, 'Lexical Borrowing', 36.

[3] Whitney, 'On Mixture in Language'; Sapir, *Language an Introduction to the Study of Speech*; Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*; Tesnière, 'Le mélange des langues'.

change, and therefore could not be borrowed.[4] This view continued to be upheld by prominent linguistics until the mid-20th century.[5]

The notion that grammatical structures could be influenced by contact with other languages began to gain popularity in the 1950s following the publication of Weinreich's seminal work *Languages in Contact* (1953). Weinreich, who is considered to have laid the foundations for the field of contact linguistics, was one of the first scholars to express the need to examine not only the role of linguistic factors in contact-induced change, but also external factors such as length and intensity of contact, degree of bilingualism, political ideology, prestige, and other socio-linguistic concerns.[6] In opposition to the prevailing view that core structures of language were resistant to external pressures, he stated that contact could result in the rearrangement of patterns and the transfer of "foreign" linguistic elements such as phonemic systems, morphology, and syntax.[7] Following on from the theories of Weinreich, scholarship over the last 60 years suggests that virtually any type of linguistic material can be transferred from one language to another.[8] The

---

[4] For a summary of Sapir's theoretical position, see his discussion of the now extinct Nicaraguan language Subtiaba in Sapir, 'The Hokan Affinity of Subtiaba in Nicaragua'; on the influence of Sapir in early contact linguistic scholarship, see Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 5; Darnell and Sherzer, 'Areal Linguistic Studies in North America', 26; Sapir, *Language an Introduction to the Study of Speech*, 217–18.

[5] See in particular Hymes, 'Na-Dene and Positional Analysis of Categories'; Hymes, 'Positional Analysis of Categories'; Hoijer, 'Linguistic and Cultural Change'; Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*.

[6] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, 83–110; for a discussion of the importance of the Weinreich to the field of contact linguistics, see Kim, 'Uriel Weinreich and the Birth of Modern Contact Linguistics'.

[7] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, 1.

[8] Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, 1; see, for example, Aikhenvald, *Language Contact in Amazonia*, 11–13; Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 149–50; Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 14.

result has been the development of a large number of models exploring contact-induced grammatical change, and the introduction of a vast amount of terminology to describe these changes.

2.1.1. Terminology

Within contact linguistic scholarship, there has been some inconsistency in the use of terminology. In *Languages in Contact*, Weinreich first introduced the concept of "interference" which he uses to refer to utterances of bilingual speakers where familiarity with the structures and patterns of one language affects the way the other is spoken.[9] Weinreich identified three types of interference: the transfer of morphemes from language (M) to language (R) (or "source language" and "recipient language" in his terminology), the replication of grammatical relations such as word order from (M) into (R), and the extension or reduction of the function of morphemes in (R) based on the functions of morphemes in (M) which are perceived to be similar.[10]

The term "interference" has also been employed by other scholars, with slightly different meanings. For example, Thomason uses the term to refer to "the importation of material and/or structures from one language into another language".[11] This broad definition is also followed by a number of other scholars.[12] More commonly, the term is used to refer to changes which occur in the speech patterns of bilinguals as they navigate two linguistic systems.[13] Rozencvejg uses "interference" to

[9] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, 1.

[10] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, 30–31.

[11] Thomason, *Language Contact*, 267; see also Thomason, 'Contact as a Source of Language Change'; Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*.

[12] Winford, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*; Tervoort, 'Bilingual Interference'; Lipski, 'Structural Linguistics and Bilingual Interference'.

[13] See for example Schmid, 'The Debate on Maturational Constraints in Bilingual Development'; Muysken, 'Language Contact Outcomes as the Result of Bilingual Optimization Strategies'; Mullen, 'Introduction: Multiple

refer to variation in bilingual speech patterns, and "convergence" to refer to the assimilation of features from one language into another in broader situations of language contact.[14]

The term "convergence" itself has a number of meanings within linguistic scholarship. It is commonly used to indicate situations in which two or more languages in contact become grammatically and structurally similar.[15] For example, in their study of multilingualism in the Indian village of Kupwar, Gumperz and Wilson suggested that the three languages spoken in the area – Kannada, Urdu and Marathi – had converged to the point of morpheme-by-morpheme intertranslatability, due to extended and intense contact.[16] However, this study has been criticised for its small data set (based on 10,000 words of text) and scant supporting evidence.[17] Conversely, Myers-Scotton uses the term "convergence" to describe a unidirectional process, in which the grammar of one language becomes similar to the grammar of another with which it is in contact.[18] Hock distinguishes between these two types of convergence, referring to them as "mutual convergence" and "unidirectional convergence" respectively.[19] These processes are also referred

---

Languages, Multiple Identities'; Evans, 'Complaints of the Natives in a Greek Dress: The Zenon Archive and the Problem of Egyptian Interference'; Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*; Tarallo and Myhill, 'Interference and Natural Language Processing in Second Language Acquisition'; Mackey, 'Bilingual Interference'; for arguments against the use of "interference" see Myers-Scotton, *Multiple Voices*, 210.

[14] Rozencvejg, *Linguistic Interference and Convergent Change*, 1–2.

[15] See for example Braunmüller and House, *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*, 4; Aikhenvald, *Language Contact in Amazonia*, 1; Silva-Corvalán, 'The Study of Language Contact: An Overview of the Issues', 8; McMahon, *Understanding Language Change*, 213; Salmons, 'Bilingual Discourse Marking', 454; Romaine, *Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 79; Gumperz and Wilson, 'Convergence and Creolization: A Case Study from the Aryan/Dravidian Border in India', 151.

[16] Gumperz and Wilson, 'Convergence and Creolization: A Case Study from the Aryan/Dravidian Border in India'.

[17] King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*, 45; Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 86–87.

[18] Myers-Scotton, *Contact Linguistics*, 172.

[19] Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, 492–93.

to as “diffusion” or “areal diffusion” by scholars such as Aikhenvald and Dixon, Campbell, and Hopkins.[20]

More recently, Matras and Sakel have distinguished between the replication of linguistic matter, which they term MAT borrowing, and the replication of patterns, termed PAT borrowing.[21] Specifically, MAT borrowing refers to the direct replication of the form and function of morphemes from (M) to (R), while PAT borrowing is defined as the replication of patterns of distribution, grammatical and semantic meaning, and syntactic arrangements at the level of word, phrase, clause, or discourse.[22] The terms MAT and PAT borrowing have also been adopted in recent discussions surrounding contact-induced change in Egyptian.[23] As Gardani et. al. note, this dichotomy has been discussed elsewhere in the literature using different terminology: MAT borrowing has been referred to variously as “borrowing”, “direct transfer”, “direct diffusion”, or “transfer of fabric”, while PAT borrowing is synonymous with the terms “replication”, “indirect transfer”, “indirect diffusion”, “loan-formation”, and “calque”.[24]

---

[20] Hopkins, ‘The Noun Classifiers of Cuchumatán Mayan Languages’; Campbell, ‘Areal Linguistics: A Closer Scrutiny’; Aikhenvald and Dixon, *Grammars in Contact*; Aikhenvald and Dixon, *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance*.

[21] Matras, *Language Contact*; Matras and Sakel, ‘Investigating the Mechanisms of Pattern Replication in Language Convergence’; Sakel, ‘Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern’; Sakel and Matras, *Database of Convergence and Borrowing*.

[22] Matras and Sakel, ‘Investigating the Mechanisms of Pattern Replication in Language Convergence’, 829–30; Sakel, ‘Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern’, 15–16.

[23] See for example Zakrzewska, ‘Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency’; Grossman and Polis, ‘Polysemy Networks in Language Contact. The Borrowing of the Greek-Origin Preposition κατά/ⲕⲁⲧⲁ in Coptic’.

[24] Gardani, Arkadiev, and Amiridze, ‘Borrowed Morphology: An Overview’, 3.

As the above discussion shows, the terminology used in the discussion of language contact and contact-induced change is highly varied. As such, it is necessary to outline how terminology will be used for the purposes of this study. Hereafter, discussions of contact-induced grammatical change will primarily follow the MAT/PAT distinction of Matras and Sakel. Terminology will subsequently be employed in the following manner:

MAT borrowing: The transfer of concrete phonological forms and their functions from one language to the other. In the context of this study, focus will be given to grammatical MAT borrowing: that is, the transfer of grammatical morphemes or morphological borrowing (see below).

PAT borrowing: The expression of structures in (R) based on patterns or features in (M) which are widespread, productive features of the grammatical system of (R). This can be further subdivided into **structural PAT borrowing**, which involves the copying of concrete structural patterns such as word order or periphrasis, and **functional PAT borrowing**, which involves the copying of more abstract patterns such as the meaning of particular words or phrases or the grammatical functions of morphemes.

Interference: Single, isolated incidences of variation in language (R) which copy structures in language (M). Unlike PAT borrowing, these variations are not fixed features of language (R), but instead arise in text/speech production of bilingual individuals as they navigate two linguistic systems.

Replication: In the context of Coptic legal formulae, the copying of the meaning of an underlying Greek formula, without directly modelling its precise semantic and structural patterns. As such, while the meaning and usage of the Coptic formula may be similar to the Greek, it exhibits no evidence of PAT borrowing or interference.

2.1.2. Types of contact-induced grammatical change

As stated previously, recent scholarship has suggested that almost all elements of a language are susceptible to external influence. The following discussion highlights some of the types and models of contact-induced grammatical change identified in the literature. These can be subdivided into three areas according to the terminology outlined above: morphological MAT borrowing, structural PAT borrowing, and functional PAT borrowing.

a) MAT: morphological borrowing

Since the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the borrowability of morphology has been one of the key areas of debate regarding contact-induced grammatical change. Early scholars such as Jackobson (1938), Meillet (1921), Müller (1862), and Sapir (1921) advocated a retentionist view which stated that inflectional morphology was resistant to borrowing.[25] Conversely, other scholars such as Schuchardt (1884), Trubetzkoy (1939), and Whitney (1881) took a diffusionist position which claimed that morphological borrowing was unrestricted.[26] Both positions were criticised by

[25] See for example Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*; Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*; Sapir, *Language an Introduction to the Study of Speech*; Jackobson, 'Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques des langues'.

[26] See for example Schuchardt, *Dem Herrn Franz von Miklosich zum 20. November 1883*, 9; Whitney, 'On Mixture in Language', 13–14; Trubetzkoy, 'Gedanken über das Indogermanenproblem', 82.

Weinreich in 1953, who noted that the borrowing of highly bound inflectional affixes was possible, but that these were rare in comparison to derivational affixes.[27]

The criticisms by Weinreich of the retentionist and diffusionist models led to subsequent research on scales, hierarchies, and frequencies of the borrowing of particular types of morphemes. For example, Moravcsik suggests inflectional morphology is only borrowed from (M) to (R) if derivational morphology has already been borrowed, and likewise unbound morphemes (or "free morphemes") are borrowed before bound morphemes.[28] Similarly, Thomason and Kaufman situate the borrowing of derivational morphology at level (3) of their model for intensity of contact, and inflectional morphology at (4).[29] More recently, scholars have demonstrated that the borrowing of inflectional morphemes is extremely rare, and is therefore one of the linguistic elements which is most resistant to borrowing.[30]

Nevertheless, that all types of morphology may be borrowed from one language to another is no longer disputed. This phenomenon has been demonstrated extensively within linguistic scholarship. For example, Gómez-Rendón notes a rare example of the borrowing of bound inflectional morphology in Imbabura Quichua, in which nouns are "double marked" for plurality with both the borrowed Spanish (Sp) plural marker *-s* and the native Quichua (Q) marker *-kuna*, as shown in (1).[31]

---

[27] Weinreich, *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, 31–33.

[28] Moravcsik, 'Universals of Language Contact', 112–13.

[29] Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 74–75.

[30] Gardani, 'Plural across Inflection and Derivation, Fusion and Agglutination', 72; Grant, 'Contact-Induced Change and the Openness of "Closed" Morphological Systems', 165; Thomason, *Language Contact*, 70–71; for a survey of cases of the borrowing of inflectional morphology, see Gardani, *Borrowing of Inflectional Morphemes in Language Contact*.

[31] Gómez-Rendón, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Imbabura Quichua (Ecuador)', 488.

(1)	riku-shka-ni	kimsa	alku-s-kuna
	see-PERF-1.SG	three	dog-(Sp)PL-(Q)PL

"I saw three dogs."[32]

However, not all such cases of the borrowing of inflectional morphology described in the literature can be termed as such. Gardani notes that certain cases of morphological transfers are better understood as instances of code-switching, since they represent temporary occurrences in individual bilingual speech production rather than fixed features of a wider linguistic system.[33] For example, he draws attention to the formation of plurals in the *Siarad corpus* of Welsh-English bilinguals, in which the English plural marker '(e)s' is attached to singular Welsh nouns in place of native Welsh plurals, demonstrated in (2).[34]

(2) Formation of Welsh plurals

(a) <u>Native Welsh singular</u>

blaidd
wolf

(b) <u>Native Welsh plural</u>

bleiddiaid
wolf.PL

(c) <u>*Siarad corpus* bilingual plural</u>

blaidd-s
wolf-PL

[32] From Gómez-Rendón, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Imbabura Quichua (Ecuador)', 488 example (14).

[33] Gardani, 'Plural across Inflection and Derivation, Fusion and Agglutination', 75, n. 6.

[34] Gardani, 'Plural across Inflection and Derivation, Fusion and Agglutination', 75.

In (2), the attachment of the English plural morpheme to the singular Welsh noun appears to be an instance of morphological borrowing. However, it is not productive across the whole language, only appearing in this single example, and is therefore an instance of code-switching, rather than MAT borrowing.[35]

While the borrowing of bound inflectional morphology is relatively rare, as indicated by the studies on borrowability hierarchies cited above, examples of the borrowing of bound derivational morphology is abundant. For example, Masliyah identifies the agentive suffix *-çi* as one of several derivational morphemes borrowed from Turkish into Iraqi Arabic.[36] The suffix appears in combination with a number of Arabic words, such as *balamçi* "boatman" from *balam* "boat" or *swālifçi* "story-teller" from *swālif* "story".[37] These contrast to similar words in Iraqi Arabic which employ the native morpheme *abu* "owner of" such as *abu-l-balam* "boatman" or *abu-l-swālif* "story-teller".[38] As noted by Matras, the suffix *-çi* first entered the language as part of Turkish loanwords (such as *aġšamçi* "a man who does the evening shift" from Turkish *akşam* "evening") before being applied to native Arabic vocabulary.[39]

However, scholars such as King and Lefebvre suggest that such examples of borrowed derivational morphology are better described as lexical borrowing.[40] For example, both King and McMahon cite the adoption of the Latinate nominal suffix '-able' into English, which initially entered the language through the borrowing of adjectives from Latin or French (such as *visible*), and which

[35] Gardani, 'Plural across Inflection and Derivation, Fusion and Agglutination', 75.

[36] Masliyah, 'Four Turkish Suffixes in Iraqi Arabic: -li, -lik, -siz and −çi', 295ff.

[37] Masliyah, 'Four Turkish Suffixes in Iraqi Arabic: -li, -lik, -siz and −çi', 298.

[38] Masliyah, 'Four Turkish Suffixes in Iraqi Arabic: -li, -lik, -siz and −çi', 299.

[39] Matras, *Language Contact*, 209.

[40] King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*; Lefebvre, 'Grammaires en contact: définition et perspectives de recherches'.

was then isolated and attached to other words of Romance origin (such as *legible*), and later to Germanic stems (such as *readable*).[41] However, while McMahon refers to this process as "morphological borrowing", King states that while the result is the addition of a new derivational affix to English, the process involved is "lexical".[42] As such, she believes that characterisation of such transfers as "morphological borrowing" is superficial.[43]

A less contentious type of morphological borrowing is the transfer of unbound morphemes from one language to another. This includes parts of speech such as subordinating and coordinating conjunctions, referred to in the literature as "function words" – lexical elements with grammatical functions detached from the main proposition of the clause.[44] These function words are among the earliest and most easily borrowed linguistics elements in situations of language contact.[45] The high instances of borrowing of these function words over bound morphemes is generally attributed to structural motivations. Since unbound morphemes have greater structural autonomy, they are less dependent on the surrounding environment which facilitates borrowing.[46] Consequently, as stated by Rießler, the transfer of these morphemes represents an intersection between lexical and grammatical borrowing.[47]

---

[41] King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*, 46–47; McMahon, *Understanding Language Change*, 210–11.

[42] King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*, 47.

[43] King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*, 47.

[44] Sakel, 'Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern', 20.

[45] Sakel, 'Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern', 24.

[46] Matras, 'Universals of Structural Borrowing', 208; see also Sakel, 'Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern', 26; Matras, 'Utterance Modifiers and Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 284; Campbell, 'On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 96–97.

[47] Rießler, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Kildin Saami', 240.

Numerous examples of the borrowing of function words are attested cross-linguistically. For example, in her study of contact between Kriol (an English-lexified Creole from northern-central Australia) and Jaminjung (a dialect cluster from the Mirndi language family), Schultze-Berndt notes that contact-induced grammatical change in Jaminjung is limited to the MAT borrowing of function words.[48] These include coordinating conjunctions originally borrowed into Kriol from English such as *en* (< Eng. "and"), *o* (< Eng. "or"), and *ani* (< Eng. "only"), and the causal subordinating conjunction *dumaji* (< Eng. "too much").[49] Similarly, the borrowing of such function words is the most easily observable case of grammatical MAT borrowing from Greek into Coptic (see below, 2.3.1).

The functional motivations for the borrowing of function words, and indeed of morphology in general, has been the subject of some speculation. A number of scholars suggest that the borrowed morphemes fill a grammatical gap in language (R): possessing a function which cannot be expressed through native morphology.[50] However, this theory has been disproven through numerous examples in which morphemes transferred into (R) are identical in function to native morphemes, or even appear alongside native morphology in rare cases of "double marking".[51]

---

[48] Schultze-Berndt, 'Recent Grammatical Borrowing into an Australian Aboriginal Language: The Case of Jaminjung and Kriol', 363.

[49] Schultze-Berndt, 'Recent Grammatical Borrowing into an Australian Aboriginal Language: The Case of Jaminjung and Kriol', 373–74.

[50] Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 128–30; Mithun, 'The Grammaticization of Coordination', 351–52; Heath, *Linguistic Diffusion in Arnhem Land*, 115–16; Karttunen, 'Uto-Aztecan and Spanish-Type Dependent Clauses in Nahuatl', 156; Vachek, 'On the Interplay of External and Internal Factors in the Development of Languages', 221–22; Hale, 'Gaps in Grammar and Culture', 300ff; Campbell, 'Syntactic Change in Pipil', 277–78.

[51] See for example the case of borrowed Kriol conjunctions cited above in Schultze-Berndt, 'Recent Grammatical Borrowing into an Australian Aboriginal Language: The Case of Jaminjung and Kriol', 373–74 in which some Kriol morphemes fill grammatical gaps in Jaminjung while others correspond to existing Jaminjung morphemes. On

b) Structural PAT borrowing

The examples of the borrowing of morphology outlined above represent instances of grammatical MAT borrowing, since both the function and the phonological form of the morphemes in question are transferred from (M) to (R). On the other hand, PAT borrowing, as stated above, involves the copying of grammatical structures and functions without any of the phonological material. As stated above (2.1.1), PAT borrowing can be divided into two general types: the copying of structural patterns, and the copying of functional patterns.

One of the most common areas affected by structural PAT borrowing is the domain of word order. For example, Matras notes that word order in possessive constructions is especially susceptible to contact-induced change.[52] Citing the work of Grenoble on the Tungusic language Evenki, he draws attention to a change in the order of constituents in possessive construction between "older" Evenki, and Evenki which has experienced contact with Russian, as demonstrated in (3a-c).[53]

(3) *Order of constituents in possessive constructions – "the deer of the old man"*[54]

a) <u>"Older" Evenki</u>

ətirkə:n	*orortin*
old_man	deer.PL.POSS.3.PL

'double marking' with borrowed and native morphology, see Gómez-Rendón, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Imbabura Quichua (Ecuador)', 488; Stolz and Stolz, 'Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika Spanisch-Amerindischer Sprachkontakt (Hispanoindiana II)'; Campbell, 'On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 96–97 which contravenes his earlier position that morphology was borrowed in order to fill grammatical gaps; see also Matras, 'Utterance Modifiers and Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 284; Brody, 'Particles Borrowed from Spanish as Discourse Markers in Mayan Languages', 508.

[52] Matras, *Language Contact*, 253.

[53] Matras, *Language Contact*, 253; Grenoble, 'Morphosyntactic Change: The Impact of Russian on Evenki', 108.

[54] After Grenoble, 'Morphosyntactic Change: The Impact of Russian on Evenki', 108.

b) Russian

olen-i	*starika*
deer-PL	old_man.GEN

c) Evenki in contact with Russian

orortin	*ətirkə:n*
deer.PL.POSS.3.PL	old_man

As shown in (3a), "older" Evenki follows the pattern of possessor + possessed. On the other hand, Evenki in contact with Russian shown in (3c) has reversed the order – possessed + possessor – which matches the pattern of Russian shown in (3b). Importantly, however, it is only the word order of the pattern which is similar to Russian, rather than the morphological structure. As demonstrated in (3b), possession in Russian is marked on the possessor "old man" through the use of the genitive form of the noun. On the other hand, in both "older" Evenki and Evenki in contact with Russian, possession is marked on the possessed noun, "deer". Both Grenoble and Matras argue that the change in word order in Evenki represents the replication of word order patterns from Russian, while the morphological structure of the language remains unaffected.[55]

Aside from changes in word order, structural replication may also introduce new grammatical/morphological constructions in language (R) based on patterns in language (M). This type of contact-induced grammatical change is often referred to as a "calque": a word-for-word or morpheme-for-morpheme translation of concepts or syntactic structures from one language into another.[56] However, this definition is problematic as the idea of a "direct translation" is subjective: that is, a word in Language A may be similar to a word in Language B, but not necessarily encode the same nuances or carry the same cultural connotations. More accurately, as noted by Meyerhoff,

[55] Matras, *Language Contact*, 253; Grenoble, 'Morphosyntactic Change: The Impact of Russian on Evenki', 108–9.

[56] Meyerhoff, 'Replication, Transfer, and Calquing', 298.

rather than a direct translation, a calque is a replication of patterns from language (M) drawing upon native lexicon from language (R) within similar semantic fields.[57]

For example, Hildebrandt notes that in Manange, a Western Bodish language from Nepal, the causal linker *ta pi-na* ("what say-ADV"), shown in (4), is a structural calque of the Nepali *kina bhane* ("why say").[58]

(4)

ŋʌ=tse	*kristin=ri*	*taŋ*	*pin-tsi*	*ta*	*pi-nʌ*
1.SG=ERG	Kristine=LOC	gift	give-PERF	what	say-ADV

nese	*kʰi*	*manaŋ=ri*	*jʌ-pʌ-ro*
tomorrow	3.SG	Manang=LOC	go-NOML-REP

"I gave Kristine a gift because (it is said) she will go to Manang tomorrow."[59]

While the Manage *ta* "what" is not exactly identical in meaning to Nepali *kina* "why", there is sufficient semantic similarity between the two for *ta* to be employed in the replica structure. The calquing of such constructions is common cross-linguistically, and there is some evidence of this process occurring in Coptic (see 2.3.2).

c) Functional PAT borrowing

The cases of structural PAT borrowing outlined above involve the copying of concrete grammatical structures and forms from (M) using lexical and morphological material from (R). Conversely, functional PAT borrowing refers to the reanalysis and redistribution of material from (R) based on the meaning or function of similar material in (M). For example, in her 1999 study of Hungarian/English contact in the US, Bolonyai notes an example of shifting patterns of usage

[57] Meyerhoff, 'Replication, Transfer, and Calquing', 299.

[58] Hildebrandt, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Manange', 293.

[59] From Hildebrandt, 'Grammatical Borrowing in Manange', 293.

in Hungarian verbs of knowing in bilingual speakers.[60] Hungarian, like many other languages, distinguishes between two verbs of knowing – *tud*, "to know a fact", and *ismer*, "to know a person/animate". However, among the participants in the study is a bilingual child who uses *tud* to express both meanings.[61] Both Boloynai and Myers-Scotton attribute this phenomenon to the copying of patterns from English, which is the socially dominant language within the community.[62] However, as with the case of Welsh-English bilinguals cited above, this does not appear to be a stable feature of US Hungarian, but rather a single instance of interference within the speech production of a Hungarian-English bilingual.

Functional PAT borrowing does not necessarily always involve the direct copying of semantic patterns. The term can also be applied to the process by which the grammatical function of existing structures in a language undergo reanalysis and redistribution under the influence of a source language. According to Matras, who refers to Harris and Campbell's theory of "reanalysis" and "extension", this process is a language-internal change which is triggered by the pressure on speakers to navigate two different sentence-structuring systems, causing the convergence of grammatical structures and patterns without the transfer of lexical or morphological material.[63]

One of the most widely attested cross-linguistic examples of the redistribution of grammatical functions in situations of contact is the simplification of noun cases. As Meakins notes, peripheral

---

[60] Bolonyai, 'The Hidden Dimensions of Language Contact: The Case of Hungarian-English Bilingual Children', 100; see also Myers-Scotton, *Multiple Voices*, 272.

[61] Bolonyai, 'The Hidden Dimensions of Language Contact: The Case of Hungarian-English Bilingual Children', 100.

[62] Myers-Scotton, *Multiple Voices*, 272; Bolonyai, 'The Hidden Dimensions of Language Contact: The Case of Hungarian-English Bilingual Children', 100.

[63] Matras, 'Layers of Convergent Syntax in Macedonian Turkish', 63; compare the use of terminology in Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*.

case markers – that is cases which do not form the main arguments of verbs, such as the genitive, locative or instrumental – are susceptible to both externally and internally motivated changes.[64] For example, Basque traditionally has separate comitative and instrumental case endings. However, under the influence of Spanish in which both of these functions are expressed by the preposition '*con*', the Basque comitative suffix has extended its use to functions previously expressed through the instrumental case.[65] As such, it is not concrete phonological forms or structural patterns which have been influenced by contact, but rather functional domains of existing linguistic material.

2.1.3. Constraints on contact-induced grammatical change

While the examples of contact-induced grammatical change provided above demonstrates that almost all grammatical categories are susceptible to borrowing, scholars have theorised that certain dynamics affect the degree to which these elements may be borrowed in individual cases. The factors which restrict or facilitate grammatical borrowing can be divided roughly into two categories: external factors, such as socio-cultural motivations or the type and extent of contact, or internal factors, such as typology and grammatical structures or the mental processes involved in navigating two grammatical systems.

The nature and intensity of contact situations is one of the most widely cited external pressures which determine the type and extent of grammatical borrowing. For example, Grimstad, Lohndal, and Åfarli note three types of socio-linguistic situations in which languages come into contact: Balanced Bilingual Mixing (BBM), Colonial Influx Mixing (CIM), and Immigrant Community Mixing (ICM).[66] Of particular relevance to the question of Greek-Egyptian language contact is the

---

[64] Meakins, 'From Absolutely Optional to Only Nominally Ergative: The Life Cycle of the Gurindji Ergative Suffix', 191.

[65] Meakins, 'From Absolutely Optional to Only Nominally Ergative: The Life Cycle of the Gurindji Ergative Suffix', 191–92; Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, 149–50.

[66] Grimstad, Lohndal, and Åfarli, 'Language Mixing and Exoskeletal Theory', 214.

CIM model, in which the language of a powerful minority influences the language of a conquered/colonised majority through its prestige and dominance in certain functional domains.[67] Scholars note that situations of CIM lead to long periods of stable bilingualism, under which the more socially dominant minority language has a visible effect on the native majority language.[68] This situation can be observed in the case of Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine rule over Egypt (see 1.2).

The perceived dominance and prestige of a donor language is viewed by some scholars as one of the main factors influencing contact-induced grammatical change. For example, Thomason and Kaufman outline a five-point scale of "intensity of contact" which they believe affects the type and extent of contact-induced change, ranging from "casual contact" to "very strong cultural pressure".[69] Under this model, they suggest that it is only towards the end of the scale, in which a high amount of pressure is exerted by a culturally and politically dominant language, that language contact results in grammatical change. At point (4), "strong cultural pressure", they identify only minimal structural change which does not affect the typology of the receiving language, while at point (5), "very strong cultural pressure", it is suggested that more widespread grammatical borrowing occurs which causes major typological shift (see below).[70]

The social and cultural imbalance between languages in contact is also at the heart of Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis. In this model, Myers-Scotton identifies that two languages in contact are of unequal relationship, which she labels as the "Matrix Language" and

[67] Grimstad, Lohndal, and Åfarli, 'Language Mixing and Exoskeletal Theory', 214–15.

[68] Sankoff, 'The Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact', 642.

[69] Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 74–76; see also Haspelmath, 'Loanword Typology: Steps toward a Systematic Cross-Linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowability', 52–53.

[70] Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 75.

the "Embedded Language".[71] In instances of code-switching within the speech of bilinguals, the Matrix Language is said to provide the grammatical framework of the utterance, while the Embedded Language provides content morphemes (such as nouns and verbs) which are inserted into speech.[72] For example, Myers-Scotten cites an example of a speaker of Pennsylvania German who employs the verb *habe* "have" as an auxiliary for verbs of motion and states for which German requires *sei* "be", shown in (5a-b), which she suggests is based on patterns in English.[73]

(5) *Standard German vs. bilingual English/Pennsylvania German speaker*

(a) Standard German

wir	*sind*	*da*	*auf-ge-wachsen*
1.PL	be.PL	there	up-PTC-grow

(b) Pennsylvania German

mer	*hab-e*	*da*	*auf-ge-wachsen*
1.PL	have-1.PL	there	up-PTC-grow

"We grew up there."

In example (5b), the Matrix Language is English, which provides the lexical structure, and the Embedded Language is German, which provides the lexical content.[74] It should be noted, however, that the Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis is used in reference to bilingual speech production. As such, while the model may be applied to describe the processes through which variation arises which leads to wide-spread change in linguistic systems, the example cited in (5b) is one of code-switching.

[71] Myers-Scotton, 'Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis', 291–92.

[72] Myers-Scotton, 'Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis', 291–92.

[73] Myers-Scotton, 'Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis', 292.

[74] Myers-Scotton, 'Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis', 292.

Aside from the external social and cultural pressures which motivate contact-induced grammatical change, a number of theories exist which describe possible structural factors which facilitate such processes. The most widely cited of such models is the "structural-compatibility requirement" theory. This label has been applied by Harris and Campbell to encompass a number of models described by linguists since the early 20th century.[75] The earliest appears in Meillet's *Le problème de la parenté des langues*, first published in 1914, in which he states that structural/grammatical borrowing can only occur between similar systems, such as those contained in different dialects of the same language.[76] Several decades later, in 1938, the idea of "structural-compatibility" was applied with reference to phonology by Jakobson, who suggested that a target language cannot borrow "foreign" elements unless they correspond to structures already prevalent in the language.[77]

The structural-compatibility requirement theory has been expanded upon and investigated by a number of linguists. For example, Aikhenvald cites a study by Storch on contact-induced change in Western Nilotic languages in which the borrowing of nominal prefixes from Karamojong into Labwor is observed.[78] Aikhenvald suggests that this process was facilitated by a pre-existing prefixal slot in Labwor into which the borrowed prefixes could be easily inserted.[79] Richter makes a similar case for Greek-Egyptian contact, noting that while Greek function words were

---

[75] Campbell, 'On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 91–93; Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 123–25.

[76] Meillet, *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 84, 87.

[77] Jackobson, 'Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques des langues', 54.

[78] Aikhenvald, 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', 32; Storch, 'How Long Do Linguistic Areas Last? Western Nilotic Grammars in Contact', 104–6.

[79] Aikhenvald, 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', 32.

susceptible to borrowing, this only applied to function words which did not work counter to the pre-existing grammatical structure of Egyptian.[80]

One of the main arguments against the structural-compatibility model is that it fails to account for cases in which the borrowing of lexical or grammatical elements has resulted in typological shift or grammatical restructuring of the target language. For example, Campbell notes a typological shift in the expression of prepositional relationships in Pipil, an Uto-Aztecean language from El Salvador, through contact with Spanish.[81] Pipil possesses no prepositions/postpositions; rather, the function is filled by means of "relational nouns", such as *–(i)hpak* – "on/upon" (literally "its-on/'its-upon"), which are used in constructions such as that demonstrated in (6a). However, these underwent reanalysis and grammaticalisation, losing their nominal status and functioning in the same way as Spanish prepositions (that is, PREP + NOUN), as demonstrated in (6b).[82]

(6) *Typological shift in Pipil: relational noun > prepositions*

(a) <u>Pipil sentence with relational noun</u>

i-hpak	*ne*	*me:sa*
POSS.3.SG-on	DEF.ART	table

"On the table." (lit. 'its-on the table)

(b) <u>Pipil sentence with preposition</u>

pak	*ne*	*me:sa*
on	DEF.ART	table

"On the table."

[80] Richter, 'Greek, Coptic, and the "Language of the Hijra"', 408.

[81] Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 126; Campbell, 'Syntactic Change in Pipil', 268–72.

[82] Campbell, 'Syntactic Change in Pipil', 268–72.

Harris and Campbell posit that this typological shift (no prepositions > prepositions) is the direct result of extended contact with Spanish.[83] Other such cases of contact-induced typological change are well attested within the literature.[84] As such, the structural-compatibility model does not hold true. More accurately, as noted by Aikhenvald, this theory describes only a *tendency* of language – it is more accurate to say that languages are *more likely* to borrow grammatical elements which are structurally similar to their own.[85]

A further model which focuses on linguistic constraints on language change, but which is also compatible with the notion of contact-induced typological shift, is the "contact-induced grammaticalisation" theory of Heine and Kuteva.[86] In this model, they identify two methods through which patterns from language (M) are borrowed into a language (R), which they term "original grammaticalisation", described in (7), and "replica grammaticalisation", described in (8).

(7) *Original grammaticalisation*[87]

a) Speakers of language (R) notice a particular pattern in language (M) (pattern Mx).
b) Speakers of language (R) replicate pattern Mx, creating an equivalent pattern (= Rx) by adapting material from language (R) (= Ry).

---

[83] Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 126; Campbell, 'Syntactic Change in Pipil', 271.

[84] See for example Farrar, 'Some Constraints on the Borrowability of Syntactic Features (and Why None of Them Work)', 92; Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 124; Campbell, 'On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing', 92.

[85] Aikhenvald, 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', 20, nn. 9; 32; see also Haig, 'Linguistic Diffusion in Present-Day Anatolia: From Top to Bottom', 210–17; Curnow, 'What Language Features Can Be "Borrowed"?', 424; Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 123–27.

[86] Heine and Kuteva, 'On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization'.

[87] Heine and Kuteva, 'On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization', 533.

c) The process of Ry > Rx follows universal patterns of grammaticalisation.

d) Ry becomes grammaticalised to Rx.

(8) *Replica grammaticalisation*[88]

a) Speakers of language (R) notice a particular pattern in language (M) (= Mx).

b) Speakers of language (R) replicate pattern Mx, creating an equivalent pattern (= Rx) by adapting material from language (R) (= Ry).

c) The speakers of (R) assume the process My > Mx from available evidence. As such, they use equivalent material from language (R) in order to replicate the process of change; that is, My = Ry. Thus My > Mx = Ry > Rx.

d) Ry becomes grammaticalised to Rx.

The main difference between original and replica grammaticalisation lies in c): in (7c) there is no model for the process of grammaticalisation x > y in language (M), while in (8c), there is a clear process My > Mx which is used as a model for the process Ry > Rx. The application of the original grammaticalisation model to documented language change is shown in (9) in reference to study of Campbell on Pipil discussed above.[89]

(9) *Original grammaticalisation – relational nouns > prepositions in Pipil*[90]

a) Speakers of Pipil (R) observe the use of prepositions in Spanish (Mx).

b) Speakers of Pipil adapt the class of relational nouns (Ry) to form a class of prepositions similar to those found in Spanish (Rx).

[88] Heine and Kuteva, 'On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization', 539.

[89] Campbell, 'Syntactic Change in Pipil', 268–72.

[90] Heine and Kuteva, 'On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization', 535.

c) This process follows known cross-linguistic patterns of the grammaticalisation of relational nouns to adpositions in languages.[91]

d) The Pipil class of relational nouns become fully grammaticalised as prepositions.

As (9) demonstrates, where the structural-compatibility model does not account for contact-induced typological shift, the grammaticalisation theory of Heine and Kuteva allows for such a shift by assuming that the target language replicates a similar shift, either assumed or observed, in the model language.

Nevertheless, there are inherent problems within the grammaticalisation model. One issue, raised by Heine and Kuteva themselves in outlining their model is the extent to which contact-induced change can be accurately distinguished from language-internal developments.[92] If cross-linguistic typology shows that certain changes occur regularly across a number of languages, then it is possible that the shift from Ry > Rx is a natural, language-internal development, rather than an attempt to replicate Mx. As such, there is ambiguity as to whether such changes are contact-induced or internally motivated.

2.1.4. Contact-induced vs. language internal-change

The dichotomy between contact-induced and language-internal change has formed a key part of discussions surrounding language contact. In the first half of the 20th century, the North American school of contact linguistics was famously dominated by the Boas-Sapir controversy, which focused on "genetic" (that is, from the same language family) versus contact-induced similarities between languages.[93] Boas suggested that, at a certain time depth, it was impossible to distinguish

[91] See Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer, *Grammaticalization*.

[92] Heine and Kuteva, 'On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization', 532.

[93] For a summary of the Boas-Sapir controversy, see Thomason and Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, 5; Darnell and Sherzer, 'Areal Linguistic Studies in North America', 25.

similarities in languages which were contact-induced from those that were a result of genetic relationship.[94] Conversely, Sapir believed it was possible to identify "superficial" elements of a language which were a result of contact, and a deeper "morphological kernel" which revealed its genetic origins and was resistant to contact-induced change (see above).[95]

Since the Boas-Sapir debate, no satisfactory methodological approaches have been developed which can accurately distinguish between the contact-induced and language internal change.[96] This issue has been repeatedly raised in contact linguistic scholarship. For example, in her study of Slovene/English contact in North America, Šabec notes the simplification and loss of case endings and agreement markers in the Slovene of bilingual speakers.[97] Šabec suggests two possible explanations for this development. On one hand is the influence of English morphology, which lacks case marking: on the other is the universal tendency for the simplification of morphology over time, which is attested cross-linguistically independent of situations of language contact.[98] However, in the absence of a reliable model with which to determine the origin of language change, Šabec is unable to give preference to either interpretation.

Furthermore, the dichotomy between contact-induced and language-internal change is increasingly being viewed as too rigid. Rather, recent research has proposed a multi-causal

---

[94] Boas, 'The Classification of American Languages', 215–16; 255; see also Darnell and Sherzer, 'Areal Linguistic Studies in North America', 25.

[95] Sapir, 'The Hokan Affinity of Subtiaba in Nicaragua', 491; see also Darnell and Sherzer, 'Areal Linguistic Studies in North America', 26.

[96] See the discussion in Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change: Internal Factors*, 1-3.

[97] Šabec, 'Language Change in a Contact Situation', 37–38.

[98] Šabec, 'Language Change in a Contact Situation', 38.

approach, in which both external and internal factors play a role in language change.[99] Similarly, certain linguistic changes may be language internal but the speed and direction of the change may be influenced by contact with another language.[100] One such example is the case of the so-called "be-perfect" in Irish-English, as discussed by Filpulla.[101] In Irish-English, it is common for speakers to use a form of the verb "be" as an auxiliary in cases where British English would use "have", as demonstrated in (10a). Filppula notes that this mirrors the perfect construction in Irish, as shown in (10b), which possess no equivalent of the verb "have".[102] On the other hand, the use of "be" as an auxiliary is part of the linguistic repertoire of English, and is used in early-modern English as an auxiliary in environments where modern English uses "have", as demonstrated in (10c).

(10) *A comparison of perfect constructions using 'be' and 'have' as auxiliaries*

a) <u>Irish-English</u>

I	know	they're	gone	mad	here
1.SG	know	3.PL_be.PRS.3.SG	go.PTC.PAST	mad	here

in	motorcar-s.
in	motorcar-PL

"I know they're gone mad here in motorcars."[103]

---

[99] Chamoreau and Goury, *Contact de langues et changement linguistique*; Chamoreau, Fernández, and Lastra, 'Introduction', 4–5; Chamoreau, 'On the Development of Analytic Constructions in Purepecha', 83–85; Aikhenvald, 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', 9; Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, 11; Kriegel, *Grammaticalisation et réanalyse*; Peyraube, 'L'évolution des structures grammaticales'; Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 50.

[100] Bowern, 'Relatedness as a Factor in Language Contact', 422; Haeberli, 'Syntactic Effects of Inflectional Morphology and Competing Grammars', 119; see also Trudgill, *Sociolinguistic Typology*.

[101] Filppula, 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited', 166ff.

[102] Filppula, 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited', 166.

[103] Filppula, *The Grammar of Irish English*, 116.

b) Irish

Tá	sé	imithe
be.PRS	3.M.SG	go.PTC.PAST

"They have gone."[104]

c) Early-modern English

This	day	letter-s	are	come
DEM.SG	day	letter-PL	be.PRS.3.SG	come.PTC.PAST

"This day, letters are come." (Diary of Samuel Pepys, c. 1666-1667)[105]

Filppula argues that the presence of the "be-perfect" in Irish-English is influenced by both internal and external factors. On one hand, it is a language-internal development, inherited from a period when Irish-English diverged from British-English and retained the use of the auxiliary 'be' in particular environments.[106] On the other hand, Filpulla suggests the retention of the "be-perfect" in Irish-English is facilitated by close contact with Irish in which this structure is the norm.[107] As such, the development of this particular grammatical feature cannot be attributed to one single cause.

2.1.5. Contact linguistics: a summary

In the last 60 years, in the wake of the influential work of Weinreich, scholars have made important progress in the study of contact linguistics. As the above discussion shows, virtually all aspects of language may be affected by contact situations. These changes may take the form of borrowing of

[104] From Ó Sé, 'The Perfect in Modern English', 46.

[105] From Filppula, 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited', 167.

[106] Filppula, 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited', 167.

[107] Filppula, 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited', 167; Filppula, *The Grammar of Irish English*, 119–20; see also Aikhenvald, 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective', 9.

linguistic matter (MAT) or the copying of grammatical or functional patterns (PAT). However, these changes are not unrestricted: rather, they are facilitated or hindered by both external and internal pressures. As such, it is necessary to consider both linguistic factors, as well as historical and social factors, when examining particular cases of language contact.

Furthermore, it is vital to recognise the difficulty in attempting to distinguish between language-internal and contact-induced changes. As of yet, no satisfactory models have been developed within the field of contact linguistics which can address this issue. However, to attribute a linguistic feature to either language-internal developments or contact-induced change is too narrow a perspective. Rather, a multi-causal approach should be taken in which multiple internal and external factors can be seen to work together to influence change. Similarly, it is important to consider the indirect role of language contact in language change, in which particular language-internal developments may be facilitated or accelerated by language contact. The study of Greek-Egyptian language contact has greatly benefited from the application of these considerations and frameworks, as demonstrated in the following sections.

2.2. Greek and Egyptian: a typological comparison

The present study focuses on the relationship between two genetically unrelated languages in an extended situation of contact – Greek, and the Coptic stage of the Egyptian language. Egyptian is classed as an autonomous branch of the Afroasiatic language family.[108] It shares a number of common features with other branches of Afroasiatic: a bi- or tri-consonantal lexical root system, similarities in morphosyntax and word formation (such as causative verbs with an initial /s/), and

[108] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 69; Voigt, 'Ägyptosemitischer Sprachvergleich'; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*; Hayward, 'Afroasiatic'.

lexical cognates, particularly with Berber, Beja and Oromo.[109] It possesses one of the longest written traditions of any language for which evidence has survived into modernity: beginning in around 3000 BCE with Archaic (or 'Pre-Old') Egyptian, and ending around 1300 CE with the end of the production of new written texts in Coptic.[110]

Conventionally, the Egyptian language is divided into two main stages: Early Egyptian, further subdivided into Old Egyptian (O.E., including Archaic Egyptian) and Middle Egyptian (M.E.), and Late/Later Egyptian, divided into Late Egyptian (L.E.), Demotic, and Coptic.[111] This division is mainly based on the shift from synthetic language to analytic language constructions that occurs between these two stages. More recent work on the subject however suggests that Coptic, as a semi-agglutinating language, represents a return to a synthetic language, a process termed by Haspelmath as "anasynthesis".[112] As such, for the purposes of this study, Egyptian will be divided into three stages – Early Egyptian (Old and Middle Egyptian), Late Egyptian (Late Egyptian and Demotic), and Coptic. Furthermore, for the sake of clarity, the term "Late Egyptian" will be used to denote the stage of the language between Middle Egyptian and Demotic, while the broader grouping of Late Egyptian/Demotic will be referred to as "Later Egyptian".

---

[109] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 69; Allen, *The Ancient Egyptian Language*, 1; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 1.

[110] Grossman and Richter, 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture', 72; Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 7.

[111] This does not take into account situations of diglossia; for example language use in different textual registers of the New Kingdom, in which forms of Middle Egyptian (sometimes termed Neo-Middle Egyptian or Late Middle Egyptian) were used in the writing of religious documents or literature alongside Late Egyptian documents; see Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 22–23.

[112] Grossman, 'No Case before the Verb, Obligatory Case after the Verb in Coptic', 121. Haspelmath also notes that, since few languages possess written evidence spanning as long a timeframe as the Egyptian evidence, it is difficult to ascertain whether anasynthesis is a universal process.

Greek represents an independent branch of the Indo-European language family, and is perhaps the second oldest branch to diverge from the family after Anatolian.[113] Unlike Egyptian, it is a highly synthetic language, characterised by a system of inflectional morphology for nouns and verbs.[114] Greek is first attested in the Linear B tablets of Pylos on the island of Crete, dated to the 2nd millennium BCE (Mycenean Greek).[115] While the language can be divided into several stages and dialects, the following typological comparison will focus on three areas:

- **Ancient Greek**: the Greek language prior to the unification of Greece by the Macedonian kings in the 4th century BCE, encompassing a number of distinct dialects.[116]
- **Koine Greek:** the Greek language under the Greco-Roman and Byzantine Empire, comprising a number of dialects.[117]
- **Egyptian Greek:** the dialect of Koine in Greco-Roman Egypt, mainly attested in documentary papyri but also in literary texts.[118]

Most relevant to this study is Egyptian Greek, since it is the language variety in direct contact with Egyptian. Various internal developments from the earlier Ancient Greek dialects are visible in Egyptian Greek (and in Koine Greek more generally – see below). However, a number of other

[113] Hoenigswald, 'Greek', 228.

[114] Christidis, 'Part IV: Ancient Greek Structure and Change - Introduction', 522.

[115] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 9; Ferrara, 'Mycenaean Texts: The Linear B Tablets', 11; Clackson, 'The Genesis of Greek', 185; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 2.

[116] On the boundary between Ancient Greek and Koine, see Bubenik, 'Koine, Origins Of'; Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 4; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 3.

[117] Bubenik, 'Koine, Origins Of'; Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 229–31; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 3.

[118] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 253; see also Dahlgren, 'Towards a Definition of an Egyptian Greek Variety'.

features unique to this language variety are considered to be the result of contact with Egyptian.[119] Phonology is an area which was particularly affected by Egyptian contact. For example, the graphic interchange between voiced and voiceless stops (/d/ and /t/, /g/ and /k/) is believed to have been influenced by Egyptian in which there was no voicing contrast.[120]

One of the key issues in examining potential Greek-influenced contact-induced grammatical change in Coptic is the typological differences between these two genetically unrelated languages. The following sections provide a brief typological comparison of the two languages, in order to highlight areas in which prolonged contact may result in significant contact-induced change. This comparison focuses on the aspects of language most relevant to the present study: nouns and nominal morphology, verbs and verbal morphology, verbal syntax, and clause chaining. Attention is devoted to some of the historical changes in the Egyptian language in order to identify features of Coptic which arise from language internal developments prior to Greek contact. Furthermore, in the discussion of Greek, linguistic features particular to Egyptian Greek, and Koine Greek more broadly, are highlighted.

2.2.1. Nouns and nominal morphology

(a) Morphology

Early Egyptian nouns are marked for both gender (masculine/feminine) and number (singular/dual/plural), demonstrated in Table 2.1.[121] However, these morphological markings had

[119] On the effect Egyptian language contact on Greek, see Torallas Tovar, 'The Reverse Case: Egyptian Borrowing in Greek'; Dahlgren, 'Outcome of Long-Term Language Contact'; Dahlgren, 'Towards a Definition of an Egyptian Greek Variety'; Evans, 'Complaints of the Natives in a Greek Dress: The Zenon Archive and the Problem of Egyptian Interference'; Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt'; Torallas Tovar, 'Egyptian Lexical Interference in the Greek of Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt'; Clarysse, 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek'.

[120] Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 261.

[121] Allen, *The Ancient Egyptian Language*, 60.

disappeared by Coptic due to phonological changes beginning in Middle Egyptian in which final /t/, as well as other final vocalic and semi-vocalic sounds such as /w/ and /r/, weakened and were eventually lost.[122] As such, while Coptic nouns possess grammatical gender and number, these are generally not overtly marked on the noun themselves. Furthermore, by Coptic, the dual system had completely disappeared.

Table 2.1: Gender and number in Early Egyptian - √*sn*

Gender	Singular	Dual	Plural
Feminine	*sn.t* – 'sister'	*sn.ty* – 'two sisters'	*sn.wt* – 'sisters'
Masculine	*sn* – 'brother'	*sn.wy* – 'two brothers'	*sn.w* – 'brothers'

There are some rare exceptions in which masculine/feminine and singular/plural counterparts exist for the same root. However, Allen suggests that these distinctions are etymological, rather than productive, since newly developed lexical items with both masculine and feminine counterparts are vocalised in the same way.[123] Rather, distinct masculine/feminine and singular/plural forms only exist for common nouns which were present in earlier stages of the language and are thus fossilised forms; for example, M.E. *sn/sn.t* > Coptic ϩⲛ/ϩⲱⲛⲉ "brother"/"sister"; M.E. *ỉt/ỉt.w* > Coptic ⲉⲓⲱⲧ/ⲉⲓⲟⲧⲉ "father"/"fathers".

Conversely, Greek nouns are overtly marked for gender and number, as well as case, through the use of inflectional morphology.[124] Gender distinctions are primarily neuter/non-neuter, with the

[122] Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 35. He notes, however, that evidence for this change can be found in the Middle Kingdom.

[123] Allen, *The Ancient Egyptian Language*, 62. Allen cites the example, ϭⲣⲟⲟⲙⲡⲉ "dove", from earlier *gri n pt* (lit. 'bird of the sky'); ⲡⲉϭⲣⲟⲟⲙⲡⲉ "male dove", ⲧⲉϭⲣⲟⲟⲙⲡⲉ "female dove".

[124] Hoenigswald, 'Greek', 243.

masculine/feminine distinction inconsistently expressed morphologically (for example masc. ὁ λόγος versus fem. ἡ φηγός; masc. ὁ πατήρ versus fem. ἡ μήτηρ).[125] Number was divided into singular, plural, and dual, although by Koine the dual form of Ancient Greek disappeared almost entirely.[126] Ancient Greek nouns also express five cases: nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, and vocative.[127]

Several changes to the Ancient Greek inflectional endings are visible in Koine Greek. Phonetic changes and the grammaticalisation of diminutive endings resulted in the remodelling of nominal declensions, in which some Koine nouns changed declensions and athematic declensions disappeared.[128] Similarly, there was a decline in the use of the dative case, resulting in its eventual abandonment and replacement with other cases.[129] This development was partially facilitated by phonetic changes.[130] However, syntactic changes also occurred which scholars believe led to the eventual loss of the dative.[131]

---

[125] Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 105.

[126] Gignac, 'Grammatical Developments of Greek in Roman Egypt Significant for the New Testament', 406; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611.

[127] Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 3.

[128] See Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611–14.

[129] Stolk, 'Dative and Genitive Case Interchange in Greek Papyri from Roman-Byzantine Egypt'; Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 277; Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 239; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611.

[130] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 116–17; Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 284.

[131] Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 284; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611.

(b) Determiners

Coptic possesses a series of articles which are directly prefixed to the noun they modify. Three main articles are used to encode varying degrees of definiteness: the definite article ⲡ/ⲡⲉ, ⲧ/ⲧⲉ, ⲛ/ⲛⲉ (< L.E. articles *pꜣ, tꜣ, nꜣ*), the indefinite article ⲟⲩ, ϩⲉⲛ (< L.E. *wʿ* "one", *nhy n* X "some of X"), and the zero article Ø.[132] Of these, the function of the zero article is highly debated.[133] Layton lists a number of usages, such as use in general and gnomic contexts (e.g. Ø-ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ "good things"), in negative expressions, particularly those expressing non-existence (e.g. ⲁϫⲛ̄ Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ "without fear"), and in comparative and distributive expressions (e.g. ϩⲱⲥ Ø-ϣⲃⲏⲣ "like a friend").[134]

Most other common types of determination are also expressed as articles prefixed to the nouns they modify. The nearer demonstrative is indicated by the articles ⲡⲉⲓ-/ⲧⲉⲓ-/ⲛⲉⲓ- (< L.E/Dem. *pꜣy, tꜣy, nꜣy*). Pronominal possession is marked through the "possessive article" ⲡⲉ=/ⲧⲉ=/ⲛⲉ= (see below), and are descended from the Late Egyptian possessive adjectives (Coptic ⲡⲉϥ- < L.E *pꜣy=f* "his"; Coptic ⲧⲁ- < L.E. *tꜣy=i* "my" etc). The main exception is the further demonstrative, which is indicated through the relative construction ⲉⲧⲙⲁⲩ (lit. 'which is there'), rather than through determiners.

[132] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2004, 38–45.

[133] Shisha-Halevy, 'A Definitive Sahidic Coptic Grammar', 434–35; see also Satzinger, 'Zero Article, Bare Noun, Absolutive Case'.

[134] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 40.

In contrast, Greek possesses a single, unbound article, ὁ (originally a demonstrative in early stages of the language), which is generally used to mark definiteness.[135] The article is inflectional, agreeing with the noun it modifies (the head noun) in gender, number, and case.[136] Similarly, demonstratives are also unbound and inflectional. Ancient Greek possesses three demonstratives: the demonstrative pronoun ὅδε, and the demonstrative adjectives οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος.[137] By Koine, a new form had also arisen, αὐτός (< Ancient Greek ὁ αὐτός "the same") while in literary Koine ὅδε had fallen out of use.[138] The position of the demonstrative in the noun phrase of Ancient and Koine Greek is flexible. The Modern Greek functional distinction between pre-article (deictic) and post-nominal (anaphoric) position was not productive in earlier stages of the language.[139]

(c) Noun phrases (NPs): attributive adjectives and possessive constructions

There are no 'true' adjectives in Coptic. Rather property-words fall under the category of nouns (e.g. ⲛⲟϭ "great/big" lit. "a great/big thing").[140] Nouns expressing attributive relationships (referred to hereafter as "attributives") are connected to the head noun by the attributive marker ⲛ̅, which is bound to the second noun in the noun phrase and is followed by a zero article. While

[135] On the function of the definite article in Ancient Greek and previous descriptions of its use, see Bakker, *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek*, 145ff.

[136] Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 3–4.

[137] On the semantic distinctions between these three demonstratives, see Manolessou, 'The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek', 130ff and the references therein.

[138] Manolessou, 'The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek', 120. It should be noted, however, that ὅδε was still in use in Byzantine papyri, as evidenced through a search of the DDbDP and demonstrated in several examples within this study.

[139] Manolessou, 'The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek', 130; 137; n. 26.

[140] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 132; Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2004.

most attributives follow the head noun, certain attributives precede it, while others may precede it for rhetorical effect (Layton's "inverted attributive constructions").[141]

Similar to attributive relationships, nominal possession in NPs is expressed through the bound morphemes ⲛ̅ (< M.E. *n.y*[142]) or ⲛⲧⲉ (< Dem. *mdy* < L.E. *mtw* "with"[143]). The use of the construct state to express possession which appears in earlier stages of the language (sometimes called the "indirect genitive") is more limited in Coptic, although etymologically some compound nouns can be traced back to this construction.[144] Pronominal possession in Coptic is typically indicated by the possessive article (see above): a shift from earlier stages of the language in which pronominal possession is expressed through post-lexical inflectional morphemes (for example M.E. *ỉt=f* > L.E. *pꜣy=f ỉt* > Coptic ⲡⲉϥⲓⲱⲧ "his father").

Unlike Coptic, Greek possesses a clearly differentiated class of adjectives which are also inflectional. These adjectives agree with their head nouns in all inflectional categories (gender, number, and case).[145] Nominal possession within NPs is marked primarily through the genitive, as is typical of Indo-European languages.[146] Pronominal possession can be marked through either the genitive of the personal pronoun (for example ἐμοῦ "my" GEN.SG of ἐγώ), or through the possessive adjective which agrees with the head noun in gender, number, and case (for example

[141] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 83.

[142] Černý, *Coptic etymological dictionary*, 102.

[143] Černý, *Coptic etymological dictionary*, 111.

[144] Haspelmath, 'The Three Adnominal Possessive Constructions in Egyptian-Coptic: Three Degrees of Grammaticalization', 271.

[145] Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 3.

[146] Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 50.

ἐμός "my/mine" NOM.SG).[147] Possession may also be constructed through prepositional phrases, as shown in (11), which Horrocks suggests is a feature of "colloquial" Greek.[148]

(11)	τὴν	παρ᾽	ἐμοῦ	λαβὼν
	DEF.F.ACC.SG	from	1.GEN.SG	take.PTC.AOR.ACT.M.NOM.SG
	ἴθι			
	go.PRS.IMP.ACT.2.SG			

"Take mine (lit. "the one from me") and go ahead." (Menander, *Dyscolus*, 375)[149]

In both Greek and Coptic, possession may also be shown beyond the level of NP in particular verbal constructions. However, these are not relevant for the present study, and will therefore not be examined.

2.2.2. Verbs and verbal morphology

Egyptian verbal predicates can be divided into three categories: finite verb forms, the infinitive, and the qualitative (or "stative").[150] In Coptic, most verbal predicates are formed of either the infinitive or the qualitative, although some subject-final finite verb forms are preserved from earlier stages of the language (see 2.2.3). Coptic verbal constructions are agglutinative, and fall into two main types: subject-predicate patterns (also "bipartite" or "durative") or TAM-subject patterns (also "tripartite" or "non-durative").[151] Qualitatives can only be used as predicates of subject-predicate constructions, while infinitives are used in both.[152]

---

[147] Viti, 'Rheme before Theme in the Noun Phrase', 897.

[148] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 104.

[149] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 103–4.

[150] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 115.

[151] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 127.

[152] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 129; 236.

In TAM subject constructions, tense, aspect and mood are indicated through a series of affixes or infixes which often encode more than one grammatical meaning. For example, the prefix ⲁ- denotes both past tense and perfective aspect. These affixes are proclitic – attached directly to the subject of the verb – since they are descended from earlier periphrastic constructions using affixed subjects which have undergone grammaticalisation, as shown in (12).[153]

(12) *Grammaticalisation of pre-verbal affixes in Egyptian*

Perfect: L.E. *sḏm=f* > Dem. *ỉr=f sdm* > Coptic ⲁϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄[154]

Adhortative (Future III): M.E. *ỉw=f r sḏm* > L.E/Dem. *ỉw=f r sdm* > Coptic ⲉϥⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄[155]

Similarly, the subject-predicate Present construction is etymologically descended from a Late Egyptian construction in which a pre-verbal pronominal subject was introduced by a particle – either *tw* or *ỉw* – which then underwent grammaticalisation, as shown in (13).[156]

(13) *Development of the Later Egyptian/Coptic Present*

Present (1st sg.): L.E. *tw=ỉ* (*ḥr*) *sdm* > Dem. *tw=ỉ sdm* > Coptic ϯⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

Present (3rd m sg.): L.E. *ỉw=f* (*ḥr*) *sdm* > Dem. *ỉw=f sdm* > Coptic ϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

[153] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 128.

[154] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 122; Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 155; Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System*, 194.

[155] Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 128.

[156] Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 111–12; Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System*, 194.

The simple Future (also "Future I") is formed by the addition of the infix ⲛⲁ to the Present. This infix is thought to have descended from the Later Egyptian verb *nʿy/nɜ* 'to go', and follows the same process of grammaticalisation as seen in (12) and (13) above, as demonstrated in (14). [157]

(14) *Grammaticalisation of the Future infix in Egyptian*

Future (1st. sg): L.E. *tw=i̯ m nʿy r sdm* > Dem. *tw=i̯ nɜ sdm* > Coptic ϯⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

Other information in the verb can also be expressed through infixes, such as the infix (ⲉ)ϣ denoting ability (i.e. "to be able to"), descended from the Early Egyptian verb *rḫ,* "to know".[158] While there is no overt marking for voice in the Coptic verbal system, passives may be constructed for transitive verbs through the use of a 3.PL subject which is non-referential, for example ⲁⲩⲕⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϥ "they built it" or "it was built".[159]

Unlike the agglutinative system of Coptic, verbs in Ancient Greek are highly inflectional, built of morphemes which denote tense, aspect, mood, voice, person, and number. The base form of the verb is the stem, to which other inflectional morphemes are added. The classification of verb stems, and their tense and aspectual functions, is the matter of some discussion. For example, the following differing models on verb stem division have been proposed:

---

[157] Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System*, 65–66. Johnson notes however that this construction was rare in Demotic, first appearing in the same sense as the Coptic construction during the Roman period. The earliest known example in Demotic comes from P. Lond. Leid., dated to the 3rd century CE (private correspondence with Tonio Sebastian Richter, 2019).

[158] Černý, *Coptic etymological dictionary*, 233.

[159] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 135–36.

- Weiss: three aspectual categories (perfective, imperfective, and resultative) and two temporal categories (past and non-past).[160]
- Rijksbaron: five "tense" stems, also called aspect stems (present, aorist, perfect, future, and future perfect), with some discussion regarding whether they encode aspect or temporal relations.[161]
- Bubenik: four aspectual categories (imperfective, perfective, perfect, and future perfect) and a two-way temporal contrast (past and non-past).[162]
- Papanastassiou and Petrounias: three aspectual categories (continuous, non-continuous, and perfect) and three temporal categories (present, past, and future).[163]

These four categorisations of Ancient Greek verbal stems represent only a small part of those put forth in the literature. It is beyond the scope of the present study to analyse these debates; rather, it is important to note that these stems form a base to which inflectional morphemes encoding other grammatical information may be added.

Ancient Greek verbs are either finite or non-finite. Finite verbs can be further divided into three moods: indicative, subjunctive, and optative.[164] The imperative is also sometimes classed as a mood.[165] However, as Weiss notes, the imperative is distinct from the other three moods since it

---

[160] Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 110–11.

[161] Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 1–2.

[162] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'.

[163] Papanastassiou and Petrounias, 'The Morphology of Classical Greek', 582.

[164] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'; Yamuza, 'Mood and Modality'; Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 111; Papanastassiou and Petrounias, 'The Morphology of Classical Greek', 581; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 4ff.

[165] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'; Yamuza, 'Mood and Modality'; Papanastassiou and Petrounias, 'The Morphology of Classical Greek', 581; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 4.

is constructed through a unique set of inflectional morphemes attached directly to the stem.[166] Conversely, the indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods are formed through the addition of thematic vowel suffixes to the stem (-ει-, -η-, and -οι- respectively).[167] Two non-finite verb forms are found in Ancient Greek: the infinitive and participle. These do not express person, tense, or mood, and are consequently dependant on finite verb forms.[168]

Furthermore, Ancient Greek verbs possess a range of inflectional morphemes which encode person, number, and voice.[169] These inflections are divided into two classes: athematic, in which the morpheme is attached directly to the verb stem, and thematic, in which the thematic vowel intervenes between stem and inflectional morpheme.[170] These inflectional endings distinguish only between two voices: active and middle. In the Aorist and Future, a distinct passive voice is expressed through the addition of the suffix -θη-/-η- to the verb stem.[171]

Formation of the verb in Koine Greek remains largely consistent with Ancient Greek. However, several important developments can be observed. Phonetic changes led to a shift in the inflectional paradigms of Ancient Greek, including the loss of athematic inflections, and the convergence of inflectional suffixes for the Imperfect and Aorist.[172] Furthermore, the distinction between the

---

[166] Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 111.

[167] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'; Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 111.

[168] Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 95.

[169] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'; Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 112–14.

[170] Bubenik, 'Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)'; Weiss, 'Morphology and Word Formation', 113; Papanastassiou and Petrounias, 'The Morphology of Classical Greek', 582.

[171] Allan, 'Voice'.

[172] Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 242; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 615–16.

functions of the Aorist and the Perfect became increasingly blurred.[173] For example, Horrocks suggests that the Perfect form ἐπιβέβηκα, shown in (15) from P. Oxy. VIII 1155, can be interpreted semantically as either a Perfect or an Aorist. Horrocks suggests that this development may have been propagated (but not instigated) by contact with Latin.[174]

(15)	γινώσκιν	σε	[θε]λω	ἔτι
	know.PRS.INF.ACT	2.ACC.SG	[wa]nt.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG	that

εὐθὺς	ἐπιβέβηκα	ἰς	Ἀλεξάνδρηαν
straight	go.PERF.IND.ACT.1.SG	to	Alexandria.F.ACC.SG

"I want you to know that I went/have gone straight to Alexandria." (P. Oxy. VIII 1155.2-4)

Finally, changes occurred to the use of mood in Koine Greek. The optative had become limited in use, and its distinctiveness had been weakened due to the phonetic changes which occurred between Ancient and Koine Greek.[175] Similarly, through the phonetic similarities which arose between the thematic vowels -ει- and -η-, certain forms of the indicative and subjunctive moods became indistinguishable.[176] As such, Brixhe suggests that verb forms in Koine no longer overtly indicated mood.[177]

---

[173] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 176; Forsten IV, *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 699–700.

[174] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 176. He notes that while there are striking similarities to the Latin Perfect, the origins of this development can be seen in the works of Classical authors such as Menander.

[175] Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 242; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 615; see also Evans, 'The Last of the Optatives'.

[176] Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 242–43; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 616.

[177] Brixhe, 'Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages', 243.

2.2.3. Syntax – verbal arguments

While Early Egyptian is a primarily VSO language, Coptic is predominately SVO. The shift from VSO to SVO arose through the grammaticalisation of earlier periphrastic verb forms (see 2.2.2), in which subjects became fixed between two elements of the verbal predicate: the TAM marker and the main verbal lexeme.[178] Several VSO constructions still exist in Coptic, for example the existential predicate ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁϩ, or fossilised remnants of the earlier Egyptian suffix conjunctions such as ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϩ "to be good" and other adjectival verbs.[179]

In standard (that is un-emphasised) word order, subjects appear unmarked before the verb and following any TAM affixes (labelled by Grossman as Actor (A)/Subject (S) incorporation).[180] Objects follow the verb and are marked by the prepositions ⲛ̅-/ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϩ in the case of direct objects, and ⲛ̅-/ⲛⲁϩ in the case of indirect objects. Like other prepositions in Coptic, the pre-nominal form of these markers is bound to the nominal object, while the pre-pronominal forms are inflected by means of a suffix pronoun. Direct objects may also be attached directly to the end of either the prenominal or pre-pronominal state of the infinitive (Patient (P) incorporation).[181]

---

[178] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 128; Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 26, n. 3.

[179] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 27.

[180] Grossman, 'No Case before the Verb, Obligatory Case after the Verb in Coptic', 206. As Grossman notes, the term "incorporation" here is somewhat unusual in that incorporated subjects can be not only nouns but whole noun phrases. However, he retains the terminology on the basis that the pre-nominal/pre-pronominal infinitive + direct object is treated in Coptic as a single group, since the reduced forms of the infinitive cannot occur on their own.

[181] Grossman, 'No Case before the Verb, Obligatory Case after the Verb in Coptic', 207.

In emphasised word order, the subject may also occur after the verb, in which case it is introduced by the marker ⲛ̅ⲑⲓ, anaphorically linked to the standard preverbal position through a resumptive pronoun.[182] Preverbal objects, as well as left-dislocated subjects, are unmarked and linked through resumptive pronouns to the corresponding argument positions of un-emphasised word order. As such, Grossman summarises argument marking in Coptic as follows: core arguments are unmarked before the verb and marked after the verb.[183] However, it is important to note that in all cases of emphasised word order, the affected verbal argument still appears in standard position in the form of a resumptive pronoun.

In Greek, verbal arguments are marked by means of case; that is, through inflectional morphemes rather than the prefixed markers of Coptic. The nominative case is used to encode the subject of finite verbs, as well as predicative nouns and adjectives.[184] The accusative is used primarily to indicate the direct object of transitive verbs.[185] However, the genitive and dative may also be employed.[186] The genitive in particular is used to express the direct object in cases where the object is only marginally affected by the action of the verb, since cross-linguistically low-transitivity verbs have been shown to take partitive cases.[187]

---

[182] On the use of ⲛ̅ⲑⲓ, see Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 71; Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 28ff.

[183] Grossman, 'No Case before the Verb, Obligatory Case after the Verb in Coptic', 203.

[184] van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 135.

[185] van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 135; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 52–53.

[186] George, 'Verbal Valency'; van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 136; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 53.

[187] George, 'Verbal Valency'; Riaño Rufilanchas, *El complemento directo en griego antiguo*, 134; see also Hopper and Thompson, 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse', 262–63.

The indirect object in Ancient Greek is expressed through the dative, which codes partial involvement with the action of the verb.[188] The indirect object is also expressed through an analytic construction consisting of εἰς/πρός + ACC, although the meaning of these phrases does not overlap entirely with that of the dative of indirect object in Ancient Greek.[189] However Papanastassiou notes that these analytic constructions became more prevalent in Koine, during which time the dative was falling out of use (see above, 2.2.1).[190] Similarly, during this time the function of the dative as indirect object was being increasingly subsumed by either the genitive or the accusative.[191]

2.2.4. Clause chaining – subordinate clauses and argument clauses

In Early Egyptian, two methods of subordination were employed: parataxis, the juxtaposition of a main clause followed by an unmarked clause, and hypotaxis, the overt marking of subordinate clauses through the use of particular morphemes.[192] By Coptic, earlier forms of paratactic subordination through the use of subject-suffix finite verb forms such as the Subjunctive/Prospective *sḏm=f* (result or purpose) or the Perfect *sḏm.n=f* (causal or temporal) had been lost. As such, only hypotactic constructions remain.

[188] Pompeo, 'Dative'; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 63–64.

[189] Pompeo, 'Dative'; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 112–13.

[190] Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611; see also Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 280.

[191] George, 'Verbal Valency'; Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 281; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611; Horrocks, 'Syntax: From Classical Greek to Koine', 628.

[192] Allen, *The Ancient Egyptian Language*, 164ff.

The hypotactic subordinating constructions of Coptic can be divided into three types, as identified by Hasznos;[193]

1. Clause conjugations
2. Converted clauses
3. Conjunction + clause.

Clause conjugations consist of a series of verbal prefixes which express subordinate relationships between a verbal predicate and a main clause. These prefixes are grammaticalised forms of earlier preposition + clause or periphrastic constructions, as shown in (16).

(16) *Grammaticalisation of clause conjugation prefixes*[194]

Temporal: L.E. *m-ḏr sdm=f* > Dem. *n-ḏr sdm=f/n-ḏr ỉr=f sdm* > Coptic ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

Finalis: L.E. *dỉ=ỉ sdm=f* > Dem. *dỉ=ỉ ỉr=f sdm* > Coptic ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

Terminative: L.E. *šꜣʿ-(ỉỉr.)tw=f sdm* > Dem. *šꜣʿ-(m)tw=f sdm* > Coptic ϣⲁ(ⲛ)ⲧϥ̄ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄

The category of "converted clauses" refers to independent clauses headed by the circumstantial converter ⲉ/ⲉⲣⲉ (< L.E. *ỉw*) which can be used to express a subordinate relationship. The translation of circumstantial clauses in these contexts is ambiguous, since it is used to express a number of subordinate relationships such as temporal, concessive, or causal.[195] More generally, a circumstantial clause expresses an event whose tense is relative to the time-frame of the main clause[196].

---

[193] Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 16.

[194] Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System*, 194, discussed individually elsewhere in the text.

[195] Haspelmath, 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic', 139; Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 190; Johnson, *Thus Wrote 'Onchsheshonqy*, 61–62.

[196] Johnson, *Thus Wrote 'Onchsheshonqy*, 61.

The final category of hypotaxis, conjunction + clause, refers to the use of particular bound or unbound morphemes to express subordination. This construction is found throughout Egyptian from its earliest stages, being identical in form to patterns such as Early Egyptian *m* + Historic Perfect *sḏm=f* or the pre-grammaticalised temporal construction *m-ḏr sdm=f* from Late Egyptian discussed above. Many of the subordinating morphemes used in Coptic are of Greek origin, as demonstrated in (17a) (see also below, 2.3.1). However, a range of native Egyptian morphemes are also employed, as shown in (17b). Only certain types of clauses appear after Egyptian and Greek conjunctions. Most common are the Conjunctive ⲛϥ̅ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅, and circumstantially converted main clauses.[197]

(17) *Conjunction + clause*

(a) Greek morphemes

ⲛⲧⲟϥ	ⲇⲉ	ⲙⲡⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲩⲱϣⲃ	ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
INDP.3.M.SG	ENCL	NEG.PERF=3.M.SG-answer.INF	DIR.OBJ-any

ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲁϫⲉ	ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ	ⲛ=ϥ-ⲣ-Ø-ϣⲡⲏⲣⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-accusation	so_that	CNJV=3.M.SG-act.INF- Z.ART-amazement

ⲛⲑⲓ-ⲡ-ϩⲏⲅⲉⲙⲱⲛ	ⲉⲙⲁⲧⲉ
SBJ.INV-DEF.ART.M.SG-governor	very

"But he did not answer any accusation, so that the governor was very amazed." (Matt. 27:14)

(b) Egyptian morphemes

ⲛⲁⲓ̈	ⲛⲉ	ⲛⲁ-ϣⲁϫⲉ
DEM.PRN.PL	COP.PL	POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-word

ⲉⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ̈-ϫⲟ=ⲟⲩ	ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ̅	ϫⲓⲛ-ⲉ=ⲓ-ϣⲟⲟⲡ
REL.PERF=1.SG-speak.INF=3.PL	IND.OBJ=2.PL	since-FOC=1.SG-exist.QUAL

[197] For a list of borrowed and native subordinating morphemes in Coptic and their constructions, see Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2004, 400ff.

ⲛⲙ̀ⲙⲏ=ⲧⲛ
with=2.PL

"These are my words which I said to you while I was still with you." (Luke 24:44)

A subset of subordinate clauses, of particular interest to the question of contact-induced change in Egyptian, is the "argument clause" (also "subject/object clause", "complement clause", "completive clause"). These are subordinate clauses which form the subject or object of verbal or non-verbal predicates.[198] Argument clauses in Coptic have been discussed in depth by Hasznos in her study of clause patterns in translational and non-translational literature.[199] She notes two types of arguments clause in Coptic: infinitival constructions (ϵ + INF/ϵ + INFL.INF), as shown in (18a), and "final clauses" (ϫϵ/ϫϵⲕⲁⲥ + ADH, ϫϵ/ϫϵⲕⲁⲥ + FOC.FUT, ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + ADH, ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + CONJ, and ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + FNL), as shown in (18b).[200]

(18) *Argument clauses in Coptic*

(a) Infinitive constructions

ⲙ̀ⲡ=ϥ̄-ⲡⲓⲑϵ
NEG.PERF=3.M.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϵ-ⲧⲣϵ=ϥ-ϣϵⲡ-ϯⲣⲏⲛⲏ
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-accept-DEF.F.SG_peace

ⲛⲁ=ϥ
IND.OBJ=3.M.SG

"He was not persuaded to accept peace." (P. Mon. Ep. 141.19)[201]

[198] Faure, 'Argument Clause'.

[199] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting'; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*; Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic'.

[200] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 245ff; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 40ff.

[201] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 254.

(b) Final clause constructions

ⲁⲓϫⲓ=ⲥ	ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ	ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲡⲁ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲥⲛⲁⲩ	ϩⲙⲁⲥ
say.IMP=3.F.SG	that	CNJV-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-son	two	sit.INF

"Permit these two sons of mine to sit." (Matt. 20:21 – Codex Scheide version)[202]

As Hasznos notes, the "final clause" constructions have no equivalent in earlier stages of Egyptian, instead replacing the earlier Subjunctive/Prospective *sḏm=f* as an alternative to infinitive constructions.[203] As such, she suggests that the use of the final clause in Coptic arises through the translation of Greek syntactic patterns (see below, 2.3.2).[204]

Subordination in Greek is expressed through both hypotactic and paratactic constructions. Hypotactic constructions consist of the pattern subordinating conjunction + finite clause (with the indicative, subjunctive, or optative), as demonstrated in (19a).[205] These function in a similar manner to the conjunction + clause type of subordination in Coptic. These constructions represent the most common type of subordination in Ancient Greek.[206] Paratactic subordination is expressed through participial phrases, including the genitive absolute construction, as shown in (19b).[207] Similar to circumstantially converted clauses in Egyptian, the semantic function of these participial

[202] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 253.

[203] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 246.

[204] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 258; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 74–78.

[205] Bentein, 'Finite vs. Non-Finite Complementation in Post-Classical and Early Byzantine Greek', 4; van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 142; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 61ff.

[206] Cuzzolin, 'Subordination'.

[207] Cuzzolin; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 122.

phrases is ambiguous and is determined by context.[208] Infinitive clauses may also be used paratactically as subordinate clauses, for example as the argument clause of verbs of exhorting, thinking, or knowing, as shown in (19c).[209]

(19) *Subordination in Greek*

(a) Hypotactic

οἵ	τ᾽	Ἀθηναῖοι	ἐνόμιζον
DEF.M.NOM.PL	and	Athenian.M.NOM.PL	think.IMPF.IND.ACT.3.PL

ἡσσᾶσθαι	ὅτι	οὐ	πολὺ
be_weaker.PRS.INF.PASS	since	NEG	much.N.ACC.SG

ἐνίκων
be_victorious.IMPF.IND.ACT.3.PL

"And the Athenians thought they were defeated, since they were not signally victorious." (Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, 7.34.7)[210]

(b) Paratactic: participial clause

ἀκούσας	δὲ	ταῦτα	ὁ
hear.PTC.AOR.ACT.M.NOM.SG	ENCL	DEM.N.ACC.SG	DEF.M.NOM.SG

Ἀστυάγης	Μήδους…	ὥπλισε
Astyages.M.NOM.SG	Mede.M.ACC.PL…	arm.AOR.IND.ACT.3.SG

πάντας
all.M.ACC.PL

"When he heard this, Astyages armed all his Medes." (Herodotus, *Histories*, 1.127.2)[211]

---

[208] van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 142; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 122.

[209] Cuzzolin, 'Subordination'; van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax', 142; Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 96–98.

[210] Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 84.

[211] Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 122.

(c) <u>Paratactic: infinitive clause</u>

ὑπώπτευον	γὰρ	ἤδη	ἐπὶ
suspect.IMPF.IND.ACT.3.PL	ENCL	by_this_time	against

βασιλέα	ἰέναι
king.M.ACC.SG	go.PRS.INF.ACT

"For they suspected by this time that they were going against the king." (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 1.3.1)[212]

Several changes from the subordination patterns of Ancient Greek are visible in Koine. Most significantly, infinitives and participles gradually disappear from the Greek system of complementation.[213] Instead, these were replaced by finite clauses headed by subordinating conjunctions, particularly with ὅτι which Cristofaro describes as a "generic completive form".[214] Furthermore, according to Gignac, coordination is used more often than subordination in Greek papyri, with the conjunction καί assuming adversative, explicative, illative, consecutive, and final meanings.[215]

2.2.5. Greek and Egyptian typology: a summary

From the above discussion, it is clear that there are a large number of typological differences between Greek and Coptic. The main differences lie in the distinction between the semi-

[212] Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 2006, 97.

[213] Bentein, 'Finite vs. Non-Finite Complementation in Post-Classical and Early Byzantine Greek', 5; Torallas Tovar, 'Koine, Features Of'; Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 262.

[214] Bentein, 'Finite vs. Non-Finite Complementation in Post-Classical and Early Byzantine Greek', 5; Torallas Tovar, 'Koine, Features Of'; Torallas Tovar, 'Greek in Egypt', 262; Cristofaro, *Aspetti sintattici e semantici delle frasi completive in greco antico*, 151.

[215] Gignac, 'Grammatical Developments of Greek in Roman Egypt Significant for the New Testament', 415.

agglutinative nature of Coptic in comparison to the primarily inflectional system of Greek, which is particularly visible in the case of nominal and verbal morphology. In the case of nouns, the inflectional nature of the Greek nominal case system also contributes to differences in the expression of verbal arguments between the two languages: inflectional morphemes in Greek and the bound or inflected markers ⲛ̄/ⲙ̄ⲙⲟϩ, ⲛ̄/ⲛⲁϩ, and ⲛ̄ⲟⲓ, or P incorporation in Coptic.

There are, however, several points of similarity between Coptic and Greek, particularly in the case of Koine. Hypotactic subordination using conjunctions follows similar patterns in both languages (subordinating morpheme + finite clause, see also below, 2.3.1). Similarly, the Greek participle and Coptic circumstantially converted clauses, while not wholly comparable, share common features in that they are non-finite forms which can be employed as subordinate clauses whose semantic relationship to the main clause is ambiguous. Furthermore, the increasing analytic tendencies of Koine resulted in some morpho-syntactic similarities to Coptic, such as a rise in the use of prepositions to introduce indirect objects.

While the typological differences identified between the two languages may lead to major typological shifts under the pressure of intense contact, the typological similarities can help facilitate particular instances of MAT or PAT borrowing. As such, awareness of the typological comparisons of Greek and Egyptian is necessary when investigating possible contact-induced grammatical change in Coptic. The current state of research on this topic is the focus of the following section.

2.3. Contact-induced change in Egyptian

Research on Greek-Egyptian language contact has, for the most part, dealt largely with the phenomenon of lexical borrowing. The most comprehensive of these studies is the ongoing Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic project (DDGLC) under the direction of

Tonio Sebastian Richter, currently operating through the Freie Universität, Berlin.[216] The project, which aims at creating a physical and digital lexicographical resource on Greek loanwords across the entire corpus of Coptic and pre-Coptic Egyptian texts, combines new research with almost a century of previous studies on Greek loanwords in Coptic. These studies have examined Greek lexical borrowings across different textual genres, word classes, and dialects.[217]

In contrast to the large body of literature of Greek lexical borrowing in Coptic, contact-induced grammatical change has been less extensively studied. However, in recent decades, there has been an increase in interest in this area of research. Work by scholars such as Grossman, Hasznos, Reintges, and Zakrzewska, to name but a few, has sought to determine the extent to which contact

---

[216] http://research.uni-leipzig.de/ddglc/index.html. See also Dils et al., *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic*; Almond et al., 'Kontaktinduzierter Sprachwandel Des Ägyptisch-Koptischen'; Richter, '»Zwischen der Epoche der Pyramidenbauer und den Anfängen des Christenthums« Sprachwandel im ägyptischen Wortschatz und das Leipziger Projekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)'.

[217] For lexical borrowings in the Coptic Old and New Testaments, see Behlmer, *Die Häufigsten griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen Neuen Testament*; Bauer, *Konkordanz der nichtflektierten griechischen Wörter im bohairischen Neuen Testament*; Böhlig, *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im sahidischen und bohairischen Neuen Testament.*; Demaria, 'Die griechischen Entlehnungen in den koptischen manichäischen Texten'; Lefort, *Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique, I. Les mots d'origine Grecque. Subs. 1.*; on borrowing in other Coptic literature, see Almond, 'A Comparative Study of Loanword Integration in Fourth-Century Coptic Literature'; Demaria, 'Die griechischen Entlehnungen in den koptischen manichäischen Texten'; Tubach, 'Griechische Lehnwörter in den koptischen Manichaica. Zur Problematik eines Lehnwortschatzes in einer Übersetzung aus einem anderen Kulturbereich'; Böhlig, *Ein Lexikon der griechischen Wörter im Koptischen. Die griechischlateinischen Lehnwörter in den koptischen manichäischen Texten*; for Greek loanwords in Coptic documentary texts, see Oréal, 'Greek Causal Discourse Markers in Coptic Letters: A Case Study in the Pragmatics of Code-Switching'; Boud'hors, 'Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts'; Boud'hors, 'Les particules ⲅⲁⲣ et ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ dans les textes documentaires coptes'; Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'.

with Greek influenced the Egyptian language beyond the lexical level.[218] The following sections present a discussion of the current state of research on contact-induced grammatical change in Coptic. The various proposed theories and arguments are organised according to the three types of contact-induced change outlined in 2.1.1: grammatical MAT borrowing, structural PAT borrowing, and functional PAT borrowing.

2.3.1. Grammatical MAT borrowing: morphology

Grammatical MAT borrowing from Greek to Coptic occurs in the borrowing of unbound morphemes or "function words" (see above, 2.1.2). These function words are drawn from a number of different word classes:[219]

- Coordinating conjunctions, e.g. ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (ἀλλά), ⲏ (ἤ), ⲟⲩⲇⲉ (οὐδέ)
- Subordinating conjunctions, e.g. ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ (ἐπειδή), ⲕⲁⲓⲧⲟⲓ (καίτοι), ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ (ὥστε)

[218] See in particular Dils et al., *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic* and the studies therein; Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency'; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*; Grossman, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic'; Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety'; Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian' as well as other works discussed in the following sections.

[219] On Greek function words in Coptic, see Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 130–32; Müller, 'Greek Connectors in Coptic: A Contrastive Overview I'; Oréal, 'Greek Causal Discourse Markers in Coptic Letters: A Case Study in the Pragmatics of Code-Switching'; Boud'hors, 'Les particules ϫⲁⲣ et ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ dans les textes documentaires coptes'; Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'; Müller, 'Greek Connectors in Coptic. A Contrastive Overview II. Semantically Subordinating Connectors'; Müller, 'Contrast in Coptic I: Concessive Constructions in Sahidic'; Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 79–82; Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 207–32; Gregorios, 'Greek Loan Words in Coptic: Greek Conjunctions in Coptic'. See also the Gertrud Bauer Zettelkasten Online, https://userpage.fu-berlin.de/johnkatrin/bauer1/index.html.

- Enclitic conjunctions, e.g. ϧⲉ (δέ), ⲅⲁⲣ (γάρ), ⲙⲉⲛ (μέν), ⲟⲩⲛ (οὖν)[220]
- Focus particles, e.g. ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ (μόνον), ⲙⲁⲗⲓⲥⲧⲁ (μάλιστα)
- Phrasal adverbs, e.g. ⲏϧⲏ (ἤδη), ⲉⲧⲓ (ἔτι)

These function words represent around 3.6% of all Greek loanwords in Coptic in terms of the overall types of words borrowed.[221] In some cases, the function of the original Greek word has shifted. For example the Greek adverb ἔτι "still" is employed in Coptic as a temporal subordinating conjunction "while".[222]

Several scholars have suggested that the borrowing of these function words, which play a critical role in the organisation of grammatical relationships and discourse, also influenced Egyptian beyond the lexical level. For example, Zakrzewska argues that the use of Greek subordinating conjunctions represents an attempt in Coptic to follow the clause-linking and organisational patterns of Classical discourse to emulate the "highly developed literary and rhetorical strategies of Greek".[223] Furthermore, she suggests that the increase in subordinate clauses introduced by

[220] On the term "enclitic conjunctions", see 1.3.3.

[221] Richter, '»Zwischen der Epoche der Pyramidenbauer und den Anfängen des Christenthums« Sprachwandel im ägyptischen Wortschatz und das Leipziger Projekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)', 77.

[222] Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 132; Müller, 'Greek Connectors in Coptic. A Contrastive Overview II. Semantically Subordinating Connectors', 112.

[223] Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 130.

Greek morphemes in Coptic as an alternative to earlier subordinating strategies may be an example of contact-induced change, noting however that this theory is highly debated (see below, 2.3.2).[224]

Similarly, Reintges argues that the importation of Greek function words into Coptic represents part of the "Hellenisation of Egyptian syntax": the restructuring of Egyptian sentence patterns on the basis of underlying Greek models.[225] In particular, he focuses on the role of the borrowed Greek enclitic conjunction ⲇⲉ in influencing the pragmatic structures of Egyptian. He notes that, in Coptic, ⲇⲉ possesses the same discourse-organising and text-creating functions in Coptic as its Greek counterpart, for example marking the transition to a new narrative section, indicating a thematic break, and indicating a return to a previous topic.[226] Consequently, he argues that its presence in Coptic represents not only a lexical borrowing, but also an example of pragmatic code-mixing in which Greek discourse structures are mapped onto Egyptian.[227] However, he also notes that in terms of sentence structure, ⲇⲉ follows Egyptian grammatical rules, rather than Greek.[228] As such, the use of ⲇⲉ in Coptic represents a mix of Egyptian grammar and Greek discourse.[229]

Beyond the borrowing of function words, there is no further evidence of grammatical MAT borrowing from Greek. Coptic does not appear to have borrowed bound derivational or inflectional

---

[224] Zakrzewska, 133; see also Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting'; Zakrzewska, '[Review Of'; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*; Reintges, 'Coordination, Converbs and Clause Chaining in Coptic Egyptian: Typology and Structural Analysis'; Grossman, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic'.

[225] Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 83.

[226] Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 208–20.

[227] Reintges, Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 220; see also Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 131.

[228] Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 220–32.

[229] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 131; Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 232.

morphemes. Zakrzewska notes the appearance of adjectives of comparison in epithets, which are constructed through the use of Greek derivational suffixes, for example ⲡⲑⲉⲟⲫⲓⲗⲉⲥⲧⲁⲧⲟⲥ NN "the most beloved by God NN".[230] However, such derivational morphemes appear only as part of borrowed Greek vocabulary, and have not undergone reanalysis and redistribution to native lexemes.[231] Similarly, there is no evidence of the borrowing of Greek inflectional morphology for gender and case into Coptic.[232] As such, grammatical MAT borrowing from Greek to Coptic is limited to the borrowing of unbound morphology.

2.3.2. Structural PAT borrowing

Several arguments have been put forth identifying possible PAT borrowing from Greek into Coptic. For example, in her analysis of evidence from the Greek and Coptic versions of the *Vita Antonii*, Hasznos suggests that the Coptic clause structures after verbs of asking and commanding are influenced by the underlying patterns in the original Greek text. She notes that in cases where the subject of the verb of asking (the "matrix verb") differs to the subject of its argument clause, the Greek uses an *accusativus cum infinitivo* (AcI) construction as shown in (20a), while Coptic uses the ϵ + INFL.INF construction, as shown in (20b).[233] Conversely, when the subjects of the matrix verb and the argument clause are identical, Greek uses the infinitive, demonstrated in (20c), while Coptic uses ϵ + INF, shown in (20d).[234]

---

[230] Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 127.

[231] See the example of the Latin suffix '-able' in English discussed above; King, *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*, 46–47; McMahon, *Understanding Language Change*, 210–11.

[232] Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 127.

[233] Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic', 92.

[234] Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic', 92.

(20) *Argument clauses after verbs of adhorting*

(a) <u>Greek: matrix subject ≠ infinitive subject</u>

ἠξίου	τὸν	Ἀντώνιον
ask.IMPF.IND.ACT.3.SG	DEF.M.ACC.SG	Antonius.M.ACC.SG

εὔξασθαι	περὶ	αὐτοῦ
pray.AOR.INF.MID	for	him.M.GEN.SG

"He asked Antonius to pray for him." (*Vita Antonii*, 57:4)

(b) <u>Coptic: matrix subject ≠ infinitive subject</u>

ⲁ=ϥ-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲩ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲗⲗⲟ
PERF=3.M.SG-ask.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-old.man

ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϣⲗⲏⲗ	ⲉϫⲱ=ϥ
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-pray.INF	for=3.M.SG

"He asked the old man to pray for him." (*Vita Antonii*, 63:22)

(c) <u>Greek: matrix subject = infinitive subject</u>

ἀξιούντων	τε	ἀκούσαι
ask.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.PL.GEN	and	hear.AOR.INF.ACT

παρ'	αὐτοῦ	λόγον
from	him.M.GEN.SG	saying.M.ACC.SG

"They asked to hear a saying from him." (*Vita Antonii* 16:2)

(d) <u>Coptic: matrix subject = infinitive subject</u>

ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲩ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ	ⲉ-ⲥⲱⲧⲙ
PERF=3.PL-ask.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG	to-hear.INF

ⲉ-ⲩ-ϣⲁϫⲉ	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ϥ
to-INDF.SG-saying	out	from=3.M.SG

"They asked him to hear a saying from him." (*Vita Antonii* 16:2)

Although several exceptions to this pattern occur within the *Vita Antonii*, Hasznos argues that the Coptic patterns may have been an attempt to replicate the distinction between the AcI construction and the bare infinitive in Greek, as well as a way of creating the most accurate translation to mirror the stylistics of the original Greek text.[235]

This particular argument, however, has been criticised by Grossman who suggests that Hasznos neglects to consider the syntax of the Coptic structures themselves.[236] Table 2.2. demonstrates his reanalysis of the ϵ + INFL.INF and ϵ + INF constructions in cases where the subject of the matrix verb differs to that of the infinitive (which Grossman terms "switch reference"), and where the subjects are identical ("coreference").

Table 2.2. Comparison of Coptic constructions with switch-reference and coreference[237]

(a) Switch reference – subject of matrix clause (I) ≠ subject of argument clause (II)

Matrix clause	Internal Manipulee	Argument Clause
ⲁ=ϥI-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲩ	(ⲛ-, ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ=)II	ϵ-ⲧⲣϵ=ϥII-ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅
	ⲛ-, ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ=II	(ØII)-ϵ-ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅

(b) Coreference – subject of matrix clause (I) = subject of argument clause (I)

Matrix clause	Internal Manipulee	Argument Clause
ⲁ=ϥI-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲩ	(ⲛ-, ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ=)II	ϵ-ⲧⲣϵ=ϥI-ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅
		(ØI)-ϵ-ⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅

[235] Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic', 93.

[236] Grossman, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic', 19.

[237] Reproduced from Grossman, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic', 24.

As Table 2.2. demonstrates, the subject of the ϵ + INFL.INF construction may be identical to either the external manipulee (II) (optionally encoded by a direct object ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲥ) as in (a), or to the subject of the matrix clause (I), as in (b). Furthermore, the subject of the ϵ + INF construction can be considered as null (Ø), and may also be identical to I or II, as in (a) and (b) respectively. As such, the two constructions are interchangeable, as both are compatible with situations of switch-reference or coreference. Grossman therefore argues that it is not underlying Greek patterns which determine the distribution of Coptic constructions after verbs of exhorting, but rather internal features of Coptic syntax itself.[238] This analysis accounts for the exceptions noted by Hasznos in her data in which the ϵ + INFL.INF construction is used when the subjects of the matrix clause and argument clause are identical.[239]

Similar to her argument regarding the distribution of infinitive constructions in Coptic, Hasznos also suggests that the use of conjunction + clause constructions after verbs of exhorting may be influenced by underlying Greek patterns. Aside from the infinitive constructions, verbs of exhorting in Coptic may be followed by a "final clause", consisting of the constructions ϫϵ/ϫϵⲕⲁⲥ + ADH, ϫϵ/ϫϵⲕⲁⲥ + FOC.FUT, ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + ADH, ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + CNJV, or ϩⲓⲛⲁⲥ + FNL.[240] Hasznos notes that final clause patterns are more common in translational literature, particularly in the New Testament, and are used to translate similar final clause patterns present in the underlying Greek text, as demonstrated in (21a-b).[241]

[238] Grossman, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic', 24.

[239] Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic', 93.

[240] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 247; see also Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*.

[241] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 258; 260.

(21) *Greek and Coptic final clause patterns: translation*

(a) Greek

εἰπὲ	ἵνα	οἱ	λίθοι
say.AOR.IMP.ACT.2.SG	that	DEF.M.NOM.PL	stone.M.NOM.PL

οὗτοι	ἄρτοι	γένωνται
DEM.ADJ.M.NOM.PL	bread.M.NOM.PL	become.AOR.SUBJ.MID.3.PL

"Command these stones to become bread." (Matt. 4:3)[242]

(b) Coptic

ⲁϫⲓ=ⲥ	ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ	ⲉⲣⲉ-ⲛⲉⲓ-ⲱⲛⲉ	ⲣ̅-Ø-ⲟⲉⲓⲕ
say.IMP=3.F.SG	that	ADH-DEM.ART.PL-stone	act.INF-Z.ART-bread

"Command these stones to become bread." (Matt. 4:3)[243]

Hasznos notes that the final clause has no pre-Coptic Egyptian counterparts, instead using the Subjunctive/Prospective *sḏm=f* or the infinitive in argument clauses (see above, 2.2.4).[244] She therefore argues that the use of final clause patterns as the object of verbs of exhorting in Coptic developed through the process of translating Greek texts.[245]

However, since the use of morpheme + clause constructions to express subordinate clauses was a feature which already existed in all stages of Egyptian, it should be emphasised that the use of final clause constructions after verbs of exhorting does not represent the borrowing of Greek structures into the language. Rather, it is more accurate to say that the underlying Greek patterns encouraged translators to draw upon similar structures which already existed in the language. In

[242] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 247.

[243] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 247.

[244] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 246.

[245] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 258; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 74–78.

this way, the rise of subordinating clauses introduced by conjunctions in Coptic may be viewed as a language-internal development which was accelerated by contact through the process of translating Greek texts.

One final area in which Greek is thought to have influenced Egyptian structural patterns is the domain of word order. For example, Reintges cites subject inversion in Coptic using the particle ⲛ̅ⲑⲓ as a further example of the "Hellenisation" of Egyptian syntax.[246] He notes that these constructions in Coptic, shown in (22a), demonstrate the sensitivity of Coptic word order to the topic or focus role of the subject.[247] Conversely, in earlier stages of the language subjects are generally post-verbal, as shown in (22b-c), regardless of their discourse-information content.[248]

(22) *Post-verbal subjects in Egyptian*[249]

(a) <u>Coptic</u>

ⲛⲧⲉⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϫⲉ-ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲇⲉ	ⲛⲑⲓ-ⲡ-ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ
TEMP=3.M.SG-say.INF-DEM.PRN.PL	ENCL	SBJ.INV-DEF.M.SG-angel

"When the angel had said these…" (Testament of Isaac, 230:12)

(b) <u>Demotic</u>

ỉr=f	*škʿ=f*	*r*	*ḏꜣḏꜣ=f*
do=3.M.SG	hit.INF=3.M.SG	at	head=3.M.SG

"He hit him on his head…" (Demotic Magical Papyrus v.20:2-3)

[246] Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 83.

[247] Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 84.

[248] Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 84.

[249] Examples from Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 83–84.

(c) Middle Egyptian

ḏd-i̓n	*sḫti̓*	*pn*	*n*	*ḫmt=f*
say-SQNT	peasant	DEM.PRN.SG.M	to	wife=3.M.SG

tn
DEM.PRN.F.SG

"Then the peasant said to his wife…" (Eloquent Peasant 1:5)

Building on the earlier work of Nagel and Morentz who suggest that the ⲛ̅ⲟⲓ construction is an example of syntactic (PAT) borrowing from Greek,[250] Reintges concludes that the pragmatics of Coptic word order is an example of a contact-induced typological shift from a rigid VSO language to a topic-orientated SVO language.[251]

However, this suggestion has been criticised by Loprieno in his study of rear extraposition in Coptic.[252] While he acknowledges that there may be some influence of Greek syntax in the stylistic patterns of Coptic, he notes that the ⲛ̅ⲟⲓ construction does not occur universally across the language in all contexts where the underlying Greek text may be a deciding factor in its use.[253] For example, he draws attention to the Coptic versions of Luke 3:2, in which the Bohairic translation uses the ⲛ̅ⲟⲓ construction while the Sahidic translation does not, as shown in (23a-c).[254]

[250] Nagel, 'Die Einwirkung Des Griechischen Auf Die Entstehung Der Koptischen Literatursprache'; Morenz, 'Die ⲛⲟⲓ-Konstruktion als Sprachliche und Stilistische Erscheinung des Koptischen'.

[251] Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 85.

[252] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic'.

[253] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 30–31.

[254] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 30–31.

(23) *The use of ⲛ̅ϭⲓ in Coptic translations of Luke 3:2*[255]

(a) Greek

ἐγένετο	ῥῆμα	θεοῦ
occur.AOR.IND.MID.3.SG	word.N.NOM.SG	God.M.GEN.SG

"The word of God occurred."

(b) Bohairic

ⲁ=ϥ-ϣⲱⲡⲓ	ⲛ̀ϫⲉ-ⲟⲩ-ⲥⲁϫⲓ	ⲛ̀ⲧⲉ-ⲫ-ⲛ̀ⲟⲩϯ
PERF=3.M.SG-occur.INF	SBJ.INV-INDF.SG-word	POSS-DEF.M.SG-God

"A word of God occurred."

(c) Sahidic

ⲁ-ⲡ-ϣⲁϫⲉ	ⲙ̀-ⲡ-ⲛ̀ⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ϣⲱⲡⲉ
PERF-DEF.M.SG-word	POSS-DEF.M.SG-God	occur.INF

"The word of God occurred."

Loprieno, among others, states that the use of the ⲛ̅ϭⲓ construction in the Bohairic of (23b) may reasonably have been influenced by the VSO word order of the underlying Greek text.[256] However, he argues that, since the Bohairic translation employs the non-specific "a word" which is lower on the hierarchy of topicality than the specific "the word" of the Sahidic translation in (23c), the ⲛ̅ϭⲓ construction is less topical.[257] He therefore concludes that there can be no claim that Greek word

[255] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 30–31.

[256] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 31; Kammerzell, *Sprachkontakte und Sprachwandel im alten Ägypten*, 19; Nagel, 'Die Einwirkung des Griechischen auf die Entstehung der koptischen Literatursprache', 350–53.

[257] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 31.

order patterns have had any impact on the distribution of the ⲛ̅ⲑⲓ construction in Coptic.[258] However, this assessment may be too rigid. Rather, as in the case of final clause patterns discussed above, it is possible that the development of a topic-orientated SVO structure in Coptic was a language-internal change which was accelerated by underlying VSO structures in Greek.

Despite the ongoing discussions of the influence of Greek on structural patterns in Coptic, some examples of structural PAT borrowing from Greek to Coptic have yet to receive sufficient attention in the literature. For example, Junge suggests that the temporal construction ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ is a native Egyptian construction, and tentatively reconstructs a Late Egyptian predecessor **m-ḫnw pꜣ dỉ.t sdm=f* > *ḫn pꜣ dỉ.t ỉr=f sdm* based on similar constructions found earlier in the language.[259] However, as demonstrated in (24a-c), it is a calque of a Greek construction found in the Septuagint which itself is a claque of a Hebrew construction which entered into the Septuagint through the process of translation.[260]

(24) *Transfer of ϩⲙⲡⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅: Hebrew > Greek > Coptic*

(a) Hebrew

bĕ-hoṣiy'a=kā	*et-hā-'ām*
in-bring_out.CAUS.INF=2.M.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF-people

mim-miṣrayim
from-Egypt

"When you lead my people out from Egypt…" (Ex. 3:12)

[258] Loprieno, 'From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic', 31.

[259] Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 103.

[260] Private correspondence with Frank Feder (Berlin), 2016

(b) Greek

ἐν	τῷ	ἐξαγαγεῖν	σε
in	DEF.N.DAT.SG	lead_out.AOR.INF.ACT	2.ACC.SG

τὸν	λαόν	μου	ἐξ
DEF..M.ACC.SG	people.M.ACC.SG	1.GEN.SG	from

αἰγύπτου
Egypt.M.GEN.SG

"When you lead my people out from Egypt…" (Ex. 3:12)

(c) Coptic

ϩⲙ-ⲡ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲕ-ⲉⲓⲛⲉ	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
in-DEF.M.SG-INFL.INF=2.M.SG-bring.INF	out

ⲙ-ⲡⲁ-ⲗⲁⲟⲥ	ϩⲙ-ⲡ-ⲕⲁϩ
DIR.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-people	from-DEF.M.SG-land

ⲛ-ⲕⲏⲙⲉ
POSS-Egypt

"When you lead my people out from the land of Egypt…" (Ex. 3:12)

As demonstrated in the examples above, the pattern "in" + DEF + INFL.INF in Coptic is a calque of Greek "in" + DEF + AOR.INF, which itself is a calque of Hebrew "in" + CAUS.INF. However, this phenomenon has not been widely commented upon in the literature. As such, it is possible that further research into the relationship between Greek and Coptic structures will uncover more such calqued constructions.

2.3.3. Functional PAT borrowing

The question of Greek influence on functional patterns in Egyptian has received very little attention in scholarship. However, this area has been the subject of a recent article by Zakrzewska, in which she discusses whether the Greek case system may have influenced valency patterns in

Coptic.[261] Using data from the Acts of the Martyrs (AM)[262], she notes that complex verbs in Bohairic which employ the light verbs ⲉⲣ "to do" and ϯ "to give", and are also used to incorporate borrowed Greek verbs into the language, always mark the direct object by means of a preposition, as shown in (24a).[263] On the other hand, for simple verbs this can either be marked with a preposition or through "head marking" (the direct attachment of the argument to the pre-nominal or pre-pronominal state of the verb) as shown in (24b).[264]

(25) *Valency patterns in Bohairic*

(a) Complex verbs – preposition

ϯ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲣ-ⲭⲁⲣⲓⲍⲉⲥⲑⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
1.SG-FUT-do.INF-donate.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲙⲟⲧ
IDEN-Z.ART-present

"I will donate him to you as a present." (AM, 67)[265]

(b) Simple verbs – head marking

ⲁ=ⲩ-ϩⲓⲧ=<u>ⲟⲩ</u>	ⲉ-ⲡⲓ-ϣⲧⲉⲕⲟ
PERF=3.PL-throw.INF=<u>3.PL</u>	to-DTC.M.SG-prison

"...(and) they threw them into the prison." (AM, 287)[266]

---

[261] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency'.

[262] Hyvernat, *Les Actes Des Martyrs de l'Égypte*.

[263] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 113.

[264] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 114.

[265] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 226.

[266] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 222.

Zakrzewska hypothesises that, since the use of prepositions to mark the direct object of verbs is unusual in earlier stages of the language and only begins to appear in Demotic at a time when Greek contact increased in intensity, it may represent a calque of Greek valency patterns employed to assist in "case marking" for borrowed verbs.[267] However, she concludes on the basis of her corpus that there is no evidence to suggest PAT borrowing of Greek valency patterns in Bohairic complex verbs.[268] Indeed, PAT borrowing is an unlikely explination, since the Stern-Jernstedt rule governing differential object marking is attested from Demotic texts from the early 6th century BCE, before intense contact with Greek and long before the earliest attested borrowed Greek verbs in Egyptian found within the Narmouthis Archive (c. 200 CE).[269] As such, the valency patterns of Coptic governing the marking of objects is a language internal development, uninfluenced by Greek contact.

This result is perhaps unsurprising, since further modification to the borrowed Greek verb after its incorporation into Egyptian would be required to create pre-nominal and pre-pronominal states in order to facilitate head marking. Furthermore, it should be emphasised that since Egyptian verbs function on a root system in which the different states of the infinitive can be created through the arrangement of vowels around the root consonants, a new process would need to develop in order to develop these states for borrowed Greek verbs. As such, in order to mark the direct object on borrowed Greek verbs, speakers would have drawn upon a method which already existed in the language – namely, the use of prepositional phrases. In this manner, as suggested by Zakrzewska, Greek may have indirectly influenced the use of prepositions to mark second arguments through propagating a pre-existing feature of the Egyptian language.[270]

---

[267] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 229.

[268] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 231.

[269] The earliest example of the Stern-Jernstedt rule in Demotic appears in Papyrus Rylands IX, dated to 514 or 513 BCE. See Depuydt, 'For the Sake of ογωϣ, 'Love': An Exception to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and Its History', 283; Johnson, *The Demotic Verbal System*, 9 and n. 5, 55ff; Parker, 'The Durative Tenses in P. Rylands IX', 180.

[270] Zakrzewska, 'Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency', 231.

2.3.4. Contact-induced change in Coptic: a summary

As the above discussion shows, the notion of contact-induced grammatical change in Egyptian through contact with Greek is an area of study which is still highly debated. Of the types of contact-induced change described in the literature, only the MAT borrowing of unbound grammatical morphemes is undisputed. However, as the arguments of Zakrzewska, Hasznos, Grossman, and Reintges show, the extent to which this MAT borrowing also affected the grammatical structures of the Egyptian language is a point of contention. Similarly, other examples of structural and functional PAT borrowing cited in the literature are somewhat tenuous, and in need of further investigation and discussion.

A recurring feature of these arguments however is the role of translation and its effects on stylistic and syntactic patterns. In a number of cases, while strong arguments cannot be made for direct PAT borrowing from Greek into Egyptian, it is possible that the prevalence of certain linguistic features in Coptic are language-internal developments which have been accelerated or propagated through contact with Greek, or an attempt to mirror Greek structures in translational literature. As such, it is vital to take a multi-causal approach to the study of language change in Egyptian, taking into consideration both internal and external factors which may facilitate such changes. This approach, and other theoretical frameworks outlined in this chapter, can be applied to the study of Coptic legal formulae in order to better understand their relationship to their Greek.

Chapter 3: Juristic papyrology and the study of language: theory and methodology

The study of Greek influence on the language and formulae of Coptic legal texts has a long history in the field of juristic papyrology. For more than a century, scholars have approached the topic of how language use in these texts developed, and the nature of their relationship to earlier Byzantine and Egyptian practices. The present chapter focuses on the theoretical approaches which have been applied to the study of Coptic legal formulae within the field of papyrology. Section 3.1 examines the current state of literature regarding Coptic juristic papyrology and the study of legal and linguistic continuity in Coptic documents. Section 3.2 discusses some of the main methodological issues which arise when using papyrological evidence for investigations into language use and language change, including issues of terminology and data collection, as well as how these issues have been addressed within the study. Section 3.3 provides a detailed overview of the presentation and analysis of the data in this study.

3.1. Coptic documents from a papyrological perspective

3.1.1. Coptic juristic papyrology: an overview

Early research into Coptic legal documents began in the 1850s and 60s, when lawyer and Egyptologist C. W. Goodwin published several important works on a number texts which were held in the British Museum.[1] He was the first scholar to present translations of Coptic legal documents, publishing an account of P.KRU 81, 91, and 108 as well as a discussion of the formulae

[1] Goodwin, 'Topographical Notes from Coptic Papyri'; Goodwin, 'XXIII.—Account of Three Coptic Papyri, and Other Manuscripts, Brought from the East by J. S. Stuart Glennie, Esq.'; Goodwin, 'Curiosities of Law, 1. Conveyancing among the Copts of the Eighth Century'.

of the Coptic *tebellio* document.[2] The importance of Coptic to the study of ancient law was revisited 30 years later when Mitteis made reference to the substantial corpus of Coptic legal texts from Western Thebes in his study of *Reichsrecht* (an imperial system of law) and *Volksrecht* ("law of the people") in the Roman Empire, published in 1891 (see below, 3.1.3).[3]

Scholarly interest in Coptic legal documents rose to new heights at the turn of the century, with the dramatic increase of the editing and translation of these texts. The important efforts of Crum in particular in the first few decades of the 20th century resulted in the publication of numerous Coptic documents for the first time.[4] Along with publications and translations of texts by other scholars, much of the corpus of Coptic legal documents available today was established during the first half of the 20th century.[5] Beyond the publication of papyri, early scholars of Coptic juristic papyrology turned their attention to the relationship of these documents to legal practices in Egypt and in the Roman Empire more broadly. Their discussions will be examined in more depth below

---

[2] Goodwin, 'Curiosities of Law, 1. Conveyancing among the Copts of the Eighth Century'; see also Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 406; n 3.

[3] Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 406; see Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs, mit Beiträgen zur kentniss des griechischen Rechts und der spätrömischen Rechtsentwicklung*.

[4] Crum, *Varia Coptica*; Crum, *Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca and Papyri*; Crum and Steindorff, *Koptische Rechtsurkunden des achten Jahrhunderts aus Djême (Theben) (= P.KRU)*; Bell and Crum, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum Vol. IV: The Aphrodito Papyri (= P. Lond. IV)*; Crum and Crawford, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*; Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum.*

[5] For an overview of these early publications and the importance of these pioneering scholars, see in particular Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 410ff; Till, *Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Theben*; Till, *Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden der Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Text, Übersetzungen, Indices. (= CPR IV)*; Kahle, *Bala'izah*; Till, *Erbrechtliche untersuchungen Aufgrund der koptischen Urkunden*; Schiller, *Ten Coptic Legal Texts (= P. CLT)*.

(3.1.3), however it is important to herald here the pioneering work of scholars such as Schiller, Steinwenter, and Till on the law of these documents and their position in the wider context of law in Late Antiquity.[6]

The study of Coptic documents has grown considerably in the past few decades, leading to the production of valuable scholarship on scribal practices, administration, and (importantly for the present study) law and legal practices in Late Antique and Early Islamic Egypt. In certain cases, scholars have focused on particular scribes and corpora. For example, Cromwell has dealt extensively with the legal and administrative documents of the village of Djême in Thebes and the scribes who composed them, particularly Aristophanes son of Johannes.[7] Fournet, MacCoull, and others have contributed much to the understanding of the bilingual notary and poet Dioscorus of Aphrodito, producing invaluable scholarship on his dossier and his archive (both his literary and documentary work).[8]

---

[6] See in particular Steinwenter, *Recht und Kultur*; Schiller, 'Zum Gegenwartigen Stand Der Juristischen Papyrusforschung'; Till, *Die koptischen Arbeitsverträge*; Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*; Till, 'Koptische Parallelurkunden'; Till, 'Die koptische Stipulationsklausel'; Till, 'Die koptischen Ehevertrage'; Till, 'Zum Eid in den koptischen Rechtsurkunden'; Schiller, *Ten Coptic Legal Texts (= P. CLT)*; Schiller, 'Koptisches Recht. Eine Studie auf Grund der Quellen und Abhandlungen'; Schiller, 'Coptic Law'; Steinwenter, 'Kindesschenkungen an koptische Klöster'; Steinwenter, *Studien zu den koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Oberägypten.*

[7] See for example Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*; Cromwell, 'Coptic Documents in Two Copies: A Study of Corrections and Amendments'; Cromwell, 'Identifying New Scribes in Old Documents'; Cromwell, 'Keeping It in the Family'; Cromwell, 'Following in Father's Footsteps'; Cromwell, 'A Potential Case of Sibling Scribes'; Cromwell, 'Aristophanes Son of Johannes'.

[8] See for example MacCoull, 'More on Documentary Coptic at Aphrodito'; MacCoull, 'The Coptic Archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodite'; MacCoull, *Dioscorus of Aphrodito*; Fournet, 'Archive ou Archives de Dioscore?'; Fournet and Magdelaine, *Les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte.*

Further scholarship has focused on the narrower question of legal and linguistic continuity in Coptic legal documents. Most notable is the ongoing work of Richter, who has dealt considerably with the question of legal practices and language use in Coptic papyri.[9] The volume of Keenan et. al. draws together research on Egyptian legal practices from the conquest of Alexander to the Early Islamic period – not only in Greek but also in Demotic and Coptic.[10] It is this research on legal and linguistic continuity between Greek and Coptic documents which is the primary concern of the present study.

3.1.2. Legal continuity: Reichtsrecht, Volksreicht, and "Coptic law"

The interest in continuity within Coptic documents has a long history – stretching back to the beginning of Coptic and juristic papyrology. The overarching question which occupied early research into Coptic legal documents was the extent to which they remained consistent with pre-Roman Egyptian legal practices. The earliest discussion of this problem was by Mitteis in 1891 who suggested that, unlike the "Romanised" western provinces, the east retained elements of earlier local legal thoughts and practices.[11] He discussed the distinction between *Reichsrecht* (an imperial system of law) and *Volksrecht* ("law of the people") and their interaction within legal systems of the provinces of the Roman Empire, which became a major point of investigation in the field of Coptic juristic papyrology in the following centuries.[12]

---

[9] Richter, 'What's in a Story?'; See in particular Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*; Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology'.

[10] Keenan, Manning, and Yiftach-Firanko, *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*; see in particular Depauw et al., 'The Historical Development of the Form, Content, and Administration of Legal Documents'; Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law'.

[11] Mitteis, *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs, mit Beiträgen zur kentniss des griechischen Rechts und der spätrömischen Rechtsentwicklung*; See Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 28.

[12] Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 406.

The relationship between *Reichsrecht* and *Volksrecht* in Coptic legal documents formed the basis of an ongoing discussion about the nature of "Coptic law". The term was first coined by Arthur Schiller in the 1930s, and used to delineate a legal system contained in documents written in Coptic from the 7th century onwards.[13] Schiller viewed "Coptic law" as an amalgamation of different legal traditions – particularly ancient Egyptian, Greek, Byzantine, and Arab.[14] The implication of Schiller's definition and terminology was that Coptic documents represented a legal system that was distinct and virtually separate from that expressed in Greek documents from the same region and period.[15]

The term "Coptic law" became the subject of some debate during the 20th century. The term was challenged in particular by Schiller's colleague Steinwenter during the 1950s, who instead spoke of "the law of Coptic documents".[16] In a similar vein to Schiller, Steinwenter viewed the legal system expressed in these documents as the result of the accumulation of legal practices over time – including earlier Egyptian practices inherited from Demotic documents.[17] Nevertheless, he favoured the possibility of Byzantine sources in cases in which the origins of legal practices were unclear. [18]

Further to the question of Byzantine influence on the development of legal practices in Egypt is the extent to which the major law codes of the empire were known and enacted within the province.

---

[13] Schiller, 'Coptic Law', 211.

[14] Schiller, *Ten Coptic Legal Texts (= P. CLT)*, 4; Schiller, 'Coptic Law', 212.

[15] Richter in Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 29.

[16] Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*.

[17] Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*, 57.

[18] Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden* , 57; see also Richter in Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 29–30; Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 408.

The prevailing view in the first half of the 20th century, following the work of Taubenschlag from the 1930s to the 1950s, was that the major Byzantine legal codes such as that of Justinian were known and enacted in Egypt.[19] He cites specific examples from papyri to support this claim; for example, in P. Oxy. I 196 – a Greek divorce document from the 6th century – he notes a number of similarities between the legal stipulations of the document and those contained within the legal code of Justinian, including male guardianship, the act of divorce as a result of mutual agreement, and the reservation of the right of both parties to remarry.[20]

The view of Taubenschlag that the laws of Justinian were known in Egypt was subsequently challenged by Schiller in the 1970s. He suggested that these laws were neither known nor practiced in Egypt, but rather the law in 6th century documents was the result of imperial decrees issued more than a century earlier and incorporated into the Egyptian legal system through notaries.[21] However, this revision was rebutted in 2007 by Beaucamp, in light of recent scholarship and an increase in papyrological evidence since the work of Schiller.[22] In response to the arguments of Taubenschlag, Schiller, and Beaucamp, Keenan astutely suggests that imperial laws were known at least to the elite of Alexandria and the Egyptian *metropoleis*, as well as certain individuals such as Dioscorus of Aphrodito, while the situation in the villages is less certain.[23] However, by his own admission, this observation is based on limited papyrological evidence.

---

[19] Keenan in Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 24. For the work of Taubenschlag, see Taubenschlag, 'Die Materna Potestas im gräko-ägyptischen Recht'; Taubenschlag, 'Geschichte der Rezeption des römischen Privatrechts in Ägypten'; Taubenschlag, 'Prozesse aus Pacht-, Miet-, Dienst- und Werkverträgen in den griechischen Papyri'; Taubenschlag, 'The Legislation of Justinian in Light of the Papyri'; and particularly the summation of his work in Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*.

[20] Taubenschlag, 'The Legislation of Justinian in Light of the Papyri', 283–84.

[21] Schiller, 'Review of Amelotti and Luzzatto 1972', 586–87; see also Schiller, 'The Courts Are No More'; Schiller, 'The Fate of Imperial Legislation in Late Byzantine Egypt'.

[22] Beaucamp, 'Byzantine Egypt and Imperial Law'.

[23] Keenan in Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 25–26

The discussions reviewed thus far assume that the origins of particular legal practices within Coptic texts are clearly observable. However, as Richter demonstrates, it is sometimes impossible to distinguish between diachronic and synchronic relationships within legal practices.[24] He notes a particular example of the donation of children to the Monastery of Apa Phoibammon, as evidenced in 8th century legal documents from Thebes, a practice whose origin is highly debated within scholarship. The tradition has been likened by some scholars to the Egyptian practice of self-dedication to particular gods and temples as witnessed in certain Demotic documents.[25] Alternatively, it has also been likened to Byzantine traditions which are the forerunners of the medieval European practice of *oblatio puerorum* ("conveyance of boys").[26] As such, there is no consensus on whether these donation documents are reflective of earlier Egyptian or contemporary Byzantine practices.

More recently, the question of continuity between earlier Byzantine practices and those present in Coptic documents has been discussed by Garel and Nowak in relation to monastic wills.[27] They note that while there is a clear sense of continuity between 7th and 8th century wills from Thebes and their late Roman Greek counterparts, these similarities cannot be attributed to the direct influence of Roman law; rather, they have been transmitted into Coptic documents through scribal

[24] Richter in Keenan et al., 29.

[25] Richter in Keenan et al., 29; Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 136–42; Thissen, 'Koptische Kinderschenkungsurkunden. Zur Hieroduile im christlichen Ägypten'; Schiller, 'Koptisches Recht. Eine Studie auf Grund der Quellen und Abhandlungen', 252; Schiller, 'Coptic Law', 212; Otto, *Beiträge zur Hierodulie im hellenistischen Ägypten von Walter Otto*.

[26] Richter in Keenan et al., 'Introduction and Historical Framework', 29; Richter, 'What's in a Story?', 245ff; Papaconstantinou, '"Notes Sur Les Actes de Donation d'Enfant Au Monastère Thébain de Saint-Phoibammon", Journal of Juristic Papyrology 32 (2002) 83-105'; Papaconstantinou, 'Θεῖα Οἰκονομία: Les Actes Thébains de Donation d'enfants Ou La Gestion Monastique de La Pénurie'.

[27] Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?'

and notarial practices.[28] For example, they observe that developments in particular formulae, such as the addition of monetary penalties which did not appear in Late Roman penal clauses, is a clear deviation from the basic underpinnings of Roman testament law.[29] As such, while elements of the language and content of these Coptic wills reflects that of earlier documents, they are somewhat divorced from the legal systems which initially produced these practices. This discussion highlights one of the key areas in which the relationship between Coptic documents and earlier legal practices can be explored: the examination and comparison of legal formulae, discussed in the following sections.

3.1.3. Linguistic continuity: Coptic and Demotic legal formulae

The study of legal formulae, particularly from the perspective of Coptic documents, has received relatively little attention within scholarship. Only a few major studies exist in which Coptic legal formulae are the subject of investigation and discussion. Biedenkopf-Ziehner's study of Coptic child donation documents from Thebes (P.KRU 78 – 103) presents an extensive overview of legal formulae found within these texts – many of which appear in other genres of legal texts – as well as their variations.[30] Other studies draw on much larger corpuses, such as Worp and Diethart's study on the *completio* formula (predominantly in Greek but with some Coptic examples), in which variations of the formula are arranged according to both geographical location and scribe.[31] Similarly, the work of Bagnall and Worp on chronological systems of Byzantine Egypt contains detailed descriptions of dating and invocation formulae in Greek and Coptic texts, including information on their diachronic and synchronic distribution.[32] Beyond these major volumes, discussions of Coptic legal formulae are generally limited to shorter articles on one particular

[28] Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?', 128.

[29] Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?', 122ff.

[30] Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais*.

[31] Worp and Diethart, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten (Byz.Not.)*.

[32] Bagnall and Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*.

formula, or discussions of formulae within the commentary of text editions.[33] However, despite the importance of these studies for understanding law and legal practices in Late Antique Egypt, few have considered the linguistic origin of Coptic formulae.

Despite the lack of large-scale studies on linguistic continuity within Coptic legal formulae, the matter has been discussed more broadly and theoretically in scholarship beginning from the earliest days of Coptic papyrology. Early scholarship on the subject, much like early scholarship on legal practices, tended to investigate linguistic continuity between Coptic documents and their Demotic counterparts. Jacob Krall, writing on Coptic documents from the Erzherzog Rainer papyrus collection in 1894, stated that Demotic formulae have survived in these documents which "have not been touched by Greek influence".[34] Eugène Revillout, who discussed the overall form of documents more broadly, identified that the Demotic "process-document" was the precursor to Greek and Coptic dialysis documents.[35] In the 1930s, Grohmann, whose work focused more on continuity in Arabic documents, identified a number of Coptic legal formulae which he suggested were inherited from Demotic, such as the "halving formula" – ⲉⲧⲁⲩⲡⲁϣⲉ ⲡⲉ X "their half being X".[36]

---

[33] Including but not limited to Till, 'Die koptische Stipulationsklausel' on the so-called 'stipulation clause'; on the formula ⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲱⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲣⲟⲩⲱⲥ from Coptic debt instruments, see Delattre, 'Un Contrat de Prêt Copte Du Monastère de Baouît', 385–89 and 388–89 and Satzinger, 'ⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲱⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲣⲟⲩⲱⲥ in koptischen Urkunden'; on the invocation formula see Cromwell, 'EN ONOMATI TOY ΘEOY TOY ΠANTOKPATAPOΣ'.

[34] Krall, 'Ägyptische Abtheilung', 47 n. 1.

[35] Revillout, *Précis du droit égyptien comparé aux autres droits de l'antiquité*, 720ff; Revillout, 'Les prières pour les morts dans l'épigraphie égyptienne', 15ff; for a discussion of the work of Revillout in relation to continuity between Demotic and Coptic documents, see Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 29–30.

[36] Grohmann, *Arabic Papyri in the Egyptian Library*, 153; for further examples, see Grohmann, 'Die Papyrologie in ihrer Beziehung zur arabischen Urkundenlehre'.

The identification of linguistic continuity between Demotic and Coptic legal formula continued within scholarship of the latter half of the 20th century. In the 1970s, Lüddeckens, identified several Coptic legal phrases which he believed were inherited directly from Demotic. For example, he described the phrase ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ, found in distance formulae in Coptic documents of the 8th century, as almost the word-for-word translation of the Demotic *pꜣ ntj ỉw=f r ỉj r.r=k*.[37] More tentatively, he suggests that the idea of 'receiving one's hand' found in the Demotic phrase *t.ṯ=n šp* "our (i.e. the guarantor) hand is received" is preserved in the Coptic ϯⲱⲧⲱⲣⲉ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲕ "I give surety in your hand".[38]

Similarly, in 1996, van den Berg-Onstwedder published his own observations of parallels between Demotic and Coptic legal formulae.[39] For example, similar to Lüddeckens, he notes continuity in the use of the word 'hand' in the formulae of repayment; *šp=ỉ swn.ṯ=w n ḥt n-d.ṯ.t* "I received its price in money from your hand"/ⲧⲉⲧⲓⲗⲓⲁ ⲧⲓⲙⲏ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲛ ⲛⲥⲓϫ ⲉⲥⲓϫ "the whole price came to us from hand to hand".[40] Furthermore, he argues that the Coptic phrase ϩⲙⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲏⲧϥ "in every place in which it is" (P.CLT 4.24) which appears as part of the *kyria* clause (KYR) is a "literal translation" of the Demotic phrase *n ꜥ.wỉ nb ntỉ ỉw.w n-ỉm.w* "in every place in which they are".[41] However, this analysis is problematic as the edition of P.CLT 4 by Schiller which van den Berg-

[37] Lüddeckens, 'Demotische und koptische Urkundenformeln', 27; see below for a rebuttle of this argument.

[38] Lüddeckens, 'Demotische und koptische Urkundenformeln', 29.

[39] van den Berg-Onstwedder, 'The Use of Demotic Phrases from Legal Texts of the Ptolemaic Period in Coptic Legal Texts'.

[40] van den Berg-Onstwedder, The Use of Demotic Phrases from Legal Texts of the Ptolemaic Period in Coptic Legal Texts', 111–12.

[41] van den Berg-Onstwedder, The Use of Demotic Phrases from Legal Texts of the Ptolemaic Period in Coptic Legal Texts', 107.

Onstwedder cites contains the phrase ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ̅ "in every place in which it will be shown".

The notion of a direct link between Demotic and Coptic legal formulae has been greatly criticised, particularly in the last few decades. Richter, in response to Lüddeckens and van den Berg-Onstwedder, states that there is no conclusive evidence to demonstrate such a relationship, although he notes the survival of some early Egyptian legal terms at the lexical level.[42] Furthermore, a direct link between Demotic and Coptic legal formulae and terminology can be dismissed on historical grounds, since the papyrological evidence shows that legal documents were not written in any form of the Egyptian language between the mid-3rd and late 6th centuries. Nevertheless, the apparent reappearance of some Demotic terminology and formulae in Coptic suggests an indirect method of the continuation of earlier Egyptian legal practice. Steinwenter suggests two explanations – either Egyptian law was preserved unwritten within Egyptian culture, to re-emerge later within Coptic documents, or the law and its language and terminology was ever-present in Greek documents, with Egyptian terminology re-introduced in Coptic.[43] An identical model was also proposed by Schiller in his 1975 monograph on the law of Coptic documents.[44]

The first method – the preservation of Egyptian law in an unwritten form – is naturally difficult to prove. The second – the survival of Egyptian law and legal terminology in Greek documents – has received more attention within scholarship. The suggestion was already raised by Schiller, who suggested that the Egyptian *Volksrecht* which he observed within Coptic documents had been

[42] Richter, 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology', 409; see also Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 58–61.

[43] Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*, 58; see also Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 35.

[44] Schiller, 'Zum gegenwartigen Stand der juristischen Papyrusforschung', 209–10; see also Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 36.

transmitted from Demotic via Greek texts.[45] More recently, Richter has argued for a case of "doppelte Interferenz", a process through which Demotic formulae were first translated into Greek, which were later translated into Coptic.[46] The formulae undergo translation from (Demotic) Egyptian to Greek, and then a retranslation from Greek into (Coptic) Egyptian. For example, at the lexical level he has noted several Demotic legal terms which were calqued into Greek and which reappear in Coptic; e.g. *ỉj r bnr r* (Demotic) > ἐπέρχεσθαι (Greek) > ει εβολ ε- (Coptic) "to sue/take proceedings against somebody (lit. "come out against somebody"), or *mḥ* (Dem.) > πληροῦν (Gr.) > ⲙⲟⲩϩ (Copt.) "to pay off somebody/to be complete" (lit. "to fill").[47]

At the grammatical level, the phenomenon of "doppelte Interferenz" can explain the apparent structural similarities between Demotic and Coptic legal formulae. This is best demonstrated in the case of Lüddeckens' argument regarding the relationship between Demotic *pз ntj ỉw=f r ỉj r.r=k* and Coptic ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ in the distance formula. The 'complex' Future *ỉw=f r sḏm* which appears in the Demotic distance formula grammaticalised into the Coptic Adhortative (Future III) ⲉϥⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄. However, rather than the Adhortative, the Coptic DST formula employs the 'simple' Future (ϥ)ⲛⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ (Future I).

Richter argues that, rather than a direct link between the Coptic and Demotic phrases, the Coptic ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ is a translation from the Greek future participle τὸν … ἐπελευσόμενον 'the one who will demand claims against…', contained in the Greek DST formula, which itself is translated

[45] Schiller, 'Coptic Law', 212 n. 1.

[46] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 38.

[47] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 137–38; see also Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 40, 48.

from the original Demotic *pꜣ ntj ỉw=f r ỉj r.r=k*.[48] The similarities between the Demotic and Coptic phrases, most notably the substantivised relative constructions *pꜣ ntj*/πετ, can therefore be attributed to the fact that they represent two different points in time of the same language, attempting to express the same basic meaning which has remained consistent from Demotic to Greek to Coptic. Furthermore, this demonstrates an important point of discussion on the development of Coptic legal formulae: the synchronic influence of Greek models.

3.1.4. Linguistic continuity: Coptic and Greek legal formulae

The process of "doppelte Intereferenz" described above demonstrates that a certain degree of linguistic continuity exists between Greek and Coptic legal texts. The relationship of Coptic legal formulae to their Greek counterparts has long been acknowledged in the field of juristic papyrology. For example, in 1912 Boulard argued that Coptic legal formulae and terminology were highly dependent on Byzantine Greek models.[49] Almost half a century later, Till described Coptic legal texts as a case of Byzantine formulae in "Coptic translation".[50] This view was adopted by later scholars, including Lüddeckens – despite his assertion that Coptic documents still bore traces of formulae from their Demotic predecessors.[51] Only a few years after Till's remarks, Wegner, one of the pupils of Mitteis and the teacher of Steinwenter, highlighted that the importance of Coptic documents lay in their relationship to Byzantine Greek texts, as seen in their formulae and clauses.[52] There was therefore little doubt in the mind of scholars that a certain degree of linguistic (or at the very least lexical) continuity existed between Greek and Coptic legal documents.

---

[48] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 51.

[49] Boulard, *La vente dans les actes coptes*.

[50] Till, 'Die koptische Stipulationsklausel', 81; see also Steinwenter, *Studien zu den koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Oberägypten.*, 61ff.

[51] Lüddeckens, 'Demotische und koptische Urkundenformeln', 21.

[52] Wenger, *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*, 318.

Despite the long history of scholarship which has recognised the relationship between Greek and Coptic legal formulae, very little data has been presented on the subject. In recent years, much work has been undertaken by Richter, whose research interests also lie in Greek-Egyptian language contact. His invaluable publication *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik* provides extensive examples of the relationship between particular Greek and Coptic legal formulae and terminology.[53] Aside from the Demotic terms translated into Greek and again into Coptic which are outlined above, Richter notes a number of examples in which Coptic legal formulae possess Greek equivalents, such as the Free Will formula (FRW) δίχα δόλου καὶ βίας καὶ ἀπάτης ("without guile and force and deceit") > ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ ϩⲓϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ϩⲓⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ ("without any guile or fear or force").[54]

Beyond the lexical level, further features of the language of Greek legal documents have been observed in Coptic texts. Richter notes the presence of Byzantine rhetorical styles in Coptic documents commonly found in their Greek counterparts, such as tautological word pairs (for example ⲕⲁⲕⲟⲛⲟⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲕⲁⲕⲟⲏⲑⲓⲁ "any wicked mind and malice" or ⲉⲓⲏⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲓⲥⲟⲡⲥ "I asking and begging"), or periphrastic phrases consisting of coordinated or contrasted words (for example ⲁⲓϩⲱⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓⲇⲱⲣⲓⲍⲉ "I determined and I donated" or ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲓⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲛⲕⲏⲙⲉ ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ϩⲛⲧⲥⲱϣⲉ "be it on the mountains, be it in the Nile valley, (or) be it on the field").[55] Richter attributes these features to changes in Greek chancellery style which occurred during the Byzantine period.[56]

---

[53] See in particular Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 166ff for an extensive glossary of Coptic legal terms, the formulae in which they appear, and their Greek counterparts.

[54] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 126.

[55] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 142–43; Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 112ff.

[56] Richter in Keenan et al., 'The Languages of Law', 142.

However, it should be further emphasised that these features are genre-specific rather than language specific: that is, these features appear in both languages as a result of an overarching Egyptian legal style that transcends the level of language. Consequently, the appearance of these rhetorical devices in Coptic documents should be understood as continuity within Egyptian legal practices, rather than the borrowing of rhetorical features from Greek into Egyptian.

In order to form a complete picture of the development of Coptic legal formulae, it is important to look beyond the notion of inheritance from Greek or Demotic as the sole factor behind the appearance of particular linguistic features. As noted by Richter, there are three main influences on the development of language use in Coptic legal texts which should be investigated: diachronic Egyptian influences (that is, continuity with Demotic texts), synchronic Greek influences behind expressions and formulae (such as those discussed in this section), and innovation by Coptic notaries.[57] This approach has also been taken by Garel and Nowak in their study of the relationship between 8th century monastic wills in Coptic and their Late Roman counterparts.[58] This multi-causal approach is similar to that discussed in 2.1. in which both external and internal factors can be seen to work simultaneously to influence language change.[59] Similarly, diachronic Egyptian influences, synchronic Greek influences, and innovation within Coptic scribal practices should all be viewed as factors which work together to develop formulae distinct to Coptic legal documents. This framework has been applied to the following study of the development of Coptic legal formulae, and the question of linguistic continuity within Coptic legal documents.

Despite the discussion of the links between Greek and Coptic legal formulae, as well as the examples cited in the works mentioned above, a large-scale comparative study of these formulae

---

[57] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 37.

[58] Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?', particularly 127-128 for a summary of their findings.

[59] See Chapter 2, n. 98

has yet to be undertaken. Particularly, in order to better understand the relationship between these formulae, it is necessary to consider the extensive variation which occurs across a wide corpus of legal texts. Finally, a better understanding of linguistic continuity in these formulae may be gained by drawing upon theoretical frameworks from the field of contact linguistics (see Chapter 2).

3.2. Papyri and the study of linguistics: methodological concerns

The utilisation of papyrological evidence to investigate language use, language change, and language contact presents several methodological concerns. Historically, the ways in which the language of documentary papyri has been described in scholarship has been somewhat problematic. Issues have arisen in the debate about language standardisation and variation, and the attitudes of early scholars towards non-standard features of the language of papyri. Furthermore, terminology around the different genres of papyri, particularly the unclear dichotomy of "literary" and "non-literary" language, obscures the true nature of the type of evidence these texts can provide for language use in antiquity. Finally, the nature of papyrological evidence – particularly its preservation and survival into modernity – creates unique challenges which are not found in the study of modern languages. It is therefore pertinent here to raise these issues and discuss the ways in which they are addressed in the study.

3.2.1. Linguistic concerns: Standard vs. non-standard language

As stated previously (3.1.1), the late 19th and early 20th centuries witnessed a shift in attitudes towards the study of documentary papyri as scholars increasingly recognised the importance of such documents, both historically and linguistically. Nonetheless, negative attitudes towards the language of the papyri persisted, even among those who deemed them worthy of publication and investigation. This is clearly demonstrated in the language used by early 20th century scholars to describe the register of documentary papyri, who use value-laden terms such as "bad Greek",

"ungrammatical", and "substandard".[60] While modern scholarship has tended to distance itself from such value laden terminology, the ideology still persists that documentary papyri represent a 'substandard' language variety in comparison to their literary counterparts.

The dichotomy between 'standard' and 'non-standard', however, is problematic for several reasons. To begin, as stated by Wagner et al., the notion of a uniform language standard is an ideal rather than a reality.[61] A language standard constitutes a set of arbitrarily prescribed norms, selected based on prestige, and subjected to geographical and social diffusion.[62] However, total uniformity across a particular register is never truly achieved. Milroy and Milroy suggest that this is true only of spoken languages, and that "the only fully standardised language is a dead language".[63] This, however, is untrue, as extensive variation is found not only in documentary papyri but also in the so-called "literary standard" of ancient texts.

Furthermore, while the rules and norms of a language standard are usually selected and imposed by native speakers, often in the case of linguistic research prestige is given to a particular language variety by the researchers themselves. This is especially true of ancient languages, for which there are no native speakers to provide such socio-linguistic data.[64] As noted by Milroy, this ideology

---

[60] See for example the comments of Edgar in *P. Cair. Zen. III* and *P. Cair. Zen. III*, 1928; see also Evans, 'Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri', 197.

[61] Wagner, Outhwaite, and Beinhoff, 'Scribes and Language Change', 10; Milroy and Milroy, *Authority in Language*, 19.

[62] Wagner, Outhwaite, and Beinhoff, 'Scribes and Language Change', 10; Milroy, 'Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization', 532; See also: Milroy and Milroy, *Authority in Language*.

[63] Milroy and Milroy, *Authority in Language*, 19.

[64] One notable exception is the phenomenon of Atticism, seen through textual evidence from the Roman period and Late Antiquity which reveals negative attitudes of Greek writers towards the register of Koine Greek, and the prestige applied by native speakers to Classical Attic. For example, in the preface to his On Ancient Orators, Dionysius of Halicarnassus commends the return to the "ancient, sober Rhetoric" in contrast to the Koine Greek,

"requires us to accept that language (or a language) is not the possession of native speakers".[65] Aside from the ethical implications of such a position, this also creates a bias within the research process and discussion of results.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to review all relevant literature about language standardisation. However, it is important to consider how such ideologies may impact on the use of papyrological sources for linguistic research. One key issue which emerges is how language variation within documentary texts should be interpreted and described. This methodological issue is highlighted by Leiwo in his discussion of the Greek letters discovered at Mons Claudianus, who states that it is necessary to distinguish between scribal error and real linguistic variation which is either endogenous (that is language-internal developments) or contact-induced.[66]

For the purpose of this study, therefore, any irregularities within the corpus are first examined as potential examples of linguistic variation. In other words, the possibility of scribal error is only used as an explanation for language variation once all other options have been explored. In this way, it may be possible to see recurring patterns of variation which, in isolated examples within particular texts, were previously considered to be errors.

3.2.2. Genre: "Literary" vs. "non-literary"

Following the increased interest in documents from Egypt in the late 19th and early 20th century, scholars tended to divide texts into two broad categories: literary and non-literary. However, this terminology is problematic and ill-defined. The question of what constitutes literature is an issue

described as "intolerably shameless and histrionic, ill-bred . . . vulgar and disgusting"; Kim, 'The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic', 472.

[65] Milroy, 'Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization', 537.

[66] Leiwo, 'Substandard Greek: Remarks from Mons Claudianus', 242.

not only within papyrology, but one which has been discussed at length within other fields of study, such as palaeography, codicology, discourse analysis, literary studies, and semiotics. While it is beyond the scope of this study to review the history of these arguments in great depth, it is nevertheless necessary to discuss some of the issues surrounding the terms 'literary' and 'non-literary' as they pertain to the use of papyri for linguistic research.

Broadly speaking, literary texts include genres such as religious texts, bibliographical texts, drama and poetry, while non-literary includes legal and administrative documents, and letters. However, certain textual genres such as magical or medical texts are more difficult to categorise. As early as the beginning of the 20th century, scholars noted texts which did not fit into the division of literary and non-literary. For example, Hunt's "miscellaneous company which lies about the borderline", which includes magical and astrological texts, medical texts, school exercises and so forth.[67] Such texts are often labelled as "semi-literary" or "para-literary": terms which is also ill-defined.

Within the present study, the terms "documents" or "documentary" papyri will be used to refer to the body of source material consisting of administrative and legal texts. However, these terms do not accurately portray the variation of language use across the different genres of texts contained within this body of evidence. When referring to language use within the source material for this study, the phrases "the language of Coptic legal texts" or "language use in Coptic legal texts" will be employed. However, these terms should be understood as a collective description of different variations of language use which depend on the type of text involved. Furthermore, references to texts other than documentary papyri will be referred to according to their specific genre; for example, Biblical translations, hagiographical texts, medical or magical papyri, and so forth.

[67] Hunt, 'Papyri and Papyrology', 86.

3.2.3. Archaeological concerns: preservation and publication of papyri

One of the most problematic aspects of the use of papyrological material for linguistic study is that the current archaeological record represents only a small percentage of papyri that have survived into modernity. While it is true that any linguistic study draws on a small subset of data which is not necessarily indicative of the entirety of the language it represents, studies of modern languages are based on textual or spoken data which are collected through controlled experiments from carefully selected participants and sources, and as such may be subject to stringent control to ensure the accuracy and reliability of results. The data for papyrological studies, conversely, is gathered from textual evidence from antiquity which has survived more or less by chance, and as such control over the source material is limited.

Furthermore, of the papyri which have survived into modernity, a large proportion consist of fragments or are highly damaged. As such, in order to ensure the accuracy of the data collected, strict criteria were used in the selection of texts and formulae regarding the amount of damage or editorial interference involved. Formulae in which grammatical morphemes such as TAM markers or object markers were wholly or partially restored were excluded from the data. So-called "content morphemes" or lexical items were included if only a small number of letters were restored, particularly if this restoration only affected internal vowels rather than the root consonants of the words. The exceptions to this were any situations in which this damage caused ambiguity in the morphology of a verb (for example infinitive vs. stative, absolute vs. pre-nominal state).

3.3. Methodology: Presentation and analysis of data

Chapters 4 and 5 present an outline, discussion, and analysis of the data for this study. The study focuses on seven Coptic legal formula with identifiable Greek counterparts. The formulae are divided on the basis of their historical development: Chapter 4 focuses on formulae which appear

in the opening of documents – the Appointment of Hypographeus (HYP), Appointment of Witnesses (AOW), Free Will (FRW), and Oath (OTH) formulae – while Chapter 5 discusses closing formulae – the Security formula (SCR), the *Kyria* clause (KYR), and the Subscription formula (SUB). The division into these categories is not always straightforward. For example, the FRW formula most commonly appears in the opening of documents but may also be repeated within the closing formulae. These formulae are discussed on a case-by-case basis within the body of each chapter.

3.3.1. Selection of formulae

The formulae discussed in this study have been selected on the basis on several factors. Most importantly, they are formulae which appear across multiple genres of legal texts; formulae which are genre specific, such as those detailing repayment of debts or payment of rent, have been omitted. Furthermore, the formulae in this study contain complex clause and phrase structures. Other formulae, such as dating or witness formulae contain less grammatical information, limiting the extent of their usefulness for the purpose of this study. Finally, formulae which have previously been the subject of detailed study have not been included, such as the invocation, address, stipulation, and *completio* formulae.

The division of texts into formulae is not necessarily a straightforward process. Since the separation of a document into constituent parts is a feature of modern scholarship and does not necessarily reflect the way in which ancient scribes conceptualised these texts, boundaries between particular formulae are not always distinct. Furthermore, the division of formulae in modern scholarship is not always consistent. An example of this is the security (SCR) and *kyria* (KYR) formulae (see Chapter 5, 5.1 and 5.2). Some scholars view these as two elements of the same

formula, while others analyse them as two distinct entities.[68] The decisions behind the identification and division of formulae in this study are discussed for each case within the body of the following chapters.

3.3.2. Analysis of formulae

The discussion and analysis of the formulae are presented in this study according to the following sections:

a) History and distribution

The data for the geographical and historical distribution of the Greek formulae is drawn from trismegistos.org. While this may not necessarily represent a complete list of all Greek documents published, it is the most efficient method of searching through the vast amount of published Greek documentary material for attestations of particular words and phrases. It provides at the very least a general idea of the lifespan of formulae and the regions in which they appear. An attempt has been made to identify the earliest published attestation of the formula, under the proviso that earlier attestations may have been published recently. A more complete analysis and dating of Greek legal formulae, while necessary, is beyond the scope of the present study.

In the case of Coptic texts, limitations imposed upon the collection of data for the corpus obscures the true diachronic and geographic distribution of particular formulae.[69] Since many non-Theban published documents are highly damaged, and therefore much of the formulaic data is unusable for the study, there is a bias in the data towards 7th and 8th century Theban material. For example,

[68] See Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais*, 32 and 55 and her analysis of the "Sicherheitsformal"; compare Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, who discusses the 'Formel der Urkundenerrichtung' (262) and the 'Kyria-Klausel' (238 and 322).

[69] See 1.3.1 for a discussion of the geographical parameters of the corpus, and issues with the availability of data in each region.

data for the Free Will (FRW) formula shows that, of the 37 attestations in the corpus, 36 originate from 7th to 8th century Thebes, while only one comes from Aphrodito. However, the FRW formula also appears in several other texts from Aphrodito and the Hermopolite nome which were excluded from the corpus on the basis of significant damage or restoration by the editor. These fragmentary formulae could not be used for qualitative analysis; however their identification is important to help provide a more accurate understanding of the distribution of the FRW formula.

The collection of this additional data on Coptic legal formulae from beyond the corpus is somewhat more difficult than for the Greek formulae, since Coptic papyrology still lack many of the digital tools and resources available for the study of Greek documents. As such, much of this evidence was taken from Förster's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* since Greek loanwords feature heavily in all the legal formulae discussed in this study.[70] Further, while limited in the number of Coptic texts currently digitised in its database, the DDbDP was also consulted. While these additional formulae were unable to provide qualitative data to aid in categorisation and description, they provided a clearer and more accurate overview of the geographical distribution of the formulae examined in this study than the main qualitative corpus.

b) Forms of the formulae

Each attestation of the legal formulae used in the study was analysed and subcategorised based on shared similarities in their structure. These categories are displayed in tables in the following three chapters, as well as in Appendix B. An example of this categorisation, based on the Subscription (SUB) formula, is shown in Table 3.1.

[70] For example, the Free Will (FRW) formula, which contains a series of borrowed Greek nouns (ϩⲓⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ ϩⲓⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲥⲩⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲅⲏ ϩⲓⲡⲉⲣⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ, etc).

Table 3.1: Sample of the categorisation of legal formulae (SUB Formula)

Broad Code	I have written	Illiteracy	Narrow Code
SUB.1	ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.1.1
		ⲭⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)	SUB.1.2
		ⲭⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.1.3†
		ⲭⲉⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ	SUB.1.4†
SUB.2	ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	ⲭⲉ(ⲛ)ⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.2.1
		ⲭⲉⲙⲁⲃⲛⲟⲉ	SUB.2.2†

†Appears only in one text within the corpus

Individual formulae can be divided into distinct segments, each of which may contain several variations. For example, the SUB formulae shown in Table 3.1 can be divided into the main clause of writing and the subordinate clause of illiteracy. Due to the high number of variables, the categorisation of some formulae is more problematic than others.

Two levels of categorisations exist, each provided with a code. The first is a Broad Code, for categories which share an overarching feature. For example, in Table 3.1, SUB.1 and SUB.2 are distinguished by the conjugation of the main verb: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ and ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ respectively. The second level is a narrow code which indicates further variations within these broader groups. For example, within SUB.1, further distinctions can be made according to differences in the subordinate clause of illiteracy: its absence in SUB.1.1, the use of the negative Habitual as opposed to the negative Present in SUB.1.2, and the use of the verb ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ in place of ⲛⲟⲓ in SUB.1.4.

For the sake of brevity and clarity, the categorisation of the formulae focuses on the core phrases: the main verbal elements and their arguments, (or other subject-predicate groupings for non-verbal clauses), and prepositional phrases which are central to the overall meaning of the formula. Recurring adverbial adjuncts, that is, those adverbial phrases which do not add to the meaning of

the formula, are omitted. For example, the Oath (OTH) formula contains several variations in its opening phrase, including:

- ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ (ⲇⲉ) ⲛ- *"(and) I swear"*
- ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ (ⲇⲉ) ⲛ- *"(and) moreover I swear"*
- ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ (ⲇⲉ) ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛ- *"(and) I swear hereafter"*
- ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ- *"subsequently I swear"*
- ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ- *"and above all I swear"*

The adverbial elements ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ, ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ and ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ are ubiquitous across different legal formulae and are used to mark the flow of discourse within the documents. As such, rather than creating different subcategories for each opening, these elements are omitted and subsumed under the one category: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-.

In order to further simplify the display of data within the tables, the following standardisations have been implemented:

- Personal names are indicated with the standard notation NN, e.g. ⲁⲛⲟⲕ NN "I, NN".
- The name of specific document types is indicated by X, e.g. ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X ⲛⲁⲕ "I have executed X-document for you".
- Other objects which consist of titles or institutions are indicated by Y, e.g. ⲉⲓⲱⲣϫ ⲛ-Y "I swear to Y."
- When variable personal pronouns appear within the same variation of a formula, these are written in the 1st person singular or 3rd masculine singular, e.g. ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ 'I write' (which also appears in some texts as ⲉⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ "we write"); ⲉⲣⲟϥ 'to him' (which may also appear as ⲉⲣⲟⲥ

"to her", ϵροογ "to them"). However, where a particular variation occurs in only one document, the original pronoun is retained.

- Since there is no agreed upon standardised spelling for the language of Coptic documents, the spelling of words in the tables represent the most common spelling attested within that variation, e.g. ϵιτι for ϵιϯ "I give". For variations which occur only in one text, the original orthography is maintained.

The typologies presented in this study represent a preliminary attempt at providing a simplified method for referring to and analysing Coptic legal formulae. It is hoped that they will provide a starting point for further development of a simpler and more accurate method of identifying and discussing legal formulae.

c) Discussion of the Coptic formula

Following the tables for each of the formulae, the different segments of the formula and the variations within these segments are discussed in detail. This discussion provides details on the number of attestations of each variation within the corpus, any significant geographic and diachronic distribution of these variations, and whether these variations may be attributed to the work of an individual scribe or scribal school. Furthermore, this section allows for the discussion and justification of any interpretations made of ambiguous grammatical forms or unique orthographies.

d) Comparison of the Greek and Coptic formulae

The comparative study of each Coptic formula begins with a brief introduction to the forms of their Greek counterparts, based on data drawn from the DDbDP (see above 3.3.1). The categorisation of the Greek formulae is less extensive than that undertaken for the Coptic. In order to make the large dataset of Greek formulae more manageable, and to provide a general overview of their structure and vocabulary, only the main recurring patterns are presented. However, all

variations contained within the data sample are taken into consideration in the subsequent comparative study.

The comparative discussion of the Greek and Coptic formulae begins with a general overview of the main similarities in their content; particularly, whether the Greek formulae can be segmented in the same way as the Coptic. A comparison is then made of the methods through which the formulae are integrated into the text, that is, whether they are independent clauses, or whether they form part of or are dependent on the preceding or following clauses. Following this, a more detailed examination of the individual clauses, phrases, and syntactic and morphological structures of the formulae is undertaken in order to identify any processes of translation or structural interference between the two languages. An overall comparison and discussion of these features across the formulae examined in this study, and the significance of the results of the data for our understanding of the development of Coptic legal formulae, is presented in Chapter 6.

Chapter 4: Opening formulae

The formulae presented in this chapter are normally found in the opening of Coptic documents, situated before the main body of the text. In some cases, they are also repeated in the closing statements of the document. However, since they more commonly appear at the beginning of texts, they have been grouped together under the heading of opening formulae. The following Coptic formulae are discussed:

4.1. The Appointment of *Hypographeus* formula (HYP)

4.2. The Appointment of Witnesses formula (AOW)

4.3. The Free Will formula (FRW)

4.4. The Oath formula (OTH)

As the following discussion shows, there is a certain degree of similarity between these formulae and their Greek counterparts. However, the linguistic relationship between the Coptic and Greek iterations of these formulae is not always straightforward.

4.1. Appointment of Hypographeus (HYP)

The HYP formula consists of a declaration by the first party stating that a *hypographeus* has been appointed to sign the document on their behalf.[1] Additionally, the formula often includes a further statement noting that witnesses have also been appointed. In Coptic documents, the latter often appears separately in the form of the AOW formula (see 4.2).

[1] On the role of the hypographeus in text production, see Youtie, 'Ὑπογραφεύς: The Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt'; Youtie, 'Because They Do Not Know Letters'; Youtie, 'Ἀγραμματος: An Aspect of Greek Society in Egypt'; Youtie, 'Βραδέως Γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy'; see also the discussion of the subscription (SUB) formula in 5.3.

4.1.1. History and distribution

The HYP formula is first attested in Greek texts in the mid-6th century CE. The earliest attestation with an absolute date appears in P. Lond. V 1722, a sales document from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan dated to 530 CE. The latest Greek attestation appears in SB I 5112, a sales document from Apollonopolis (Edfu) dated to 618 CE. Aside from SB I 5112 and one other text from Apollonopolis (P. Grenf. I 60), all examples of the Greek HYP formula occur within bilingual archives: the Patermouthis archive, the archive of Aurelius Pachymios in This, and the archives of Dioscorus and of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos in Aphrodito.[2]

The Coptic HYP formula is attested 33 times within the corpus. All 33 attestations appear in Theban documents, written in Djême and dated to the 8th century, and no traces of this formula are attested in fragmentary documents from outside of Thebes. While the surviving papyrological records are unavoidably incomplete (see 3.2.3), the available data suggests that the Coptic HYP formula was unique to 8th century Theban documents. The earliest attestation of the formula appears in P. CLT 1, a release dated to 698 CE and written by Psate son of Pisrael.

As the dates highlighted above show, there are no Greek HYP formulae which are contemporaneous with their Coptic counterparts. While the latest attestation of the Greek formula is written in 618, the earliest Coptic formula is not attested until 80 years later. This may be a result of the chance survival of papyri, and later Greek or earlier Coptic formulae have been lost. Nevertheless, considering the nature of the data, it is difficult to determine whether the Coptic HYP formula was directly modelled on their Greek counterparts (see 4.1.4 and 6.2.1.).

[2] On the archives of Dioscorus and Patermouthis, see 1.3.1, n. 73 and 75 respectively. On the archive of Pachymios (TM Arch id: 36), see Clackson, "Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri," 98; MacCoull, "Further Notes on Interrelated Greek and Coptic Documents of the Sixth and Seventh Centuries," 347–50; On the archive of Phoibammon (TM Arch id: 193), see Fournet, "Sur les premiers documents juridiques coptes (2) : Les archives de Phoibammôn et de Kollouthos"; Bagnall and Worp, "Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito," 248–52.

4.1.2. Forms of the Coptic HYP formula

The Coptic HYP formula is composed of two main segments. The first, hereafter referred to as the "appointment of *hypographeus*" statement, appears as an independent verbal clause containing a verb of appointing. The second, referred to as the "appointment of witnesses" statement, is an optional element which is connected to the main clause in several ways (see 4.1.3). Table 4.1 summarises the different variations and combinations of these two segments within the corpus.

Table 4.1: Forms of the Coptic HYP formula in the corpus

Broad Code	Appointment of *hypographeus*	Appointment of witnesses	Narrow Code
HYP.1	ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	-	HYP.1.1
		ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.1.2
		ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ	HYP.1.3
		ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ... ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.1.4†
		ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ... ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.1.5†
		ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.1.6†
HYP.2	ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.2.1†
		ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.2.2†
HYP.3	ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.3
HYP.4	ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ	HYP.4.1†
		ⲙⲛⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ··· ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.4.2
		ⲙⲛⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.4.3†
HYP.5	ⲉϥϯ ⲛⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ…	ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.5†
HYP.6	ⲉⲩϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ... ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.6†
HYP.7	ⲉⲩⲧⲣⲉⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ	-	HYP.7†

HYP.8	ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ... ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.8
HYP.9	ⲉⲓϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲛⲛⲁϭⲓⲝ ⲙⲙⲓⲛ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	HYP.9†

†Only appears in one text in the corpus.

It should be noted that within these variations the synonyms ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ/ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ "witness" and ⲣ̅-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ/ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "to witness" are viewed as functionally distinct, since scribes are consistent in their choice of words (see below, for examples, as well as Appendix B for a list of attestations and the scribes who wrote them). As such, within the categorisations shown in Table 4.1, different combinations of these synonyms are treated as separate formulae.

4.1.3. Analysis of the Coptic HYP formula

a) *Appointment of hypographeus: Verb of appointing*

In all attestations of the Coptic HYP formula in the corpus, the appointment of *hypographeus* statement consists of an independent clause containing the verb ⲧⲓ (ϯ) "to give/place" (here "to appoint"). However, there are several variations in the way in which this verb is expressed. HYP.1-4, which account for 27 of the 33 attestations of the HYP formula in the corpus, open the formula with the form ⲉⲓⲧⲓ, shown in (1). This construction is an example of the Performative ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ which is a common feature of Coptic legal documents and Theban documentary material more broadly.[3] The Performative is categorised as a tripartite, main clause conjugation which invariably possesses a 1st person subject.[4] Shisha-Halevy identifies the Performative as one of the functions of the

[3] Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*, 79 n. 92; Shisha-Halevy, *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*, 177; see also Cromwell and Grossman, "Condition(al)s of Repayment: P. CLT 10 Reconsidered," 8, 10–12.

[4] Cromwell and Grossman, "Condition(al)s of Repayment: P. CLT 10 Reconsidered," 11.

focalised Present, which he observes in the works of Shenoute and elsewhere within Coptic literary and documentary texts.[5]

(1) ϵ=ι-ⲧι ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵⲩⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-appoint.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-hypographeus

ϵ-ⲧⲣ=ϥ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ι
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-sign.INF for=1.SG

"I appoint hereafter a hypographeus *to sign on my behalf."* (P.KRU 14.8-9)

Of the remaining six attestations of the HYP formula, two are introduced by the form ϵϥϯ/ϵⲩϯ: P.KRU 74 (HYP.5) and P.KRU 36 (HYP.6).[6] Since these possess 3rd person rather than 1st person subjects, they cannot be Performatives. As such, both ϵϥϯ and ϵⲩϯ should be analysed as circumstantial Presents, expanding upon the preceding name of the first party, as shown in (2).[7] Note that, in these texts, the name of the first party acts as a left dislocated subject for the following formulae, which is normally headed by the Performative. For example, in the case of P.KRU 36 shown in (2), the HYP formula is embedded with the opening AOW formula.

(2) ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲥⲧϵⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ-ⲭⲁⲣϵⲃ ⲙⲛ-ⲁⲃⲓⲅⲁⲓⲁ…
INDP.1.PL Stephanos with-Khareb with-Abigaia…

[5] Shisha-Halevy, *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*, 79 n. 92.

[6] Crum transcribes the formula in P.KRU 36 tentatively as ϵⲩϯ, however a re-examination of a digital image of the papyrus confirms that his reading of ⲩ is correct.

[7] While "circumstantial Presents" are in reality a circumstantial conversion of a Present clause, for the sake of simplicity this study will hereafter use the term "circumstantial Present". Similar terminology will also be employed for the circumstantial conversion of other verbal clauses, as well as for instances of relative and focalising conversions.

ϵ=ϒ-ϯ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩϒⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵϒⲥ
CIRC=3.PL-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus

ϵⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩϒⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ	ⲁϒⲱ	ϵ=ϒ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗϵⲓ
REL-FUT-sign.INF	and	CIRC=3.PL-beseech.INF

ⲛ-ϩϵⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣϵ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ…
DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy…

ϵ=ⲛ-ⲣ-ϩⲟϒⲟ	ⲇϵ	ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-do.INF-more	ENCL	confirm.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩϵⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣϵ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
through-INDF.PL-witness	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"We, Stephanos and Khareb and Abigaia… appointing a hypographeus *hereafter who will sign, and beseeching some trustworthy witnesses… we further confirm it (the document) through some trustworthy witnesses…"* (P.KRU 36.4-12)

P.KRU 36 is written Psate son of Pisrael, while the scribe of P.KRU 74 is unknown. Two other attestations of the formula can also be attributed to Psate: P. CLT 1 (HYP.2.2) and P.KRU 85 (HYP.1.5), which both open with the Performative. As such, the use of the circumstantial Present to introduce the HYP formula is not a particular feature of Psate, but rather one of two variations upon which he draws.

The third variant of the opening verb form found only in P.KRU 23 (HYP.7), begins with the phrase ϵϒⲧⲣϵⲟϒϩϒⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵϒⲥ ϩϒⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ. The marker ϵ- at the beginning of the construction is understood by Till as a Theban form of the Sahidic Perfect ⲁ-.[8] However, as shown in (3), the opening of P.KRU 23 follows the same NN + HYP + PFRM structure as P.KRU 36 and 74. As

[8] Till, *Die Koptischen Rechtsurkunden Der Papyrussammlung Der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Text, Übersetzungen, Indices. (= CPR IV)*, 31 n. 3: 'es ist angenommen, daß ϵϒ- thebanisch für klassisches ⲁϒ- steht.'

such, is more likely to be a circumstantial convertor, causing the HYP formula to become imbedded within the opening Address formula.

(3) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲥⲁⲣⲣⲁ… ⲉⲣⲉ-ⲫⲟⲓⲃⲁⲙⲙⲱⲛ ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
INDP.1.SG Sarra… CIRC-Phoibammon DEF.M.SG-son

ⲙ-ϯⲁⲧⲏ ⲥⲩⲛⲉⲩⲇⲟⲕⲉⲓ… ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ
POSS-Psate assent.INF after=3.F.SG

ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲧⲣⲉ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ
CIRC=3.PL-INFL.INF-INDF.SG-*hypographeus* sign.INF

ϩⲁ-ⲧⲉⲓ-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲓⲅⲩⲡⲧⲓⲁⲕⲟⲛ… ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
for-DEM.ART.F.SG-sale ATTR-Z.ART-Egyptian… PFRM=1.PL-write.INF

ⲙ-ⲡⲁⲩⲗⲟⲥ
DIR.OBJ-Paul…

"I, Sarra… Phoibammon the son of Psate assenting… causing a hypographeus *to sign hereafter for this Egyptian sale… we write to Paul…"* (P.KRU 23.1-5)

One further variant of the HYP formula, HYP.8 (P.KRU 80 and 81), begins with the construction ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ, as shown in (4). The scribes of both P.KRU 80 and 81 are unknown, however a palaeographic comparison of the two documents suggests that they may have been written by the same scribe.[9] Consequently, ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ appears to be a variation which can be attributed to a particular unknown individual.

(4) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲱⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ
PERF=1.SG-appoint.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-*hypographeus*

[9] Private correspondence with Dr Jennifer Cromwell, 2018.

ϵ-ⲧⲣϵ=ϥ-ϩⲩⲡⲱⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-sign.INF	for=1.SG

"I have appointed hereafter a hypographeus *to sign on my behalf."* (P.KRU 81.5)

The interpretation of the form ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ is somewhat problematic. It may be an erroneous writing of the Performative ϵⲓⲧⲓ, possibly confused with the infinitive of the Greek loan-verb ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ (αἰτέω) "to ask" which appears within other legal formulae. This explanation seems more plausible when one considers that the verb ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ is often written as ϵⲓⲧⲓ elsewhere in Coptic documents.[10] However, the appearance of ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ in two HYP formulae written five years apart suggests that the choice of orthography is deliberate. Consequently, in order to minimise editorial interference in the original text, the form ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ here is understood to be a Perfect conjugation, with ⲧϵⲓ appearing as a (well-attested) variant of the infinitive ϯ.[11]

The final variation of the HYP formula, found in P.KRU 41 (HYP.9), opens with an entirely different construction. Rather than the appointment of a *hypographeus*, the first party states that he signs the document by his own hand. The formula opens with the verb ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ "to sign" written in the Performative, as shown in (5).

(5)	ϵ=ⲓ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ	ϩⲛ-ⲛⲁ-ϭⲓϫ	ⲙⲙⲓⲛϵⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ
	PFRM=1.SG-sign.INF	through-POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-hand	INTS.PRN=1.SG

[10] For example, P.KRU 10.62; 15.108; 17.53; 26.31; 37.94, 114; 43.71; 45.68; 50.76; 52.11; 65.87; 70.66, 68; 75.145; 86.6; 90.36. See Förster, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*, 19. Förster also includes the attestations of ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ in the HYP formulae of P.KRU 80 and 81 in his list, however these can in no way be interpreted as the verb "to ask".

[11] CD 392a

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
and	PFRM=1.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"I sign by my own hand, and I beseech some other trustworthy witnesses…" (P.KRU 41.8-10)

Although the opening of this attestation is markedly different to other attestations of the HYP formula, the statement of the appointment of witnesses in HYP.9 is the same (see below). Furthermore, its position and function within the document is similar to other versions of the formula. As such, it has been categorised within this study as an attestation of the HYP formula.

b) Appointment of hypographeus: Object of verb of appointing

In Table 4.1 above, the variations of the HYP formula are further distinguished according to the object of the verb ⲧⲓ, as well as the following constructions which expand upon it. In HYP.1, which accounts for 20 of the 33 attestations of the formula in the corpus, the object of ⲧⲓ consists of an indefinitely determined noun (ⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ "a *hypographeus*") followed by a purpose clause using the construction ⲉ + INFL.INF, as shown in (6).

(6)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ
	PFRM=1.SG-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-hypographeus

ⲉ-ⲧⲣ=ϥ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-sign.INF	for=1.SG

"I appoint hereafter a hypographeus *to sign on my behalf."* (P.KRU 27.7)

In three further texts, P.KRU 86 (HYP.2.1), P.CLT 1 (HYP.2.2) and P.KRU 36 (HYP.5), the noun ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ is definite and expanded by a relative Future, as shown in (7). Of these three texts,

P.KRU 36 written in 724 and P.CLT 1 written in 698, are both written by Psate son of Pisrael, suggesting that the use of ⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ in the HYP formula is an idiosyncrasy of his writing. However, P.KRU 86, whose scribe is unknown, was composed in 766 and is therefore too late to be part of Psate's dossier. This may therefore be evidence of a scribal school spanning several generations, although there does not appear to be any further links between P.KRU 86 and the work of Psate.

(7)	ⲉ=ⲛ-ϯ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ
	PFRM=1.PL-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus
	ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲛ	
	REL-FUT-sign.INF	for=1.PL	

"We appoint hereafter the hypographeus *who will sign on our behalf."* (P.KRU 86.5)

In P.KRU 35 and 38 (HYP.3), the direct object of ⲧⲓ is expressed by the substantivised relative Future construction ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ "the one who will scribe", as demonstrated in (8). Both texts were composed by Johannes son of Lazarus, suggesting that the use of this construction in the HYP formula was a personal variation. However, this was not his only choice of construction, also employing a HYP.4 formula in P.KRU 21 and 42.

(8)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
	PFRM=1.SG-appoint.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF	for=1.SG

"I appoint the one who will sign on my behalf..." (P.KRU 38.14-15)

In HYP.4 (P.KRU 6, 9, 20, 21 and 42) and HYP.5 (P.KRU 74), the direct object of ⲧⲓ is expressed through the noun phrase ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ "the signature of the one who will sign", shown in (9).

(9) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲧ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
PFRM=1.SG-place.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG-signature

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
POSS-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF for=1.SG

"I place hereafter the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf." (P.KRU 6.6-7)

While HYP.4-5 differ from the other iterations of the HYP formula in that they do not specifically mention the appointment of a *hypographeus*, its structure, position in the document, and overall legal function remains the same. As such, they have been included as examples of the HYP formula.

c) Appointment of witnesses: incorporation of the noun

Of the 33 attestations of the HYP formula in the corpus, 21 contain the appointment of witnesses statement. In these formulae, the noun "witness" is expressed either through the borrowed Greek word ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ (μάρτυρος), which appears in 12 attestations of the formula, or the Egyptian ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ, which appears in nine. The choice between these two nouns appears to be a result of scribal preference. For example, all four of the HYP formulae mentioning witnesses composed by Aristophanes son of Johannes use ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ (P.KRU 15, 27, 41, and 47), while all four HYP formulae attributed to Johannes son of Lazarus contain ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ (P.KRU 21, 35, 38, and 42). However, the number of attestations of the HYP formulae attributed to each individual scribe is too small to make any definitive claims about the distribution of these words.

The appointment of witnesses statement is introduced by one of two different constructions. The first is the PP (prepositional phrase) ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ/ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ "and some (other) witnesses", which appears in 17 attestations within the corpus. As shown in (10), the noun ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ/ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ consequently becomes part of the NP which forms the direct object of the verb ⲧⲓ. As such, both

elements of the formula (that is the appointment of a *hypographeus* and the appointment of witnesses statements), are part of the same verbal clause.

(10) ϵ=ⲛ-ϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵⲩⲥ…
PFRM=1.PL-give.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-hypographeus…

ⲙⲛ-ϩϵⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣϵ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
with-INDF.PL-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"We appoint hereafter a hypographeus… and some trustworthy witnesses…" (P.KRU 5.5-6)

The second construction introducing the appointment of witnesses statement consists of a separate verbal clause introduced by a verb of asking or requesting: ϵⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗϵⲓ/ϵⲓⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ ⲛϩϵⲛ(ⲕϵ)ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ/ⲙⲛⲧⲣϵ "I beseech/ask some (other) witnesses…". As shown in (11), this clause is coordinated with the first using the conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ. This construction occurs in only three texts within the corpus: P.KRU 36 and 41 with ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗϵⲓ, and P.KRU 86 with ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ.

(11) ϵ=ⲛ-ϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵⲩⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-give.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus

ϵⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫϵ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ϵ=ⲛ-ⲁⲓⲧϵⲓ
REL-FUT-sign.INF for=1.PL and PFRM=1.PL-ask.INF

ⲛ-ϩϵⲛ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲟⲥ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

ϵ-ⲧⲣϵ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲓⲍϵ
to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF

"We appoint hereafter the hypographeus *who will sign on our behalf, and we ask some trustworthy witnesses to witness…"* (P.KRU 86.5-7)

The constructions in P.KRU 41 and 86, in which the verbs of asking possess 1st person subjects, can be understood as Performatives. The verb of asking in P.KRU 36, however, differs from the other two attestations in that the subject of ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ is in the 3rd person, as shown in (12). This verb form can be analysed as a circumstantial Present which mirrors the expression of the initial verb of appointing in the formula.

(12) ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲙⲛ-ⲭⲁⲣⲉⲃ ⲙⲛ-ⲁⲃⲓⲅⲁⲓⲁ…
INDP.1.PL Stephanos with-Khareb with-Abigaia…

ⲉ=ⲩ-ϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ
CIRC=3.PL-appoint.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus

ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ
REL-FUT-sign.INF and CIRC=3.PL-beseech.INF

ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ…
DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy…

"We, Stephanos and Khareb and Abigaia… appointing hereafter a hypographeus *who will sign and beseeching some trustworthy witnesses…"* (P.KRU 36.4-11)

d) Appointment of witnesses: verb of witnessing

In 20 of the 21 attestations of the HYP formulae which include an appointment of witnesses statement, the noun ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ/ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ is followed by a phrase containing the verbs ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓϫⲉ or ⲣ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ "to witness". These verbs are contained within one of two constructions. The first is a purpose clause consisting of the form ⲉ + INFL.INF, as shown in (13a), which occurs in 11 attestations of the formula. The second, which appears in nine attestations, is an NP which stands in apposition to the noun ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ/ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ, consisting of the demonstrative pronoun ⲛⲁⲓ expanded by a relative Future, shown in (13b).

(13) *HYP formula constructions containing verbs of witnessing*

(a) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ
and PFRM=1.PL-ask.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF

"...and we ask some trustworthy witnesses to witness." (P.KRU 86.6)

(b) ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
and PFRM=1.SG-beseech.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy DEM.PRN.PL REL-FUT-witness.INF to=3.M.SG

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
for=1.SG

"...and I beseech some other trustworthy witnesses; these ones who will witness it on my behalf." (P.KRU 15.8-9)

Certain scribes exhibit a preference for one construction over the other. For example, Johannes son of Lazarus uses ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ in three of the four HYP formulae within the corpus which he composed (P.KRU 21, 35, and 38), while in his remaining HYP formula (P.KRU 42) no verb of witnessing appears. Conversely, other scribes alternate between the two constructions. For example, Aristophanes son of Johannes uses ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ early in his career (P.KRU 47 dated 737/738 and P.KRU 27 dated to the 740s), but later uses ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ (KRU 41 dated to 749 and P.KRU 15 dated to 756).

One final variation of the verb of witnessing appears in P.KRU 36 (HYP.6). In this attestation, the verb of witnessing is not introduced by any morphology. Rather, the infinitive stands alone directly after the main verb of asking and its object, as shown in (14).

(14) …ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
…and CIRC=3.PL-beseech.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy witness.INF for=3.PL

"…and beseeching some trustworthy witnesses to witness on their behalf…" (P.KRU 36.10)

The formula is composed by Psate son of Pisrael, who composed only one other HYP formula in the corpus (P.CLT 1) in which the verb of witnessing appears in the phrase ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ. It is therefore likely therefore that the lack of any morphological markers on the verb of witnessing in P.KRU 36 is a result of scribal error, and the ⲉ + INFL.INF construction is intended. Alternatively, this may have been intended as an ⲉ + INF construction, in which the preposition was erroneously omitted. However, since no other attestations of this construction occur in the HYP formula, this explanation is less likely.

4.1.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic HYP formulae

As the discussion in 4.1.3 shows, the Coptic HYP formula exhibits a large amount of variation in terms of both its structure and morphology. The two distinct components of the formula – the appointment of a *hypographeus* and appointment of witnesses statements – each contain several variations, which are then combined in different ways to produce multiple iterations of the same formula.

Conversely, an analysis of the Greek HYP formula reveals distinct regional patterns which contain very little variation. Within Greek documents, 21 attestations of the formula can be identified. Of

these, six are too heavily restored to provide accurate linguistic data.[12] Within the remaining 15 attestations, the following forms can be observed:

Form 1: …ὁ καὶ ἑξῆς ὑπογραφέα παρέχων τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτον ὑπογράφοντα καὶ μάρτυρας τοὺς ἑξῆς… (προσ)μαρτυροῦντας τῇδε τῇ X

"…and the one who provides a hypographeus *hereafter, the one who subscribes on his behalf, and witnesses, the ones who witness hereafter… this X-document."*

Form 1 of the Greek HYP formula occurs in 8 texts in the sample: P. Lond V 1727, 1729, 1730, 1731 and 1733; P. Münch. I 1, 4+5v, 9, 11, and 12. All 8 attestations are contained in the Patermouthis archive from Aswan, and are dated between 574 and 594 CE.[13] The formula is introduced by the Present active articular participle ὁ παρέχων (from παρέχω "to hand over/appoint"). It is the only variation of the Greek HYP formula to contain a verb of witnessing: the Present active participle μαρτυροῦντας (from μαρτυρέω) or προσμαρτυροῦντας (from προσμαρτυρέω).

Form 2: … παρέχοντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ὑπογραφέα καὶ μάρτυρας (τῆσδε τῆς αἰωνίας X) τοὺς ἑξῆς ὑπογράφοντας…

"… appointing a hypographeus *on their behalf and witnesses (of this perpetual X-document), the ones who subscribe herafter…"*

[12] SB I 5112 and P. Grenf. I 60 from Apollonopolis, P. Vat. Aphrod. 5 from the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos in Aphrodito, and P. Lond V 1724 and P. Münch. I 4+5v and 13 from the Patermouthis archive.

[13] On the Pathermouthis archive, see Chapter 1, n. 77.

Form 2 of the Greek HYP formula occurs in four texts in the sample. The first, P. Lond. V 1722 belongs to the Patermouthis archive in Aswan and is dated to 530 CE, and omits the phrase τῆσδε τῆς αἰωνίας X. The remaining three attestations, P. Paris 21, P. Paris 21bis, and SB I 4503, belong to the archive of Aurelius Pachymios the Purple Seller, composed in This and possibly discovered in Akhmim.[14] These are dated to 592 (P. Paris 21bis), 605/607 (SB I 4503), and 616 (P. Paris 21). Form 2 is introduced by the nominative Present active participle παρέχων (from παρέχω).

Form 3: …παρέχοντος δὲ ὑπογραφέα ὑπ(ὲρ) αὐτοῦ καὶ μάρτυρας τοὺς ἑξῆς ὑπογράφοντας τῇ παρούσᾳ X

"… and appointing a hypographeus *and witnesses, the ones who subscribe herafter on his behalf for the present X-document."*

Form 3 appears in two texts in the sample: P. Coll. Youtie II 92 dated to 596 CE, and P. Lond. V 1714 dated to 570 CE. Both texts were written in Antinoopolis and were discovered in the archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodito. Form 3 is introduced by the genitive Present active participle παρέχοντος (from παρέχω).

Due to the large percentage of Greek loanwords in Coptic (particularly for technical terms) there is a high level of similarity in terms of vocabulary between the Greek and Coptic formulae. The loanwords ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ (ὑπογραφεύς) "*hypographeus*", ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ (ὑπογράφω) "to sign", and ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ (μαρτυρίζειν) "to witness" appear in the Coptic formula in positions which correspond to their counterparts in the Greek formula. Furthermore, the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae can both be divided into the same two segments: the appointment of a *hypographeus* statement and the

[14] On the archive of Pachymios, see n. 2 above.

optional appointment of witnesses statement. As such, there is a clear sense of continuity in the meaning and discursive structure of the HYP formulae from Byzantine Greek to Early Islamic Coptic.

a) Relationship to the wider document

The Greek HYP formula is integrated into the wider discourse of the document in one of two ways. The Form 1 HYP formula appears as an NP headed by an articular participle, as shown in (15). The NP stands in apposition to the name of the first party which is contained in the opening Address formula.

(15) Αὐρηλία Τσώνη… ὁρμωμένη
Aurelia.F.NOM.SG Tsone.F.NOM.SG… originate.PTC.PRS.MID.F.NOM.SG

ἀπὸ Συήνης ἡ καὶ
from Syene.GEN.F.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG and

ἑξῆς ὑπογραφέα παρέχουσα…
herafter hypographeus.M.ACC.SG appoint.PTC.PRS.ACT.F.NOM.SG…

"Aurelia Tsone… originating from Syene and the one who appoints a hypographeus *hereafter…"* (P. Lond. V 1731.4-5)

Alternatively, the HYP formulae in Forms 2 and 3 are expressed as participial clauses. The participle is written in either the nominative (Form 2) or the genitive (Form 3), as shown in (16a) and (16b) respectively.[15] The participle is used attributively, expanding upon the name of the first party contained within the opening Address formula.

[15] Note that the difference in cases of the participle between these two variations (NOM in 16a, GEN in 16b) is a result of the different constructions in the Greek address formula: A_{NOM}…B_{DAT} "A to B" versus B_{DAT} παρ' ἐμοῦ A_{GEN} "To B, from I, A".

(16) *The Greek HYP formula as participial clause*

(a) Αὐρηλίαις Πύρας... καὶ Ἀνθερία…
Aurelia.F.NOM.PL Puras.F.NOM.SG… and Antheria.F.NOM.SG…

παρέχουσαι ὑπὲρ αὐταις
appoint.PTC.PRS.ACT.F.NOM.PL for 3.F.DAT.PL

ὑπογραφέα καὶ μάρτυρας…
hypographeus.M.ACC.SG and witness.F.ACC.PL…

"Aurelias Puras… and Antheria… appointing on their behalf a hypographeus *and witnesses…"* (P. Paris 21.4-8)

(b) Φλαυΐῳ Θεοδώρῳ… παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ
Flavius.M.DAT.SG Theodoros.M.DAT.SG… from 1.GEN.SG

παρόντος Αὐ̣ρ̣η̣[λ]ί̣[ο]υ
be_present.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.GEN.SG Aure[l]i[o]s.M.GEN.SG

Πεκυσίου… παρέχοντος δὲ
Pekusios.M.GEN.SG… appoint.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.GEN.SG ENCL

ὑπογραφέα ὑπ(ὲρ) αὐτοῦ…
hypographeus.M.ACC.SG for 3.M.GEN.SG…

"To Flavius Theodoros… from I who is present, Aurelius Pekusios… appointing a hypographeus *on his behalf…"* (P. Lond. V 1714.12-20)

Consequently, all versions of the Greek HYP formula are dependent on the preceding Address formula, acting either as an attributive verbal expansion of the name of the first party as in (16) ("NN, appointing a hypographeus"), or as part of an NP which contains the name of the first party as in (15) ("NN, the one who appoints a hypographeus").

Conversely, almost all iterations of the Coptic HYP formula stand as independent, finite verbal clauses. As stated above, 27 of the 33 attestations of the HYP formula in the corpus are headed by the finite Performative ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲛ̅. They appear in the opening of the document alongside other

formulae whose main verb is written in the Performative, forming a series of distinct independent clauses, as demonstrated in (17a). In these cases, as previously discussed, the name of the first party appears as a left-dislocated subject, repeated as a pronominal subject within the subsequent formulae. A similar situation occurs in P.KRU 80 and 81 which open with the finite Perfect ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ, as shown in (17b).

(17) *Coptic HYP formula as independent clause*

(a) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁⲕ(ⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ)
INDP.1.SG Stephanos DEF.M.SG-son POSS-DEF.SG-late

ⲅⲉⲣⲙⲁⲛⲟⲥ…
Germanos…

(HYP): ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
PFRM=1.SG-provide.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG_signature

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ…
POSS-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF for=1.SG

(FRW): ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
without INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear…

(AOW): ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ
PFRM=1.SG-do.INF-more ENCL confirm.INF

ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ…
DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG through-INDF.PL-witness…

(Address): ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ…
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF IND.OBJ=2.M.SG…

"I, Stephanos the son of the late Germanos… I provide hereafter the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf… I wish and am perusaded without any guile or fear… And I furthermore confirm it through witnesses… I write to you …" (P.KRU 20.13-35)

(b) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲩ [ⲧ-ϣ]ⲏⲣⲉ ⲡ-ⲙⲁⲕ(ⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ)
INDP.1.SG Staurou [DEF.F.SG-d]aughter DEF.M.SG-late

ⲡⲉϣⲁⲧⲉ…
Peshate…

(HYP): ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ
PERF=1.SG-appoint.INF after=3.F.SG

ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲱⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϩⲩⲡⲱⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ
DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-*hypographeus* to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-sign.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ…
for=1.SG…

(Address): ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲧⲟⲡⲟⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-topos

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ…
REL-become_holy.QUAL…

"I, Staurou, [the d]aughter (of) the late Peshate… I have appointed hereafter a hypographeus *in order to sign on my behalf… I write to the holy topos…"* (P.KRU 81.2-8)

The only exceptions to this structure are HYP.5 (P.KRU 74), HYP.6 (P.KRU 36), and HYP.7 (P.KRU 23). As discussed previously, the form ⲉϥϯ which opens these three HYP formulae can be understood as a circumstantial Present. As such, these three variations are incorporated into the wider document in a similar manner to the Greek Form 2 and 3 formulae, in that they appear as dependant clauses which expand upon the name of the first parties.

The precise relationship of the Coptic HYP formulae to their pre-existing Greek counterparts is difficult to determine since no Coptic formulae are attested which are contemporary to known Greek examples. However, in the case of the HYP.5-7 formulae, there are some differences in their content which suggest they are not directly modelled on the Greek Form 2 and 3 formulae. In both forms, the Greek contains the phrase "appointing a hypographeus". Conversely, P.KRU 74 uses the phrase "providing the signature of the one who will scribe", while P.KRU 23 contains

the causative construction ⲉⲩⲧⲣⲉⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ "causing a *hypographeus* to scribe" which is both semantically and structurally dissimilar to its Greek counterparts. Of the three formulae using the circumstantial Present, only P.KRU 36 contains a similar phrase to the Greek: ⲉⲩϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ "…they appointing hereafter a *hypographeus* who will scribe". However, the structural similarities of this clause are problematic, as discussed below. As such, it is likely that the structures in these three isolated Coptic examples are unrelated to their Greek counterparts in terms of their use of a non-finite opening verb form, but rather represent synchronic variations of an already well-established Coptic formula.

(b) Internal structures

In terms of the internal grammatical structures of individual clauses and phrases, there are relatively few similarities between the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae. The first lies in the incorporation of the verb ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ/ὑπογράφω "to sign" into the formula. In Greek, the verb appears as an articular participle, τὸν… ὑπογράφοντα, as shown in (18). It stands in apposition to the noun ὑπογραφέα, thus forming part of the direct object of the main verb of appointing.

(18)	ὁ	κ(αὶ)	ἑξῆς	ὑπογραφέα		
	DEF.M.NOM.SG	and	hereafter	hypographeus.M.ACC.SG		
	παρέχων		τὸν	ὑπὲρ	αὐτον	
	appoint.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.NOM.SG		DEF.M.ACC.SG	for	3.M.ACC.SG	
	ὑπογράφοντα					
	scribe.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.ACC.SG					

"… and the one who appoints a hypographeus, the one who signs hereafter on his behalf…" (P. Lond. V 1730.5-6)

A similar strategy appears in the Coptic HYP.3 formula, which occurs in only two texts within the corpus (P.KRU 35 and 38). In these two texts, the verb ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ is incorporated as a substantivised relative Future which appears as the direct object of the main verb, shown in (19).

(19)	ⲉ=ⲛ-ϯ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲛ
	PFRM=1.PL-appoint.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF	for=1.PL

"We appoint the one who will sign on our behalf." (P.KRU 35.18-19)

Several striking similarities can be observed between ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ and τὸν ὑπογράφοντα in that they both represent the nominalisation of a non-finite verb form (relative Future and Present participle respectively) to express the agent of a particular action. Furthermore, the nominalisation process in both constructions is achieved through the addition of a definite determiner to the verb form in question. Only one main point of contrast occurs between the two constructions (aside from obvious morphological differences between Greek and Coptic verbal constructions), namely the aspectual disntinctions of the underlying verb forms. In the Greek construction, the Present participle ὑπογράφοντα expresses an ongoing, incomplete action, while the Coptic relative Future ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ implies that the action is yet to take place.

A similar relationship between Greek and Coptic constructions can be observed in a further two instances within the HYP formula. The first appears in the Coptic HYP.4 and HYP.5 formulae and their use of the phrase ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ "the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf". While no equivalent of this phrase appears in the Greek HYP formulae, its presence in the Coptic formula may be based on a similar phrase which appears as an optional PP within Greek SCR formulae from the 6th to mid-7th centuries: μεθ' ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ὑπογράφοντος "with the signature of the one who signs on my behalf", shown in (20).

(20) καὶ κατὰ νόμους τετελειωμ(ένην)
and according_to law.M.ACC.PL complete.PTC.MID.PASS.F.ACC.SG

μεθ᾽ ὑπογραφ(ῆς) τοῦ ὑπὲρ
with signature.F.GEN.SG DEF.M.GEN.SG for

ἐμοῦ ὑπογρ(άφοντος) καὶ τῶν
1.GEN.SG scribe.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.GEN.SG and DEF.M.GEN.PL

ἑξῆς συνηθ(ῶν) μαρτύρ(ων) ἐξεδόμην
hereafter customary.M.GEN.PL witness.M.GEN.PL give.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG

σοι πρὸς ἀσφάλ(ειαν)
2.DAT.SG for security.F.ACC.SG

"And I have given (it) to you as a security, complete according to the laws, with the signature of the one who signs on my behalf, and the customary witnesses herafeter…" (P. Mich. XIII 664.36-37)

Like the Greek HYP formula, there are no attestations of the phrase μεθ᾽ ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ὑπογράφοντος which are contemporary with the Coptic HYP formula. However, the latest attestation with an absolute date appears in SB VI 8986, a marriage document from Apollonopolis dated to 641 CE, which is part of the archive of Philemon and Thekla (TM Arch id: 190).[16] Within this rather small archive is one Coptic text, SB Kopt. I 36, which is dated 645/646 CE and therefore is roughly contemporaneous with SB VI 8986.[17] While the phrase ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ does not appear in this text, since the text is a hearing rather than a notarial deed requiring witnesses, this archive demonstrates that, at least in Apollonopolis, Coptic legal documents were being composed while the Greek phrase μεθ᾽ ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ

[16] While the text is highly damaged, the phrase is preserved: -ca.?- μεθ᾽] ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ὑπογράφοντος (ln. 34). On the dating of this text, see Gonis, 'SB VI 8986 and Heraclius' Sons'.

[17] The date provided here is based on that given by Trismegistos, which states that this range was provided through private communication with Clarysse.

ὑπογράφοντος was still in use. As such, there is a point of contact in which this phrase may have been copied into Coptic formulae which suggests that others may have also existed.

Nevertheless, the similarities between Greek ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ὑπογράφοντος and Coptic ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ are the same to those which have been identified between ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ and τὸν ὑπογράφοντα above. The lexical relationship of the two phrases is clear: the Coptic noun phrase ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ is written entirely with content words of Greek origin but using Egyptian morphology. Furthermore, while both ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ and τοῦ… ὑπογράφοντος are formed through the addition of a definite determiner to a non-finite verb form, the aspect expressed in the verbal component is different in each language (futurity in Coptic and incomplete action in Greek).

The third similarity between Coptic constructions in the HYP formula occurs in the appointment of witnesses statement. Of the Greek HYP formulae identified in the sample, only those in Form 1 contain a verb of witnessing. As with the integration of the verb ὑπογράφω, the verb of witnessing is nominalised in the form of an articular Present participle, τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας, as demonstrated in (21).

(21)	ὁ	καὶ	ἑξῆς	ὑπογραφέα
	DEF.M.NOM.SG	and	hereafter	hypographeus.M.ACC.SG

παρέχων…		καὶ	μάρτυρας
appoint.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.NOM.SG…		and	witness.F.ACC.PL
τοὺς	ἑξῆς	μαρτυροῦντας	
DEF.M.ACC.PL	hereafter	witness.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.ACC.PL	

"… and the one who appoints hereafter a hypographeus… and witnesses, the ones who witness hereafter…" (P. Lond. V 1729.5-6)

This construction bares some similarity to the phrase ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "these ones who will witness" which occurs in several variations of the Coptic HYP formulae (HYP.1.5, 1.6, 3, 4.2 and 5). Like the previous two cases discussed, both ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ and τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας incorporate the verb of witnessing as an NP formed through the nominalisation of a non-finite verbal form. However, once again the aspect of these underlying verb forms is different: futurity in the Coptic relative Future, and incomplete action in the Greek Present participle. A further difference also occurs in the nominalisation process, in that the Coptic construction is formed through a relative expansion of a pronominal element (the demonstrative pronoun), rather than through the addition of a definite article as in Greek. If the Coptic were directly modelled from the Greek, the substantivised relative ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ would create a more similar structural replication. As such, while there is a clear relationship between the phrases in terms of vocabulary, content, and position within the HYP formula, there are important linguistic features which differentiate them.

As the above discussion shows, three cases appear in which an NP containing a relative Future in the Coptic HYP formula may be linked to an articular Present participle in Greek legal formulae:

a) ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ (HYP.3) – τὸν ὑπογράφοντα (Greek HYP)

b) ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ (HYP.4/5) – ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπογράφοντος (Greek SCR)

c) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ (HYP.1.5/1.6/3/4.2/5) – τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας (Greek HYP Form 1)

Aside from the broad structural similarities outlined above (that is, the nominalisation of verb forms), there is a clear lexical relationships between each of the pairs, and the Greek and Coptic phrases in a) and c) correspond in terms of their position and function within the HYP formula. However, the introduction of the Future into the Coptic phrases suggests a certain level of

reinterpretation of the pre-existing Greek formulae. The change in aspect from the Greek Present participle (ongoing incomplete) to the Coptic relative Future (not yet begun) most likely indicates that the two constructions were viewed as semantically similar: that is, that the Greek Present participle within the formula conveyed a sense of futurity which was required to be made explicit in the Coptic due to the differeing linguistic constraints of the two languages.

A similar relationship can be posited for the appearance of the ϵ + INFL.INF construction in place of ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ and ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ in certain variations of the Coptic HYP formula. As outlined above, the verbs ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ and ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ/ⲣ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ may be expressed within the formula as purposes clauses (ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ and ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ respectively), demonstrated in (22). While there are similarities in terms of their position in the formula and their vocabulary, these constructions are markedly distinct, both morphologically and semantically, from the corresponding articular participles τὸν ὑπογράφοντα, ὑπογραφῆς and τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας in the Greek HYP formula.

(22) ⲉ=ⲛ-ϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-appoint.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-hypographeus

ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁϥⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ⲙⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-sign.INF for=3.M.SG with-INDF.PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲉⲍⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF

ⲉ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ ⲙ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ
to-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed ATTR-Z.ART-sale

"We appoint hereafter a hypographeus *to sign on his behalf, and some trustworthy witnesses to witness this deed of sale."* (P.KRU 5.4-6)

It is possible that the introduction of the ϵ + INFL.INF construction into the Coptic formula is a result of a similar reinterpretation of the Greek Present participle as outlined above for the Coptic relative Future. Since the act of subscribing has not yet taken place, an intention for the action to occur is implied which is consequently expressed in Coptic as a purpose clause. Since the ϵ + INFL.INF bears little structural resemblance to the Greek articular participle, it may represent a synchronic development within the Coptic formula, arising as a variation of the Coptic substantivised relative Future rather than as an alternate rendering of the underlying Greek formula. These processes of reinterpretation are discussed further in 6.3.2.

One final question remains regarding the relationship between the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae: the origin of the Performative ϵιτι in the opening clause of the Coptic formula. The construction is equivalent in meaning and position to the Present participles παρέχων/παρέχοντες/παρέχοντος in the Greek HYP formula. Furthermore, since the Performative is one of the functions of the focalised Present, it expresses continuous aspect in a similar manner to the Greek Present participle. However, aside from the obvious morphological differences between the Greek and Coptic verbal constructions, the two forms are different in that the Greek participle is a non-finite verb form while the Coptic Performative is finite.

However, there are variations of the Coptic HYP formula in which the opening verb form bares a closer relationship to its Greek counterparts. As stated previously, in HYP.5 (P.KRU 74) and HYP.6 (P.KRU 36) the verb ϯ appears as a circumstantial Present which expands upon the name of the first party, as demonstrated in (23).

(23)	ⲁⲛⲟⲛ	ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ	ⲙⲛ-ⲭⲁⲣⲉⲃ	ⲙⲛ-ⲁⲃⲓⲅⲁⲓⲁ…
	INDP.1.PL	Stephanos	with-Khareb	with-Abigaia…

ϵ=ⲩ-ϯ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ
CIRC=3.PL-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus

ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ
REL-FUT-sign.INF

"We, Stephanos and Khareb and Abigaia… appointing hereafter a hypographeus *who will sign…"* (P.KRU 36.4-9)

While the grammatical categories of the Coptic circumstantial Present and Greek Present participle cannot be wholly equated, there are certain similarities in their use within the opening of the HYP formula. Both are non-finite verb forms, both are used to express an accompanying circumstance to the main verbal action, and both possess left-dislocated subjects in the form of the name of the first party of the contract. Furthermore, as presented in Table 4.2, there is a clear similarity in terms of content and flow of discourse between the opening structures of the Greek HYP formula and the formula in P.KRU 36, following the pattern SUBJECT (first party) + NON-FINITE VERB (appointing) + OBJECT (*hypographeus*).

Table 4.2: Opening of the Coptic HYP.6 and Greek formulae

	SUBJECT	HYP formula	
		APPOINTING	*HYPOGRAPHEUS*
Greek (P. Lond. V 1714)	Αὐρη[λ]ί[ο]υ Πεκυσίου… *Aurelius Pekusius...*	παρέχοντος δὲ *appointing*	ὑπογραφέα… *a* hypographeus
Coptic (P.KRU 74)	ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ *We, Stephanos…*	ⲉⲩϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ *appointing hereafter*	ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ *the* hypographeus...

P.KRU 36, written by Psate son of Pisrael in 724, and P.KRU 74, written by an unnamed scribe in 733/748, are among the earliest texts from Djême and therefore may reasonably be closer to earlier Greek practices. However, Psate son of Pisrael also wrote an earlier attestation of the HYP formula (P. CLT 1, dated to 698) in which he employed the Performative. It should again be highlighted

that the orthographic similarities between the Performative and the circumstantial Present result in ambiguity in the opening verb forms. As such, the form ⲉⲓⲧⲉ in P. CLT 1 could also be interpreted as a circumstantial Present. It is therefore possible that the use of the circumstantial Present in the HYP formula began as a replication of the Greek participle, which then became reanalysed as a Performative due to the orthographic similarities between the two constructions.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the relationship of the Coptic constructions to their Greek counterparts within the HYP formula is obscured by the nature of the papyrological evidence. While the earliest Coptic HYP formula is dated to 698 CE (P. CLT 1), the latest Greek attestation is dated to 618 CE (SB I 5112). As such, a period of 80 years existed in which no form of the HYP formula is attested in either language, possibly because such attestations have not survived from antiquity. The question therefore remains as to how the Coptic HYP formula developed in the absence of direct points of comparison to the Greek formula. This question, and possible explanations for the emergence of the Coptic HYP formula and its similarities to its Greek counterpart, is discussed in greater depth in 6.2.1.

4.1.5. Conclusion

In general, the data described above reveals a certain level of similarity between the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae. The use of vocabulary and the structuring of the flow of discourse (appointing + *hypographeus* + witnesses) is testament to continuity in legal practices and legal stipulations, both diachronically (that is, from the Byzantine period to the early Islamic period) and across two different languages. Consequently, the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae are inherently interrelated.

However, analysis of the grammatical structures contained within the formulae shows only a tentative link between certain features of the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae. Furthermore, the attestations of the Coptic HYP formula also contain some unique variation, such as the use of

verbs of asking to introduce the appointment of witnesses (e.g. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ "and I ask some witnesses") which has no parallels in the Greek formulae. These differences may be indicative of synchronic change within Coptic scribal practices or may represent later forms of the Greek formula which are unattested in the current papyrological records. These relationships and their significance are discussed in greater depth in Chapter 6.

4.2. Appointment of Witnesses (AOW)

The AOW formula consists of a statement by the first party that witnesses have been appointed to sign at the end of the document. While it usually stands within the opening of the document, several instances occur in which it is repeated in the closing statements. As stated previously (see 4.1.3), the AOW formula appears when the two main elements of the HYP formula, the appointment of a *hypographeus* statement and the appointment of witnesses statement, become two independent formulae. As such, the AOW formula bears some relationship to the Byzantine Greek HYP formula. However, within the surviving dataset, the AOW formula has no direct counterparts in Greek legal documents.

4.2.1. History and distribution

The Coptic AOW formula is attested only 20 times within the corpus. The earliest attestation of the formula with an absolute date appears in P.KRU 36, dated to 724 CE and written by Psate son of Pisrael. However, two attestations may have been written earlier: P.KRU 18, dated to the first half of the 8th century, and P. CLT 7, broadly dated from 700-775 CE. All 20 attestations appear in Theban documents dated to the 8th century, written in the village of Djême. No traces of this formula are visible in fragmentary documents from other regions outside of the corpus. As such, the data suggests that the Coptic AOW formula, like the Coptic HYP formula, is an exclusively Theban feature.

Of the 20 attestations of the AOW formula in the corpus, only five are not preceded by a HYP formula: P.KRU 3, 16, 18, and 87, and P. CLT 7. Similarly, 19 of the 33 attestations of the HYP formula are not followed by the AOW formula. Only two texts containing the HYP formula (P.KRU 7 and 99) make no statement on the provision of witnesses, possessing a HYP.1.1 formula which omits the appointment of witness statement, but also lacking an AOW formula. Conversely, five texts contain both an AOW formula as well as a HYP formula with an appointment of witnesses statement: P.KRU 5, 20, 21, 24, and 36 (see below, 4.2.4.). In one text, P.KRU 87, the AOW appears in the closing statements of the document. In P.KRU 12, two AOW formula appear: one at the beginning of the text, and one at the end.

4.2.2. Forms of the AOW formula

The AOW formula consists of three elements: the main verbal component of the formula, a PP which contains the noun "witness" (in same cases forming the direct object of the main verb), and a verb of witnessing. The variations and combinations of these three main elements are summarised in Table 4.3 below.

Table. 4.3: Forms of the Coptic AOW formula

Broad Code	*Main Verb*	*Witness*	*Verb of witness*	*Narrow Code*
AOW.1	(ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ) ⲉⲓⲣ ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ	ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ	AOW.1.1
		ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲁⲓⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉ-X ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ	AOW.1.2†
		ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲛϩⲟⲧ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉ-X	AOW.1.3†
AOW.2	(ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ) ⲉⲛⲏⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲥⲟⲡⲥ	ⲛⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲉⲥⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ	AOW.2
AOW.3	ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ	ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲉⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	AOW.3†
AOW.4	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲁⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲁⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ	AOW.4

†Appears only in one text within the corpus

4.2.3. Analysis of the AOW formula

a) Main verb

Within the AOW formula, several variations occur in the expression of the main verbal component. In AOW.1, which accounts for 15 of the 20 attestations in the corpus, the formula opens with the phrase ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ "and I further confirm it (the document)", shown in (24a-b). In all 15 attestations, the auxiliary verb ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ "to do more/exceed" is written in the Performative. The following infinitive, ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ "to strengthen", generally stands after the enclitic conjunction ⲇⲉ without any intervening morphology to link it to the auxiliary, as shown in (24a). However, in one attestation (P.KRU 12.19-23) it is introduced by the preposition ⲉ-, as shown in (24b).

(24) *AOW.1: ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ + ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ*

(a) ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
PFRM=1.PL-do.INF-more ENCL confirm.INF DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
through-INDF.PL-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"And we further confirm it through some trustworthy witnesses." (P.KRU 1.20-22)

(b) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲱ ⲇⲉ ⲉ-ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲛⲙⲟ=ⲥ
PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more ENCL to-confirm.INF DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
through-INDF.PL-other-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"And I further comfirm it through some other trustworthy witnesses." (P.KRU 12.9-10)

One further variation of the AOW.1 formula occurs in P.KRU 45, in which the phrase ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ "and additionally" appears before the opening verb, as shown in (25). The fact that a second ⲇⲉ

appears between ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ and ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ suggests that both ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ and ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ have been learnt by scribes as fixed units.[18] As such, it is possible that the original function and structural constraints of the enclitic ⲇⲉ within this phrase may have become indistinct.

(25) ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ
additionally ENCL PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more ENCL

ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
confirm.INF DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG through-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"And additionally, I further confirm it through some other trustworthy witnesses." (P.KRU 45.11-12)

The remaining five attestations of the AOW formula in the corpus begin with a verb of asking. In AOW.2 and AOW.3, the main verb is expressed as a Performative, shown in (26a), while the main verb in AOW.4 is written in the Perfect, as demonstrated in (26b). P.KRU 16 and 18 (AOW.2) open with the verbs ⲛⲧⲉⲓ (ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ) and ⲥⲟⲡⲥ, and are both written by Jeremias son of Athanasios. In both cases, no HYP formula is contained in the text. Since these are the only two attestations of the AOW formula attributed to Jeremias, and no HYP formulae are attributed to him, this appears to be a feature of his documents. P.KRU 7 (AOW.3) opens with ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲉ (ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ) and is written by Mosese son of Shenoute. P.KRU 12.50-52 and 87 (AOW.4) open with the verb ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ and are written by Chemtsneus son of Senouthios and Aristophanes son of Johannes respectively.

[18] On the appearance of ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ as a fixed phrase, see ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ in the Gertrud Bauer Zettelkasten Online: https://userpage.fuberlin.de/johnkatrin/bauer1/index.html.

(26) *Conjugation of verbs of asking in the AOW formula*

(a) ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲏⲧⲉⲓ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲥⲟⲡⲥ
after=3.F.SG PERF=1.PL-ask.INF PERF=1.PL-entreat.QUAL

ⲛ-ⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
DIR.OBJ-DEF.PL-witness ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"Hereafter, we ask and entreat the trustworthy witnesses." (P.KRU 18.6-7)

(b) ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
after=3.F.SG PERF=1.SG-beseech.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"I have beseeched hereafter some other trustworthy witnesses.." (P.KRU 87.43-44)

The AOW.2-4 formulae are similar in structure and content to the appointment of witnesses statement found in the five HYP formulae which also contain a verb of asking (HYP.1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 6, and 9). However, a comparison of these attestations to the AOW.2-4 formulae demonstrates that they should be interpreted as distinct entities (see 4.2.4. below).

b) Witness

In all 15 attestations of the AOW.1 formula, the noun ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ "witness" appears in the phrase ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ "through some (other) trustworthy witnesses". Only one attestation, P.KRU 20 (AOW.1.3), contains some variation, additionally expanding the noun ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ with the relative clause ⲉⲩⲛϩⲟⲧ "who are faithful", as shown in (27). This clause also appears as an expansion of the ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ in certain attestations of the HYP formula.

(27) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more ENCL confirm.INF DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ	ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛϩⲟⲧ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
through-INDF.PL-witness	CIRC=3.PL-trust.QUAL	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"And I further confirm it through some faithful and trustworthy witnesses." (P.KRU 20.31-33)

In the remaining five attestations of the formula (AOW.2-4), the noun ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ is expressed as the direct object of the verb of asking, as demonstrated in (28a). The noun in AOW.3-4 (as well as AOW.1) is indefinite, however it is definite in AOW.2 (P.KRU 16 and 18), as shown in (28b).

(28) *Incorporation of the noun in AOW.2-4*

(a)

ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁ{ⲕⲁ}ⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
after=3.F.SG	PERF=1.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness
ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ...		
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy		

"Subsequently, I have beseeched some trustworthy witnesses…" (P.KRU 12.50-51)

(b)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲏⲧⲉⲓ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥⲟⲡⲥ	ⲛ-ⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
PFRM=1.PL-ask.INF	PFRM=1.PL-entreat.QUAL	DIR.OBJ-DEF.PL-witness
ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ		
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy		

"I ask and I entreat the trustworthy witnesses…" (P.KRU 16.8-9)

c) Verb of Witnessing

In 18 of the 20 attestations of the AOW formula in the corpus, the verb of witnessing ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ appears in one of two constructions which are identical to those found in the Coptic HYP formula: the NP (noun phrase) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "these ones who will witness" which stands in apposition to the noun ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ, shown in (29a), or the purpose clause ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "(in order)

to witness", as demonstrated in (29b). The latter appears in only one attestation of the AOW formula in the corpus, P.KRU 7 (AOW.3).

(29) *Incorporation of the verb of witnessing in the AOW formula*

(a)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ	ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more	ENCL	confirm.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ
through-INDF.PL-witness	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	DEM.PRN.PL

ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲓⲍⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲛ
REL-FUT-witness.INF	to=3.M.SG	for=1.PL

"And I further confirm it through some trustworthy witnesses, these ones who will witness it on our behalf." (P.KRU 2.9-10)

(b)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲉⲧⲉ	ⲇⲉ	ⲟ[ⲛ]	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-ask.INF	ENCL	also	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲉⲍⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF	to=3.M.SG

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
for=1.SG

"And I al[so] ask some other trustworthy witnesses to witness it on my behalf." (P.KRU 7.9-11)

The remaining two attestations, P.KRU 12.50-52 and P.KRU 87 (AOW.4), introduce the verb of witnessing as a second independent clause. The verb ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ is written in the Perfect, and the entire clause is coordinated asyndetically (that is, without conjunctions) with the preceding Perfect verb of asking, as shown in (30).

(30)

ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
after=3.F.SG	PERF=1.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	PERF=3.PL-witness.INF	to=3.M.SG
ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ		
for=1.SG		

"Hereafter, I beseeched some other trustworthy witnesses (and) they witnessed it on my behalf." (P.KRU 87.43-45)

4.2.4. Comparison to the Coptic HYP formulae

As the above analysis shows, the structure and content of the Coptic AOW formula is inextricably linked to the Coptic HYP formula. As such, at first glance it would appear that the AOW formula is in fact a subset of the HYP formula which omits the initial appointment of *hypographeus* statement. However, despite their similarities several factors indicate that the AOW formula should be understood as separate from the HYP formula.

The analysis of AOW.1 as a distinct entity is unproblematic. The phrase ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ "and I further confirm it" clearly delineates the following clause as a new topic, particularly through the use of the borrowed Greek enclitic conjunction ⲇⲉ which appears in both Greek and Coptic to mark a change in topic.[19] Furthermore, as outlined in 4.2.1 above, five of the 15 attestations of AOW.1 in the corpus are preceded by a HYP formula which already mentions the appointment of witnesses (P.KRU 5, 20, 21, 24, and 36), demonstrated in (31).

(31)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ϯ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ…
	PFRM=1.SG-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-*hypographeus*…
	ⲙⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ
	with-INDF.PL-witness	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF

[19] On the use of ⲇⲉ in Coptic and its similarities to its Greek counterpart, see in particular Reintges, 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety', 79–82.

ⲉ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ
to-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed	ATTR-Z.ART-sale…	PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more

ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
ENCL	confirm.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ
through-INDF.PL-other-witness	ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	DEM.PRN.PL

ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓϫⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲥ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲛ
REL-FUT-witness.INF	to=3.M.SG	for=1.PL

"I appoint hereafter a hypographeus… and some trustworthy witnesses to witness this deed of sale… and I further confirm it through some other trustworthy witnesses, these who will witness it on our behalf." (P.KRU 24.14-22)

All five of these texts were composed by different scribes and at different times (see Appendix B). It would therefore appear that the AOW.1 formula and the HYP formula containing the appointment of witnesses statement have been learnt as distinct entities.

Conversely, the five attestations of the AOW.2-4 formulae are less obviously separate entities based on their vocabulary alone. As stated above, in form and function they are almost identical to the second clause in HYP.1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 6, and 9, all of which contain a verb of asking, as shown in (32a) and (32b). The main difference is AOW.4, in which the verb of asking appears in the Perfect rather than the Performative (see above, 4.2.3).

(32) *Comparison of the HYP and AOW formulae: verbs of asking*

(a) <u>HYP.2.1</u>

ⲉ=ⲛ-ϯ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ…
PFRM=1.PL-appoint.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-hypographeus…

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲟⲥ
and	PFRM=1.PL-ask.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witnesses

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF
ⲉ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲛⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ
to-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed	ATTR-Z.ART-donation_document

"We appoint hereafter a hypographeus… and we ask some trustworthy witnesses to witness this deed of donation." (P.KRU 86.5-7)

(b) AOW.3

ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁ{ⲕⲁ}ⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
after=3.F.SG	PERF=1.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-witness
ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ...		
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy…		

"Subsequently, I have beseeched some trustworthy witnesses…" (P.KRU 12.50-51)

A further similarity between the Coptic AOW and HYP formulae appears in the integration of the verb ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "to witness". The two phrases which contain the verb of witnessing outlined above, ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "these ones who will witness" and ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ "in order to witness", are identical to those used in the Coptic HYP formula, demonstrated in (33a-d).

(33) *Comparison of the HYP and AOW formulae: verbs of witnessing*

(a) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ: HYP

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
and	PFRM=1.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲝⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	DEM.PRN.PL	REL-FUT-witness.INF

ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
to=3.M.SG	for=1.SG

"...and I beseech some other trustworthy witnesses, these who will witness it on my behalf." (P.KRU 15.8-9)

(b) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓϫⲉ: AOW

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲏⲧⲉⲓ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥⲟⲡⲥ	ⲛ-ⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-ask.INF	PFRM=1.SG-entreat.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEF.PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲉϫⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	DEM.PRN.PL	REL-FUT-witness.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
for=1.SG

"I ask and I entreat the trustworthy witnesses, these who will witness on my behalf." (P.KRU 16.8-10)

(c) ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓϫⲉ: HYP

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲟⲥ
and	PFRM=1.PL-ask.INF	DIR.OBJ-INDF..PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲏⲣⲓϫⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF

"...and we ask some trustworthy witnesses to witness." (P.KRU 86.6)

(d) ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓϫⲉ: AOW

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲉⲧⲉ	ⲇⲉ	ⲟ[ⲛ]	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲕⲉ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-ask.INF	ENCL	al[so]	DIR.OBJ-INDF.ART.PL-other-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ	ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲩ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲉϫⲉ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy	to-INFL.INF=3.PL-witness.INF	to=3.M.SG

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
for=1.SG

"And also I ask some other trustworthy witnesses to witness it on my behalf." (P.KRU 7.9-10)

As evident in examples (33a-d), there are few differences between the five attestations of the AOW.2-4 formulae and the Coptic HYP formulae containing verbs of asking. However, four of the attestations of the AOW.2-4 formulae (P.KRU 7, 12, 18, and 87) contain a linguistic marker which heralds the introduction of a new topic, either the adverb ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ "hereafter" (AOW.2 and 4) or the enclitic conjunction ⲇⲉ (AOW.3). This contrasts with the second phrase in in the Coptic HYP formula, which is coordinated with the appointment of *hypographeus* statement through the conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ. Therefore, while the appointment of witnesses statement in the HYP formula is connected to the action of the appointment of a *hypographeus* statement, in AOW.2-4 there is a conscious effort to delineate the formula from the preceding sections of text through the use of linguistic markers which indicate a shift in discourse. As such, they can be classed as separate entities, rather than as a subset of the Coptic HYP formula.

It is clear from the above discussion that the AOW.2-4 formulae are distinct entities, separate from the HYP formula. Nevertheless, it is unclear as to how or why they arose in this manner. It is possible that the AOW.2-4 formulae diverged first, since it is most similar in vocabulary and structure to the appointment of witnesses statement of the HYP formula. However, as shown in Table 4.4, the dating of the available papyrological evidence makes this difficult to assess.

Table 4.4: Dating of the Coptic AOW formulae

	701-710	711-720	721-730	731-740	741-750	751-760	761-770
a) AOW.2-4: Verb of asking							
P.KRU 18	700-750						
P.KRU 12.50-52				08.12.733			
P.KRU 7				730-739			
P.KRU 87						756-758	
P.KRU 16				735/736 or 750/751			
b) AOW.1: ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲛⲟϥ							
P. CLT 7	700-775						
P.KRU 36			04.06.724				
P.KRU 21			725-726				
P.KRU 3			728/729? or 743/744?				
P.KRU 12.9-12				08.12.733			
P.KRU 50				22.08.738			
P.KRU 45					24.04.740		
P.KRU 5					24.03.748		
P.KRU 2					07.10.749		
P.KRU 4					19.11.749		
P.KRU 39					749-750		
P.KRU 1					25.02.750		
P.KRU 14						29.04.756	
P.KRU 20						759-760	
P.KRU 24							29.06.763

As shown in Table 4.4, the AOW.2-4 formulae are attested between at least 733 (P.KRU 12) and 756-758 (P.KRU 87).[20] However, since P.KRU 18 is broadly dated to the first half of the 8th century, it may possibly have appeared earlier. Similarly, AOW.1 is securely dated between 724 (P.KRU 36) and 763 (P.KRU 24), while P. CLT 7 is dated broadly between 700-775 CE and therefore could also have appeared earlier.

[20] On the dating of P.KRU 87, see Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 56.

The available evidence suggests that AOW.1 and AOW.2-4 formulae arose in more or less the same period (attested at least within a decade of each other). Nevertheless, it is likely that earlier attestations of the AOW formula existed which may have shed more light on the origin of this formula. It is interesting to note, however, that the AOW.1 and AOW.4 formulae both appear in P.KRU 12 (in the opening and closing of the text respectively). This suggests a certain level of familiarity among Theban scribes with both the clearly delineated AOW.1 formula and the AOW.2-4 formula which were closer in form to the HYP formula.

4.2.5. Conclusion: a Greek connection?

No Greek equivalent of the AOW formula exists. This may simply be because they have not survived from antiquity. However, with the available data only those features which the Coptic AOW shares with the Coptic HYP formulae can be compared to Greek legal formulae, namely the verbs of asking in AOW.2-4, and the two phrases ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ and ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ. As discussed above in relation to the Coptic HYP formula (4.1.4), the use of verbs of asking to introduce the clause of witnessing has no parallels in the Greek HYP formula. Furthermore, while the phrase ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ is similar to the Greek articular Present participle τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας, aside from their morphological and aspectual features, ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ can only tentatively be linked to the Greek construction.

It is possible, therefore, that the AOW formula represents a synchronic development from the Coptic HYP formula, and is consequently one step removed from the Greek. However, with the small data sample and a lack of knowledge about the transmission of the HYP formula from Greek to Coptic during the 7th century, this is difficult to determine. Furthermore, if the AOW did arise from synchronic variations of the HYP formula, it is unclear what motives would have led to this divergence. The matter of the development of the AOW formula, and its relation to other Greek and Coptic legal formulae, will be addressed in more depth in 6.3.3.

4.3. Free-will formula (FRW)

The FRW formula consists of a statement declaring that the first party has entered into the contract without any coercion, deception, or threat of physical violence. The formula usually appears within the opening of the body of the document. However, as with the other formulae in this chapter, it is occasionally written (or repeated) in the closing statements of the contract.

4.3.1. History and distribution

The Greek FRW formula is attested from the late 5th century onwards. The earliest securely dated example is found in CPR VII 40, a Hermopolite loan contract dated to 492 CE. One further document, SB I 4765 written in the Fayum, is dated broadly from the 4th to 7th centuries and may therefore be earlier.[21] The remainder of the formulae are attested from the 6th century onwards, with the latest attestation with an absolute date appearing in SB VI 8988, written in Apollonopolis and dated to 647 CE. However, one further attestation, P.Köln VII 323 from Herakleopolis, is dated broadly to the 7th to 8th centuries and therefore may be a century or more later. The Greek FRW formula is attested from a number of sites across Egypt, particularly from the archives of Patermouthis in Aswan and Phoibammon son of Triadelphos in Aphroditio, but also from Apollonopolis, the Fayum, Herakleopolis, the Hermopolite nome, the Oxyrhynchite nome, and Thebes. This formula is also attested outside of Egypt, with several examples appearing in the Petra papyri: P. Petra I 2, discovered in Petra but composed in Gaza, dated to 538 CE, and P. Petra III 29, 30 and 31, all dated between 579 and 592 CE.

The Coptic FRW formula is attested 37 times within the corpus. Of these, 36 occur in Theban documents dated between 698 CE (P. CLT 1) and 780 (P.KRU 99). The remaining attestation, which is also the earliest in the corpus, appears in SB Kopt. III 1369 (P. Mich. inv. 6898) written

[21] The appearance of the FRW formula however may be evidence that the document is dated from the late 5th century onward.

in Aphrodito.[22] The dating of this contract has been the subject of some discussion. The earliest date proposed for the text is 571/572 CE, suggested by MacCoull based on prosopographical and formulary similarities to Coptic documents P. Vat. Copt. Doresse 1, 2 and 5, and the Greek document P. Mich. XIII 662.[23] This she argues is more plausible than the later date of 616/617 previously provided by Alcock and Sijpesteijn.[24] More recently, a later date of 647/648 has been proposed by Bagnall and Worp, based on a re-dating of the P. Vat. Copt. Doresse and P. Mich. texts cited by MacCoull.[25] Based on the discussion they present, this later date appears the most plausible, and as such has been selected for the purposes of this study.

Beyond the corpus, other fragmentary examples of the Coptic FRW formula are attested in the 8th century in other texts from Aphrodito, as well as texts from the Hermopolite nome. These attestations are too heavily restored to be included in the following typology of FRW formulae. However, sufficient information survives within these attestations to provide an insight into the differences between Theban and non-Theban iterations of the formula, as well as the development of the Coptic FRW formula from their Greek counterparts (see 4.3.3. and 4.3.4).

4.3.2. Forms of the Coptic FRW formula

The Coptic FRW formula contains two to four distinct sections. Almost all iterations of the formula contain a similar "core": a PP headed by a "subtractive connector" (usually ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ) followed by a series of coordinated nouns (guile, fear, etc).[26] The core is preceded by an introductory verbal

[22] Förster, 'Ein Weg für ein besseres Verständnis von P.Mich. inv. 6898'; MacCoull, 'P. Mich. Inv. 6898 Revisited'; Alcock and Sijpesteijn, 'Early 7th Century Coptic Contract from Aphrodito (P. Mich. Inv. 6898)'.

[23] MacCoull, 'P. Mich. Inv. 6898 Revisited'.

[24] Alcock and Sijpesteijn, 'Early 7th Century Coptic Contract from Aphrodito (P. Mich. Inv. 6898)', 1.

[25] Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito', 251–52.

[26] On 'subtractive connectors' in Coptic, see Müller, 'Greek Connectors in Coptic: A Contrastive Overview I', 274–79.

clause in all attestations of the formula. Additionally, one or both of the following elements may optionally follow the core:

A) the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ

B) ⲁⲗⲗⲁ “but” + adverbial adjunct

Table 4.5 shows the different combinations of these four elements within the corpus. These are divided into seven sub-groups, based either on their opening verb form, or on their core.

Table 4.5: Forms of the Coptic FRW formulae within the corpus

Broad Code	Introduction	Core	A	B	Narrow Code
			a) ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅		
FRW.1	ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	-	-	FRW.1.1†
			-	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.1.2
			ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.1.3†
			ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.1.4
			ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ	-	FRW.1.5†
FRW.2	ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.2†
FRW.3	ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧⲉ ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.3†
FRW.4	ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ	ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	-	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.4†
FRW.5	ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ⲛⲁⲧⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.5†
FRW.6	ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.6†

		b) Perfect - ⲟⲩⲱϣ + ⲡⲓⲑⲉ			
FRW.7	ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ⲁϫⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲅⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲛ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.7†
FRW.8	ⲁⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.8†
		c) Perfect - ⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉ-…			
FRW.9	ⲁⲓⲉⲓ (ⲟⲩⲛ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	-	FRW.9.1†
				ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.9.2†
			ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.9.3†
FRW.10	ⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲉ-X	ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.10†
FRW.11	ⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ-X ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.11†
		d) Perfect - ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ…			
FRW.12	ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	-	FRW.12.1†
				ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.12.2
			ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.12.3
FRW.13	ⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉ-X ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	-	-	FRW.13.1†
			ⲉⲏⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.13.2†
FRW.14	ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥⲃⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ…	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.14†
		e) …ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓ-			
FRW.15	…ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	-	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.15.1†
			ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.15.2†
		ⲁϫⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲉⲏⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.15.3†

FRW.16	…ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲛϩ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…	-	-	FRW.16†
		f) <u>Core merged with A</u>			
FRW.17	ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉ-X…	ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϫⲛⲥⲟⲛⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ…	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.17.1†	
	ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲓⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛ-X			FRW.17.2†	
FRW.18	ⲁⲓ̈ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲓⲱⲧ	ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϩⲟⲧⲉ ϩⲓϫⲓⲛⲥⲟⲛⲥ	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…	FRW.18†	
		g) <u>Aphrodito</u>			
FRW.19	ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲡϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ϩⲛⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙⲛⲧⲛⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲙⲙⲱⲛ	ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲃⲓⲁ ϩⲓⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…	-	-	FRW.19†

† Appears only in one text within the corpus

4.3.3. Analysis of the Coptic FRW formula

a) Introductory verb form

The variations of the Coptic FRW formula outlined in Table 4.5 are primarily distinguished through the opening verbal clause. FRW.1-2, which account for ten of the 37 attestations of the FRW formula in the corpus, begin with the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ "I desire and am persuaded".

The interpretation of these verb forms is ambiguous. Both can reasonably be understood as Performatives, since they invariably possess a 1st person subject and appear within a series of other opening formulae which also begin with Performatives.

However, the opening of the FRW formula lacks any linguistic markers which herald a change in topic which appear in the HYP and AOW formulae within this such as ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ "hereafter" or the

enclitic conjunction ⲇⲉ. Consequently, the forms ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ may be circumstantial Presents which are dependent on the previous formula, as demonstrated in (34). Since the orthography of both the Performative and the circumstantial Present is identical, either of these two interpretations are likely. For the present study, the forms ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ in FRW.1-2 are considered to be Circumstantial presents, based on similarities to the Greek formulae (see below 4.3.4.).

(34) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲛ-ⲧ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
PFRM=1.SG-provide.INF after=3.F.SG DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG-signature

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ… ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
POSS-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF for=1.SG… CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
and CIRC=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF without INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear… PFRM=1.SG-do.INF-more ENCL

ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ
confirm.INF DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG through-INDF.PL-witness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-trustworthy

"I provide hereafter the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf (HYP)… I desiring and being persuaded without any guile or fear (FRW)… And I further confirm it through trustworthy witness (AOW)…" (P.KRU 21.13-21)

A similar problem arises in the analysis of FRW.3-6, which contain the verb ⲥϩⲁⲓ "to write" in their opening clause. FRW.3 and FRW.4 contain only the verb ⲥϩⲁⲓ, while FRW.5 and FRW.6 contain a combination of ⲥϩⲁⲓ, ⲟⲩⲱϣ, and ⲡⲓⲑⲉ. In all cases, each verb appears in the form ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄.

The interpretation of these ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ verbs must be made on an individual basis, depending on the relationship of each formula to their surrounding context.

In FRW.3, which occurs only in P.KRU 6, the FRW formula follows an initial HYP formula headed by the Performative, as shown in (35). While the form ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ is ambiguous, it is possible that it is a Performative, appearing in a series of independent formulae headed by Performatives as in the case of FRW.1-2. However, a reading of the circumstantial Present cannot be entirely ruled out and thus the FRW formula may also be subordinate to the preceding HYP formula.

(35) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲥⲉⲛⲟⲩⲑ(ⲓⲟⲥ)… ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ
INDP.1.SG Senouthios… PFRM=1.SG-provide.INF after=3.F.SG

ⲛ-ⲧ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG-signature POSS-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ… ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲩⲉ
for=1.SG… PFRM=1.SG-write.INF without INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear

"I, Senouthios… I provide hereafter the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf… (and) I write without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 6.4-10)

In FRW.4 (P.KRU 9) and FRW.5 (P.KRU 99), the FRW formula falls within a series of other formulae headed by ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ, as shown in (36a) and (36b) respectively. As with (35) above, it is likely that each subsequent ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ after the initial Performative is also Performative. It should be noted, however, that in (36b) the ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ verbs within the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ are ambiguous. Both verbs are either circumstantial Presents dependent on the Performative ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ (that is, "I write, desiring and being persuaded"), or Performatives, creating a series of three

coordinated Performative verbs (that is, “I write, I desire, and I am persuaded”). In this case, the former interpretation has been selected.

(36) *FRW formulae with* ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ

(a)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲑⲁⲛⲁⲥⲓⲟⲥ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ϯ
INDP.1.SG	Thanasius…	PFRM=1.SG-write.INF	PFRM=1.SG-provide.INF

ⲛ-ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG_signature	POSS-DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲙ-ⲡⲁ-ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ
for=1.SG…	PFRM=1.SG-write.INF	IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-beloved

ⲛ-Ø-ⲥⲟⲛ	ⲉⲛⲱⲭ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
ATTR-Z.ART-brother	Enoch…	PFRM=1.SG-write.INF	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲃⲟⲗ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
in-DEF.M.SG-outside	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear

“I, Thanasius… I write, (and) I provide the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf… I write to my beloved brother Enoch… I write to you without guile or fear…” (P.KRU 9.14-29)

(b)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲑⲱⲙⲁⲥ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ
INDP.1.SG	Thomas…	PFRM=1.SG-write.INF	PFRM=1.SG-appoint.INF

ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-INDF.PL-hypographeus…	PFRM=1.SG-write.INF

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF	and	CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ⲛ-ⲁⲧ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
in-PRIV-INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear…

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲓⲍⲉ	ⲛ-ⲥⲁⲃⲓⲛⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF	CIRC=1.SG-donate.INF	DIR.OBJ-Sabine

ⲙⲛ-ⲓⲱⲃ	ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ	ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ
with-Job	POSS.ART.PL_1.SG-beloved	ATTR-Z.ART-son	in

ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲙⲟⲛⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
to-DEF.M.SG-monastery	REL-become.holy.QUAL

"I, Thomas… I write (and) I appoint hereafter some hypographeis… I write, I desiring and being persuaded without any guile or fear… I write that I am donating Sabine and Job, my beloved children, to the holy monastery…" (P.KRU 99.3-10)

In FRW.6 (P.KRU 7), the FRW formula is the first to appear following the unit ϫⲉⲡⲉⲇⲏ (ϫⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲏ) which introduces the body of the document, as shown in (37). As such, like the initial ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ in (35) and (36a-b), ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ is likely to be a Performative. However, it cannot be ruled out that it is a circumstantial Present clause which is dependent on the following main clause headed by ⲧⲛϩⲉⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉ (that is, "In this time now… I desiring, writing to you, and being persuaded without any guile… we acknowledge and we sell to you…"). The ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ verbs which follow ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ in (37) are also ambiguous, being either circumstantial Presents (that is, "I desire, writing and being persuaded") or Performatives (that is, "I desire, I write, and I am persuaded"). While the former interpretation seems more plausible, as in the case of (35b) this is open to debate.

(37)

ϫⲉⲡⲉⲇⲏ	ϩⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ⲕⲉⲣⲟⲥ	ⲡⲁⲓ	ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ
CNJ	in-DTC.M.SG-time	DEM.PRN.M.SG	now

ⲉⲧ-ⲕⲏ	ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ	ⲛ-ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ-ⲥⲟⲩⲗⲁⲓⲉⲓⲙⲁⲛ	ⲡ-ⲁⲙⲉⲣⲁ
REL-place.QUAL	down	in-before-Solomon	DEF.M.SG-amir

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ	ⲁⲩⲱ
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF	CIRC=1.SG-write.INF	IND.OBJ=2.PL	and

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ…	ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ
CIRC=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF…	without-INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲉⲓ
or-Z.ART-fear…	1.PL-acknowledge.INF	PFRM=1.SG-give.INF

ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ	ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
IND.OBJ=2.PL	away

"In this time now, which is before Solomon the amir, I desire, writing to you and being persuaded… without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 7.13-18)

The formulae in FRW.7 (P.KRU 3) and FRW.8 (P.KRU 80) open with the pattern PERF + ⲁⲩⲱ + ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄, as demonstrated in (38). The conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ introduces symmetric coordination, therefore both verb forms in these phrases must have equal weighting within the sentence.[27] Consequently, since the Perfect is finite, the subsequent ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ must also be finite, and therefore should be interpreted as a Performative.

(38)

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ
PERF=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF	without

ⲛⲁⲁⲩⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear

"I have been persuaded and I desire without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 80.31-32)

The Perfect is also used in the opening of FRW.9-11, which all begin with the phrase ⲁⲓⲉⲓ (ⲟⲩⲛ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ/ⲉ-X "I have come to it/to X-document". In FRW.9, which accounts for three attestations of the FRW formula in the corpus (P.KRU 27, 36, and P.CLT 5), this initial Perfect clause is additionally followed by the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ, as shown in (39). Once again, the forms

[27] For ⲁⲩⲱ as a symmetric coordinator, see Reintges, 'Coordination, Converbs and Clause Chaining in Coptic Egyptian: Typology and Structural Analysis', 204.

ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ in this context are ambiguous. However, unlike the previous examples cited in (35)-(37) in which all verbs appear as identical ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ forms, in FRW.9 there is a distinction between ⲁⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ and ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ verbs. As such, it seems more likely that ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ in this context are circumstantial Presents, subordinate to a main Perfect clause.

(39) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲥ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ
PERF=1.SG-come.INF to=3.F.SG CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF and

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
CIRC=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF without INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
or-Z.ART-fear

"We have come to it, desiring, and being persuaded without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 27.15-16)

A similar pattern occurs in FRW.12-14, which open with the phrase ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ/ⲉ-X "I have given my assent to it/to X-document". In FRW.12 (P.KRU 1, 5, 11, 15, and 24) and FRW.13 (P.KRU 85 and 107), the initial Perfect clause is followed by the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ, as shown in (40), while in FRW.14 (P.KRU 14), it is followed only by ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ. As with the case of FRW.9 above, the verbs ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ are best interpreted as circumstantial Present forms which are subordinate to the opening Perfect clause.

(40) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲥ
PERF=1.SG-give.INF POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent to=3.F.SG

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile

"I have given my assent to it, (and) I desire, and I am persuaded without any guile…" (P.KRU 15.19-20).

FRW.15 and 16 are the only examples of the FRW formula in the corpus which are clearly dependent on their preceding context. All four attestations appear as NPs consisting of the construction DEM.PRN + REL + PERF: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ "this one to which I have come" in FRW.15 (P.KRU 12, 50, and 93) and ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ "this one to which I have given my assent" in FRW.16 (P.KRU 86), as shown in (41a-b) respectively. The demonstrative pronoun is anaphorically linked to the name of the document type contained in the previous clause. The verbs ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ in FRW.15 and ⲉⲓⲟⲛϩ in FRW.16 are once again best understood as circumstantial Presents.

(41) *FRW formulae as dependent entities*

(a)

ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲱⲣϫ		ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ
as-DEF.M.SG-security		ENCL	POSS-DEF.M.SG-place

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲱ(ⲛ)
REL-become.holy.QUAL	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation_document

ⲡⲁⲓ	ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ϯ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲓ
DEM.PRN.M.SG	REL-PERF=1.SG-give.INF-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent

ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
to=3.M.SG	CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF	and	CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear

"As the security, therefore, of the holy place, I have executed this donation document, this one to which I have given my assent, desiring and being persuaded without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 93.23-25)

(b) ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ
as-DEF.M.SG-security ENCL POSS-DEF.ART.M.SG-place

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁ=ⲩ̣-ϣⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ
REL-become.holy.QUAL PERF=3.PL-ask.INF through_1.SG

ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ… ⲡⲁⲓ
after-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation_document… DEM.PRN.M.SG

ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ-ϯ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
REL-PERF=1.SG-give.INF-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent to=3.M.SG

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲛϩ… ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲱⲛⲉ
CIRC=1.SG-live.QUAL… CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-sickness

ⲛ-Ø-ⲥⲱⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲧⲱ ϩⲓⲱⲱ=ⲧ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
ATTR-Z.ART-body place.QUAL on=1.SG but

ϩⲛ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲏⲧ
through-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-wish ATTR-Z.ART-heart

ⲙⲛ-ⲧⲁ-ⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲁⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲉⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ
with-POSS.ART.F.SG_1.SG-choosing INTS.PRN=1.SG without

ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear…

"As the security, therefore, of the holy place, they inquired through me about this donation document… this one which I have given my agreement to while I am alive… there being no bodily sickness placed upon me, but rather through my desire of heart and my own choosing, without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 86.36-41)

FRW.17-18, which account for three of the 37 attestations of the FRW formulae in the corpus, are differentiated from the remaining attestations in their distinctive writing of the core of the formula (see below). In terms of their opening verb form, all three variations of the formulae open with a Perfect verbal clause similar to those outlined above: ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉⲧⲓⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ "now I have given my assent to this testament" in FRW.17.1 (P.KRU 76), ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲓⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ "and

now I have sought this testament" in FRW.17.2 (P.KRU 66), and ⲁ̈ⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲓⲱⲧ "I agree with your fatherhood" in FRW.18 (P.CLT 4).

The final attestation of the FRW formula, FRW.19, appears in only one text in the corpus: SB Kopt. III 1369. It is the only non-Theban attestation of the formula in the corpus, written in Aphrodito, as well as the earliest attested example, dated to 647/648 CE.[28] Furthermore, as shown in (42), it exhibits clear distinctions from its Theban counterparts. The formula begins with a Perfect verb ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ "we have executed", followed by a PP in which the words ⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ appear as nouns.

(42) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ
PERF=1.PL-execute.INF

ⲛ-ⲡ-ϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ
DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-copy

ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲱⲧ
ATTR-Z.ART-single

ϩⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
through-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-volition

ⲙⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
with-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-agreement

ⲙⲛ-ⲧ=ⲛ-ⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲥⲓⲥ
with-POSS.ART.F.SG=1.PL-choice

ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲙⲙⲱ=ⲛ
INTS.PRN=1.PL

ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
without-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲃⲓⲁ
ATTR-Z.ART-force

ϩⲓ-Ø-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…
or-Z.ART-deceit…

"We have executed the single copy through our own volition and agreement and choice, without any force or deceit…" (SB. Kopt. III 1369.100-101)

Evidence for a similar construction, ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ… ϩⲛⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲡⲓⲑⲉ "I wish… through my volition and my agreement" can be found in formulae omitted from the corpus due to their fragmentary nature.[29] This phrase appears in P. Lond. IV 1576 and 1584, financial documents

[28] On the dating, see above, 4.3.1.

[29] On the omission of formulae and texts from the corpus due to damage and editorial restoration, see 3.2.3.

written in Aphrodito in 707 and 708 CE respectively, both belonging to the Basilios archive. Traces of the same or similar phrases also occur in P. Lond. IV 1548 (Aphrodito, 700-725 CE, also from the Basilios archive) and CPR IV 32 (the Hermopolite nome, 7th-8th centuries).[30] The use of ⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ as nouns does not appear in any of the FRW formulae from Thebes. Similarly, no traces of the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ which appears in the Theban formulae are attested in any fragmentary formulae omitted from the corpus. Consequently, the available data suggests that there is a clear difference between Theban and non-Theban iterations of the FRW formula. The significance of these regional differences will be discussed in greater depth in 4.3.4 below.

b) The core

Almost all variations of the Coptic FRW formula are linked through the presence of a standard "core". This core almost always appears as a PP, consisting of a series of coordinated nouns headed by a subtractive connector which indicates that the contract has been entered into free of coercion ("without guile or fear" etc). These coordinated nouns represent an example of what Richter describes as "multi-unit tautological expressions", a feature of the Byzantine rhetorical style inherited from Greek documents (see 3.1.3).[31]

The core appears in 34 of the 37 attestations of the FRW formula in the corpus. In 26 of these attestations, the core is introduced by the borrowed Greek preposition ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ "without" and is followed by the indefinite pronoun ⲗⲁⲁⲩ, as shown in (43a). A similar construction occurs in a further five texts (P.KRU 3, 7, and 50, P.CLT 6, and SB Kopt. III 1369), in which the Egyptian

[30] The phrase ϩⲛⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲡⲓⲑⲉ is preserved in each case, however the preceding context in both texts is lost.

[31] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 126.

preposition ⲁϫⲛ appears in place of ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ, as shown in (43b). The nouns within this PP possess a zero article and are coordinated by the preposition ϩⲓ.

(43) *FRW core with subtractive prepositions*

(a)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF	without

ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear	or -Z.ART-force

"I desire and am persuaded without any guile or fear or force…" (P.KRU 21.16-17)

(b)

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
PERF=1.SG-desire.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
without-INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
or-Z.ART-force

"We desired and we are persuaded without any guile or fear or force…" (P.KRU 3.11-12)

Within the corpus, several other less common constructions are used to introduce the core. FRW.5, which occurs only in P.KRU 99, introduces the core with the phrase ⲛⲁⲧⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ, as shown in (44). This consists of the indefinite pronoun ⲗⲁⲁⲩ modified by the preposition ⲛ expressing agency or instrument and the privative marker ⲁⲧ-. This construction also appears in one of the fragmentary FRW formula identified outside of the corpus: P. Ryl. Copt. 183, composed in the Hermopolite nome and dated broadly from the 7th to 8th centuries.

(44) ϵ=ι-ϩⲁι ϵ=ι-ⲟⲩⲱϣϵ ⲁⲩⲱ
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF and

ϵ=ι-ⲡⲓⲑϵ ⲛ-ⲁⲧ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩϵ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF through-PRIV-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧϵ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ…
or-Z.ART-fear or-Z.ART-force…

"I write, desiring and being persuaded through no guile or fear or force…" (P.KRU 99.6-7)

In FRW.4 (P.KRU 9), the core is introduced by the compound preposition ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ- (lit. "in the outside of"), as shown in (45). It is also the only example of the FRW formula in which the coordinated nouns are not preceded by the indefinite pronoun ⲗⲁⲁⲩ. It should be noted, however, that the first noun still possesses a zero article. As such, three possibilities for this writing can be posited: either ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ- (INDF.PRN + ATTR) has been unintentionally omitted, the nu in the construction ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ- is an attributive marker used to link the compound with the following noun, or the nu is a possessive marker and the subsequent indefinite article has been omitted due to the common writing of ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ in the FRW formula. The latter interpretation has been adopted in this study.

(45) ϵ=ι-ϩⲁι ⲛⲁ=ⲕ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲃⲟⲗ
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF IND.OBJ=2.M.SG in-DEF.M.SG-outside

ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧϵ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
POSS-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear or-Z.ART-force

"I write to you without guile or fear or force…" (P.KRU 9.28-31)

One final variation of the core occurs in FRW.2 (P.CLT 7) which is introduced by ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ-, shown in 46. This construction consists of the circumstantial conversion of a negative adverbial clause. This construction is not attested in the FRW core in any fragmentary formulae identified outside of the corpus.

(46) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-[ⲡⲓⲑⲉ]
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-[be_persuaded.INF]

ⲉ̣-ⲙ̣ⲛ̣-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
or-Z.ART-force…

"I desire and I [am persuaded], there being no guile or fear or force…" (P.CLT 7.13-14)

As mentioned previously, the remaining three attestations of the FRW formula do not contain a core which follows the patterns outlined above. Rather, the initial verbal clause is followed by a circumstantial negative Present with a nominal subject – ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ "no single force being placed upon me" in FRW.17 (P.KRU 66 and 76), and ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ "no force being placed upon me" in FRW.18 (P.CLT 4), shown in (47a-b) respectively. These phrases are identical to those contained in optional Element A, discussed below.

(47) *Non-standard variations of the FRW core*

(a) ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ…
now ENCL PERF=1.SG-seek.INF DIR.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-testament…

ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲕⲏ
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.ART.SG-force ATTR-Z.ART-single place.QUAL

ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ Ø-ϫⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ
IND.OBJ=1.SG down nor Z.ART-force nor

Ø-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…
Z.ART-deception…

"And now I have sought the testament… no single force being placed upon me, nor force nor deception…" (P.KRU 66.14-16)

(b) ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅-ⲧⲉ=ⲧ̅ⲛ̅-ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
PERF=1.SG-agree.INF with-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-ABST-father

ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̅-Ø-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-force place.QUAL down

ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲓ̈ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛ[c]…
to=1.SG nor Z.ART-fear or-Z.ART-force…

"I have agreed with your fatherhood, no force being placed upon me, nor fear or force…" (P. CLT 4.5)

However, these formulae also contain an element of the standard core in that the initial circumstantial clause is followed by a similar series of nouns which are coordinated by the disjunctive coordinator ⲟⲩⲇⲉ "neither/nor" (or a combination of ⲟⲩⲇⲉ and ϩⲓ in P. CLT 4). Rather than appearing as a PP, as in the case of the core in other FRW formulae, this series of nouns is coordinated with ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ and thus form part of a discontinuous NP which is the subject of the circumstantial clause.

A link between the attestations of FRW.17 and 18 is difficult to establish. P.KRU 66 and 76 (FRW.17) are two copies of the Testament of Susanna, part of the archive of the family of Germanos, and were composed sometime before the mid-8th century by Comes the priest.[32] P.

[32] On P.KRU 66 and 76, see Cromwell, "Coptic Documents in Two Copies: A Study of Corrections and Amendments"; Schaten, "Ein weiteres Familienarchiv aus Djeme: KRU 66 Und KRU 76, Die Testament der

CLT 4 (FRW.18) is dated absolutely to 702 CE, and therefore could possibly be contemporary to the Testament of Susanna. However, it was composed by a different scribe: Kalapesios, son of Shenoute. The similarities in the FRW formula may be indicative of a professional connection of some type between Comes and Kalapesios, however there is little else within the three texts to suggest this. As such, the unique writing of the core in these three texts could be coincidental, or indicative of a wider variation which has not survived within the papyrological records.

c) Optional element A: ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ…

In 26 of the 37 FRW formulae identified in the corpus, the core is followed by a circumstantial negative Present clause. This clause contains either the verb ⲕⲏ (QUAL of ⲕⲱ "to place") as shown in (48a), or the verb ϣⲟⲟⲡ (QUAL of ϣⲱⲡⲉ "to exist"), shown in (48b). The clause containing ⲕⲏ is identical to that found in the variation of the core in FRW.17 and 18 described above. No evidence of this clause can be seen in any of the fragmentary FRW formulae attested outside of Thebes. As such, the data suggests that the use of this phrase in the Coptic FRW formula is a specifically Theban development.

(48) *ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ: ⲕⲱ vs ϣⲱⲡⲉ*

(a) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
PFRM=1.SG-write.INF without INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲱⲧⲉ
or-Z.ART-fear… CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.ART.SG-force ATTR-Z.ART-single

ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁ=ⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ
place.QUAL IND.OBJ=1.SG down

"I write without any guile or fear… no single force being placed upon me…" (P.KRU 6.9-11)

Susanna"; Stern, "Das Testament der Susanna nach einem koptischen Papyrus im Britischen Museum"; Stern, "Zwei koptische Urkunden aus Theban auf einem Papyrus des Ägyptischen Museums zu Berlin."

(b) ϵ=ι-ογωϣϵ ⲁγω ϵ=ι-ⲡⲓⲑϵ χορις
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF without

ⲗⲁⲁγ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩι-Ø-ϩⲟⲧϵ… ϵ-ⲙⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁγ
INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear… CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁ=ι
ATTR-Z.ART-force exist.QUAL IND.OBJ=1.SG

"I desire and I am persuaded without any guile or fear… no force existing upon me…" (P.KRU 81.32-34)

Of these 26 formulae, only six contain the verb ϣⲟⲟⲡ (P.KRU 3, 50, 80, 81, and 93, and P.CLT 6), while the remaining 20 contain ⲕⲏ. Of the six containing ϣⲟⲟⲡ, only the scribes of three are known – P.KRU 3 (Moses son of Senouthios), P.KRU 50 (Kyriakos son of Petros), and P.KRU 93 (Papas son of Kleonikos) – while P.KRU 80 and 81 may have been written by the same scribe.[33] Furthermore, all six texts are dated to different parts of the 8th century (see Appendix B for the dates of these attestations). As such, it appears that the use of ϣⲟⲟⲡ in place of ⲕⲏ was a standard variation, albeit less common, upon which scribes could draw, rather than a variation particular to one scribe or scribal school.

d) Optional element B: ⲁⲗⲗⲁ *+ adjunct*

Within the corpus, 29 of the 37 FRW formulae attested possess a final clause introduced by the adversative conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ. The content of the final clause varies greatly between texts, and as such these have not been included in the typology presented in Table 4.5 above. However, several recurring phrases can be observed:

[33] See n. 79 above.

1) (ⲉⲃⲟⲗ) ϩⲛⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟϩⲅⲣⲉⲓⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲙⲓⲛⲛⲙⲟⲓ (ⲙⲛ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲛϩⲏⲧ) *"through my own choosing (and my desire)."*

2) ϩⲙⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧ (ⲙⲛⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟϩⲅⲣⲉⲥⲓⲥ) *"through my wish (and my choosing)."*

3) ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛⲡⲁⲧⲱⲧ ⲛϩⲏⲧ ⲧⲏⲣϥ *"through all my satisfaction"* (the Testament of Susanna, P.KRU 66 and 76)

4) ἐν πάσῃ (ἀγαθῇ καὶ) καλῇ προεραίσῃ *"in every good and fair choosing."*[34]

5) ἐπὶ πάσῃ καλῇ προεραίσῃ *"with every fair choosing"* (P.KRU 98)

6) ⲙⲡάσῃ ἀγαθῇ καὶ καλῇ προεραίσῃ "in every good and fair choosing"

Several connections can be made between these phrases. All are PPs and denote agency or instrument. Furthermore, all are similar in content in that they express that the first party has entered into the contract through their own desire and choice. Adjuncts 1-3 are written entirely in Coptic (including words of Greek origin), while adjuncts 4-5 are written entirely in Greek, that is, using Greek lexicon and morphology. Adjunct 6, however, contains a mix of Greek and Egyptian linguistic features. The Greek phrase πάσῃ ἀγαθῇ καὶ καλῇ προεραίσῃ is introduced with the Coptic preposition ⲛ- "through". As such, the entire Greek noun phrase is integrated into the clause through Coptic morphology, as shown in (49).

(49)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ		ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-wish.INF		and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF
ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ…	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	but

[34] The phrase ἐν πάσῃ (ἀγαθῇ καὶ) καλῇ προεραίσῃ also appears in P.KRU 11.16, however no ⲁⲗⲗⲁ is present beforehand.

ⲙ-πάσῃ	ἀγαθῇ	καὶ	καλῇ
through-every.F.DAT.SG	good.F.DAT.SG	and	fair.F.DAT.SG

προεραίσῃ
choosing.F.DAT.SG

"I wish and am persuaded without any guile… but rather through every good and fair choosing." (P.KRU 4.19-23)

In one further attestation of the FRW formula, P.KRU 21, ⲁⲗⲗⲁ is followed by a verbal clause using a focalised Perfect rather than a PP, as shown in (50). In a further two texts, P.KRU 36 and P.CLT 5, written by Psate son of Pisrael, the conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ is followed by the OTH formula (see below, 4.4.3).

(50)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ
	PFRM=1.SG-wish.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF	without

ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…	ⲁⲗⲗⲁ
INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear…	but

ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲉⲓ	ϩⲙ-ⲡⲁ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
FOC-PERF=1.SG-come.INF	through-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-agreement

ⲡⲱⲓ	ⲙⲙⲓⲛ_ⲉⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ
POSS.PRN.M.SG=1.SG	INTS.PRN=1.SG

"I wish and am persuaded without any guile or fear… but rather I have come through my own agreement." (P.KRU 21.26-29)

The appearance of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ + final clause creates a point of contrast to the preceding core (and, where relevant, the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ). As such, despite the difference in the content and form of the final clause, the attestations of FRW formulae which

contain ⲁⲗⲗⲁ are linked through the way in which function words are employed to structure discourse according to the following pattern:

Main verb → ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ (statement x) → ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (statement y)

Main verb → "without x" → "but rather y"

This discourse structure is significant in understanding the relationship between the Greek and Coptic FRW formula, discussed in more depth below.

4.3.4. Relationship to Greek FRW formula

The following comparisons are based on a sample of 31 Greek FRW formulae from across Egypt which are preserved enough to use for accurate linguistic data. These attestations can be divided into the following three distinct recurring forms:

Form 1: ὁμολογῶ… (διὰ ταύτης μου Χ…) ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος (etc.)… δίχα/ἄνευ/χωρὶς δόλου καὶ φόβου… (ἀλλὰ…)

"I acknowledge… (through this my X document…) willingly and convinced (etc.)… without guile and fear… (but rather…)

Form 1 of the Greek FRW formula appears in 18 texts within the sample. The formula is embedded within a declarative clause introduced by the Present active indicative form of the verb ὁμολογῶ "to acknowledge". This verb of acknowledgment does not form part of the formula itself. Rather, the main content of the formula is contained within one or two adverbial clauses which intervene between ὁμολογῶ and its argument clause. The first expresses that the first party has entered the

contract of their own free will, only omitted from P. Herm. 61 (Thebes, 6th C), and consists of the following variations:

- ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος *"willingly and convinced"*
- ἑκουσίω γνώμῃ *"through free-will"*
- ἰδίᾳ μου πίστει καὶ βεβαιώσει *"through my own faith and confirmation"*
- κοινῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ἀδόλῳ προαιρέσει *"of common mind and guileless choosing"*

The second adverbial clause is the core of the free-will formula, similar to the Coptic core (see below), consisting of a series of nouns coordinated by καὶ and introduced by the subtractive connectors δίχα, ἄνευ or χωρὶς "without". Form 1 is attested in texts from a range of locations across Egypt: Antinoopolis, Apollonopolis, Aswan, Hermopolis, Oxyrhynchus, and Thebes. It appears in texts securely dated between 566 CE (P. Cairo Masp. II 67161) and 618 CE (SB I 5112).

Form 2: ...δι᾽ ἧς ὁμολογῶ… ἑκόντες καὶ πεπειμένοι/ἑκουσίω γνώμῃ… δίχα (etc.) δόλου καὶ φόβου… (ἀλλὰ…)

... through which I acknowledge… willingly and convinced/through free-will… without guile and fear… (but rather…)

Form 2, accounts for only six of the 31 attestations of the Greek FRW formula in the sample: P. Lond. I 77 (the Testament of Abraham, written in Hermonthis), P. Lond. V 1727 and P. Münch. I 1, 8, and 14, all from the Patermouthis archive of Aswan, and SB XXII 15477, written in Antinoopolis and part of the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos from Aphrodito (see 4.1.1). It is similar to Form 1 in its construction and content, however in this form the verb of acknowledgment upon which the formula is dependent is contained within a relative clause. This form of the formula is attested between 537 CE (SB XXII 15477) and c. 610 CE (P. Lond. I 77).

Form 3: ...ἥνπερ ἁπλῆν/δισσὴν γραφεῖσαν ἑκοντες καὶ πεπεισμένος ἐθέμην σοι ἄνευ βίας καὶ ἀπάτης… ἐν δημοσίῳ ἀρχείῳ…

"… which (document) written in a single copy/duplicate freely and willingly, I have executed for you without guile and force… in the public registry.

Form 3 is attested in seven documents in the sample. In contrast to Forms 1 and 2, which possess several variations in terms of their content and vocabulary, Form 3 contains little variation. Aside from the alternation between ἁπλῆν "single copy" and δισσὴν "duplicate", all ten attestations follow the same pattern, stating that the first party has executed the document in the public registry (δημόσιον ἀρχεῖον) of their own free will. Similar to Form 2, Form 3 is constructed as a relative clause containing the τίθημι "to execute" written in the Aorist. The main content of the formula which expresses the free will of the first party appears in two key elements: the phrase ἑκοντες καὶ πεπεισμενος "willingly and convinced", and the adverbial core ἄνευ βίας καὶ ἀπάτης… "without force and deceit…"

Of the seven attestations of Form 3 identified in the sample, six appear in the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos and are dated between 540 CE (P. Michael 45) and 645 CE (P. Mich. XIII 662).[35] The remaining attestation appears in P. Herm. 32 (6th C), possibly written in Hermopolis. In all cases, Form 3 appears towards the end of the text. Furthermore, in those cases in which the beginning of the text is persevered, a further FRW formula (Form 1) is present in the initial declaration. As such, it appears that Form 3 is only employed as a secondary FRW formula in the closing of the document.

[35] On the dating of some of the texts in this archive, see Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito'.

The Greek FRW formula is similar in content and structure to its Coptic counterparts. As outlined in 4.4.2, the Coptic FRW formula can be divided into four sections: the opening verb form, the core, the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ, and a final clause introduced by the conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ. Of these four sections, the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ has no parallels in Greek. Rather, it appears to be an innovation of the Coptic version of the FRW formula, used to extend the list of nouns contained in the core (see 6.3.3). However, the remaining three elements can be observed within the Greek FRW formula.

a) Relationship to wider document

Several different strategies are employed in order to integrate the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae into the wider structure of the document. For the Greek FRW formula, the most common strategy is that contained in Form 1, in which the formula appears as a series of NPs or adjectival adjuncts embedded within the opening declarative statement. Aside from the FRW formula core (see below), these phrases take one of two forms. The first is an NP written in the instrumental dative, as shown in (51a). The second is the phrase ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος consisting of the adjective ἑκὼν "willing", and the Perfect middle participle πεπεισμένος (from πείθω "to persuade") used attributively, as shown in (51b). Consequently, the FRW formula appears between the main verb of acknowledgement, ὁμολογῶ, and its argument clause (which is usually expressed in the infinitive).

(51) *Greek FRW formula as dependent entity*

(a) ὁμολογοῦμεν… ἑκουσίᾳ γνώμῃ
acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.PL… voluntary.F.DAT.SG will.F.DAT.SG

καὶ αὐθαιρέτῳ βουλήσει καὶ
and self_chosen.F.DAT.SG volition.F.DAT.SG and

ἀδόλῳ προαιρέσει… δίχα παντὸς
guileless.F.DAT.SG choosing.F.DAT.SG without any.M.GEN.SG

δόλου καὶ φόβου καὶ βίας…
guile.M.GEN.SG and fear.M.GEN.SG and force.M.GEN.SG…

πεπρακέναι	ὑμῖν	σήμερον
sell.PERF.INF.ACT	2.DAT.PL	today

"We acknowledge… of (our own) free will and through self-chosen volition and guileless choosing… without any guile and fear and force… that we have sold to you today…" (P. Münch. I 13.9-17)

(b)

ὁμολογῶ…		ἑκὼν	καὶ
acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG…		willing.M.NOM.SG	and
πεπεισμένος		ἄνευ	δόλου
persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.PL		without	guile.M.GEN.SG
παντὸς	καὶ	φόβου…	πεπρακέ[ναι]
any.M.GEN.SG	and	fear.M.GEN.SG…	sell.PERF.INF.ACT
ὑμῖν	σήμερον…		
2.DAT.PL	today		

"I acknowledge… willing and being persuaded, without any guile and fear… that I have sold to you today…" (P. Münch. I 12.6-10)

Conversely, the most common method through which the Coptic FRW is integrated into the wider document is as an independent clause, headed by either the Performative or the Perfect. For FRW formulae which appear within the opening of a text, they form part of a series of opening formulae which are usually headed by Performatives, as shown in (52).

(52)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ	ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁⲕ(ⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ)
INDP.1.SG	Stephanos	DEF.M.SG-son	POSS-DEF.AR.M.SG-late
ⲅⲉⲣⲙⲁⲛⲟⲥ…			
Germanos…			

(HYP):

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ	ⲛ-ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ
PFRM=1.SG-.INF	after=3.F.SG	DIR.OBJ-DEF.F.SG_signature

	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ
	POSS-DEF.ART.M.SG-REL-FUT-sign.INF	for=1.SG

(FRW):	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ	
	PFRM=1.SG-wish.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF	
	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
	without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear…

(AOW):	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ	ⲇⲉ	ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ
	PERF=1.SG-do.INF-more	ENCL	confirm.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG
	ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ϩⲉⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ			
	through-INDF.PL-witness			

"I, Stephanos the son of the late Germanos… I provide hereafter the signature of the one who will sign on my behalf (HYP)… I wish and am persuaded without any guile or fear (FRW)… And I further confirm it through witnesses (AOW)…" (P.KRU 20.13-32)

However, not all Coptic FRW formulae appear as independent clauses. As outlined above, the formula in FRW.15 and 16 appears as an NP consisting of the pattern DEM.PRN + REL. This NP stands in apposition to the name of the document type in the preceding clause. Only four examples of this type of integration occur in the corpus: two embedded within the SCR formula (P.KRU 86 and 93) as in (53a), one within an opening declarative clause headed by the verb ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ (P.KRU 12), shown in (53b), and one within the body of the document, immediately before a declarative clause (P.KRU 50) as shown in (53c).

(53) *Coptic FRW formula as dependent entity*

(a)	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ
	for-DEF.M.SG-security	therefore	POSS-DEF.M.SG-place
	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲱ(ⲛ)	
	REL-be.holy.QUAL	PERF=1.SG-establish-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation_document	

ⲡⲁⲓ	ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓϯ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲓ
DEM.PRN.M.SG	FOC-PERF=1.SG-give.INF-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent

ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
to=3.M.SG	CIRC=1.SG-wish.INF	and	CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ…
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile…

"As the security of the holy place, I have established this donation document, this one to which I have given my assent, wishing and being persuaded without any guile…" (P.KRU 93.23-25 = (41a) above)

(b)

ⲧⲉⲓ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ…	ⲕⲁⲧⲁ	ⲟⲩ-ⲉⲛⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ
1.SG-acknowledge.INF…	according_to	INDF.SG-deed

ⲛ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ…	ⲡⲁⲓ
ATTR-Z.ART-sale	DEM.PRN.M.SG

ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲡⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ	ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
FOC_PERF=1.PL-give.INF-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-assent	to=3.M.SG

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ
CIRC=1.SG-wish.INF	and	CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ…
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile…

"I acknowledge… according to a deed of sale… this one to which we have given our assent, wishing and being persuaded without any guile…" (P.KRU 12.13-17).

(c)

ⲁ=ⲧⲉⲧⲛ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ	ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ	ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ
PERF=2.PL-seek.INF	through_1.SG	after-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed

ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲙⲉⲣⲓⲙⲛⲉⲓⲁ	ⲡⲁⲓ	ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲉⲓ
ATTR-Z.ART-settlement	DEM.PRN.M.SG	REL-PERF=1.SG-come.INF

ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ
to=3.M.SG	CIRC=1.SG-desire.INF	and

ϵ=ι-πϵιθϵ	ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
CIRC=1.SG-be.persuaded.INF	without-INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile

ϩι-Ø-ϩⲟⲧϵ…	ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ϥ	ϯ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅϵι
or-Z.ART-fear…	through=3.M.SG	1.SG-acknowledge.INF

ϵ=ι-ⲱⲣⲕ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ
CIRC=1.SG-swear.INF	IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God	DEF.M.SG-Almighty

"You have inquired through me after this deed og settlement; this one to which I have come, desiring and being persuaded without any guile or fear… Through it I acknowledge, swearing by God the Almighty…" (P.KRU 50.32-37 = (50) above)

The use of an NP containing a relative clause to integrate the Coptic FRW formula into the body of the document is similar to the construction found in Form 3 of the Greek formula. In these seven Greek attestations from the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos, the FRW formula is also dependent on the preceding formula and linked using a relative clause, as shown in (54).

(54) πρὸς	τῷ	βεβαίαν	εἶναι
to	DEF.N.DAT.SG	valid.F.ACC.SG	be.PRS.INF.ACT

καὶ	ἀνισχυρὰν	ταύτην	τὴν
and	inviolable.F.ACC.SG	DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG	DEF.F.ACC.SG

πρᾶσιν…	ἥνπερ	ἁπλῆν
sale.F.ACC.SG…	REL.PRN.F.ACC.SG	twofold.F.ACC.SG

γραφῖσαν	ἑκοντες	καὶ
write.PTC.AOR.PASS.F.ACC.SG	willing.M.NOM.PL	and

πεπεισμενος	ἐθέμην	σοι
persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.PL	execute.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG	2.DAT.SG

"…in order that this deed of sale be valid and inviolable… which, written in a single copy, I have executed for you willing and being persuaded…" (P.Mich. XIII 662.51-53)

However, despite the use of a relative clause in both examples, the Coptic FRW.15/16 and Greek Form 3 formulae are largely dissimilar. To begin, there are key lexical differences between the two. For example, in Coptic the first party states either that they have "come to" the document of their own free will, or that they have "given their assent" to it, while in the Greek they have "executed" it. Furthermore, there is a notable structural difference; while the Greek formula opens with a non-finite verbal clause, which is used to expand the name of the document type in the preceding formula, in FRW.15/16 the opening of the FRW formula is an NP in which the demonstrative pronoun ⲡⲁⲓ intervenes between the relative clause and the name of the document type. Therefore, although the broad meaning of the formulae is similar, there are insufficient connections to argue that the Coptic has been modelled directly on the Greek in terms of their use of relative constructions.

The Greek Form 2 formula, which also contains a relative clause, bears even less of a resemblance to the Coptic FRW.15/16 formulae. As shown in (55), the relative clause which introduces the Greek FRW formula is not strictly part of the formulae itself. Rather, it forms a declarative clause within which the FRW formula is embedded.

(55) εἰς ταύτην ἐληλύθαμεν τὴν
to DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG come.PERF.IND.ACT.1.PL DEF.F.ACC.SG

ὁμολογίαν τῆς διαλύσεως
acknowledgement.F.ACC.SG DEF.F.GEN.SG settlement.F.GEN.SG

δι᾽ ἧς ὁμολογοῦμεν…
through REL.PRN.F.GEN.SG acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.PL…

ἑκουσίῳ γνώμῃ πρῶτον μὲν
voluntary.F.DAT.SG will.F.DAT.SG first.N.ACC.SG ENCL

δεδέχθαι καὶ εἰληφέναι παρὰ
accept.PERF.INF.MID and receive.PERF.INF.ACT from

σοῦ	τὸν	σεβάσμιον	ὅρκον
2.GEN.SG	DEF.M.ACC.SG	venerable.M.ACC.SG	oath.M.ACC.SG

"We have come to this acknowledgement of the settlement, through which we acknowledge… of (our own) free will… firstly that we have accepted and received from the venerable oath…" (P. Münch. I 1.27-31)

From the above analysis, the methods for the incorporation of the Coptic FRW formula into the body of the document are unrelated to their Greek counterparts. Rather, they bear similarities to the incorporation of other Coptic legal formulae: finite verbal clauses in the Performative or Perfect as in the HYP and AOW formulae, or the construction ⲡⲁⲓ + REL + PERF which also occurs in the SCR formula (see 5.1.3). However, more substantial links between the Greek and Coptic FRW formula can be observed through a comparison of the vocabulary and internal grammatical structures of the formulae themselves.

b) Internal structures

The main similarity between the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae can be found in SB Kopt. III 1369, written in Aphrodito by Apa Rasios in 647/648 CE.[36] As outlined above (4.3.3), the opening of the FRW formula in this text is different to its Theban counterparts, both in the use of ⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲡⲓⲑⲉ as nouns in the phrase ϩⲛⲧⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲧⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ "through our wish and desire" and in its use of the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ "to draw up/execute a deed", as demonstrated in (56).

(56)	ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ	ⲛ-ⲡ-ϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲱⲧ
	PERF=1.PL-execute.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-copy	ATTR-Z.ART-single

[36] On Apa Rasios, see Cromwell, 'Aristophanes Son of Johannes'; Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito', 250–52.

ϩⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
through-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-volition

ⲙⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
with-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-agreement

ⲙⲛ-ⲧ=ⲛ-ⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲥⲓⲥ
with-POSS.ART.F.SG=1.PL-choice

ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲙⲙⲱ=ⲛ
INTS.PRN=1.PL

ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
without-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲃⲓⲁ
ATTR-Z.ART-force

ϩⲓ-Ø-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…
or-Z.ART-deceit…

"We have executed the single copy of our own volition and agreement and choice, without any force or deceit…" (SB Kopt. III 1369.100-101 = (42) above)

This opening clause bears a close resemblance to that of the Greek Form 3 formula. As stated previously, six of the seven attestations of this formula appear in texts from Aphrodito contained in the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos. Among these is P. Mich. XIII 662, a Greek house sale also written by Apa Rasios, and dated by Bagnall and Worp to 645 CE, shown (57).[37]

(57) ἥνπερ
REL.PRN.F.ACC.SG

ἁπλῆν
single_copy.F.ACC.SG

γραφῖσαν
write.PTC.AOR.PASS.F.ACC.SG

ἑκοντες
willing.M.NOM.PL

καὶ
and

πεπεισμενος
persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.PL

ἐθέμην
execute.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG

σοι
2.DAT.SG

ἄνευ
without

βίας
force.FEM.GEN.SG

καὶ
and

ἀπάτης…
deceit.F.GEN.SG…

"…which, written in a single copy, I have executed for you willingly and being persuaded without force and deceit…" (P.Mich. XIII 662.52-53 = (54) above).

[37] Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito', 252.

These two texts provide a rare opportunity to compare Greek and Coptic formulae written by the same scribe.[38] The main verb of this variation, like that found in SB Kopt. III 1369, is one of execution/writing. There are also grammatical similarities between the expression of the verb: the Aorist in Greek and the Perfect in Coptic which both express past completed actions. Furthermore, both the Greek Form 3 formula and the formula in SB Kopt. III 1369 state that the document has been drawn up in a single copy (ⲡϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ in Coptic and ἁπλῆν in Greek). As such, the formula in SB Kopt. III 1369 and the Greek Form 3 formulae represent a variation specific to Aphrodito that spans two languages.

While the phrase ϩⲛⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ in SB Kopt. III 1369 bears less resemblance to the Form 3 Greek formula from Aphrodito, it has some similarities to some constructions found in other forms of the Greek FRW formula elsewhere. Through the use of the instrumental preposition ϩⲛ, it functions in a similar manner to the instrumental NPs found in Greek Forms 1 and 2 such as ἑκουσίῳ γνώμῃ "through free-will", and particularly ἰδίᾳ μου πίστει καὶ βεβαιώσει "through my own faith and confirmation" which contains the noun πίστει, a possessive (μου), and an intensifier (ἰδίᾳ) corresponding to Coptic ⲡⲓⲑⲉ, ⲡ(ⲉ)ⲛ-, and ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲙⲱⲛ respectively. Due to these similarities, and the striking similarities to the Form 3 formula, there is a clear sense of linguistic continuity between FRW formula in SB Kopt. III 1369 and its contemporary Greek counterparts. However, in the case of the similarities between SB Kopt. III 1396 and the Greek Form 3 formulae, it is unclear whether the Coptic formula was influenced by the Greek, or the Greek by the Coptic. This will be discussed in more depth in (6.2.2).

[38] A further text in which this can be seen is CPR IV 34, an 8th bilingual delivery contract from Hermopolis. However, this text was too heavily restored to be included in this study.

As mentioned previously, the opening of the FRW formula in SB Kopt. III 1369 is distinct from its Theban counterparts, which open with the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ "I desire and am persuaded". This phrase bears some similarity in terms of vocabulary to the Greek phrase ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος "freely and willingly" which occurs in numerous attestations of the Greek FRW formula. The Greek and Coptic phrases share vocabulary in the use of the verb ⲡⲓⲑⲉ/πείθω "to persuade". Furthermore, the adjective ἑκὼν shares some semantic similarities with the Coptic root ⲟⲩⲱϣ, namely willingness, desire, and volition.

Nevertheless, structurally these two phrases are quite distinct. As discussed in 4.3.3, the verbs ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ are usually interpreted as Performatives. Conversely, the Greek phrase contains an adjective (ἑκὼν) and a Perfect participle (πεπεισμένος). While the Greek adjective and participle are used attributively, and the participle is non-finite, the Coptic Performative is a finite verb form and therefore stands as an independent clause. Since the forms ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ are ambiguous, it is possible that they should be interpreted as circumstantial Presents modelled on the non-finite Greek participle, as demonstrated in (58).

(58) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧⲓ ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟ=ⲥ
PERF=1.SG-give.INF POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent to=3.F.SG

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ
CIRC=1.SG-wish.INF and CIRC=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ
without INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile

"I have given my assent to it, desiring and being persuaded without any guile…" (P.KRU 15.19-20 = (40) above).

Although the grammatical categories of the Coptic circumstantial Present and the Greek adjective and Perfect participle cannot be wholly equated, they nonetheless share some similar features in the context of the FRW formula. Like the Greek adjective and participle, the Coptic circumstantial Present is used attributively. Both the Coptic circumstantial Present and Greek participle are non-finite verbal forms. Furthermore, both phrases follow the same pattern – "desire" + CNJ + "persuaded". As such, it is possible that in those cases in which ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ and ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ may be interpreted as circumstantial Present forms, the phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ϧⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ is a replication of the Greek ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος.

Further structural similarities between the Coptic FRW formula (both from Aphrodito and from Thebes) and their Greek counterparts lie in the core phrase "without any guile or fear…". This core, which appears in most variations of the formula in both languages with very few exceptions, can be considered as the main feature which marks the FRW formula. In both languages, the core consists of a series of coordinated nouns, introduced by a subtractive connector and modified by an indefinite pronoun or adjective. This follows the broad pattern:

PREP + INDF + Ø-NOUN + CNJ + Ø-NOUN

This pattern in Greek and Coptic is demonstrated in (59a) and (59b) respectively.

(59) *Construction of the FRW formula core in Greek and Coptic*

(a)	ἄνευ without	παντὸς any.M.GEN.SG	δόλου guile.M.GEN.SG	καὶ and
	φόβου… fear.M.GEN.SG…			

"…without any guile and fear…" (P. Lond. V 1733.12)

(b)	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
	without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear…

"…without any guile or fear…" (P.KRU 12.16-17)

The lexical and semantic relationship between the Greek and Coptic core is clear. The two main subtractive connectors used in the Coptic formula, the prepositions ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ and ⲁϫⲛ-, correspond in function to Greek χωρίς, ἄνευ, δίχα, and ἐκτός. The preference for ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ in the Coptic formula is most likely independent of its use in the Greek, as χωρίς appears in only two of the 31 attestations of the Greek FRW formula in the sample (P.Münch. I 14 and SB VI 9586). Rather, by this stage of the language, ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ would have already become a stable part of Egyptian vocabulary, and therefore would be a viable translation of the Greek prepositions ἄνευ and ἐκτός which were not borrowed into Coptic, and δίχα which is only attested once.[39]

Furthermore, the meaning of the coordinated nouns in both languages is highly similar. The Coptic formula contains either an Egyptian word which is a translation of the corresponding Greek, or the same Greek word borrowed into Egyptian.[40] An example of the words and their general order in the two languages is presented in Table 4.6. Note however the presence of the word ἀνάγκης "force/constraint" in Greek which appears in Coptic within the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ, rather than in the core. Furthermore, the order of the nouns presented in Table 4.6 is not fixed but represents one of the most common orders in the Coptic FRW formula.

[39] The words ἄνευ and ἐκτὸς are not attested as lemma in Coptic in either Förster's *WB*, or in the digital database of the DDGLC project examined personally in July 2018. Only one attestation of the borrowing of δίχα in Coptic has been identified to date, found in P.Ien. Inv. 450 published in Richter, 'Die koptischen Papyri aus dem „Ankauf aus Edfû (Apollinopolis magna) vom Jahre 1911" der Jenaer Papyrussammlung (P.Ien. Inv. 446–453)', 170-174.

[40] On the relationship of the Coptic nouns to their Greek counterparts, see the extensive glossary in Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 179ff.

Table 4.6: Coordinated nouns in the Greek and Coptic FRW formula 'core'

	Guile	*Fear*	*Force*	*Deceit*	*Force*	*Treachery*	*Falsehood*
Greek: P.Cair. Masp. II 67159	δόλου	φόβου	βίας	ἀπάτης	ἀνάγκης	συναρπαγῆς	περιγραφῆς
Coptic: P.KRU.7	ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲟⲧⲉ	ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ	ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ	(-)	ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲕⲏ	ⲡⲉⲣⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ

Despite these lexical similarities, however, there are several key grammatical features which differentiate the core of the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae. As a result of typological differences between Greek and Egyptian, most notably the use of noun cases in Greek, the word order of elements other than the main nouns is more flexible in the Greek FRW formula than in its Coptic counterpart. For example, the preposition does not always come first in the Greek core, as demonstrated in (60). This contrasts with the Coptic formula in which the preposition must always precede the noun it modifies.

(60) δι᾽ ἧς ὁμολογοῦσιν
through REL.PRN.F.GEN.SG acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.3.PL

ἑκουσίᾳ γνώμῃ… δόλου παντὸς
voluntary.F.DAT.SG will.F.DAT.SG… guile.M.GEN.SG any.M.GEN.SG

χωρὶς καὶ βίας
without and force.F.GEN.SG

"… through which they acknowledge, of (their own) free-will… without any guile or force…" (P.Münch. I 14.59-61)

Similarly, the position of the Greek adjective παντός and indefinite pronoun τινός can vary, either following the first noun as in (61a), or appearing at the end of the entire phrase, as in (61b). Furthermore, this indefinite element is optional in Greek, but appears in almost all versions of the Coptic FRW formula.

(61) *Position of the indefinite element in the Greek FRW core*

(a) διʼ ἧς ὁμολογεῖ
through REL.PRN.F.GEN.SG acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.3.SG

καὶ ὡμολόγησεν… δίχα
and acknowledge.AOR.IND.ACT.3.SG… without

δόλου τινος καὶ χλευῆς
guile.M.GEN.SG INDF.PRN.GEN.SG and jest.F.GEN.SG

καὶ βίας…
and force.F.GEN.SG…

"…through which he acknowledges and has acknowledged… without any guile and jest and force…" (SB VI 8988.45-51)

(b) …πρὸς τῷ βεβαίαν εἶναι
…to DEF.N.DAT.SG valid.F.ACC.SG be.PRS.INF.ACT

καὶ ἀνισχυρὰν ταύτην τὴν
and inviolable.F.ACC.SG DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG DEF.F.ACC.SG

πρᾶσιν… ἥνπερ ἁπλῆν
sale.F.ACC.SG… REL.PRN.F.ACC.SG single_copy.F.ACC.SG

γραφῖσαν ἑκοντες καὶ
write.PTC.AOR.PASS.F.ACC.SG willing.M.NOM.PL and

πεπεισμενος ἐθέμην σοι…
persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.PL execute.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG 2.DAT.SG…

ἄνευ βίας καὶ ἀπάτης καὶ
without violence.F.GEN.SG and deceit.F.GEN.SG and

ἀνάγκης καὶ πλάνης πάσης...
force.F.GEN.SG and deceit.F.GEN.SG any.F.GEN.SG…

"…in order that this deed of sale be valid and inviolable… which, written in a single copy, we have executed for you freely and willingly… without any violence and deceit and compulsion and fraud…" (P.Mich. XIII 662.51-54)

A further difference between the Greek and Coptic structures appears in the methods used to link the indefinite element of the core to the nouns which it governs. In Greek, the relationship between πᾶς/τις "any" and the noun δόλος "guile" is shown through case agreement: since both are governed by the preposition "without", both appear in the genitive. Conversely, the connection between Coptic ⲗⲁⲁⲩ "any" and the noun ⲕⲣⲟϥ "guile" is shown in part by word order, but more specifically through the use of the attributive marker ⲛ-.[41] The attributive marker has no equivalent in Greek. Rather, its presence is necessitated through the constraints of the Egyptian grammatical system. Therefore, as demonstrated in Table 4.7, the structure of the Coptic phrase cannot be mapped directly onto the corresponding Greek.

Table 4.7: Correspondence of elements in the Greek and Coptic core

	Preposition	*Indefinite*	*Attributive*	*"guile"*	*Conjunction*	*"fear"*
Greek: P. Lond. V 1733	ἄνευ	παντὸς	(-)	δόλου	καὶ	φόβου
Coptic: P.KRU 12	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-	ⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ	ϩⲓ-	ϩⲟⲧⲉ

These structural differences are central to understanding the relationship between the Coptic and Greek FRW formulae. The analysis above demonstrates that while the content and meaning of the Greek core has been replicated by the Coptic, the structural patterns have not. Rather, the Coptic phrase adheres to the constraints of the Egyptian grammatical system, both in terms of rigid word order, and the use of the attributive marker to link the indefinite pronoun to the following noun.

[41] On the differences between Greek and Coptic NPs in terms of attributive relationships, see 2.1.1c

One final feature of the Coptic FRW core bares only a distant relationship to its Greek counterpart, namely the use of ⲛⲁⲧ- (P.KRU 99), ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ- (P.KRU 9), and ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ- (P.CLT 7) in place of the prepositions ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ and ⲁϫⲛ-. While these constructions are similar in meaning to ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ and ⲁϫⲛ-, they appear to have no counterparts in the Greek FRW formula. This is particularly true in the case of ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ- which changes the core from a PP to a subordinate adverbial clause, as shown in (62).

(62) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲓ-[ⲡⲓⲑⲉ]
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-[be_persuaded.INF]

ⲉ̣-ⲙ̣ⲛ̣-ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ
or-Z.ART-force…

"I desire and I [am persuaded], there being no guile or fear or force…" (P.CLT 7.13-14 = (46) above)

These three constructions appear only once each in the corpus, with ⲛⲁⲧ- also appearing only once in the fragmentary formulae omitted from the corpus (P. Ryl. Copt. 183). Since they possess no corresponding Greek counterparts, these most likely represent innovations of Coptic, arising as synchronic variations in the 8th century, which are identical in meaning to the prepositions ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ and ⲁϫⲛ- but are expressed through uniquely Egyptian constructions.

Further similarities between the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae can be observed in relation to the use of the adversative conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά. Of the 31 Greek formulae identified in the sample, the conjunction ἀλλά appears in only five. Four of these attestations, P. Münch. I 9, 12, and 13, and P. Lond. V 1733 appear in texts from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan, and represent

four of only ten attestations from this region identified in the sample. The remaining text, P. Lond. I 77, originates from Hermonthis. Since all attestations of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ in the Coptic FRW formula occur in Theban texts, it is therefore possible that the use of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά in both Greek and Coptic was a variation particular to these southern regions. However, since no FRW formulae in Greek or Coptic are attested in texts from other sites in Upper Egypt, it is difficult to say for certain whether the use of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά in the FRW formula was a more widespread feature of Upper Egypt or only restricted to these three sites.

As in the case of the Coptic attestations of the FRW formula, there is a great deal of variation in Greek as to the content of the clauses following ἀλλά. However, there are also some unifying features. All variations express agency or instrument, either through an NP in the dative, as shown in (63a), or with a PP headed by ἐξ "through", shown in (63b). Furthermore, all phrases which follow ἀλλά expresses variations upon the theme of free-will.

(63) *Clauses of agency after ἀλλά in the Greek FRW formula*

(a) ὁμολογῶ… ἑκοῦσα καὶ
acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG… willing.F.NOM.PL and

πεπεισμένοι δίχα παντὸς
persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.F.NOM.PL without any.M.GEN.SG

δόλου καὶ φόβου καὶ βίας…
guile.M.GEN.SG and fear.M.GEN.SG and force.F.GEN.SG…

ἀλλ' ἑκουσίῳ γνώμῃ καὶ
but voluntary.F.DAT.SG will.F.DAT.SG and

αὐθαιρέτῳ βουλήσει…
self_chosen.F.DAT.SG volition.F.DAT.SG…

"I acknowledge… willing and being persuaded, without any guile and fear and force… but rather through (our own) free-will and through self-chosen volition… (P. Münch. I 9.12-18)

(b) …δι᾽ ἧς ὁμολογῶ
… through REL.PRN.F.GEN.SG acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG

ἑκὼν καὶ πεπεισμένος
willing.M.NOM.SG and persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.SG

δίχα παντὸς δόλου καὶ
without any.M.GEN.SG guile.M.GEN.SG and

φόβου καὶ βίας… ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ
fear.M.GEN.SG and force.F.GEN.SG… but through

οἰκεία[ς] προθέσεως καὶ σκόπῳ
own.F.GEN.SG purpose.F.GEN.SG and intention.F.DAT.SG

αὐθαιρέτῳ…
self_chosen.F.DAT.SG…

"…through which I acknowledge, willing and being persuaded, without any guile and fear and force… but rather through (my) own purpose and through self-chosen intention…" (P. Lond. I 77.5-9)

Since there is a high amount of variation in the final phrases after ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά in both the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae, it is difficult to establish a direct relationship between them. There are some similarities in terms of vocabulary, which has been discussed previously by Richter.[42] However it is difficult to observe structural similarities between these expressions. Nevertheless, a broad relationship can be observed between the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae in terms of the role of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά in structuring discourse. As discussed above (4.3.3), the presence of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ in certain variations of the Coptic FRW formula creates a point of contrast to the core headed by the subtractive connector (usually ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ). The elements ⲁⲗⲗⲁ and ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ indicate key turning points

[42] See for example his discussion of the use of the Greek phrase ἐν πάσῃ (ἀγαθῇ καὶ) καλῇ προεραίσῃ in Coptic: Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 74; for the relationship of Coptic ϩⲛⲧ to Greek, 341.

in the discursive structure of the formula, creating the pattern VERB → χωρις (statement x) → ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (statement y). The same pattern appears in the five attestations of the Greek FRW formula containing ἀλλά. As such, it appears as though the discursive pattern from the Greek FRW has been mapped onto its Coptic counterpart, built around these two key linguistic markers.

However, as in the case of the HYP formula, the connection between the Greek and Coptic FRW formula regarding the use of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά is obscured by the dates of the documents in question. The earliest attestation of the Coptic FRW formula in Thebes appears in P. CLT 1, dated to 698 CE. Conversely, the five attestations of the Greek FRW formula in which ἀλλά occurs are dated between 585 (P. Münch. I 9) and 610 (P. Lond. I 77). As such, two direct contemporary points of comparison have been identified in which the Theban formula in Coptic could have modelled the use of on ⲁⲗⲗⲁ their Greek counterparts. It is therefore difficult to identify how the discursive patterns of the Upper Egyptian Greek formulae may have been replicated into the Coptic texts of late 7th and 8th century Thebes. This is discussed in further detail in 6.3.1.

4.3.5. Conclusion

As the above discussion shows, there are elements of the Coptic FRW formula which bear a large amount of similarity to their Greek counterparts. The core of the Coptic formula appears to be a replication from Greek, mirroring the content and meaning of the Greek phrase while adhering to the constraints of the Egyptian language. However, the Coptic formula also shows a degree of innovation, such as the inclusion of the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ, or the use of the Performative phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ in the opening of Theban formulae.

The most striking similarities occur between the Greek and Coptic FRW formulae of Aphrodito. Of particular importance is the appearance of the formula in two documents written by Apa Rasios: SB Kopt. III 1369 in Coptic and P. Mich. XIII 662 in Greek. This provides a rare opportunity in the data to witness Greek and Coptic versions of a formula written by the same scribe. Of similar importance is the similarity of these documents to other Greek texts from Aphrodito contained in the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos. These Greek texts, as well as several fragmentary Coptic formulae from Aphrodito identified outside the corpus, suggest that there were distinct regional variations of the FRW formula. The significance of this in highlighting the development of the Coptic FRW formula will discussed in more depth in 6.2.1.

4.4. Oath formula (OTH)

The Coptic OTH formula is one of several legal formulae which are specific to a Christian context.[43] The formula consists of an oath sworn primarily to either God the Almighty (ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ) or the holy trinity (ⲧⲉⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ). It appears predominantly in the opening of the document after the FRW formula; however it also occasionally appears in the closing of the document between the curse/penalty formulae and the SCR formula.

4.4.1. History and distribution

Pre-Christian OTH formulae are attested in Greek legal documents as early as the 2nd century BCE, consisting of an imperial oath sworn to the king during the Ptolemaic period and to the emperor during the Roman period.[44] Oaths containing Christian elements are attested in Greek documents

[43] On the Coptic OTH formula and related legal stipulations, see Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 1:190–92; Till, 'Zum Eid in Den Koptischen Rechtsurkunden'.

[44] For the Ptolemaic OTH formula ὀμνύω βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον 'I swear to the king, Ptolemy', see the numerous examples published in P. Tebt. III. On Greek oaths from the Roman and Byzantine periods, see Bagnall and Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 43ff; Worp, 'Byzantine Imperial Titulature in the Greek Documentary

from at least the early 5th century CE. The earliest secure attestation of "God Almighty" in the OTH formula appears in P. Mich. XI 613, a delivery contract from Herakleopolis dated to 415 CE.[45] An earlier example most likely appears in P. Kellis I 24, a declaration to the office of the dux excavated at the site of Ismant el-Kharab (Kellis) in the Dakhleh Oasis and dated to 352 CE.[46] However, while an oath formula is clearly present, the phrase "God Almighty" is almost entirely restored, as shown in (64). Nevertheless, this restoration is likely correct, and therefore the Christian oath formula almost certainly appeared as early as the mid-4th century CE.

(64) ὁμολογοῦμεν ὄμνυντες
acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.PL swear.PTC.PRS.ACT.M.NOM.PL

τὸν πα[ντοκράτορα Θεὸν καὶ
DEF.M.ACC.SG A[mlighty.M.ACC.SG God.M.ACC.SG and

τὴν ε]ὐσέβειαν τῶν
DEF.F.ACC.SG r]everence.F.ACC.SG DEF.M.GEN.PL

πάντα νικῶντων αἰωνίων
all.N.ACC.PL victorious.M.GEN.PL eternal.M.GEN.PL

δεσποτῶν
lord.M.GEN.PL

"We acknowledge, swearing to the A[lmighty God and the r]everence of all the victorious, eternal lords…" (P. Kellis I 24.4-5)

Papyri'; Packman, 'Regnal Formulas in Document Date and in the Imperial Oath'; Packman, 'Epithets with the Title Despotes in Regnal Formulas in Document Dates and in the Imperial Oath'; Packman, 'Notes on Papyrus Texts with the Roman Imperial Oath'; Seidl, *Der eid im römisch-ägyptischen provinzialrecht*.

[45] Worp, "Byzantine Imperial Titulature in the Greek Documentary Papyri," 217. This and subsequent dates by Worp for the appearance of particular phrases in the Greek OTH formula have been confirmed through a search of papyri.info.

[46] For details of this document and its archaeological context, see Worp, *Greek Papyri from Kellis*, 72.

The Holy Trinity appears in Greek OTH formulae from the mid-5th century onwards. The earliest reference to πατήρ υἱὸς ἅγιος πνεῦμα ("the father, son, and the holy spirit") appears in an OTH formula in Stud. Pal. XX 122, a contract from Hermopolis dated to 439 CE.[47] The earliest securely dated attestation of the phrase ἡ ἅγια καὶ ὁμοούσιος τριάς ("the holy and consubstantial trinity") appears in SB V 8029, a guarantee declaration from Antinoopolis dated to 537 CE.[48] The Greek OTH formula is attested until the end of the 7th century, with the last absolutely dated example in the sample appearing in P. Grenf. II 100, a receipt from Krokodilopolis dated to 683 CE.

Within the corpus, the Coptic OTH formula is attested 56 times. Five attestations appear in texts from Aphrodito (P. Lond. IV 1494, 1509, 1518, and 1593, and SB Kopt. III 1369), and 11 are found in Hermopolite texts (CPR IV 48, 74, 80, and 90. P. Mon. Apollo 24 and 25, and P. Ryl. Copt. 128, 144, 159. 191, and 196). The remaining 40 attestations occur in Theban texts. The earliest securely dated example is found in CPR IV 90, a Hermopolite debt instrument dated to 596 CE. Outside of the corpus, traces of the formula are also found in three fragmentary documents from Herakleopolis, (CPR IV 84,176, and 205, all written in Fayumic), and one from the Fayum (CPR IV 125).

4.4.2. Forms of the Coptic OTH formula

The Coptic OTH formula can be divided into two main sections: an initial main clause containing a verb of swearing, and the argument clause which completes this verb. The attestations of the formula can be further divided into eight main groups depending on the construction used to express the argument clause. These groups, and the variations which occur within them, are summarised in Table 4.8.

[47] Worp, 'Byzantine Imperial Titulature in the Greek Documentary Papyri', 217.

[48] Worp, "Byzantine Imperial Titulature in the Greek Documentary Papyri," 217.

Table 4.8: Forms of the Coptic OTH formulae within the corpus

Broad Code	Verb of swearing	Argument clause	Narrow Code
		a) No argument clause	
OTH.1	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	-	OTH.1.1
	ϯϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-		OTH.1.2
	ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛ-		OTH.1.3†
		b) ⲉⲧⲙⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.2	ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲩ…	OTH.2
OTH.3	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ-	OTH.3†
OTH.4	ⲉⲓⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ	OTH.4†
		c) ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.5	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ (ⲛⲁⲕ)	OTH.5.1
	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ	OTH.5.2
OTH.6	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲣⲛⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	OTH.6†
		d) ⲉⲧⲙⲧⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.7	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲉⲧⲙⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ…	OTH.7.1
	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ϯⲧⲁⲣⲕⲱ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲛⲓⲁⲛⲁϣ…		OTH.7.2
		e) ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.8	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-	ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ	OTH.8.1
	ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲛⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ	OTH.8.2†
OTH.9	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-	ⲧⲁⲣⲛⲫⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲥϭⲟⲙ	OTH.9†
OTH.10	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ⲧⲁⲣϥϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲁ-	OTH.10†
OTH.11	ⲧⲛ̄ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲙ̄-	ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ… ⲧⲁⲣⲛ̄ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲟ ⲛ̄ⲕⲟⲓⲱⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ	OTH.11†
OTH.12	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-	ⲧⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲛⲁⲕ	OTH.12†

		f) ϫⲉⲛⲛⲉϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.13	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲉ-	ϫⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲉ ⲙⲉⲕ	OTH.13.1†
	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲛⲛⲉⲓⲉϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉϥⲥⲏϩ ϩⲛⲧⲓⲙⲓⲥⲑⲱⲥⲓⲥ	OTH.13.2†
	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-	ϫⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲉϩ ϩⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲓ-X	OTH.13.3†
OTH.14	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲛⲛⲓ̈ⲉ̈ⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	OTH.14†
OTH.15	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲉⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲓϣⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ	OTH.15†
OTH.16	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲉⲛⲛⲉⲓϩⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲉϣϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲉⲛⲁⲅⲉ	OTH.16†
		g) ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉϥⲉⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄	
OTH.17	ⲉⲛⲟⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ-X ϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉ-Y	OTH.17†
		h) ϫⲉ + clause	
OTH.18	ⲉⲓϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲓⲱⲣ̄ⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲉⲡⲛ̄ⲧ<ⲁⲓⲧ>ⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ̈	OTH.18†
OTH.19	FRW + ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-	ϫⲉⲁⲛϫⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲱϩ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲛϣ	OTH.19†
OTH.20	FRW + ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̄-	ϫⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̄-Y	OTH.20†

†Appears only in one text within the corpus

Within the opening verbal clause, the object of the verb of swearing (that is, the entity to whom the oath is sworn) can take the form of the following phrases:

- ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ *"God"* (CPR IV 90)
- (ⲡⲣⲁⲛ) ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ *"(the name of) God the Almighty"*
- (ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲛ) ⲧⲉⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲥ (ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲛⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲛⲡⲉⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ) *"(the power of) the holy consubstantial trinity (the father and the son and the holy spirit)"*
- ⲡⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ/ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩⲉ (ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ) *"the health of our (kingly) lords"*
- ⲡⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ/ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩⲉ (ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ) ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ *"the health of our (kingly) lords who rule over us"*

- ⲡⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ/ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩⲉ (ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ) ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲁⲙⲁϩⲧⲉ ⲉϫⲱⲛ *"the health of our (kingly) lords, these ones who rule over us"*
- ⲡⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲛⲧⲇⲓⲁⲛⲟⲙⲏ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ *"the strength and the power of our kingly lords"*
- ⲡⲉⲩϫⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲉⲧⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲛ "*the health of those who rule over us"*
- ⲧⲕⲁⲑⲟⲗⲓⲕⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲗⲏⲥⲓⲁ *"the universal church"* (P. Mon. Apollo 25)[49]
- ⲡⲉⲩϫⲁⲓ̈ ⲙⲡⲉⲑⲣⲟⲛ[ⲟⲥ] ⲙⲡⲉⲛⲉ̣ⲓⲱ̣ⲧ̣ ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲩⲁⲛⲕⲉⲗⲓⲥⲧⲏⲥ *"the safety of the throne of our father Mark the evangelist"* (P. Mon. Apollo 25)
- ⲡⲉⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲁⲩⲣⲓⲕⲉ *"our lord King Mauricius"* (CPR IV 90)

These objects may appear in different combinations with each other. However, for the purposes of simplification, these objects have been omitted within the categorisation of the formulae shown in Table 4.8.

4.4.3. Analysis of the Coptic OTH formula

a) Verb of swearing

Within the corpus, there is very little variation within the expression of the verb of swearing. Of the 56 attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, 55 introduce the formula with the verb ⲱⲣⲕ, as shown in (65a). The remaining attestation, P.CLT 4 (OTH.4), contains the verb ⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟ "to adjure", as shown in (65b). It also appears as a secondary main verb in the Testament of Susanna (P.KRU 66 and 76 = OTH.7.2), as demonstrated in (65c). In 50 of these attestations, this initial verb of swearing is written in the Performative.

[49] On the term ⲕⲁⲑⲟⲗⲓⲕⲏ, see Wipszycka, "Καθολική et les autres épithètes qualifiant le nom ἐκκλησία: Contribution à l'étude de l'ordre Hiérarchique des églises dans l'égypte byzantine."

(65) *Verbs of swearing in the Coptic OTH formula*

(a) ϵ=ι-ϣρκ ⲇϵ ⲙⲛⲛⲥϣ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF ENCL after=3.F.SG

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty

"And I swear hereafter to God the Almighty…" (P.KRU 15.23-25)

(b) ϵ=ι-ⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩι-Ø-ϵⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ
PFRM=1.SG-adjure.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-ruler every and-Z.ART-power

ⲛⲓⲙ
every

"I adjure every ruler and every power…" (P.CLT 4.21)

(c) ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇϵ ϵ=ι-ϣρκ ⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ
moreover ENCL PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-trinity

ϵⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ… ⲁⲩϣ ⲟⲛ
REL-become.holy.QUAL ATTR-Z.ART-consubstantial… and also

ϯ-ⲧⲁⲣⲕϣ ⲛ-Ø-ⲣⲱⲙϵ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ-ⲛⲓ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ
1.SG-adjure.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-man every DIR.OBJ-DTC.M.SG-oath

ϵⲧ-ϩⲁ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧϵ
REL-under-Z.ART-fear

"And moreover, I swear to the holy and consubstantial trinity… and also I adjure every man by the fearsome oath…" (P.KRU 76.10-12)

While the form ϵⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ is generally ambiguous, as noted in the discussions of the previous formulae, the interpretation of the Performative in most of these cases is clear. In a similar manner to the AOW.1, almost all 51 attestations of the Coptic OTH formula contain linguistic markers

heralding a change in topic which clearly delineate them as independent clauses separate from the surrounding formulae. These include the following PPs:

- ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ
- ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ
- ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ
- ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ
- ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ
- ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ (SB Kopt. III 1369)

These markers are of Greek origin (ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ < μαλλόν; ⲇⲉ < δέ), Egyptian origin (ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ, ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲓ), or a mix of both (ⲉϫⲛⲛⲁⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ). As in the case of the objects of the verb of swearing, these markers or phrases have been omitted from the categorisations in Table 4.8. for the sake of simplicity. However, it is important to highlight their presence and the important role they play in interpreting the form of the opening verb and the relationship of the OTH formula to its surrounding contexts. The importance of these markers in understanding the relationship between the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae will be discussed below (4.4.4).

In five of the remaining six attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, the formula appears embedded within a declarative statement following the verb ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ "to acknowledge". This verb of acknowledging is written either in the Present (P.KRU 3, 10, and 50, and P.CLT 6), or the Performative (P.CLT 1), shown in (66a) and (66b) respectively. In all five cases, the form of the following verb of swearing, ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ, is ambiguous. Since the act of swearing is in itself performative, it is highly possible that a Performative is intended. However, based on comparisons to the Greek OTH formula (see below, 4.4.4), a reading of the circumstantial Present has been selected. This is

further strengthened by the fact that PPs such as those mentioned above which appear within the opening verbal clause counteract the *Koinzidenzfall* of speaking which is a requirement of the performative.[50]

(66) *Coptic OTH formulae with ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ*

(a) ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲛ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
now 1.PL-acknowledge.INF CIRC=1.PL-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty…

"Now we acknowledge, swearing to God the Almighty…" (P.KRU 10.28-29)

(b) ⲉ=ⲓ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣ̅ⲕ̅
PFRM=1.PL-acknowledge.INF CIRC=1.PL-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty…

ϫⲉ-ⲡ-ⲛ̅ⲧ<-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲧ>ⲁⲁ=ϥ[51] ⲛⲁ=ⲩ
that-DEF.M.SG-REL-PERF=1.SG-give.INF=3.M.SG IND.OBJ=3.PL

ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲧⲁⲁ=ϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲓ̈ ⲟⲩ-ⲙⲟⲛⲟⲛ̅
PERF=3.PL-give.INF=3.M.SG for=1.SG INDF.SG-alone

"I acknowledge, swearing to God the Almighty… that that which I gave to them, they have spent for me only." (P. CLT 1.59-63)

In a one further attestation (P.KRU 16), the OTH formula is preceded by the Performative ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ, as shown in (67). Once more, ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ in this example may be understood either as a circumstantial

[50] Cromwell and Grossman, "Condition(al)s of Repayment: P. CLT 10 Reconsidered," 159.

[51] For this correction, see Till and Steinwenter, "Neue koptische Rechtsurkunden," 307, n. 6.

Present describing an accompanying circumstance (that is, "I write, swearing to…"), or as a Performative (that is, "I write and I swear to…"). Since, as stated previously, the act of swearing is itself Performative, this latter interpretation has been selected. However, this is only tentative.

(67) ϵ=ι-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϵ=ι-ⲱⲣⲕ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-write.INF PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF after=3.F.SG

ⲛ-ⲧϵ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ
IND.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-trinity ATTR-Z.ART-consubstantial

"I write (and) I swear hereafter to the consubstantial trinity…" (P.KRU 16.6-7)

As examples (65)-67) show, the object of ϵⲓⲱⲣⲕ is introduced by either the indirect object marker ⲛ-, or the preposition ϵ-. The latter occurs in only seven of the 58 attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus: P. Ryl. Copt. 144, 191, and 196 (OTH.8.1), P. Ryl. Copt. 128 (OTH.9) CPR IV 48 (OTH.12.1), CPR IV 74 (OTH.12.3), and CPR IV 80 (OTH.16). All seven of these attestations are from the Hermopolite nome, exhibiting the substitution of ϵ for ⲛ common in Middle Egypt.[52] The remaining four attestations of the OTH formulae from the Hermopolite nome use the indirect object marker ⲛ-, showing that either strategy could be called upon in this region.

b) Argument clause

The main distinctions between the variations of the Coptic OTH formula lie in the expression of the argument clause which completes the main verb of swearing. OTH.1, which accounts for 18 of the 56 attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, possesses no argument clause. Rather, as demonstrated in (68), the OTH formula stands between the FRW formula and a declarative statement which are both headed by a Performative.

[52] Stolk, "Subscriptions to a renunciation contract", 55.

(68) ϵ=ι-ογωϣ ϧγω ϵ=ι-πιθϵ χωρις
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF and PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF without

ϧϧϧγ ν-Ø-κρογ ϩι-Ø-ϩοτϵ… ϵ=ι-ωρκ
INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-guile or-Z.ART-fear… PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF

μ-π-νογτϵ π-πϧντοκρϧτωρ μν-π-ογϫϧι
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty with-DEF.M.SG-health

ν-νϵ=ν-ϫιϲοογϵ ϵτ-ϧμϧϩτϵ ϵ=ι-ϩομολογϵι
POSS-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-lord.PL REL-rule.INF PFRM=1.SG-acknowledge.INF

ϵ=ι-ϫωριζϵ ν-ϣϵνογτϵ πϧ-μϵριτ
CIRC=1.SG-donate.INF DIR.OBJ-Shenoute POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-beloved

ν-Ø-ϣηρϵ ϵϩογν ϵ-π-μονϧϲτηριον
ATTR-Z.ART-son in to-DEF.M.SG-monastery

ϵτ-ογϧϧϧβ ϵτ-μμϧγ
REL-become_holy.QUAL REL-there

"I desire and have been persuaded without any guile or fear… I swear to God the Almighty and the health of our lords who rule, (and) I acknowledge that I am donating Shenoute my beloved son to that holy monastery." (P.KRU 93.24-29)

OTH.2-4 introduces the argument clause with a negated ϵ + INF construction as demonstrated in (69). This occurs in five of the 5 OTH formulae in the corpus: P.KRU 20, 21, and 42 (OTH.2), P.KRU 9 (OTH.3), and P.CLT 4 (OTH.4). All five examples occur in Theban texts. However, since the number of attestations of the OTH formula outside of Thebes is low, this does not necessarily indicate that the use of ϵτμϲωτ̅μ̅ is a particular Theban variation.

(69) μννϲω=ϲ ϵ=ι-ωρκ μ-π-νογτϵ
after=3.F.SG PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God

ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…	ⲉ-ⲧⲙ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ	ⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ
Almighty…	to-NEG-transgress.INF	DIR.OBJ-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed
ⲙ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ…		
ATTR-Z.ART-sale…		

"Hereafter, I swear to God Almighty… not to transgress this deed of sale…" (P.KRU 9.86-90)

In OTH.5-6, which account for 11 attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, the argument clause is introduced by the ⲉ + INFL.INF, as shown in (70).

(70)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲕ	ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲣⲁⲛ	ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
	PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF	IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-name	DEF.M.SG-God
	ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…	ⲉ-ⲧⲣ=ⲛ-ϩⲁⲣϩ	ⲧⲛ-ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ
	Almighty	to-INFL.INF=1.PL-guard.INF	1.PL-keep.INF

"I swear by the name of God Almighty… that we guard and we keep (this document)…" (P. Lond. IV 1509.19-20)

Of the 11 attestations of this construction in the OTH formula, five originate form Aphrodito, and contain the phrase ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ: P. Lond. IV 1494, 1509, 1518, and 1593, and SB Kopt. III 1369 (OTH.5.2). All four P. Lond. IV texts form part of the Basilios archive, three of which were written by the same scribe, Theodoros, at the beginning of the 8th century (P. Lond. IV 1494, 1509, and 1593).[53] The scribe of P. Lond. IV 1593 is unknown, while SB Kopt. III 1369 was written by Apa Rasios in 647/648 and forms part of the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos. While there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the phrase ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ in the Coptic OTH formula was a specific feature of Aphrodito, at the very least it appears to have been favoured by Theodoros.

[53] For the Basilios dossier and the texts of Theodoros, see Richter, 'Language Choice in the Qurra Dossier'.

A further four texts contain the negative ϵ + INFL.INF construction, demonstrated in (71). All four of these texts were written in Djême in the early 8th century. Of these, two were written by Johannes son of Lazarus (P.KRU 35 and 38 = OTH.7.1), while the remaining two were written by Komes (P.KRU 66 and 76, the Testament of Susanna = OTH.7.2). While this may signify that the appearance of the clause ϵⲧⲙⲧρϵⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲁρⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡϵ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ "to not cause any transgression to happen in it" is indicative of a particular scribal school within Djême, as in the case of the Aphrodito texts discussed above there is insufficient data to make any definitive claims.

(71) ϵ=ⲓ-ⲱρⲕ ⲛ-ⲧϵ-ⲧρⲓⲁⲥ ϵⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-trinity REL-become_holy.QUAL

ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ… ϵ-ⲧⲙ-ⲧρϵ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
ATTR-Z.ART-consubstantial… to-NEG-INFL.INF-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲡⲁρⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡϵ ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-transgression happen.INF in=3.F.SG

"I swear to the holy consubstantial trinity… that no transgression will happen in it." (P.KRU 38.49-53)

OTH.8-11, which account for seven attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, introduce the argument clause of ⲱρⲕ with the Finalis ⲧⲁρϵϥⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅, as shown in (72a). Five of these attestations originate from the Hermopolite nome: P. Ryl. Copt. 144, 191, 196 and P. Mon. Apollo 24 (OTH.8), and P. Ryl. Copt. 128 (OTH.9). The remaining two, P.KRU 87 (OTH.10) and P.CLT 6 (OTH.11), are Theban. One further text, CPR IV 80 (OTH.12), uses the 1st person singular Conjunctive form ⲧⲁⲥⲱⲧⲙ̅ as shown in (72b), which supplements the lack of a 1st person singular form of the Finalis.

(72) *The Finalis and the Conjunctive in the Coptic OTH formula*

(a) ϵ=ⲛ-ѡⲣⲕ ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ ⲡ̀ⲁⲛ̀ⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧѡⲣ…
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God Almighty…

ⲧϵⲣ=ϵⲛ-ⲣⲟϵⲓⲥ ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ
FNL=1.PL-guard.INF IND.OBJ=2.PL

"We swear to God Almighty… that we will guard for you…" (P. Mon. Apollo 24.9)

(b) ϵ=ⲓ-ѡⲣⲕ̅ ϵ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲧϵ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧѡⲣ…
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF to-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty...

ⲧⲁ-ϩⲁⲣϵϩ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
CNJV_1.SG-guard.INF IND.OBJ=2.PL

"I swear to God the Almighty… that I will guard for you…" (CPR IV 80.12-13)

In OTH.13-16, which accounts for six attestations of the OTH formula in the corpus, the argument clause is expressed through the construction ϫϵ + NEG.ADH, as shown in (73a). OTH.17, which occurs only in P.KRU 84, contains the final clause construction ϫϵⲕⲁⲥ + ADH, as shown in (73b). These belong to the category of "final clause" constructions discussed by Hasznos (see 2.2.4).[54]

(73) *Final clause patterns in the Coptic OTH formula*

(a) ϵ=ⲓ-ѡⲣⲕ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲅⲣⲁⲧѡⲣ…
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God Almighty…

ϫ-ⲛⲛϵ=ⲓ-ϵϣ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
that-NEG.ADH=1.SG-able-transgress.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PRN

[54] Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 245ff; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 40ff.

ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲁϫⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲥⲏϩ	ϩⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲥⲑⲱⲥⲓⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-matter	CIRC=3.M.SG-write.QUAL	in-DTC.F.SG-lease

"I swear to God Almighty… that we will not be able to transgress any matter written in this lease." (P. Ryl. Copt. 159.21-22)

(b)

ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲣⲕ	ϫⲉ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF	ENCL	after=3.M.F.SG

ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…	ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God	DEF.M.SG-Almighty…	that

ⲉⲣⲉ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ	ⲁⲡⲁ
ADH-DEF.M.SG-martyr	REL-become.holy.QUAL	Apa

ⲫⲟⲃⲁⲙⲱⲛ	ϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟ-ⲛ-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
Phoibamon	exist.QUAL	CIRC=3.M.SG-act.QUAL-IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord

ⲉ-ⲡⲉ=ⲛ-ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ	ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
to-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-beloved	ATTR-Z.ART-son

"And I swear hereafter to God the Almighty… that (the church of) the holy martyr Apa Phoibamon will be lord of our beloved son." (P.KRU 84.13-17)

Of the seven attestations of the OTH formula in which the object contains the Adhortative or Negative Adhortative, five occur in texts from the Hermopolite nome: CPR IV 48, and 74, and P. Ryl. Copt. 159 (OTH.14), P. Mon. Apollo 25 (OTH.15), and CPR IV 90 (OTH.16). The remaining two attestations, P.KRU 98 (OTH.17) and P.KRU 84 (OTH.18), are from Thebes. There is little to connect these texts. All five texts from the Hermopolite nome which contain the construction ϫⲉ + NEG.ADH are written by different scribes (see Appendix B). Furthermore, while CPR IV 48 and 90 are absolutely dated to 625 CE and 596 CE respectively, the remaining three Hermopolite texts are dated broadly: CPR IV 74 to the 7th century, P. Ryl. Copt. 159 to the 6th to 7th centuries, and P. Mon. Apollo 25 to the 8th century.

The remaining four attestations of the OTH formula (OTH.18-20) introduce the argument clause of ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ through the pattern ϫⲉ + main clause. The following two patterns are attested:

- ϫⲉ + PERF: OTH 18 (P. CLT 1) and OTH.19 (P.KRU 36)
- ϫⲉ + nominal sentence: OTH.20 (P.CLT 5)

All three of these formulae appear in texts written by Psate son of Pisrael. Furthermore, the OTH formula in P.KRU 36 and P.CLT 5 (OTH.18-19) both follow the FRW formula and form the final clause which follows the conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ, as shown in (74). While the use of ϫⲉ + main clause appears to be a feature of the OTH formula specific to Psate, it cannot be ruled out that it was a much more widespread variation within Djême.

(74) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
PERF=1.PL-come.INF ENCL to=3.M.SG CIRC=1.PL-wish.INF

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ⲙ-ⲡⲓⲑ[ⲉ] ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
and CIRC=1.PL-be_persuaded.INF without INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
ATTR-Z.ART-guile… but moreover PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ… ϫⲉ-ⲁ=ⲛ-ϫⲓ
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty… that-PERF=1.PL-receive.INF

ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲱϩ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲁⲛⲁϣ
and fulfil.QUAL by=2.PL DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-oath

"Therefore, we have come to it, wishing and being persuaded without any guile or fear… but rather we moreover swear to God the Almighty… that we have received and been fulfilled by you in regards to the oath…" (P.KRU 36.46-50)

As the above descriptions show, the final argument clause of the OTH formula contains a large amount of variation, even within the broader categories identified. Only a few of these variations can be attributed to a specific region or scribe, and many occur in only one text. In the case of common constructions such as the ϵ- + INF/INFL.INF, Finalis, and "final clause" constructions, their use represents well attested strategies for the introduction of argument clauses in Coptic from earlier in the Byzantine period (see 2.2.4).

4.4.4. Relationship to Greek OTH formula

The comparisons in this section are based on a sample of 52 Greek OTH formula. Like their Coptic counterparts, the Greek OTH formulae possess much variation in terms of their structure and content. Similarly, the formulae can also be divided into two segments: the opening verb of swearing, and its object clause. The Greek formulae identified in the sample can be divided into the following patterns:

Form 1: ἐπομνύμενος Y + INF

"...swearing by Y that..."

Form 1 of the Greek OTH formula accounts for 14 of the 52 attestations in the sample. The earliest attestation appears in CPR VI 6, a settlement from Hermopolis dated 439 CE, while the latest occurs in P. Grenf. II 100, a receipt from the Fayum dated 683 CE. This form of the formula appears in texts across Egypt, predominantly from the Fayum, but also from Aswan, the Antaiopolite nome, Herakleopolis, and Hermopolis. The main verb of swearing, ἐπόμνυμι, appears as a Present middle participle and is completed by an infinitive. However, in one attestation (P. Münch. I 4+5v) the verb appears as the Aorist participle ἐπομωσάμενος.

Form 2: **(**ἅμα δὲ καὶ) ὀμνύοντες/ὑπόμνυντες Y + INF

"…(and at the same time) swearing by Y that…"

Form 2 of the Greek OTH formula is similar to Form 1, however it uses the Present active participle of the verb ὄμνυμι (or ὑπόμνυμαι in the case of P. Michael 41). Form 2 appears in 16 of the 52 attestations of the Greek OTH formula in the sample. The earliest attestation is found in P. Kellis I 24, an official declaration from Kellis dated to 352 CE. The remaining examples of the formula are dated between the early 5th century (P. Mich. XI 613, written in Herakleopolis and dated to 415 CE) and the late 6th century (P. Mich. XIII 664, written in Aphrodtio and dated to 599/600 CE).[55] The formula is attested in Aswan, the Antaiopolite nome, the Hermopolite nome, Herakleopolis, and Kellis.

Form 3: ὁμολογῶν πρός Y + AOR

"swearing to Y that…"

Form 3 of the Greek OTH formula appears in only six documents in the sample: P. Laur. III 112-117. All six documents are tax lists from Hermopolis and are dated broadly to the 7th to the 8th centuries. The verb of swearing consists of the Present active participle of ὁμολογέω and is completed by an Aorist. The indirect object of the verb of swearing is introduced by the preposition πρός, which was used increasingly in Koine in place of the older dative form (see 2.2.3).[56]

[55] On the dating of P. Mich. XIII 664, see Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito', 250–52.

[56] Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611; see also Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 280.

Form 4: (ἅμα δὲ) ἐπωμοσάμεθα (πρὸς) (δὲ) Y + INF

"(And at the same time) I have sworn to Y that…"

Form 4 of the Greek OTH formula appears in only seven texts in the sample: P. Münch. I 1 (574 CE), P. Münch. I 8 (540 CE), and P. Lond. V 1727 (584 CE) from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan; P. Köln III 157 (589 CE) from Apollonopolis Heptakomias, P. Laur. III 91 (606 CE) of unknown provenience, P. Oxy. I 138 (610-611 CE) from Oxyrhynchus, and SB I 5112 (618 CE) from Apollonopolis. Like Forms 1-2, the argument clause in this formula is formed of an infinitive construction. However, it is distinct from the previous iterations of the Greek OTH formula in its use of a finite verb of swearing: the Aorist indicative middle of ἐπόμνυμι. The object of the verb of swearing is introduced by the preposition πρός in P. Oxy. I 138 and SB I 5112.

Form 5: ἐνορκῶ (δὲ) πρὸς/κατὰ Y + INF

"(And) I swear to/by Y that…"

Form 5 appears in only two texts in the sample: PSI I 76 from Oxyrhynchus, dated to 572/573 CE, and P. Cairo Masp. II 67151 from Aphrodito, dated to 570 CE. The main verb of swearing is the Present indicative of the verb ἐνορκόω and is completed by an infinitive. The object of the verb of swearing is introduced by πρός in PSI I 76, and κατά in P. Cairo Masp. II 67151.

Form 6: ὁμολογ(ῶ) πρός Y + INF

"I swear to Y that…"

Form 6 appears in only two texts in the sample: P. Wuerzb 20 and P. Lips. I 103. Both texts originate from Hermopolis and are dated broadly to the 7th to 8th centuries. The verb of swearing is expressed as the Present indicative of the verb ὁμολογέω and is completed by an infinitive. The object of the verb of swearing is introduced by πρός.

The remaining five attestations of the Greek OTH formula cannot be classified according to the above forms, and show much variation in their constructions:

P. Haun. III 58.10-11: ὀμνύοντες Y + Ø

"...swearing by Y."

P. Cairo Masp. I 67003.24-25: ἐνορκοῦντες κατὰ Y + INF

"...swearing by Y that..."

P. Münch. I 14.92-93: ὅτι + PRS + ἐπωμόσαντο… κατὰ Y

"(They) have sworn by Y... that..."

P. Cair. Masp. III 67295.15-17: ὁρκίζ[ω] ὑμ[ὰ]ς κατά Y + INF

"I swear to you by Y that..."

P. Mich. XI 613.6-7: ὄμνυμει Y + INF

"I swear to Y that..."

As the above forms show, there is little variation in expression of the argument clause in the Greek OTH formula. All but ten of the 52 attestations of the formula in the sample complete the verb of swearing with an infinitive construction. Furthermore, while there is some variation in the vocabulary used in the opening verbal clause of swearing, all but 14 attestations express this verb as a participle.

a) Relationship to wider document

The main methods for incorporating the OTH formula into the body of the document differ between Greek and Coptic. The Greek formula appears in 38 of the 52 attestations in the sample as a participial phrase embedded within a main clause, as shown in (75a). Conversely, as discussed above (4.4.3), at least 50 of the 56 attestations of the Coptic OTH formulae consist of an independent verbal clause headed by a Performative, standing between a series of other formula as shown in (75b).

(75) *Most common opening constructions in the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae*

(a)

τίθημι	τὴν	διάλυσιν
execute.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG	DEF.F.ACC.SG	settlement.F.ACC.SG

δι᾽	ἧς	ὁμολογῶ
through	REL.PRN.F.GEN.SG	acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG

ἐπομνύμενος	τόν	τε
swear.PTC.PRS.MID.M.NOM.SG	DEF.M.ACC.SG	both

παντοκράτορα	Θεὸ̣ν	καὶ…	μηδένα
Almighty.M.ACC.SG	God.M.ACC.SG	and…	not_any

λόγον	ἔχειν	πρό̣ς	[σε]
claim.M.ACC.SG	have.PRS.INF.ACT	against	[2.ACC.SG]

"… I execute the settlement through which I acknowledge, swearing by both God Almighty and… that I have no claim against [you]…" (CPR VI 6.11-13)

(b)

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF

ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ…
without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear…

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲉⲕ	ⲇⲉ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF	ENCL	after=3.F.SG

ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ	ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
IND.OBJ-DEF.F.SG-trinity	REL-become_holy.QUAL

ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ…	ⲉ=ⲓ-ϯ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
ATTR-Z.ART-consubstantial…	CIRC=1.SG-give.INF	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

ⲉⲃⲟⲗ…	ⲛ-ⲡ-ϫⲱⲣⲩⲙⲁ	ⲧⲏⲣⲉ=ϥ
out…	DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-room	all=3.M.SG

"I desire and am persuaded without any guile or fear… And I swear hereafter to the holy consubstantial trinity… that I am selling to you… the entire room…" (P.KRU 4.19-32)

There are, however, exceptions to these constructions in both the Greek and the Coptic formulae. As highlighted above (4.4.3), in five attestations of the Coptic OTH formula the form ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ is ambiguous and may reasonably be understood as a circumstantial Present. If this interpretation is correct, the Coptic OTH formula in these attestations would sit as a dependent clause embedded within a declarative statement, as shown in (76). This interpretation, and its significance in determining the relationship of these variations to the Greek OTH formula, is discussed in more depth below.

(76)

ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ	ⲧⲛ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ	ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
now	1.PL-acknowledge.INF	CIRC=1.PL-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God	DEF.M.SG-Almighty…

"Now we acknowledge, swearing to God the Almighty…" (P.KRU 10.28)

Similarly, the Greek OTH formula shows some variation from its usual participial constructions. In 14 attestations of the formula in the sample, the verb of swearing is written as a finite verb. As such, much like most of their Coptic counterparts, these variations of the Greek OTH formulae constitute independent clauses situated between a series of other formula, as shown in (77).

(77) τῇ DEF.F.DAT.SG | οὖν ENCL | παρούσῃ be_present.PTC.PRS.ACT.F.DAT.SG

διαμαρτυρίᾳ affidavit.F.DAT.SG | ἐχρησάμην use.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG | πρὸς to | αὐτὴν 3.F.ACC.SG

πεμφθείσῃ send.PTC.AOR.PASS.F.DAT.SG | αὐτῇ… 3.F.DAT.SG… | μεθ᾽ with

ὑποσημιώσεως signature.F.GEN.SG | τοῦ DEF.N.GEN.SG | εἰρημένου mention.PTC.PERF.MID.N.GEN.SG

λογιωτάτου eloquent.N.GEN.SG.SUP | ἐκδίκου prosecutor.N.GEN.SG | ἐνορκῶ swear.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG

δὲ ENCL | πρὸς to | τῆς DEF.F.GEN.SG | ἁγίας holy.F.GEN.SG | καὶ and

ὁμοουσίου consubstantial.F.GEN.SG | τριάδος… trinity.F.GEN.SG… | μὴ NEG

ἀποστῆναι be_absent.AOR.INF.ACT | τῆς DEF.F.GEN.SG | Ἀλεξανδρέων Alexandrian.F.GEN.PL

"Therefore I have utilised the present affidavit, it having been sent to it (Your Brilliancy)… with the signature of the aforementioned most eloquent prosecutor. And I swear to the holy consubstantial trinity… not to be absent from the (city) of Alexandrians." (PSI I 76.10-13)

Consequently, the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae are both incorporated into the body of the document in one of two ways, either as an independent clause headed by a finite verb, or as a dependent clause headed by a non-finite verb form in which the OTH formula is expressed as an accompanying circumstance. However, each language favours one strategy over the other, and exceptions to that strategy are relatively rare. It is possible that the exceptions in the Coptic formulae are based on similar variations of the formula in Greek. This can be demonstrated more clearly with a closer comparison of their internal structures.

b) Internal Structures

The main similarities between the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae lie in the opening verbal clause of swearing. In both languages, the clause takes the form of a verb of swearing expressed in the first person (or as a participle linked to a finite verb in the first person), followed by its object. The various entities to whom the oath is sworn are similar across the two languages, as demonstrated in Table 4.9. The Coptic objects either consist of a translation of the Greek, as in the case of oaths to God Almighty and the holy trinity, or contain similar vocabulary, for example σωτηρία > ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣⲓⲁ "health/safety", διαμονῆς > ⲧⲇⲓⲁⲛⲟⲙⲏ "power", ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν > ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩ "our lords".

Table 4.9: Objects of the verb of swearing in the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae

Greek	Coptic
θεὸς παντοκράτωρ *"God Almighty"*	ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ (ⲡ)ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ *"God (the) Almighty"*
ἡ ἁγία καὶ ὁμοούσιος τριάς *"the holy and consubstantial trinity"*	ⲧⲉⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲥ *"the holy and consubstantial trinity"*
ἡ βασιλικὴ σωτηρία *"the imperial safety"*	ⲡⲟⲩϫⲁⲓ/ⲧⲥⲱⲧⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩⲉ (ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ) *"the health of our (kingly) lords"*
νίκης καὶ διαμονῆς τῶν γαληνοτάτων ἡμῶν δεσποτῶν *"the victory and power of our most gentle lords"*	ⲡⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲛⲧⲇⲓⲁⲛⲟⲙⲏ ⲛⲛⲉⲛϫⲓⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲣⲣⲟⲟⲩ *"the strength and power of our kingly lords"*

However, these similarities exist only at the lexical level. A key pragmatic difference lies in the absence of linguistic markers in the Greek OTH formula which signal a change in topic which appear in its Coptic counterpart such as ϫⲉ, ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ϫⲉ and ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ (see above, 4.4.3). This is unsurprising, since in most cases there is a continuous flow between the previous formula and the

Greek OTH formula expressed as a participial clause. However, most interestingly, the Greek OTH formula does not contain the particle which occurs in Coptic. As such, its appearance in Coptic is not based on the underlying Greek formula, as tentatively suggested previously by Cook.[57] The significance of this phenomenon will be discussed in greater depth in 6.4.2.

Furthermore, the relationship between the opening verb forms of the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae is more complex than it may first appear. The clearest relationship between the opening verbs of the Greek and Coptic formulae can be observed in the use of finite verbs in the opening clause of swearing. In Coptic, the finite Performative ⲉⲓⲥⲱⲧⲙ̄ accounts for all but six of the 56 attestations of the Coptic OTH formula in the corpus. In Greek, only 14 attestations of the OTH formula contain finite verbs of swearing, eight beginning with an Aorist, as demonstrated in (78a), and six beginning with a Present, as shown in (78b).

(78) *Finite verbs of swearing in the Greek OTH formula*

(a)

καὶ	προσεπὶ	τούτοις	πᾶσι
and	in_addition_to	DEM.ADJ.N.DAT.PL	all.N.DAT.PL

ἐπωμοσάμεθα	τὸν	θεῖον	καὶ
swear. AOR.IND.MID.1.PL	DEF.M.ACC.SG	holy.M.ACC.SG	and

σεβάσμιον	ὅρκον	τοῦ
venerable.M.ACC.SG	oath.M.ACC.SG	DEF.M.GEN.SG

παντοκράτορος	Θεοῦ…	μὴ	παραβαίνειν
Almighty.M.GEN.SG	God.M.GEN.SG…	NEG	transgress.PRS.INF.ACT

τὰ	προδεδηλουμένα	διάστολα
DEF.N.ACC.SG	show_before.PTC.PERF.MID.N.ACC.SG	diastolon.N.ACC.SG

"And in addition to all this we have sworn the holy and venerable oath of God Almighty… not to transgress the aforementioned diastolon*."* (P. Lond. V 1727.56-58)

[57] Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'.

(b)	ἐνορκῶ	δὲ	πρὸς	τῆς
	swear.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG	ENCL	to	DEF.F.GEN.SG

ἁγίας	καὶ	ὁμοουσίου	τριάδος…
holy.F.GEN.SG	and	consubstantial.F.GEN.SG	trinity.F.GEN.SG…

μὴ	ἀποστῆναι	τῆς	Ἀλεξανδρέων
NEG	be_absent.AOR.INF.ACT	DEF.F.GEN.SG	Alexandrian.F.GEN.PL

"And I swear to the holy consubstantial trinity… not to be absent from the (city) of Alexandrians." (PSI I 76.11-13)

Of the attestations of the Greek OTH formula which begin with a finite verb form, those containing the Present are most similar to the Coptic OTH formula. Since the Coptic Performative is a form of the focalised Present, it shares some grammatical features with the Greek Present in that both are finite, and both express continuous aspect and Present tense.

It is unlikely that the use of the Present in the Greek OTH formula was influenced by its Coptic counterparts. Of the six Greek attestations beginning with the Present, P. Mich. XI 613, is dated to 415 CE, almost two centuries earlier than the other Greek attestations and the use of Coptic in legal documents. As such, the use of a Present verb of swearing already existed as a viable variation as early as the beginning of the 5th century, and therefore its appearance in texts of the late 6th/early 7th centuries cannot necessarily be attributed to the influence of the Coptic form of the formula.

Conversely, those Coptic formulae which open with circumstantial Presents may arguably have been replicated from their Greek counterparts. In 38 of the 52 attestations of the Greek OTH formula in the sample, the verb of swearing is expressed as a Present participle. Furthermore, in at least 28 of the attestations of the Greek formulae, the participle is preceded by verb ὁμολογέω

"to acknowledge", as shown in (79a).[58] The same verb (ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ) precedes the verb of swearing in five of the six attestations of the Coptic OTH formula which open with a circumstantial Present, as shown in (79b).

(79) ὁμολογέω/ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ + *OTH formula in Greek and Coptic*

(a) ὁμολογῶ ἐπομνύμενος
acknowledge.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG swear.PTC.PRS.MID.M.NOM.SG

τόν τε παντοκράτορα Θεὸν
DEF.M.ACC.SG both Almighty.M.ACC.SG God.M.ACC.SG

"...I acknowledge, swearing by both God Almighty..." (CPR VI 6.11-12)

(b) ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲛ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ
now 1.PL-acknowledge.INF CIRC=1.PL-swear.INF

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God DEF.M.SG-Almighty…

"Now we acknowledge, swearing to God the Almighty..." (P.KRU 10.28 = (76) above)

As stated previously, the form ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ in these Coptic examples is ambiguous and can be interpreted as either a Performative or a circumstantial Present. If the Coptic is indeed modelled on the underlying Greek formula, an interpretation of the circumstantial Present is likely. While it cannot be wholly equated with the Greek participle, the similarities in their usage have been previously observed in other formulae: they are both non-finite forms describing an accompanying circumstance, and both express continuous Aspect. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a Performative

[58] In one further attestation, P. Münch. I 4+5v, the opening of the text is lost and therefore it is unclear whether or not the OTH formula appears in a declarative statement.

would appear in non-initial position following ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲛϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ since this would interrupt the *Koinzidenzfall* of speaking (see above, 4.4.3).

Within these five Coptic formulae, the close connection in both structure and vocabulary to the Greek OTH formula also affirms that there is some level of replication. In all 28 Greek and five Coptic attestations, the verb ὁμολογῶ/ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ is written in the Present (or the Performative in P.CLT 1). Furthermore, in all cases in both languages, the oath is sworn to God (the) Almighty. Consequently, both the Greek and Coptic formulae follow the same pattern: "acknowledge" (PRESENT) + "swear" (NON-FINITE) + "God Almighty", compared in Table 4.10. It is therefore likely that these five Coptic formulae are replications of the Greek, expressing the same meaning, content, and grammatical features through Egyptian constructions. As such, the form ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ should be interpreted as a circumstantial Present introducing a non-finite clause.

Table 4.10: Structure of Greek and Coptic OTH formulae with non-finite verbal clause

	"Acknowledge" (PRESENT)	OTH formula	
		'Swear' (NON-FINITE)	'God Almighty' (OBJECT)
Greek (CPR VI 6)	ὁμολογῶ	ἐπομνύμενος	τόν παντοκράτορα Θεὸν…
Coptic (P.KRU 10)	ⲧⲛϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ	ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ	ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…

While the relationship between the main verbal clause of swearing of the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae is apparent, the high degree of variation within the final argument clause in both languages makes a comparison of the two somewhat complicated. For the most part, the constructions used to complete the verb of swearing in Coptic appear unrelated to the Greek

formula, but rather are indicative of long-established methods for the introduction of argument clauses in Coptic (see 2.2.4).[59]

However, there are several cases in which the content and vocabulary of the object clauses in the Greek OTH formula are similar to those found in Coptic. For example, three Greek texts (P. Münch. I 1 and 8, and P. Lond. V 1727 from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan) state that the first party swears not to transgress that which is written in the document. The object clause is expressed as a negated infinitive of the verb παραβαίνω "to transgress", as shown in (80a). In Coptic, a similar expression occurs using either the verb ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ "to transgress" or the causative construction ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ "to cause any transgression to happen". The object clause appears as either a negative ⲉ + INF construction, as shown in (80b), a negative ⲉ + INFL.INF construction, as shown in (80c), or the final clause pattern ⲭ(ⲉ) + NEG.ADH, as shown in (80d).

(80) *Expression of* παραβαίνω/ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ *in the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae*

(a) ἐπωμοσάμεθα swear.AOR.IND.MID.1.PL τὸν DEF.M.ACC.SG θεῖον divine.M.ACC.SG

καὶ and σεβάσμιον venerable.M.ACC.SG ὅρκον oath.M.ACC.SG τοῦ DEF.M.GEN.SG

παντοκράτορος almighty.M.GEN.SG Θεοῦ… God.M.GEN.SG… μὴ NEG παραβαίνειν transgress.PRS.INF.ACT

τὰ DEF.N.ACC.PL προδεδηλουμένα cite_above.PTC.PERF.MID.N.ACC.PL διάστολα term.N.ACC.PL

"We have sworn the divine and venerable oath by God the Almighty… not to transgress the above-cited terms." (P. Lond. V 1727.56-58 = (78a) above).

[59] See Hasznos, 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting', 245ff; Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*, 40ff. While Hasznos argues that some of these clause patterns (i.e. the 'final clause') entered the language through the influence of Greek, by the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic period these would have become established linguistic features.

(b) ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱ=ⲥ ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲕ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ
after=3.F.SG PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God

ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ… ⲉ-ⲧⲙ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ
almighty… to-NEG-transgress.INF DIR.OBJ-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed

ⲙ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-sale

"Hereafter, I swear to God Almighty… not to transgress this deed of sale." (P.KRU 9.86-90 = (69) above)

(c) ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲣⲓⲁⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.F.SG-trinity

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲛ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲟⲩⲥⲓⲟⲛ…
REL-become_holy.QUAL ATTR-Z.ART-consubstantial…

ⲉ-ⲧⲙ-ⲧⲣⲉ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ
to-NEG-INFL.INF-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-transgression exist.INF

ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ⲥ
in=3.F.SG

"We swear to the holy and consubstantial trinity… not to cause any transgression to happen in it." (P.KRU 35.71-75)

(d) ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲱⲣⲕ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲅⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God Almighty…

ϫ-ⲛⲛⲉ=ⲓ-ⲉϣ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
that-NEG.ADH=1.SG-able-transgress.INF DIR.OBJ-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉ=ϥ-ⲥⲏϩ ϩⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲥⲑⲱⲥⲓⲥ
ATTR-Z.ART-matter CIRC=3.M.SG-write.QUAL in-DTC.ART.F.SG-lease

"I swear to God Almighty… that I will not be able to transgress any matter written in this lease." (P. Ryl. Copt. 159.21-22 = (73a) above).

Of the three Coptic variations, the phrase ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ in (80b) is the closest in meaning to the Greek parallel. However, although Hasznos has suggested there is a relationship between Greek and Coptic infinitival constructions within translational literature (see 2.3.2), there are very few structural similarities between Coptic ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ and Greek μὴ παραβαίνειν.[60] Following the criticisms of Hasznos' theories by Grossman discussed in Chapter 2, it is unlikely that the choice of the ⲉ + INF construction over the ⲉ + INFL.INF construction is influenced by the underlying Greek models, but rather is a reflection of the internal syntax of Coptic object clauses.[61] Furthermore, the process involved in the development and writing of these formula is inherently different to the translation processes identified by Hasznos in the relationship between Greek and Coptic infinitive constructions, in that the pressure to match the underlying Greek constructions is less, if at all present.

One final similarity between the Greek and Coptic argument clauses in terms of their content and legal stipulations appears in the expression of the notion of "guarding". In Greek, this appears in two texts: P. Lond. V 1660, written in the Antaiopolite nome in c. 553 CE and part of the archive of Disocorus of Aphrodito, and P. Münch. I 14, dated to 594 CE and part of the Patermouthis archive in Aswan. In P. Lond. V 1660, the argument clause is introduced by the Aorist infinitive διαφυλάξαι "to guard carefully", as shown in (81a). In P. Münch. I 14, the object clause appears as the construction ὅτι + φυλάττουσιν (PRS.IND) "to guard/preserve", as shown in (81b). These two passages correspond to a similar stipulation in the Coptic, containing either the verb ϩⲁⲣⲉϩ "to guard/keep", ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ "to keep/observe", or ⲫⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ "to guard/preserve" (from Greek φυλάσσω), the

[60] Hasznos, *Graeco-Coptica*; Hasznos, 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic'.

[61] Grossmann, 'Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic', 24.

latter appearing in only one text (P. Ryl. Copt. 128). These are expressed in Coptic formulae through either the ϵ + INFL.INF construction, as shown in (81c), or the Finalis, as shown in (81d).

(81) *"To guard/keep" in Greek and Coptic OTH formulae*

(a) ἐπομνύμενος τόν τε
swear.PTC.PRS.MID.M.NOM.SG DEF.M.ACC.SG both

παντοκράτορα Θεὸ(ν) καὶ… ταύτην
almighty.M.ACC.SG God.M.ACC.SG and… DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG

τὴν ὁμολογίαν διαφυλάξαι
DEF.F.ACC.SG agreement.F.ACC.SG guard.AOR.INF.ACT

σοι
2.DAT.SG

"…swearing by both God the Almighty and… that I will guard this agreement for you carefully…"

(P. Lond. V 1660.34-37)

(b) καὶ ὅτι ταύτην φυλάττουσιν
and that DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG preserve.PRS.IND.ACT.3.PL

ἄτρωτον καὶ ἀπαράβατον
unblemished.F.ACC.SG and unalterable.F.ACC.SG

ἐπωμόσαντο οἱ ἀφ' ἑκατέρου
swear.AOR.IND.MID.3.PL DEF.M.NOM.PL from each.N.GEN.SG

μέρους κατὰ τῆς ἁγίας
side.N.GEN.SG by DEF.F.GEN.SG holy.F.GEN.SG

καὶ ὁμοουσίου τριάδος
and consubstantial.F.GEN.SG trinity.F.GEN.SG

"And those on each side have sworn by the holy and consubstantial trinity… that they preserve this (agreement) as unblemished and unalterable." (P. Münch. I 14.92-94)

(c) ϵ=ι-ωρκ ⲙ-π-ⲛⲟⲩⲧϵ
PFRM=1.SG-swear.INF IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God

π-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ… ϵ-ⲧⲣⲁ-ϩⲁⲣϵϩ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
DEF.M.SG-Almighty… to-INFL.INF_1.SG-guard.INF IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

ⲡⲣⲟⲥ	ⲧ-ϭⲟⲙ	ⲛ-ⲧⲉⲓ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲉⲥⲧⲏⲣⲟⲛ
according_to	DEF.F.SG-power	POSS-DEM.ART.F.SG- *asphalesteron*

"I swear to God the Almighty… that I will guard for you according to the power of this asphalesteron*."* (P.KRU 58.21-24)

(d)

ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲱⲣⲕ	ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF	to-DEF.M.SG-God	DEF.M.SG-Almighty…

ⲧⲁⲣ=ⲛ-ⲫⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ	ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ	ⲡⲣⲟⲥ
FNL=1.PL-guard.INF	IND.OBJ=2.PL	according_to

ⲧⲉ=ⲥ-ϭⲟⲙ
POSS.ART.F.SG=3.F.SG-power

"We swear to God the Almighty… that we will guard for you according to its power." (P. Ryl. Copt. 128.4-5)

There is some similarity in vocabulary between the Greek and Coptic formulae in the expression of the concept of guarding or preserving. For example, Richter, among others, has previously noted the lexical similarities between ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ/ϩⲁⲣⲉϩ and φυλάσσω.[62] Furthermore, the Coptic formula also employs the borrowed Greek verb ⲫⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ, mirroring its counterpart in the Greek formula.

However, beyond these lexical similarities, the grammatical relationship between the Greek and Coptic phrases is only minor. There is some overlap in the grammatical features of the verbs involved: both the Greek ὅτι + φυλάττουσιν (81b) and Coptic ⲧⲁⲣⲛⲫⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ (81d) are finite verb forms, while διαφυλάξαι (81a) and ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ (81c) are non-finite. Nevertheless, there are no

[62] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 249; 338; Preisigke, *Wörterbuch Der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, 709–10.

structural similarities between the Greek and Coptic constructions; rather, the morphological and syntactic patterns adhere to the constraints of the respective languages. Since there are minimal similarities, and since these passages are only attested in relatively few texts in both languages, it is unlikely that argument clauses in Coptic have been replicated from underlying Greek models. Rather, it would appear that the concept of "swearing to guard something" is a stipulation within Egyptian legal texts whose expression is dependent on the scribe in question and the language in which they write.

4.4.5. Conclusion

As the above discussion shows, while there are clear lexical similarities between the Greek and Coptic OTH formulae, structural similarities are more difficult to observe. In all cases where there is a close semantic relationship between clauses or phrases, the grammatical similarities may be coincidental, based on similar structures in Greek and Coptic which, while genetically unrelated, are not contact-induced. Only one instance occurs in which variations of the Coptic formula could be replicated from Greek: the "acknowledge" (PRESENT) + "swear" (NON-FINITE) pattern. However, since the form ϵιωρϰ is ambiguous, this relationship is only tentative. These features, and their relationship to overall trends in the legal formulae examined in this study, are discussed in further depth in 6.3.

4.5. Conclusion

As the discussion presented above shows, there is a clear sense of legal continuity between Greek and Coptic legal formulae of the Late Byzantine and Early Islamic periods. The four formulae examined in this chapter express similar sorts of legal stipulations and legal practices observable in their earlier Greek counterparts. Nevertheless, the extent to which these practices represent continuation of earlier Byzantine law, or are simply the result of continued transmission within scribal practices, is unclear. This is particularly true in the case of the HYP and AOW formulae,

in which no direct Greek counterparts can be identified upon which the Coptic formulae could be modelled. While this is most likely the result of the incomplete nature of papyrological evidence and their survival from antiquity, rather than their complete absence from the 7th century, this nonetheless makes it difficult to observe the development of Coptic formulae. The FRW formula, with clear examples in Aphrodito of Greek and Coptic formulae written by the same scribe (Apa Rasios) may help to shed some light on the development of Coptic legal formulae from their Greek counterparts. However, in light of the small data sample, and the scant evidence from the 7th century, again the true nature of these relationships is obscured. These issues are discussed in more depth in 6.2.

The linguistic relationship between the Greek and Coptic formulae are just as complex. The connections identified so far can be divided into several common relationships. First is the replication of structures, in which the content and grammatical features of Greek are mirrored in their Coptic counterparts, such as in the case of the FRW formula core. It should be emphasised, however, that no examples of interference occur in this example: rather, Coptic continues to adhere to the linguistic constraints of the Egyptian language. Certain features of the Coptic formulae appear to be reinterpretations of underlying Greek structures, such as the shift in verbal aspect from continuous/incomplete to future in the verbs of scribing and witnessing in the HYP formula. Finally, certain elements of the Coptic formulae seem unrelated to their Greek counterparts, such as the development of the AOW formula as a distinctly separate entity, or the development of the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ in the Coptic FRW formula. Rather, these appear to be synchronic developments within Coptic scribal and notarial practices. These types of relationships between Greek and Coptic legal formulae can be further investigated through the examination of closing formulae, presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Closing Formulae

In Chapter 4, numerous linguistic and legal relationships were identified between Greek and Coptic formulae which appear in the opening of legal documents. These same relationships can be observed in formulae which appear in the closing sections of these documents. In this chapter, the following formulae are discussed:

5.1. The security formula (SCR)

5.2. The *kyria* clause (KYR)

5.3. The subscription formula (SUB)

These formulae differ from those examined in Chapter 4 in several ways. Unlike formulae appearing in the opening of Coptic documents, the SCR, KYR, and SUB formulae do not open with Performative verb forms. Furthermore, due to its use (although not exclusively) in the context of witness statements, the SUB formula is attested more than any other formula, and these attestations are not all necessarily written by professional scribes. Finally, as the following sections will demonstrate, the level of replication from Greek to Coptic is higher in these formulae than in others examined so far in this study.

5.1. Security Formula (SCR)

The SCR formula is a legal stipulation in which the first party states that they have had the document executed for the second party as a security against counterclaims. It consistently occurs in the closing sections of the document, most commonly between the curse/penalty formula and the *kyria* clause (KYR formula). It is closely associated with the KYR formula, and often the two are considered part of the same formula (see below, 5.2).

5.1.1: History and distribution

The Greek SCR formula is first attested from the 4th century CE. The earliest secure attestation appears in P. Lond. III 975, a loan contract seemingly from the Hermopolite nome dated to 314 CE. However, attestations prior to the 5th century are scarce, with the majority dated to the mid-5th to 6th centuries. The latest securely dated attestation appears in P. Lips. I 90, a receipt from Hermopolis dated to 614/615 CE and belonging to the archive of Flavius Magistor.[1] The Greek SCR can be found in texts from various sites across Egypt: Aswan, Alexandria, Aphrodito, the Fayum, the Hermopolite nome, Kellis, Oxyrhynchus, and Thebes. Several attestations of the formula also occur in the Petra papyri from the Palestinian provinces, dated to the mid-6th century (P. Petra III 23 and 24), although these are heavily restored by the editor.

Within the corpus, the Coptic SCR formula is attested 100 times. Five attestations occur in texts from Aphrodito and 22 attestations occur in texts from the Hermopolite nome: four from Hermopolis, one from the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit, and 17 with unspecified locations within the nome. The remaining 73 attestations are found in Theban documents. The earliest securely dated example occurs in P. Lond. inv. 2849, a lease from the archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodito dated between 580–590 CE.[2] Beyond the corpus, fragmentary examples of the formula are also attested in documents in Antinoopolis and Saqqara.

5.1.2. Forms of the Coptic SCR formula

The Coptic SCR formula can be divided into three types. Type A is composed of two elements: a PP expressing that the document has been made as a security, hereafter referred to as the "statement of security", and a following main verbal clause which states that the document has

[1] On the dating of this document, see Gonis, 'Recent News from Flavius Magistor and Sons'.

[2] Published in Fournet, Richter, and Förster, 'Une Misthôsis Copte d'Aphrodité (P.Lond. Inv. 2849)'.

been written or executed, hereafter referred to as the "statement of composition". Type A accounts for 88 of the 100 attestations of the Coptic SCR in the corpus. In Type B, which accounts for ten attestations of the formula, these two elements are reversed. In Type C, which occurs in only two attestations in the corpus, the formula consists of a nominal non-verbal sentence. These three types and the variations which are contained within them are summarised in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Forms of the Coptic SCR formulae within the corpus

a) Security + composition

Broad Code	Statement of Security	Statement of Composition	Narrow Code
SCR.1	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ (ⲟⲩⲛ)	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)	SCR.1.1
		ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ	SCR.1.2
		ø	SCR.1.3
	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲛ (ⲟⲩⲛ)	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)	SCR.1.4
SCR.2	ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)	SCR.2.1
		ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ	SCR.2.2
		ⲁⲓ̈ϩⲁⲓ-X ⲛⲁⲕ	SCR.2.3†
SCR.3	ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧⲥ	SCR.3
SCR.4	ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X ⲛⲁⲕ	SCR.4
SCR.5	ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲙⲉⲛ	ⲁⲓⲥⲙ̄ⲛ̄-X	SCR.5†
SCR.6	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-Y	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲏⲧⲛ)	SCR.6.1
		ⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉ-X + FRW	SCR.6.2†
		ⲁⲓ̈ⲱ̄ⲣ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲧⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈	SCR.6.3†
SCR.7	ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-Y	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)	SCR.7.1
		ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ	SCR.7.2
		ⲁⲩⲱⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ ⲛⲥⲁ-X	SCR.7.3†
SCR.8	ⲉϥⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ) (ⲛⲁⲕ)	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)	SCR.8
SCR.9	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲙⲛⲧϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ	ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲓⲛ-X ⲛⲏⲧⲛ	SCR.9.1†
	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲙⲛⲧⲓⲱⲧ		SCR.9.2†
SCR.10	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲡⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲛⲇ(ⲟϫⲟⲧⲏⲥ) ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ	ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲓⲛ-X ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲉⲛⲕⲓⲛⲇⲩⲡⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ…	SCR.10

b) *Composition + security*			
Broad Code	Statement of Composition	Statement of Security	Narrow Code
SCR.11	ⲁϊⲥⲙⲛⲧⲥ	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ…	SCR.11.1†
	ⲉⲁϊⲥⲙⲛⲧ-X		SCR.11.2†
SCR.12	ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ	SCR.12.1
		ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲙ-Y	SCR.12.2
		ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲛⲱⲣϫ	SCR.12.3†
		ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ̅ ⲙ-Y	SCR.12.4†

c) *Nominal sentence*		
Broad Code	Formula	Narrow Code
SCR.13	ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲉ	SCR.13.1†
	ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲉ X	SCR.13.2†

† Appears only in one text within the corpus

5.1.3. Analysis of the Coptic SCR formula

a) Statement of Security: ⲱⲣϫ

Within the Coptic SCR formula, the statement of security centres on the Egyptian root ⲱⲣϫ. In 96 attestations of the formula in the corpus, ⲱⲣϫ appears as a noun "security" and is contained within a PP.[3] This follows the pattern PREPOSITION + DETERMINER + ⲱⲣϫ. Optionally, the Greek enclitic conjunction ⲟⲩⲛ (sometimes ⲙⲉⲛ) is also included. The significance of this is discussed below (see 5.1.4).

[3] On the use of the noun ⲱⲣϫ in Coptic legal texts, see Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 304.

There is very little variation in the type of preposition used in this phrase. Within 91 attestations, the PP is headed by the preposition ϵ- "to/for/as", as shown in (1a).[4] The remaining five attestations use the preposition ϵтвϵ "regarding": P. Ryl. Copt. 158, CPR IV 148, CPR XXXI 9, SB Kopt. I 243, and SB Kopt. III 1381 (SCR.4), shown in (1b).

(1) *PPs in the Coptic SCR formula*

(a) ϵ-ϒ-ѡрϫ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
as-INDF.SG-security IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲥⲑѡⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-lease IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

"As a security for you, I have executed this lease for you." (P. Ryl. Copt. 159.22)

(b) ϵтвϵ-пϵ=ⲕ-ѡрϫ̅ ⲟⲩⲛ
concerning-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.M.SG-security ENCL

ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲥⲙⲛ̅-ⲧⲓ-ⲁⲡⲟⲇϵⲓ̈ϫⲓⲥ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-receipt IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

"Therefore, concerning your security, I have executed this receipt for you." (CPR XXXI 9.6-7)

All five attestations which contain ϵтвϵ appear in texts from the Hermopolite nome and are broadly dated to the 7th century. As such, the use of ϵтвϵ in the SCR formula may be indicative of a specific Hermopolite variation. Nevertheless, ϵтвϵ is still uncommon in texts from this region, with the remaining 17 texts from the Hermopolite nome containing ϵ-. It is therefore also possible that the use of ϵтвϵ is a feature of one scribe or scribal school within the nome. However, the name of the

[4] The analysis of ϵ- as a preposition is tentative. Cromwell suggests it may be a circumstantial convertor; private correspondence with Jennifer Cromwell, 2019.

scribe is not preserved in any of these five texts, the dating of the texts is too broad to determine if they are contemporaneous with each other, and only one text can be more precisely located within the nome (SB Kopt. I 243, written in Hermopolis). As such, there is insufficient data to verify this theory.

The main variation within the statement of security appears in the determiner used before the noun ϣⲣϫ. The determiner most commonly attested is the indefinite article, shown in (2a), which accounts for 58 attestations of the formula in the corpus (SCR.1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12.1, 12.2, and 13). A further 26 attestations employ the 2nd person possessive article (SCR.2, 4, and 12.3), as shown in (2b), while 11 attestations use the definite article (SCR.5, 7, and 12.4), shown in (2c). The remaining three attestations employ the demonstrative article: P.KRU 24, 25, and 26 (SCR.3), demonstrated in (2d). The appearance of the demonstrative article may be linked to a particular scribal school: two of the attestations, P.KRU 25 and 26, were composed by Aristophanes son of Johannes, while the remaining attestation, P.KRU 24, was composed by David son of Psate whom Cromwell suggests may have been trained by Aristophanes.[5]

(2) *Determiners in the Coptic statement of security*

(a)	ⲁ=ϊ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ⲥ	ⲉ-ϒ-ϣⲣϫ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF=3.F.SG	as-INDF.SG-security	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

"I have executed it as a security for you." (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 58.14)

(b)	ⲉ-ⲡⲉ=ⲕ-ϣⲣϫ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ϥ
	as-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.M.SG-security	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF=3.M.SG

"I have executed it as your security." (P.KRU 58.24)

[5] Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 183. On the work of David son of Psate, see Richter, 'Zwei Urkunden des koptischen Notars David, des Sohnes des Psate'.

(c)	ϵ-ⲡ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲙϵⲛ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙ̄ⲛ̄-ⲡϵ-ϫⲁⲣⲧ(ⲏⲥ)
	as-DEF.M.SG-security	ENCL	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEF.M.SG-document

"As the security (for the second party), I have executed this document." (SB Kopt. II 945.16)

(d)	ϵ-ⲡϵⲓ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ⲥ
	as-DEM.ART.M.SG-security	ENCL	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF=3.F.SG

"Therefore, I have executed it as this security (for the second party)." (P.KRU 26.23)

In a further two attestations of the SCR formula, SB Kopt. II 937 and P.KRU 9 (SCR.13), ⲱⲣϫ is also nominal, and appears as the predicate of a nominal non-verbal clause. In SB Kopt. II 937 (SCR.13.1), the formula consists of a bipartite nominal sentence following the pattern ⲱⲣϫ + COP, as shown in (3a). In P.KRU 9 (SCR.13.2), the formula takes the form of a tripartite nominal sentence containing the name of the document, as demonstrated in (3b).

(3) Coptic SCR as a nominal clause

(a)	ⲟⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ	ⲧϵ
	INDF.SG-security	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG	COP.F.SG

"It is a security for you." (SB Kopt. II 937.15)

(b)	ⲟⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ	ⲧϵ	ⲧϵⲓ-ⲡⲣⲁⲥⲓⲥ
	INDF.SG-security	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG	COP.F.SG	DEM.ART.F.SG-sale

"This sale is a security for you." (P.KRU 9.93-94)

SB Kopt. II 937 was written in an unspecified location in Thebes at some point in the 6th or 7th centuries, while P.KRU 9 was written in Djême in the 8th century. Since these texts were written in different centuries and constitute only two of 100 surviving examples of the SCR formula in the

corpus, it is likely that the similarities in their constructions are not the result of shared scribal training. Rather, it is possible that this form of the SCR was more widespread in Thebes but has not been transmitted in the surviving papyrological record. However, the dating of SB Kopt. II 937 is tentative, and thus no definite conclusions should be drawn from the gap in time between it and P.KRU 9.

In the remaining two attestations of the SCR formula, P.KRU 88 and 109 (SCR.8), ϣⲣϫ is verbal and possesses the meaning "to be secure".[6] In both texts, the formula is introduced with the construction ⲉϥϣⲣϫ, as shown in (4). This can be interpreted as a circumstantial Present verbal clause, which is subordinate to the following verb of execution.

(4) ⲉ=ϥ-ϣⲣϫ ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be.secure.INF IND.OBJ=2.PL

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.M.SG-donation_document

"Being secure for you, I have executed this donation document." (P.KRU 109.13)

These two attestations were written in different parts of the 8th century: P.KRU 88 written in 734 CE by Job son of Alex, and P.KRU 109 written 771 CE by an unnamed scribe. As in the case of the expression of the statement of security as nominal clause, it is possible that the use of the circumstantial Present was a more widespread form of the formula for which other attestations have been lost in antiquity.

[6] On the verb ϣⲣϫ in Coptic legal formulae, see Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 303–4.

b) Statement of Security: indirect object

Within the statement of security, a second optional PP is included at the end of the clause, introduced by the indirect object marker ⲛ̅-/ⲛⲁϩ. The presence of this PP in this position is somewhat unusual, creating the pattern PP + PP + SVO which is uncommon in Coptic. However, this may be explained through a comparison with the Greek SCR formula (see below, 5.1.4). The object attached to the indirect object marker is usually pronominal, taking the form of a 2nd person singular or plural suffix pronoun as shown in many of the examples cited above. However, several variations on this pattern occur.

In two attestations of the SCR formula, CPR IV 160 and P.CLT 6 (SCR.1.4), the indirect object is reciprocal and appears as a 1st person plural pronoun as shown in (5). In these two texts, the SCR formula states that the various parties who have entered into the contract have executed the document as a security for each other.

(5) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁ=ⲛ ⲙ̅ⲛ-ⲛⲉ=ⲛ-ⲉⲣⲏⲩ
as-INDF.SG-security IND.OBJ=1.PL with-POSS.ART.PL=1.PL-companion.PL

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲛ̅-ⲧⲉⲓ-ⲕⲟⲓⲡⲏ Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ
PERF=1.PL-draw_up.INF-DEM.ART.F.SG-communal Z.ART-agreement

"As a security for we and each other, we have drawn up this communal agreement." (P. CLT 6.44-45)

In a further 19 documents from the Theban region (SCR.6, 7, and 12.2), the indirect object is nominal and consists of the name of the second party. Of these, 18 attestations are found in donation documents written to the monastery of Apa Phoibamon at Deir el-Bahri in which the name of the second party is the monastery itself, as shown in (6).

(6) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-place

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ
REL-become_holy.QUAL PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation

"As a security, therefore, for the holy place, I have executed this donation document." (P.KRU 86.36-37)

In a further two attestations of the Coptic SCR formula, contained in P. Lond. IV 1494 and 1509 (SCR.10), the indirect object consists of the phrase ⲡⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲛⲇ(ⲟⲝⲟⲧⲏⲥ) ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ "the *demosios logos* (the state treasury) through our most honoured lord", as demonstrated in (7).

(7) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲡ-ⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ Ø-ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL DEF.M.SG-*demosios* Z.ART-*logos*

ϩⲓⲧⲛ-ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲉⲛⲇ(ⲟⲝⲟⲧⲏⲥ) ⲛ-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
through-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-most_honoured ATTR-Z.ART-lord

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲓⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗ(ⲟⲅⲓⲁ) ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.ART.F.SG-agreement IND.OBJ=2.PL

"As a security, therefore, (for) the demosios logos*, through your most honoured lord, I have executed this agreement for you."* (P. Lond. IV 1509.16-17)

Both P. Lond. IV 1494 and 1509 originate from Aphrodito, and further traces of this phrase also appear in at least four other fragmentary SCR formulae from the village (P. Lond. IV 1497, 1498, 1521, and 1528). Of these six texts, four are composed by the scribe Theodoros (P. Lond. IV 1494,

1497, 1509, and 1521), one is written by Victor son of Theodosios (P. Lond. IV 1528), while the scribe of the remaining text (P. Lond. IV 1498) is unknown. All six texts form part of the Basilios archive.[7]

As example (7) above shows, no indirect object marker appears before the phrase ⲡⲁⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲛⲁ(ⲟϣⲟⲧⲏⲥ) ⲛ̀ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ in at least three of the four fragmentary texts written by Theodoros: P. Lond. IV 1494, 1509, and 1521 (with the relevant section of the formula in P. Lond. IV 1497 lost in a lacuna). This is most likely the result of haplography, in which the final nu of ⲟⲩⲛ has merged with the indirect object marker. A further example of this type of SCR formula appears in preserved section of the fragmentary SCR formula in P. Lond. IV 1528, composed by Victor, in which the indirect object marker is present.

The final variation of the indirect object in the statement of security, SCR.9, is also nominal. In P. Lond. IV 1518 (SCR.9.1) written in Aphrodito, this consists of the noun ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲙⲛⲧϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ "your lordship" (P. Lond. IV 1518, written in Aphrodito = SCR.9.1), as shown in (8a). In a further two texts, as shown in (8b), the indirect object appears as the noun ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲙⲛⲧⲓⲱⲧ "your fatherhood": P. Mon. Apollo 24 from the monastery of Apa Apollo in Bawit (SCR.9.2), and P. CLT 4 (SCR.6.3).

(8) *Other nominal objects in the Coptic statement of security*

(a) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧ-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-ABST-lord

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲓⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲉⲣⲅⲩⲏⲧⲓⲕⲏ Ø-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲏⲓⲁ
PERF=1.PL-execute.INF-DTC.ART.F.SG-document Z.ART-declaration

[7] On the Basilios archive and the work of Theodoros, see Richter, 'Language Choice in the Qurra Dossier'. See also 4.4.3.

ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ
IND.OBJ=2.PL

"As a security, therefore, (for) your lordship, we have executed this guarantee declaration for you." (P. Lond. IV 1518.15)

(b) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲉⲙⲛⲧ-ⲓⲱⲧ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-ABST-father

ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲩⲙⲓⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ
PERF=1.PL-execute.INF-DTC.ART.F.SG-*aspheleia* IND.OBJ=2.PL

"As a security, therefore, (for) your fatherhood, we have executed this aspheleia *for you."* (P. Mon. Apollo 24.8)

As in the case of the SCR formulae addressed to the *demosios logos*, the indirect object marker in both P. Lond. IV 1518 and P. Mon. Apollo 24 is omitted (although it is present in P. CLT 4). Of these texts, P. Lond. IV 1518 is composed by Theodoros which further suggests that the omission of the object marker is a feature of his writing of the SCR formula. The omission of the object marker in P. Mon. Apollo 24, however, cannot be related, since it was written in Bawit.

c) Statement of composition

Within the 100 attestations of the SCR formula in the corpus, 96 contain a main verbal clause which states that the document has been written or executed. Of these, 92 employ the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ "to execute/draw up a deed". The direct object of the verb is either nominal, consisting of the name of the document type as shown in (9a), or pronominal, referring to an earlier mention of the document type, as shown in (9b).

(9) *Direct object of the Coptic SCR statement of composition*

(a) ϵ-ⲡϵ-ⲟⲩⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲧϵ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓ̈ⲁ
as-DEF.M.SG-security ENCL PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEF.F.SG-asphaleia

ⲛⲏ
IND.OBJ_2.F.SG

"As the security (for the second party), therefore, I have executed this asphaleia *for you."* (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 57.16-18)

(b) ϵ-ⲡϵ=ⲕ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ϥ
as-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.M.SG-security PERF=1.SG-execute.INF=3.M.SG

"As your security, I have executed it." (P.KRU 58.24 = (2b) above)

In all 92 attestations which contain ⲥⲙⲓⲛϵ, the verb is written in the Perfect, as in (9a) and (9b) above. However, in nine of these attestations the Perfect is modified through the addition of a convertor. In eight attestations (SCR.12), the verb is contained within an NP consisting of the construction ⲡⲁⲓ + REL + PERF. As demonstrated in (10), the demonstrative pronoun ⲡⲁⲓ stands in apposition to the name of the document type contained in the previous formula.

(10) …ⲛ=ϥ-ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ=ϥ-ϩⲱⲛ
…CNJV=3.M.SG-come.INF in CNJV=3.M.SG-comply.INF

ϵ-ⲧ-ϭⲟⲙ ⲧⲏⲣ=ⲥ ⲙ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲓⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲱ(ⲛ)
to-DEF.F.SG-power all=3.F.SG POSS-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation

ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ=ϥ
DEM.PRN.M.SG REL-PERF=1.SG-execute.INF=3.M.SG

ϵ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲟⲛⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ϵⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
as-INDF.SG-security IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-monastery REL-become_holy.QUAL

"... and he will enter and comply with all the power of this donation document, this one which I have established as a security for the holy monastery." (P.KRU 93.46-47)

In one further attestation, O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59 (SCR.11.2), the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ appears as a circumstantial Perfect clause expressing a temporal subordinate relationship to the preceding formula, as shown in (11).

(11) ϯ-ⲛⲁ-ϯ=ⲟⲩ ⲛⲁ=ⲕ ϩⲙ-ⲡⲁⲱⲛⲉ
1.SG-FUT-give.INF=3.PL IND.OBJ=2.M.SG in-Paone

ⲛ-Ø-ⲧⲉⲧⲁⲣⲧⲏ ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲩⲉ ⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲛⲇⲟⲗⲟⲅⲓⲁ
ATTR-Z.ART-fourth without-INDF.PRN ATTR-Z.ART-objection

ⲉ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛⲧ-ϯ-ⲃⲗϫⲉ ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ
CIRC-PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.ART.F.SG-ostracon as-INDF.SG-security

ⲛⲁ=ⲕ
IND.OBJ=2.M.SG

"I will give them to you in Paone of the fourth (year) without any objection, since I have executed this ostracon as a security for you." (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59.7-9)

Several variations of the statement of composition occur in which the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ does not appear. O. Medin. Habu Copt. 61 (SCR.2.3) and P. CLT 4 (SCR.6.3) use ⲥϩⲁⲓ "write" and ϣⲣ̄ⲡⲕⲱ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ "previously set down" respectively. These replace the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ with very little change in the meaning of the formula, as shown in (12).

(12) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣ̄ϫ ⲛ̄-ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ̄-ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ-ⲉⲓⲱⲧ
as-INDF.SG-security IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-ABST-father

ⲁ=ⲓ-ϣⲣ̄ⲡ-ⲕⲁⲁ=ϥ ⲛⲧⲏ=ⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈
PERF=1.SG-first-place.INF=3.SG IND.OBJ=2.PL down

"As a security for your fatherhood, I have previously set it down for you." (P. CLT 4.23-24)

P.KRU 86 (SCR.7.3) expresses the statement of composition using the verb ϣⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=Ⲩ ⲛⲥⲁ-X; “to seek X through Y”, as shown in (13). Unlike the other examples of the SCR formula, the main verb appears with a 3rd person plural subject rather than a 1st person subject. This subtly changes the meaning of the formula by shifting the action from the first party to the second: that is, rather than the first party writing the document for the second party, the second party has requested it from the first party. However, structurally there is little difference between this formula and those containing ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ.

(13) ⲉ-ⲡ-ϣⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁ
as-DEF.ART.M.SG-security ENCL IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-place

ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲁ=ⲩ-ϣⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ
REL-become_holy.QUAL PERF=3.PL-seek.INF through_1.SG

ⲛⲥⲁ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ
after-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation_document

“As the security, therefore, for the holy place, they have sought this donation document through me.” (P.KRU 86.36-37 = (6) above)

One final attestation of the SCR formula which contains a main verbal clause, P.KRU 80 (SCR.6.2), uses the phrase ⲁⲓϯⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲱ(ⲛ) “I have given my assent to this donation document”, as shown in (14). This attestation is followed by the FRW formula with which this phrase is usually associated (see 4.2.2 and 4.2.3).

(14) ⲉ-ⲩ-ϣⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-saint

ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ=ⲕ… ⲁ=ⲓ-ϯ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ
through=2.M.SG… PERF=1.SG-give.INF-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-assent

ⲉ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲱ(ⲛ) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ
to-DEM.ART.M.SG-donation_document PERF=1.SG-be_persuaded.INF and

ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ	ⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ…
PFRM=1.SG-wish.INF	without	INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile…

"As a security, therefore, for (the monastery of) the saint, through you… I have given my assent to this donation document. I have been persuaded and I wish without any guile…" (P.KRU 80.29-32)

The final two variations of the SCR formula in which a statement of composition does not appear, P.KRU 45 and P.CLT 7 (SCR.1.3), are somewhat more problematic. In both texts, the SCR formula is combined with the KYR formula which follows. In P.CLT 7, the KYR formula forms the main verbal element upon which the statement of security of the SCR formula is dependent, as shown in (15).

(15)

ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ		ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ	ⲙ̅ⲛ̅-ⲛ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲏⲩ
as-INDF.SG-security		IND.OBJ=2.PL	with-DEF.PL-REL-come.QUAL
ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲥⲱ=ⲧⲛ	ⲥ-ⲟⲣ̅ϫ̅		ⲥ-ⲟ
after=2.PL	3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL		3.F.SG-do.QUAL
ⲛ̅-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ	ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ		ⲛⲓⲙ
IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord	in-Z.ART-place		every
ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲉⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ		ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ=ⲥ	ⲛ̅ϩⲏⲧ=ϥ
CIRC=3.PL-FUT-produce.INF		DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG	in=3.M.SG

"As a security for you and those who come after you (SCR), it is firm and binding in every place in which it will be produced (KYR)." (P.CLT 7.63-65)

In P.KRU 45, however, both formulae are incomplete. No finite clause appears (it is firm etc.); rather, a PP from both the SCR formula and the KYR formula have been combined, as shown in (16). It is likely that the lack of any finite verb form in this passage is the result of scribal error, arising from the omission of the main verbal clause of one or both of the formulae in question.

(16)	ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲛⲏ	ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ	ⲛⲓⲙ
	as-INDF.SG-security	IND.OBJ_2.F.SG	in-Z.ART-place	every

ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ	ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ⲥ
CIRC=3.PL-FUT-produce.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.F.SG	in=3.F.SG

"As a security for you (it is firm etc.) in every place in which it will be produced." (P.KRU 45.60-61)

5.1.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic formulae

The following comparisons are based on a sample of 48 attestations of the Greek SCR formula. These attestations can be divided into the following five categories within which there is some variation in structure and vocabulary:

Form 1: καὶ πρὸς σὴν ἀσφάλειαν ταύτην σοι πεποίημαι τὴν X

"And as your security, I have produced this X-document for you."

This form of the Greek SCR formula is the most common in the data sample, accounting for 27 of the 48 attestations identified. The word order is flexible, with the positions of σήν, ταύτην, and σοι varying from text to text. Furthermore, ταύτην and σοι are optional. The main features linking the variations of Form 1 are the use of the possessive pronoun σήν and Perfect verb πεποίημαι (from ποιέω "to make/produce"). Two similar constructions appear which utilise different verbs: ἐξεδόμην (Aorist of ἐκδίδωμι "to publish/to deliver a document"), found in P. Lond. V 1729 and P. Münch. I 9 from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan, dated to 548 and 585 CE respectively, and ἐθέμην (Aorist of τίθημι "to execute/put down in writing"), found in CPR VI 6 from Hermopolis (439 CE) and P. Jena II 22 from Ibion (5th to 6th C).

Form 2: καὶ ἐξεδόμην/ἐξέδωκα σοι ταύτην τὴν X πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν

"And I have published this X-document for you as a security."

Form 2 of the Greek FRW formula appears ten times in the sample: six times using the Aorist active ἐξεδόμην, and four using the Aorist middle ἐξέδωκα. Aside from the alternation between active and middle voice, there is little variation in the attestations. The only exception is P. Horak. 12 from Kaine (modern Qena), dated to 335 CE, which uses τήνδε in place of ταύτην.

Form 3: καὶ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν πεποίημαι ταύτην τὴν X

"And as a security, I have produced X-document."

Form 3 occurs only once in the sample, within P. Iand. III 45 (of unknown provenience) dated from the 6th to 7th centuries. While similar in vocabulary to Form 2, the main difference lays in the order of the elements of the formula (security + composition vs composition + security), and the use of the verb πεποίημαι (from ποιέω "to do/make").

Form 4: καὶ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν ὑμῶν πεποίημαι ὑμῖν τὴν X

"And as your security, we have produced X-document for you."

Form 4 occurs in four texts within the sample: P. Flor. III 346 from the Hermopolite nome and possibly dated to the 5th century, P. Giss 106 from Hermopolis (500-625 CE), SB VIII 9749 from Herakleopolis (642 CE), and P. Stras. VI 520 of unknown provenience (500-550 CE). As with Form 1, the word order is flexible, with the position of the genitive pronoun ὑμῶν varying within the four attestations. Furthermore, similar to Form 1, the dative pronoun ὑμῖν is optional. Form 4 is only attested in the plural, that is, only within documents in which the second party is comprised of more than one individual.

Form 5: καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀσφαλείαν ταύτην σοι πεποίημαι τὴν X

"And as the security (of the second party), I have produced this X-document for you".

Form 5 occurs only in two texts: P. Stras. V 317 from Antinoopolis (529/530 CE) and P. Iand. III 37 from Oxyrhynchus (5th-6th C). In the latter, the pronoun σοι is omitted. Furthermore, the position of ταύτην differs between the two attestations.

From these forms, several similarities may already be observed between the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae in terms of their broader structure and content. The Greek formula can be divided into the same two elements as their Coptic counterparts: the statement of security and the statement of composition. Furthermore, as in the Coptic formulae, these two elements can change their order (compare for example Forms 2 and 3).

a) Relationship to wider document

The way in which the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae are incorporated into the broader structure of the document is, for the most part, identical. In all five forms of the formula identified in the Greek sample, the formula appears as a finite verbal clause written in the Aorist or Perfect. As such, the Greek SCR formula stands as a distinct entity independent of the preceding formulae, as shown in (17a). Similarly, almost all attestations of the Coptic SCR formula stand as finite verbal clauses in the Perfect (or as main non-verbal clauses in the case of SCR.13). As such, like their Greek counterparts, they stand independent of the surrounding formulae, as demonstrated in (17b).

(17) *Incorporation of the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae*

(a)

μηδένα		λόγον	ἔχω	
NEG.INDF.ADJ.M.ACC.SG		claim.M.ACC.SG	hold.PRS.IND.ACT.1.SG	
πρὸς	σὲ	περὶ	τούτου	καὶ
against	2.ACC.SG	concerning	DEM.N.GEN.SG	and

πρὸς	σὴν	ἀσφάλειαν	τοῦτό
as	POSS.ADJ.2.F.ACC.SG	security.F.ACC.SG	DEM.N.ACC.SG
σοι	πεποίημαι	τὸ	ἐντάγι(ον)
2.DAT.SG	produce.PERF	DEF.N.ACC.SG	receipt.N.ACC.SG
μεθ’	ὑπογραφῆς	ἐμῆς	ὡς
with	agreement.F.GEN.SG	POSS.ADJ.1.F.GEN.SG	as
πρόκ(ειται)			
prescribe.PRS.IND.MID.3.SG			

“I have no claim against you concerning this (document). And as your security, I have produced this receipt for you with my agreement, as prescribed above.” (BGU XVII 2716.8-11)

(b)

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ
and	DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-transgress.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG
ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϯ-ⲟⲩ-ⲗⲓⲧⲣⲁ		ⲛ-Ø-ⲛⲟⲩⲃ
FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-give.INF-INDF.SG-pound		ATTR-Z.ART-gold
ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ	ⲛⲁ=ⲕ	
as-INDF.SG-security	IND.OBJ=2.M.SG	
ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟ(ⲛ)		
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEM.M.SG-deed		

“And the one who will transgress it will give a pound of gold. As a security for you, I have executed this deed.” (P.KRU 55.22-24)

The exceptions are SCR.11.2, and SCR.12, which are dependent on the preceding formula. As stated previously, in SCR.11.2 which occurs only once in the corpus (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59), the formula is headed by a circumstantial Perfect. Consequently, the entire formula consists of a subordinate clause which is dependent on the previous formula, as shown in example (11) above. In SCR.12, which accounts for eight attestations of the Coptic SCR formula in the corpus, the formula appears as a noun phrase headed by the construction ⲡⲁⲓ + relative Perfect which stands in apposition to the name of the document type in the previous formula, as shown in (10) above.

These variations have no parallels within the Greek SCR formula. The form ⲡⲁⲓ + relative Perfect also appears in the opening of the Coptic FRW formula (see 4.3.3) and the KYR formula (see below 5.2.3), which suggests that it is a rhetorical device used within Coptic legal documents. The use of the circumstantial Perfect to link two formulae together is otherwise unattested in other formulae in the corpus, with the circumstantial Present more commonly employed. As such its use in the SCR formula of O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59 appears to be an isolated variation. These two constructions therefore do not appear to be linked to underlying Greek forms, but perhaps arose as synchronic variations within scribal practices to create a distinctly Coptic rhetorical style.

b) Internal structures

The main similarity between the internal structures of the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae lies in the statement of security. As in the case of its Coptic counterpart, this statement appears within the Greek formula as a PP, consisting of the pattern πρὸς + DETERMINER + ἀσφάλειαν (+ σοι), as shown in (18). There is a clear lexical relationship between the Greek and Coptic phrases, centred on the shared meaning of Greek ἀσφάλειαν and Coptic ⲱⲣϫ.[8]

(18) καὶ ἐξεδόμην σοι
and execute.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG 2.DAT.PL

ταύτην τὴν ἀποχὴν πρὸς
DEM.ADJ.F.ACC.SG DEF.F.ACC.SG receipt.F.ACC.SG as

ἀσφάλειαν
security.F.ACC.SG

"And I have executed for you this receipt as a security." (Chrest. Wilck 187.16-17)

[8] See Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 120.

Notably, the enclitic conjunction οὖν does not appear in the Greek formula. As such, as in the case of ⲇⲉ in the OTH formula (see 4.4.4), the use of ⲟⲩⲛ in the Coptic SCR formula is not based on its presence in its Greek counterparts. The significance of this observation is discussed in 6.4.1.

Similar to their Coptic counterparts, the forms of the Greek SCR identified above vary predominantly in the type of determiner used to modify the noun ἀσφάλεια. Almost all the types of determination used in the Coptic SCR formulae have comparative constructions in Greek, as outlined in Table 5.2. The only exception is the Coptic demonstrative, which has no equivalent in the Greek formulae identified in the sample.

Table 5.2: Determiners in the Greek and Coptic SCR formula

	Greek	Coptic
Indefinite *"as a security"*	πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν	ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ
Definite *"as the security"*	πρὸς τὴν ἀσφαλείαν	ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ
Possessive *"as your security"*	πρὸς σὴν ἀσφάλειαν πρὸς ἀσφάλειάν σου	ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ
Demonstrative *"as this security"*	-	ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲣϫ

As in the case of the Coptic SCR formula, the use of an indefinite noun is the most common of all constructions in the Greek, appearing in 39 of the 48 attestations (Forms 1-3). The definite article appears in only two texts in the sample, P. Stras. V 317 and P. Iand. III 37 (Form 5), and in both cases the phrase is partially restored.[9] Possessive determination is expressed in two ways in Greek: either through the 2nd person possessive adjective σήν (from σός), or the genitive 2nd person pronoun σου (from σύ) (see also 2.2.1).

[9] [πρὸς] τὴν ἀσφαλείαν (P. Stras. V 317.11-12) and πρὸς τὴν [ἀσφά]λ(ειαν) (P. Iand. III 37.16-17).

The construction of the Greek statement of security is strikingly similar to that found in the Coptic SCR formula. As Table 5.3 demonstrates, each element of the Coptic statement of security has a corresponding construction in the Greek formula. This close similarity may be an example of calque, discussed in more depth in 6.4.2.

Table 5.3: Comparison of the statement of security in Greek and Coptic

	Preposition	Determiner	Noun	Indirect Object 2nd person (optional)
Greek	πρὸς	ø τὴν σὴν (or noun + σου)	ἀσφάλειαν	σοι
Coptic	є єтвє	ογ- п- пєк- пєι-	ωрϫ	ⲛⲁⲕ

Despite the clear semantic similarities between the Greek and Coptic constructions, there are also some important structural differences. Some are unsurprising, resulting from the typological difference between Greek and Coptic outlined in 2.2: the more flexible word order of Greek based on marking of syntactic roles by case endings, and the use of bound articles in Coptic as opposed to the unbound determiners in Greek. However, a further grammatical difference appears in the way in which indefiniteness is marked on the noun. In Greek, indefinite determination of the noun is shown through the absence of any morpheme (ἀσφάλειαν), while in Coptic it is shown through the article ογ- (ογωрϫ). If the Coptic formula were to directly replicate the pattern of its Greek counterpart, the article would also be omitted resulting in the form є-ø-ωрϫ. Such an omission would still fall within the bounds of the Egyptian grammatical system, since Coptic nouns may take a zero article after prepositions.[10]

[10] See for example the coordination of nouns in the FRW formula core, 4.3.3.

However, the zero article and indefinite article in Coptic are used to express different semantic categories. While the zero article is still the matter of some discussion, it is restricted to only certain functions: in compound verbs and verbal predicates expressing general characteristics (such as ⲣ̅-ø-ϩⲙ̅ϩⲁⲗ "to be a slave/serve"), in generalisations (for example ⲉϣⲁⲣⲉ-ⲡ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̅-ø-ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲥ ⲧⲁⲩⲉ-ø-ⲁⲅⲁⲑⲟⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ "a good person brings forth good things" Luke 6:45), or after certain prepositions expressing coordination (ϩⲓ) or comparison (ϩⲱⲥ).[11] Conversely, the indefinite article is used to indicate one particular instance of the noun in question.[12] Since this reflects the meaning of the Greek phrase πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν more closely (that is, one single instance of a "security"), the Coptic indefinite article provides a more accurate replication of the Greek formula than the zero article. The SCR formula containing ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ therefore represents an instance of replication, in which not only the content but also the grammatical nuances of the Greek formulae are mirrored in the Coptic.

A similar relationship between the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae can be seen in the statement of composition. While there is some variation in the verb used, as outlined above, all Greek SCR formula contain the same elements: a verb of execution/writing in the Perfect or Aorist, its direct object which appears as the name of the document type, and an optional indirect 2nd person dative pronoun, as shown in (19).

(19)	καὶ	ἐξεδόμην	σοι	ταύτην
	and	publish.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG	2.DAT.SG	DEM.F.ACC.SG

[11] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 40, 110 from which the given examples are taken; see also Satzinger, 'Zero Article, Bare Noun, Absolutive Case'; and the review of Layton by Shisha-Halevy, 'A Definitive Sahidic Coptic Grammar', 434–35.

[12] Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 43.

τὴν	ἀποχὴν
DEF.F.ACC.SG	receipt.F.ACC.SG

"And I have published this receipt for you." (P. Lips. I 61.16-17)

As in the case of the statement of security, the Coptic and Greek statements of execution are similar in content. Each element of the Greek phrase has a corresponding counterpart in the Coptic SCR formula, as shown in Table 5.4. Furthermore, the main verb in both languages expresses an action that has been completed in the past: the Perfect in Coptic, and the Aorist or Perfect in Greek. Note also here the collapse of the function of the Aorist and the Perfect in Greek, used to express a completed action in the past, as discussed in 2.2.2.[13]

Table 5.4: Comparison of the statement of composition in Greek and Coptic

	Verb	NP (object)		Indirect Object
		Demonstrative	Noun	
Greek	πεποίημαι/ἐξεδόμην/ ἐξέδωκα/ἐθέμην	ταύτην	τὴν X	σοι
Coptic	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲏⲛ-	ⲡⲉⲓ-	X	ⲛⲁⲕ

One final comment may be made on the relationship between the Greek and Coptic SCR formulae: the order of constituent parts of the formula. As stated previously (5.1.2), the Coptic SCR formula most commonly follows the pattern STATEMENT OF SECURITY + STATEMENT OF COMPOSITION. While the left-dislocation of PPs is not unheard of in Coptic, the inclusion of the indirect object

[13] Horrocks, *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers*, 176; Forsten IV, *Indo-European Language and Culture*, 699–700.

ⲛⲁⲕ in the statement of security results in the left-dislocation of two PPs, creating the structure PP + PP + SVO which is not commonly observed. It is possible that order of STATEMENT OF SECURITY + STATEMENT OF COMPOSITION reflects that of the Greek SCR formula, in which the verb of writing/execution is almost always final in all 5 Forms identified in the sample. This phenomenon, as well as other apparent instances of Greek interference identified in the Coptic SCR formula, is discussed in more depth in 6.4.2.

5.1.5. Conclusion

From the above comparison, the Coptic SCR formula is closely modelled on its Greek counterpart. The content and function of the formula in both languages is the same, revealing that they are both part of the same overarching legal institution. Furthermore, there is a high degree of lexical similarity between the Greek and Coptic formulae: not only in terms of the verbs and nouns which express the main content and meaning of the formula (for example ἀσφάλεια/ϣⲣϫ "security" and "to execute"), but also in the use of determiners and prepositions. The Coptic SCR formula can therefore be classed as a direct replication of its Greek counterpart (see 6.3.2).

However, there are also certain elements of the Coptic SCR formula which suggest interference from the underlying Greek formula. The use of the preposition ⲉ- which mirrors the use of the Greek πρὸς, the presence of two left-dislocated PPs, and the general order of parts of the Coptic SCR formula are features which, while not ungrammatical, are nevertheless uncommon in Coptic. Drawing upon contact-linguistic theory, these features will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 6.

5.2. Kyria Clause (KYR)

The *kyria* clause (KYR) is a formula which states that the document in question is legally valid and has authority, whose name is derived from the Greek version of the formula which centres on the adjective κύριος "legally binding/authoritative". The Coptic formula is presented by some scholars as part of the SCR formula.[14] However, the division of formulae in general is arbitrary, imposed by modern scholars and not necessarily reflecting the thought processes behind the composition of documents in antiquity. For ease of analysis, the KYR formula is examined as a separate entity in this study.

5.2.1. History and distribution

The Greek KYR formula appears as early as the 4th century BCE and is attested until at least the 7th century. The earliest attested usage appears in P. Eleph. 1, a marriage document from Elephantine dated to 310 BCE. The latest securely dated attestation appears in P. Lond. III 1012, a sales document from Hermopolis dated to 633 CE. However, many attestations are dated broadly to the 7th century, and therefore may be written later. The Greek KYR formula is attested in various sites across Egypt, particularly in the Fayum and the Hermopolite nome, but also in Aphrodito, Aswan, the Kharga Oasis, and Oxyrhynchus. The formula is also attested from Greek papyri outside of Egypt, in the Palestinian settlements of Petra (P. Petra III 18) and Rinokoloura (P. Ness. III 15), as well as within a bilingual Greek/Aramaic document from the Arabian province, thought to be written in the kome of Maoza in Jordan (P. Yadin I 19).

[14] See Biedenkopf-Ziehner, *Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais*, 32, 55 in which both entities are combined under the singular category of 'die Sicherheitsformel'; compare Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik* who separates the two into the 'Formel der Urkundenerrichtung' (262) and the 'Kyria-Klausel' (238 and 322).

Within the corpus, the Coptic KYR formula appears 68 times. Two attestations are contained within texts from Aphrodito (SB Kopt. III 1369 and P. Lond. inv. 2849). The remaining 66 attestations are Theban. The earliest attestation of the formula in the corpus occurs in P. Lond. inv. 2849 (580-590 CE), while the earliest Theban attestation is found in P.KRU 75, a testament from Djême written in the mid-7th century. Further fragmentary formulae are also attested outside the corpus in Apollonopolis (SB Kopt. I 242), and Aswan (P. Lond. Copt. I 447).

5.2.2. Forms of the Coptic KYR formula

The KYR formula can be divided into two main elements. The first is the main verbal clause which appears in all attestations of the formula in the corpus, stating that the document is "firm" or "valid". The second is an optional PP, usually headed by ϩⲛ̅ or ⲛ̅. The variations of the Coptic KYR formula which appear in the corpus are presented in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5: Forms of the Coptic KYR clause in the corpus

Broad Code	"Be firm/valid"	"In every place"	Narrow Code
KYR.1	ϥⲟⲣϫ	-	KYR.1.1
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ	KYR.1.2
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.1.3
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ	KYR.1.4
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧⲥ ⲉⲛⲁⲩ	KYR.1.5†
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲉⲛⲧⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ	KYR.1.6†
KYR.2	ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ/ⲉⲥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲣϫ…	ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.2.1
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ ⲉⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥϩⲁⲉⲟⲟⲩ	KYR.2.2†
		ⲛϩⲣⲛⲟⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ *(sic)* ⲛⲓⲙ ⲕⲁⲛ ϩⲛⲡⲟⲗ(ⲓⲥ) ⲕⲁⲛ…	KYR.2.3†
KYR.3	ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ…	ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.3.1†
		ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲛⲧⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.3.2†

KYR.4	ⲉϥⲟ ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ	-	KYR.4.1†
	ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ ⲉϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ	ϩⲛⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.4.2
		ϩⲛⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧϥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ	KYR.4.3†
KYR.5	ⲡⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲱⲣϫ…	ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲙⲱ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ	KYR.5†
KYR.6	ⲛⲧⲉ-Ⲭ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ…	-	KYR.6.1†
		ϩⲛⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫ(ⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ) ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.6.2
KYR.7	ⲉⲧⲣⲉ-Ⲭ ⲡⲁⲓ ϣⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲥⲙⲟⲟⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ	ϩⲛⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ	KYR.7†
KYR.8	ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ…	ϩⲛ̄ⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ̀ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧⲥ́ ⲉⲣⲟϥ̀	KYR.8†

†Appears in only one text within the corpus

5.2.3. Analysis of forms of the Coptic KYR formula

a) "Be firm"

Central to all attestations of the Coptic KYR formula is the initial verbal clause which states that the document is legally valid. This clause consists of one or more of the following verbs: ⲟⲣϫ (QUAL of ⲱⲣϫ) "to be firm", ⲟ ⲛ̄ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ (QUAL of ⲣ̄ ⲛ̄ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ) "to be authoritative", ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ "to have power", and ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ (Greek βεβαιόω) "to be valid". In almost all cases in which more than one verb appears, coordination is asyndetic (that is, occurring through juxtaposition without conjunctions), as shown in (20a). However, in 12 attestations the conjunction ⲁⲩⲱ is used, as shown is (20b). In all 12 cases, ⲁⲩⲱ appears only between two of the verbs in the chain, while all other verbs are coordinated asyndetically.

(20) *Coordination of verbs in the Coptic KYR formula.*

(a) ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL 3.M.SG-have_power

"It is firm and has power…" (P.KRU 86.49)

(b) ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ
3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL 3.M.SG-have_power and

ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ
3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

"If is firm, it has power, and it is valid…" (P.KRU 98.44)

In all but one attestation of the Coptic KYR formula in the corpus, the subjects of the verbs are pronominal, as in (20a-b) above. However, in P.KRU 66 the initial verb possesses a nominal subject, as shown in (21).

(21) ⲧⲓ-ⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ
DTC.F.SG-testament establish.QUAL 3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ⲥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
3.F.SG-have_power.INF

"This testament is established, it is firm, it has power…" (P.KRU 66.64)

The main difference between the various forms of the KYR formula lies in the way in which the main verbs are expressed. KYR.1-3 stand as independent clauses containing finite verb forms. In KYR.1, the sequence of verbs is written in the Present, as shown in (22). This is the most common form of the KYR formula, accounting for 46 of the 68 attestations in the corpus.

(22) ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ ϥ-ⲟ ⲛ̅-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL 3.M.SG-do.QUAL IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord

"It is firm (and) it has authority…" (P.CLT 5.135-136)

In KYR.2 and 3, the sequence of verbs appear as circumstantial Presents within periphrastic constructions headed by the verb ϣⲱⲡⲉ "to exist". In KYR.2, which accounts for six attestations of the formula in the corpus (P. CLT 4 and P.KRU 21, 35, 81, 84, and 89), ϣⲱⲡⲉ is written as a focalised Future, as shown in (23a). In KYR.3, which appears in only two texts (P.KRU 75 and 100), ϣⲱⲡⲉ is expressed as an Adhortative, as shown in (24b). The latter construction is also attested in a fragmentary KYR formula in P. Lond. Copt. 447, a deed of loan from Aswan dated c. 696-710 CE.

(23) *Periphrastic constructions in the Coptic KYR formula*

(a) ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ
FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-exist.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲉⲟⲩ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

"It will be firm, have power, and be valid…" (P.KRU 81.49-50)

(b) ⲉ=ϥ-ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ
ADH=3.M.SG-ADH-exist.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ϩⲁ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ
CIRC=3.M.SG-under-DEF.M.SG-law

"It will be firm, have power, be valid, and be subject to the law…" (P.KRU 100.64-65)

In KYR.4-8, the main verbal clause is dependent on the preceding formula. In KYR.4, which accounts for eight attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus, the opening verb forms appear as circumstantial Presents, as shown in (24). In all eight attestations, the KYR formula is dependent on the preceding SCR formula.

(24) ϵ-ϒ-ϣⲣϫ ⲟϒⲛ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲧⲓⲁⲗⲏⲥⲓⲥ
as-INDF.SG-security ENCL PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-dialysis

ϵ=ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ ϵ=ⲥ-ⲟ ⲛ-Ø-ϫⲟϵⲓⲥ
CIRC=3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL CIRC=3.F.SG-do.QUAL IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord

"As a security, therefore, I have executed this dialysis, *being firm and having authority…"* (P.KRU 38.53-54)

KYR.5, which appears in only one text in the corpus (P.KRU 105), is similar to KYR.2 in that the main verbs in the sequence appear as circumstantial Presents dependent on a Future conjugation of the auxiliary ϣⲱⲡϵ. However, as shown in (25), the verb ϣⲱⲡϵ appears as a relative Future whose antecedent is the demonstrative ⲡⲉⲓ (variant of the pronoun ⲡⲁⲓ) standing in apposition to the name of the document type in the previous formula. This is a construction that appears in several other formulae previously discussed in this study (see the FRW formula, 4.3.3, and the SCR formula, 5.1.3).

(25) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲓⲛ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ϫⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ ⲡⲉⲓ
PERF=1.PL-execute.INF-DEM.ART.M.SG-document DEM.PRN.M.SG

ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲱⲡϵ ϵ=ϥ-ϣⲣϫ
REL-FUT-exist.INF CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ϵ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟϒ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

"We have executed this document, this one which will be firm and valid…." (P.KRU 105.21-22)

In KYR.6, which accounts for three attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus (P.KRU 28, 50, and 76), a periphrastic construction using the verb ϣⲱⲡϵ is also employed. As shown in (26a), ϣⲱⲡϵ is written as a Conjunctive, while the main lexical verb of the clause (ⲟⲣϫ) appears as a

circumstantial Present. In P.KRU 76, a reading of the Conjunctive is tentative since the opening verbal unit is written ⲛⲧⲓⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ ϣⲱⲡⲉ, as shown in (26b).

(26) *The Conjunctive in the Coptic KYR formula*

(a) …ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲓ ⲉ-ⲡ-ⲗⲟⲅ(ⲟⲥ)
…but FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-give.INF to-DEF.M.SG-penalty

ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲓⲙⲟⲛ ⲛ-ⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲟⲗⲟⲕⲧ(ⲓⲛⲟⲥ)
POSS-DEF.M.SG-fine POSS-six ATTR-Z.ART-solidus

(ⲕⲁⲓ) ⲉⲓⲑⲟⲩⲧⲱⲥ ⲛⲧⲉ-ⲡⲉⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ ϣⲱⲡⲉ
and hereupon CNJV-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed exist.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

"…but rather he will pay the value of the fine of six solidi, and hereupon this deed will remain firm…" (P.KRU 50.68-70)

(b) ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲏⲡ
FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-exist.INF CIRC=3.M.SG-have_claim.QUAL

ⲉ-[ⲡ]-ⲁⲛⲁϣ ⲉⲧ-ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ… ⲛ<ⲧⲉ>-ⲧⲓ-ⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ[15]
to-[DEF.M.SG]-oath REL-become_holy.QUAL… CNJV-DTC.F.SG-testament

ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ
exist.INF CIRC-3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL

"He will be liable to the holy oath… And this testament will be firm…" (P.KRU 76.64-68)

Both P.KRU 28 (735-763) and P.KRU 50 (724) were written in Djême by Kyriakos son of Petros. In both texts, the KYR formula is introduced by the Greek expression ⲕⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲑⲟⲩⲧⲱⲥ (καὶ εἴθ' οὕτως) "and hereupon". This therefore appears to be a feature of his style, although this is only

[15] Possible correction proposed in this study.

based a small body of evidence. P.KRU 76 (749) was written by Komes in the monastery of Apa Phoibammon at Deir el-Bahri and is one of the two copies of the Testament of Susanna. In the other copy, P.KRU 66, Komes instead uses a KYR.1 formula: ⲧⲓⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ ⲥⲟⲣϫ (*"this testament is established and is firm…"* P.KRU 66.64).[16]

In KYR.7 and 8, which occur in SB Kopt. III 1369 and P. Lond. inv. 2849 respectively, the KYR formula is expressed as the apodosis of a conditional sentence introduced by the construction ⲉ + INFL.INF. In SB Kopt. III 1369 the subject is nominal, consisting of the name of the document type as shown in (27a), while in P. Lond. inv. 2849 the subject is pronominal, as shown in (27b). In both attestations, the series of verbs are again contained in a periphrastic construction headed by the auxiliary ϣⲱⲡⲉ. While in SB Kopt. III 1369 the series of verbs is clearly written using circumstantial Presents, the beginning of the verb ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ in P. Lond. inv. 2849 has been lost in a lacuna. As such, it cannot be used as reliable evidence for this version of the formula and is only tentatively included in the categories outlined in Table 5.5.

(27) *The ⲉ + INFL.INF construction in the Coptic KYR formulae*

(a) ⲡ-ⲉⲧⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ϩⲓⲟⲟ=ⲛ ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲙⲉⲣⲟⲥ
DEF.ART.M.SG-REL=3.M.SG-wish.INF from=1.PL GEN-DEF.ART.M.SG-party

Ø-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ̣-[ⲡⲁ]-ⲉ̣ⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫ(ⲟⲛ)
Z.ART-two to-transgress.INF DIR.OBJ-[POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG]-document

…ⲉⲡⲉⲓ_ⲧⲱ ⲡ-ⲉⲧ-ⲛⲁ-ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ϥ-ϯ
…on_condition DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-dare.INF to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-give.INF

ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲛ-Ø-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲧⲓⲙⲱⲛ… ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ-ⲡⲁⲓ-ⲉⲅⲅⲣⲁⲫⲟⲛ
DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-value ATTR-Z.ART-fine… to-INFL.INF-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed

[16] For the differences between P.KRU 66 and 76 in terms of formulae and corrections, see Cromwell, 'Coptic Documents in Two Copies: A Study of Corrections and Amendments'.

ⲡⲁⲓ	ϣⲟⲡⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲥⲙⲟⲟⲧ	ⲁⲩⲱ
DEM.PRN.M.SG	exist.INF	CIRC=3.M.SG-establish.QUAL	and
ⲉ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ			
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF			

"If somebody from us or the two parties wishes to transgress this document… then the one who will dare will pay you the value of a fine… (and) this deed is established and valid…" (SB Kopt. III 1369.88-92)

(b)

ⲉ-ⲡⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲱⲣⲭ̅	ⲟⲩⲛ̀	
for-POSS.ART.M.SG=2.PL-security	ENCL	
ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ̅-ⲧⲓ-ⲙⲓⲥⲑⲱⲥⲓⲥ	ⲛⲏ=ⲧⲛ̅	
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-lease	IND.OBJ=2.PL	
ⲉ-ⲧⲣⲉ=ⲥ-ϣⲣ̣ⲡⲉ	[ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲃⲉ]ⲃ̣ⲁⲓⲟⲩ	ⲡⲣⲟⲥ
to-INFL.INF=3.F.SG-exist.INF	[CIRC=3.F.SG-be_v]alid.INF	according_to
ⲧⲉ=ⲥ-ϭⲟⲙ		
POSS.ART.F.SG=3.F.SG-power		

"For your assurance, therefore, I have executed this lease for you so that it is safe according to its power…" (P. Lond. inv. 2849.7-8)

Although the formula in P. Lond. inv. 2849 is damaged, resulting in the restoration of grammatical information, this example has been included in this study for the insight it provides into regional variations of the KYR formula. Both SB Kopt. III 1369 and P. Lond. inv. 2849 originate from Aphrodito and represent the only attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus which are not found in Theban texts. While there is insufficient data from regions outside Thebes to determine whether the use of the ⲉ + INFL.INF construction is a form of the KYR formula specific to Aphrodito, it appears at least to be a non-Theban variation.

b) "In every place"

In 64 of the 68 attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus, the initial verbal clause is followed by a PP. In 63 of these attestations, this phrase is headed by ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ "in every place" (or ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ in P.KRU 105). In P.KRU 12 and 87 (KYR.1.2), the PP stands alone without any further qualification, as shown in (28).

(28)	ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ	ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ	ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ	ⲛⲓⲙ
	3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL	3.M.SG-have_power.INF	in-Z.ART-place	every

"It is firm, and it has power in every place." (P.KRU 85.51)

In the remaining attestations, the phrase ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ is expanded by a circumstantial clause. The most common phrase used is ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ "in every place in which it will be produced", as shown in (29), which accounts for 55 attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus.

(29)	ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ	ϥ-ϭⲟⲙϭⲟⲙ	ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ	ⲛⲓⲙ
	3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL	3.M.SG-have_power.INF	in-Z.ART-place	every

ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ϥ	ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ϥ
CIRC=3.PL-FUT-produce.INF	DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG	in=3.M.SG

"It is firm, and it has power in every place in which it will be produced." (P.KRU 112.9)

In a further three texts (P.KRU 15, 27, and 105), the phrase ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ "through every power and authority" is used in place of ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ, as shown in (30). This results in an incomplete pseudo-relative clause, which lacks the resumptive pronoun usually required in such constructions.

(30) ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ ⲥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ
3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL 3.F.SG-have_power.INF in-Z.ART-place every

ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲣⲭⲏ
CIRC=3.PL-FUT-produce.INF DIR.OBJ=3.M.SG through-Z.ART-power

ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓ-Ø-ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ
any or-Z.ART-authority

"It is firm, and it has power in every place which it will be produced through any power or authority." (P.KRU 15.88-90)

Of these three attestations, two were composed by Aristophanes son of Johannes: P.KRU 15 and 27, dated to 756 and c. 730 respectively. The third attestation, P.KRU 105, was composed by Damianos, and is dated broadly to the 7th century.[17] As such, it is difficult to connect this attestation to Aristophanes. It is possible that the phrase ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ was a more widespread feature with which both scribes were familiar. Alternatively, the omission of ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ with its resumptive pronoun in all three texts may be coincidental, arising from the same scribal error being produced by two unconnected scribes.

In a further four texts, the verb ⲉⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ is replaced with little change to the meaning of the formula. P.KRU 75 (KYR.3.2), contains the verb ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ "to bring forth", as shown in (31a). The verb ϫⲓ "to receive" appears in P.KRU 9 (KYR.1.5), P.KRU 97 (KYR.4.3), and P. Lond. inv. 2849 (KYR.8), as shown in (31b). A further variation using the verb ϫⲓ occurs within P.KRU 9, in which ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ is replaced with the adverb ⲉⲙⲁⲩ (ⲉⲙⲁⲁⲩ) "there", as shown in (31c).

[17] MacCoull corrects this name from Daikianos on the basis of a photograph of the text. See MacCoull, *Coptic Legal Documents*, 8; see also Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 17, n. 72.

(31) *Alternates to* ⲉⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ *in the Coptic KYR formula*

(a) ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ ⲁⲩⲱ
ADH=3.F.SG-ADH-exist.INF CIRC=3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL and

ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟ ⲛ-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ
CIRC=3.F.SG-act.QUAL IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord in-Z.ART-place

ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ⲛⲧ=ⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
every CIRC=3.PL-FUT-bring.INF=3.F.SG away

ⲛϩⲏⲧ=ϥ
in=3.M.SG

"It will be firm and have authority in every place in which it will be brought forth." (P.KRU 75.125-126)

(b) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲡⲉ-ϫⲁⲣⲧⲏⲥ Ø-ⲇⲱⲣⲉⲁⲥⲧⲓⲕⲏ
PERF=1.PL-execute.INF-DEF.M.SG-document Z.ART-donation

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL and CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF

ϩⲛ-Ø-ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ϫⲓⲧ=ϥ
in-Z.ART-place every CIRC=3.PL-FUT-take.INF=3.M.SG

ⲉⲣⲟ=ϥ
to=3.M.SG

"...we executed the donation document, it being firm and having power in every place to which it will be taken." (P.KRU 97.81-82)

(c) ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ ⲥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ϩⲙ-Ø-ⲙⲁ
3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL 3.F.SG-have_power.INF in-Z.ART-place

ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉ=ⲩ-ⲛⲁ-ϫⲓⲧ=ⲥ ⲉⲙⲁⲩ ϩⲓⲧⲛ-Ø-ⲁⲣⲭⲏ
every CIRC=3.PL-FUT-take.INF=3.F.SG there through-Z.ART-power

ⲛⲓⲙ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ⲉϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ	ⲛⲓⲙ
any	or- Z.ART-authority	any

"It is firm, and it has power in every place which it will be received, through any power or any authority." (P.KRU 9.94-96)

There is no common factor which links the three attestations of ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧϥ together. P.KRU 9 was written in the village of Djême in 715 or 730, P.KRU 97 possibly in the monastery of Apa Phoibammon at Deir el-Bahri in 770-771, and P. Lond. inv. 2849 in Aphrodito between 580-590. Once again, it is possible that this variation was more widespread than the surviving papyrological evidence suggests and was well-known to scribes from various regions.

Two of the 68 attestations of the KYR formula in the corpus contain slightly different variations of the final prepositional phrase. In P.KRU 81 (KYR.2.2), the phrase ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ is followed by a second prepositional phrase headed by ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ "before", as shown in (32a). In P.KRU 84 (KYR.2.3) ⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ is used to open the prepositional phrase in place of ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ, as shown in (32b).

(32) *Alternate PPs in the Coptic KYR formula*

(a)

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ	
FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-exist.INF	CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL	
ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ	ⲉ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲉⲟⲩ	ϩⲛ-Ø-ⲙⲁ
CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF	CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF	in-Z.ART-place

ⲛⲓⲙ	ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ-Ø-ⲉⲓϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ	ⲛⲓⲙ	ⲉ=ϥ-ϫⲟⲥⲉ
every	before-Z.ART-authority	every	CIRC=3.M.SG-exalt.QUAL

ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ϥ-ϩⲁ-Ø-ⲉⲟⲟⲩ
and	CIRC=3.M.SG-under-Z.ART-glory

"It will be firm, have power, and be valid in every place before every exalted and honoured authority." (P.KRU 81.49-51)

(b) ϵ=ϥ-ⲛⲁ-ϣⲟⲟⲡϵ ϵ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ
FOC=3.M.SG-FUT-exist.INF CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ϵ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ϵ=ϥ-ⲃϵⲃϵⲟⲩ
CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

ⲛϩⲣⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲓϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ
before-Z.ART-authority any

"It will be firm, have power, and be valid before every authority, whether in the city or in the kastron, whether in the courts or outside of the courts…" (P.KRU 84.33-34)

5.2.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic KYR formulae

The Greek KYR formula contains a high degree of variation in terms of its vocabulary and morphology. However, within a sample of 197 attestations, three broad patterns can be observed:

Form 1a: X κυρία καὶ βεβαία

"X-document is legally binding and valid."

Form 1a is the most common variation of the Greek KYR formula, accounting for 98 of the 197 attestations identified in the sample. The earliest attestation of this form of the formula occurs in PSI I 76, a sales document from Oxyrhynchus dated to 216/217 CE. The latest securely dated attestation occurs in P. Lond. III 1012, a lease from Hermopolis dated to 633 CE.[18] Form 1a is attested in various locations: primarily in the Hermpolite nome, but also in Aphrodito, the Fayum, Herakleopolis, and Oxyrhynchus. In all 98 attestations of this form, no verb is present. However, one further variation occurs in which the participle οὖσα (from εἰμί "to be") is included:

[18] P. Krammer 15 may be later, dated between 629 and 644 CE.

Form 1b: Χ κυρία οὖσα καὶ βεβαία

"X-document being legally binding and valid."

This variation occurs in four documents: P. Cair. Masp. I 67097 written in Aphrodito in 571/572 CE, P. Münch. I 12, part of the Patermouthis archive of Aswan and written in 590/591 CE, P. Vind. Sijp. 11, written in Hermopolis in 453 CE, and SB XX 14300, written in Oxyrhynchus in 324 CE.

Form 2a: SCR + κυρίαν καὶ βεβαίαν (ἁπανταχοῦ προφερομένην/πανταχῇ)

SCR formula + *"legally valid and valid (everywhere it is produced)"*

Form 2a, which accounts for 14 of the attestations of the Greek KYR formula in the sample, appears directly after a SCR formula upon which it is dependent. As in Form 1, the KYR formula is non-verbal. The earliest attestation of this form of the formula appears in P. Lips. I 51, a receipt from Antinoopolis dated to 375 CE. The latest occurs in P. Lond. V 1736, from the Patermouthis archive in Aswan, dated to 611 CE. Form 2a of the formula is attested in Antinoopolis, Aswan, Hermopolis, and Panopolis. One further variation can be identified in the sample containing the participle οὖσαν, which occurs in only one text, P. Oxy. LXVII 4605, a receipt written in Pelusion dated to 361 CE:

Form 2b: SCR + βεβαίαν καὶ κυρίαν οὖσαν - SCR + *"it being firm and valid"*

Form 3: Χ κυρία ἔστω

"Let X-document be legally binding…"

Form 3 accounts for 80 attestations of the Greek KYR formula in the sample and is found in several sites across Egypt: Aphrodito, the Fayum, Hermopolis, the Karga Oasis, Oxyrhynchus, and Thebes.

This iteration of the formula is characterised by the use of the 3rd person imperative of the verb "to be" (ἔστω). Within these 80 attestations, four main variations can be observed:

Form 3a: Χ κυρία ἔστω… πανταχῆ οὗ ἂν ἐπιφέρηται *"let X-document be legally binding… everywhere it is to be produced"* which appears in 20 attestations, all written in the 4th to 2nd centuries BCE.

Form 3b: Χ κυρία ἔστω… πανταχῆ/πανταχοῦ (ἐπιφερομένη/προφερομένη) *"let X-document be legally binding… everywhere (it is produced)"* which accounts for 18 attestations, written between the 3rd century BCE and the 5th century CE.

Form 3c: μηθὲν ἧσσον κύρια ἔστω Χ *"let X-document be no less legally binding"* which occurs in 10 attestations, written between the 2nd century BCE and the 2nd century CE.

Almost all attestations of the Form 3 formula are written before the mid-4th century CE. Only two exceptions occur within the sample: P. Hamb. I 23 from Antinoopolis, dated to 596 CE, and P. Vat. Aphrod. 2 from Aphrodito, dated broadly to the 6th century.

As the above forms show, the Greek formula can be divided into the same two main elements as its Coptic counterpart: the main verbal phrase "to be legally binding/valid" and the optional adverbial phrase "everywhere/in every place". As such, there is a clear legal and lexical relationship between the Greek and Coptic KYR formulae, discussed in more depth below.

b) Relationship to wider document

The Greek KYR formula is incorporated into the body of the document through several different constructions. Most commonly, the formula appears as a main clause which stands independent of the surrounding formulae. In Forms 1a and 2a, this appears as a non-verbal clause in which the verb "to be" is implied, as shown in (33a). In Form 3, the formula is constructed as an independent verbal clause written in the 3rd person Imperative, as shown in (33b).

(33) *The Greek KYR as an independent clause*

(a)

…ὅνπερ	χρυσικὸν	φόρον
…REL.M.ACC.SG	cash.M.ACC.SG	payment.M.ACC.SG

ἀποδώσω	σου	τῷ
give.FUT.IND.ACT.1.SG	2.M.GEN.SG	DEF.M.DAT.SG

Φαῶφι	μηνὶ	κατ᾽	ἔτος
Paopi.M.DAT.SG	month.M.DAT.SG	according_to	year.N.ACC.SG

ἀνυπερθέτως	ἡ	μ̣[ίσ]θωσ̣ις
immediately	DEF.ART.F.NOM.SG	lease.F.NOM.SG

κυρία	καὶ	β̣εβαία	καὶ
legally_binding.F.NOM.SG	and	valid.F.NOM.SG	and

ἐπερ(ωτηθεὶς)	ὡμολ(όγησα)
ask.PTC.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG	agree.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG

"...which cash payment I will give you in the month of Paopi annually without delay. The lease (is) legally binding and valid. And having been asked, I have agreed." (BGU XII 2159.13-15)

(b)

ἂν	δ[ὲ]	μὴ	ἀποδῶ	σοι
COND	ENCL	NEG	repay.AOR.SUBJ.ACT.1.SG	2.DAT.SG

ἐκτίσω	σοι{ι}	παραχρῆμα	τιμὴν
forfeit.FUT.IND.ACT.1.SG	2.DAT.SG	forthwith	value.F.ACC.SG

ἑκάστης	ἀρτάβη{α}ς…	καὶ	[ἐ]πίτιμον
each.F.GEN.SG	artaba.F.GEN.SG…	and	fine.F.ACC.SG

ἀργυρίου ἐ	πισήμου	δραχμὰς	ἑξ[ή]κοντα
silver.N.GEN.SG	coined.N.GEN.SG	drachma.F.ACC.PL	sixty

καὶ	εἰς	τὸ	βασιλικὸν	τὸ
and	to	DEF.N.ACC.SG	treasury.N.ACC.SG	DEF.N.ACC.SG

ἴσον	ἡ	χεὶρ	ἥδε
equal.N.ACC.SG	DEF.F.NOM.SG	bond.F.NOM.SG	DEM.F.NOM.SG

κυρία	ἔστω	πανταχῆ
legally_binding.F.NOM.SG	be.PRS.IMP.ACT.3.SG	everywhere

ἐπιφερομένη
produce.PTC.PRS.MID.F.NOM.SG

"And if I do not repay you, I will forfeit to you forthwith the value of each artaba… and a fine of 60 drachmas of coined silver and the loss, and to the Treasury an equal amount. Let this bond be legally binding everywhere it is produced." (P. Tebt. I 110.8-15)

Similarly, as outlined in 5.2.3, the Coptic KYR formula most commonly appears as an independent finite verbal clause written in either the Present, the focalised Future, or the Adhortative. While it is possible that the expression of the Coptic KYR formula in this manner is based on the underlying Greek formula, this is better assessed through a closer comparison of the internal grammatical structures of the formulae in question (see below).

Those few attestations of both the Greek and Coptic KYR formulae which are not expressed as independent clauses are more easily comparable. In the Greek Forms 1b and 2b which contain the participle οὐσα, the KYR formula appears as a subordinate clause which is dependent on the preceding formula, as shown in (34). The exact nature of the subordinate relationship is ambiguous, since the Greek participle does not overtly code for one particular type of subordinate clause (see 2.2.4). As such, the formula can be interpreted either as a purpose/result clause "so that it is legally binding and valid", or as a relative clause "which is legally valid" depending on the context of the formula.

(34) ἐπωμοσάμην θεὸν τὸν
swear.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG God.M.ACC.SG DEF.M.ACC.SG

παν[τοκράτορα]… [εἰς] πέρ[ας] ἄ̣ξ̣α̣ι̣
Almi[ghty]… [to] en[d].N.ACC.SG carry.AOR.INF.ACT

δ̣ι̣ὰ̣ παντός ἡ δὲ
through all.M.GEN.SG DEF.F.NOM.SG ENCL

πρᾶ[σ]ις κυρί̣α̣ οὖσα
sale.F.NOM.SG legally_binding.F.NOM.SG be.PTC.PRS.ACT.F.NOM.SG

καὶ βεβαία ἁπανταχοῦ προφερομ(ένη)
and valid.F.NOM.SG everywhere produce.PTC.PRS.MID.F.NOM.SG

"I have sworn by God Almi[ghty]… to carry it out [to] the end always, so that the deed of sale is legally binding and valid everywhere it is produced." (P. Münch. I 12.46-49)

A similar method of incorporation appears in the Coptic KYR.4 formula, which appears as a subordinate clause headed by a circumstantial Present, as shown in (35). As previously discussed, the Greek participle and Coptic circumstantial Present share some features in that both are non-finite clauses used to express an accompanying circumstance or subordinate relationship. Furthermore, as in the case of the Greek participle, the type of subordinate clause introduced by the Coptic circumstantial is ambiguous. Consequently, the Coptic KYR.4 formula and its integration into the body of the document bears a close resemblance to those Greek formulae containing οὖσα.

(35) ⲉ-ⲩ-ⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ⲧⲓⲁⲗⲏⲥⲓⲥ
for-INDF.SG-security ENCL PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-*dialysis*

ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟⲣϫ ⲉ=ⲥ-ⲟ ⲛ-Ø-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
CIRC=3.F.SG-be_firm.QUAL CIRC=3.F.SG-do.QUAL IND.OBJ-Z.ART-lord

"As a security, therefore, I have executed this dialysis*, it being firm and having authority…"* (P.KRU 38.53-54 = (24) above)

However, a further two variations of the Coptic KYR formula in which the formula is expressed as a subordinate clause remove this ambiguity. As discussed previously, in SB Kopt. III 1369 (KYR.7) and P. Lond. inv. 2849 (KYR.8), the Coptic KYR formula is introduced by the ϵ + INFL.INF construction, shown in (36). This construction overtly codes the apodesis of a conditional clause. Consequently, it is only in these two examples that the subordinate relationship between the KYR formula and the preceding clause is made explicit through morphology, rather than implied by context.

(36) п-єтє=ч-ⲛⲁ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ϩⲓⲟⲟ=ⲛ ⲛ-п-ⲙєрос
DEF.ART.M.SG-REL=3.M.SG-wish.INF from=1.PL GEN-DEF.ART.M.SG-party

Ø-ⲥⲛⲁⲩ є-пⲁрⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ̣-[пⲁ]-ⲉ̣ⲅⲅрⲁф(ⲟⲛ)
Z.ART-two to-transgress.INF DIR.OBJ-[POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG]-document

…єпєі_тⲱ п-єт-ⲛⲁ-тⲟⲗⲙⲁ є-трє=ч-ϯ
…on_condition DEF.M.SG-REL-FUT-dare.INF to-INFL.INF=3.M.SG-give.INF

ⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲛ-Ø-прⲟⲥⲧⲓⲙⲱⲛ… є-трє-пⲁⲓ-єⲅⲅрⲁфⲟⲛ
DIR.OBJ-INDF.SG-value ATTR-Z.ART-fine… to-INFL.INF-DEM.ART.M.SG-deed

пⲁⲓ ϣⲟпє є=ч-ⲥⲙⲟⲟт ⲁⲩⲱ
DEM.PRN.M.SG exist.INF CIRC=3.M.SG-establish.QUAL and

є=ч-ⲃєⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

"If somebody from us or the two parties wishes to transgress this document… then the one who will dare will pay you the value of a fine… (and) this deed is established and valid…" (SB Kopt. III 1369.88-92) = (27a) above)

The KYR.7 and 8 formulae are therefore similar to those Greek formulae containing οὐσα in that they appear as subordinate clauses of purpose. However, the scribes in question have drawn upon

features of the Egyptian language which remove the ambiguity of the underlying Greek. Since both texts were written in Aphrodito, it therefore appears that those Greek KYR formulae which form subordinate clauses have been rendered in Coptic in two different ways depending on the region in which the texts were produced: as the є + INFL.INF construction in Aphrodito, or as a circumstantial Present in Thebes.

The remaining two constructions through which the Coptic KYR formula is incorporated into the document, the ⲡⲁⲓ + relative Future construction (KYR.5) and the Conjunctive (KYR.6), are less comparable to their Greek counterparts. The ⲡⲁⲓ + relative construction has been discussed previously in relation to the FRW formula (4.3) and the SCR formula (5.1). It has no equivalent or related structure in Greek: rather, it appears to be a rhetorical device of Coptic used as an expansion of a preceding NP. Conversely, while the Conjunctive cannot stand in isolation, it replicates the grammatical features of a previous finite verb form. In this regard, the KYR.6 formula is similar to Greek and Coptic KYR formulae which appear as independent clauses in that it is equal in status to the preceding clause, rather than subordinate to it. However, this is a uniquely Coptic form which is not modelled on the underlying Greek formula.

As this discussion shows, there is some similarity between the Greek and Coptic KYR formulae regarding their relationship to the wider document. For the most part, the formulae examined in both languages appear either as an independent clause, or a clause of purpose (either ambiguously or explicitly marked as such). However, these similarities are only broad. More substantial relationships between the Greek and Coptic formulae can be seen through a comparison of their internal structures.

(c) Internal structures

The main similarities between the Greek and Coptic KYR formulae are lexical, rather than structural or grammatical. For example, there are clear relationships between the vocabulary used in the "be firm/valid" phrase which opens the formulae in each language; primarily ⲟ ⲛ̅ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ "to be legally binding/have authority" for κύριος/κύριος εἶναι,[19] ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ (ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ) "to be valid/secure/established" for βέβαιος,[20] and ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ "to be valid" which is also cognate with βέβαιος. However, the way in which these general concepts are expressed differs between the two languages, appearing as adjectives in Greek, and verbs in Coptic. While functionally both grammatical categories in this context are similar, in that they both describe an attribute of the subject of the clause, syntactically they are different. Most notably, verbs can take arguments (such as a subject or object) while adjectives cannot.[21] As such the Coptic phrase is best understood as a replication of the Greek, mirroring the content of its Greek counterpart, but without any signs of structural interference.

A similar process can also be seen in the second element of the formula: the phrase "in every place…". In Greek, this is expressed as an adverbial phrase, either appearing as (ἁ)πανταχοῦ/πανταχῇ προφερομένην "everywhere it is produced", as shown in (37a), or πανταχοῦ/πανταχῇ οὗ ἂν ἐπιφέρηται "everywhere it is to be produced", as shown in (37b).

(37) *Adverbial phrases in the Greek KYR formula*

(a)	ἐξεδόμεθα execute.PRS.IND.MID.1.PL	τὴν DEF.F.ACC.SG	ἀλληλομολογίαν agreement.F.ACC.SG
	κυρίαν legally_binding.F.ACC.SG	οὖσαν be.PTC.PRS.ACT.F.ACC.SG	καὶ and

[19] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 358.

[20] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 120, 123.

[21] On the syntactic differences between verbs and adjectives, see Baker, *Lexical Categories*, 23ff.

βεβαίαν	κ(αὶ)	ἔννομον	ἁπανταχοῦ
valid.F.ACC.SG	and	legal.F.ACC.SG	everywhere
προφερομένην			
produce.PTC.PRS.MID.F.ACC.SG			

"We execute this agreement which is legally binding and valid and lawful everywhere it is produced." (P. Lond. V 1727.59-60)

(b)

ἡ	δὲ	ὁμολογία	ἥτε
DEF.F.NOM.SG	ENCL	agreement.F.NOM.SG	DEM.PRN.F.NOM.SG
κυρία		ἔστω	πανταχῆ
legally_binding.F.NOM.SG		be.PRS.IMP.ACT.3.SG	everywhere
οὗ	ἂν	ἐπιφέρηται	
REL.PRN.M.GEN.SG	COND	produce.PRS.SUBJ.MID.3.SG	

"And may this agreement be legally binding wherever it may be produced." (BGU III 998 Col. 2.13)

Of these two phrases, πανταχοῦ/πανταχῆ οὗ ἂν ἐπιφέρηται appears only in texts from the 4th to 2nd centuries BCE and is therefore unlikely to have influenced the formation of the Coptic KYR formula. Conversely, scholars have previously noted links between the Greek phrase (ἁ)πανταχοῦ προφερομένην and the Coptic ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ "in every place in which it will be produced".[22] Similarly, Richter notes that the adverb πανταχοῦ "everywhere" appears as ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ "every place" in Coptic translational literature.[23]

[22] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 55. The Greek formula has been linked (erroneously as discussed by Richter) to a similar formula in Demotic - *n ꜥwi nb nti iw=w n-im=w* "in every house in which they are."; see also van den Berg-Onstwedder, 'The Use of Demotic Phrases from Legal Texts of the Ptolemaic Period in Coptic Legal Texts', 107.

[23] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 55 n. 252.

While there is a clear lexical relationship between Greek (ἁ)πανταχοῦ προφ̣ερομένην and Coptic ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ, there is also an aspectual distinction between the underlying verb forms. As in the case of certain constructions which appear in the HYP formula (see 4.1.4), the Greek present participle προφ̣ερομένην expresses ongoing action, the Coptic circumstantial Future ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ implies an action which has not yet taken place. However, in the context of the formula, the act of 'being produced' in both the Greek and Coptic are events which will take place after the document is written. As such, similar to the HYP formula, futurity is implied by the Greek present participle while the Coptic linguistic system requires this futurity to be made explicit.[24] This is discussed further in 6.3.2.

One further, more tentative similarity can be observed between the Greek and Coptic KYR formula, in reference to the main verb forms used in the Greek Form 3 and the Coptic KYR.3 attestations. As outlined above, the Greek Form 3 formula, attested 80 times in the sample, appears as a finite verbal clause written with the 3rd person Imperative ἔστω, as shown in (38a). In KYR.3, the main finite verb appears as an Adhortative, shown in (38b). As stated previously, this variation is found in only two texts in the corpus: P.KRU 75, written by an unnamed scribe in the village of Djême between 626-675, and P.KRU 100, written by Apa Apater in the monastery of Apa Phoibammon after 799.

(38) *The Greek Form 3 and Coptic KYR.3 formulae*

(a)	καὶ	ἔστω	ἡ	χάρις
	and	be.PRS.IMP.ACT.3.SG	DEF.F.NOM.SG	grant.F.NOM.SG

κυρία	καὶ	βεβαία	πανταχοῦ
firm.F.NOM.SG	and	valid.F.NOM.SG	everywhere

[24] It is curious to note, however, that the Future of the Coptic phrases more closely matches the sense of irrealis conveyed in the 4th-2nd century BCE phrase πανταχοῦ/πανταχῇ οὗ ἂν ἐπιφέρηται.

προφερομένη
produce.PTC.PRS.MID.F.NOM.SG

"And may the grant be firm and valid everywhere it is produced." (P. Gron. 10.20)

(b) ⲉ=ϥ-ⲉ-ϣⲱⲡⲉ
ADH=3.M.SG-ADH-exist.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲟⲣϫ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_firm.QUAL

ⲉ=ϥ-ϭⲙϭⲟⲙ
CIRC=3.M.SG-have_power.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ
CIRC=3.M.SG-be_valid.INF

ⲉ=ϥ-ϩⲁ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ
CIRC=3.M.SG-under-DEF.M.SG-law

"It will be firm, have power, and be valid, in accordance with the law…" (P.KRU 100.64-65 = (23b) above)

The choice of the Adhortative ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ in P.KRU 100 over the focalised Future ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ found in other Coptic attestations may be influenced by the Greek Form 3 formula. Since the Coptic Adhortative in a main clause is used to express commands, strong wishes, and *realis* events, its pragmatic functions overlap with those of the Greek 3rd person imperative.[25] Furthermore, the phrase ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ is similar to the Greek ἔστω… κυρία in that the concept of "being firm/legally valid" is expressed via two words: one expressing existence and carrying the grammatical information (ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ/ἔστω), the other carrying the lexical information (ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ/κυρία). However, this last point is most likely coincidental, rather than a direct replication of Greek structures into Coptic, since the ϣⲱⲡⲉ + INF/QUAL construction is an internal Egyptian development rather than contact-induced.

[25] On the functions of the Coptic Adhortative/Future III, see Layton, *A Coptic Grammar*, 2011, 264–65; Wilson, *Coptic Future Tenses*, 22.

The relationship between the Greek Form 3 and Coptic KYR.3 formula described above is somewhat problematic. As mentioned previously, almost all attestations of the Greek Form 3 formula were written before the mid-4th century. Only two attestations were composed after this date: P. Hamb. I 23 from Antinoopolis, dated to 596 CE, and P. Vat. Aphrod. 2 from Aphrodito, dated broadly to the 6th century. As such, it is unlikely that the scribes of P.KRU 75 and 100 writing in the mid-7th to late 8th centuries would be familiar with this form of the Greek formula. While it is possible that the Greek Form 3 formula was more widespread after the 4th century than the surviving papyrological records convey, it is also likely that the variation ⲉϥⲉϣⲱⲡⲉ is a synchronic Coptic development from ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ, rather than a direct replication of underlying Greek models.

5.2.5. Conclusion

As the above analysis shows, there is a clear sense of legal continuity between the Greek and Coptic KYR formula. While the similarities in vocabulary between the formulae are minimal, limited mainly to κύριος/ⲕ̀ⲩ̀ⲣⲓⲟⲥ εἶναι and ⲟ ⲛ̅ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ "to be legally binding/have authority", and (ἁ)πανταχοῦ προφερομένην and ϩⲙⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ "everywhere it is produced", these represent the main focal points around which the formulae are built. As such, the Coptic formula appears to be a reinterpretation of the Greek, rather than a direct replication as seen in the case of the SCR formula discussed previously (5.1.4). These relationships, and their place within the wider context of linguistic continuity in Coptic legal formula, will be discussed in more detail in 6.3.

5.3. Subscription Formula (SUB)

The SUB formula is a legal stipulation which states that a *hypographeus* (Greek: ὑπογραφεύς) has written on behalf of a witnessing party because said party is illiterate. The formula appears directly

after the witness statement(s) to which it pertains. The notion of "illiteracy" and how it should be defined in this context is the matter of some discussion.[26] However, it is beyond the scope of the present study to enter ongoing debates surrounding this topic.

5.3.1. History and distribution

The subscription formula first appears in Greek documents of the late 1st century BCE, although attestations prior to the 1st century CE are rare. The earliest securely dated example comes from BGU IV 1170i, a loan contract from Alexandria dated to 10 BCE. The Greek SUB formula appears in both monolingual Greek documents and bilingual Greek/Demotic documents.[27] However, no Demotic equivalent of the formula has been identified. Within the sample of Greek formulae discussed in 5.3.4 below, the latest securely dated attestation appears in SB XVI 12717, a guarantee declaration from the Herakleopolite nome dated between 640 and 650 CE. However, other attestations dated more broadly to the 7th or 7th to 8th centuries may have been written later.

Within the corpus, the Coptic SUB formula is attested 138 times. Six attestations appear in texts from Aphrodito, one in Aswan (SB Kopt. III 1395), and 13 in the Hermopolite nome. Of the 13 attestations from the Hermopolite nome, two attestations appear in texts written in Hermopolis (CPR IV 35 and P. Ryl. Copt. 191), while one was written in the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit (P. Mon. Apollo 25). The remaining 120 attestations of the Coptic SUB formula appear in Theban

[26] See for example Choat and Yuen-Collingridge, 'A Church with No Books and a Reader Who Cannot Write: The Strange Case of P.Oxy. 33.2673'; Kraus, *'Slow Writers'—Βραδεως Γραφοντες*; Kraus, '(Il)Literacy in Non-Literary Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt'; Kraus, '"Uneducated", "Ignorant", or Even "Illiterate"?'; Youtie, 'Because They Do Not Know Letters'; Youtie, 'Ὑπογραφεύς'; Youtie, 'Αγραμματος'; Youtie, 'Βραδέως Γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy'.

[27] Examples of bilingual Demotic/Greek documents containing Greek SUB formulae include P. Ryl. Dem. III 45, discussed in Youtie, 'Because They Do Not Know Letters', 102–3; Youtie, 'Αγραμματος: An Aspect of Greek Society in Egypt', 162–63; or SB I 5117, discussed in Youtie, 163.

texts. The earliest securely dated attestation in the corpus is found in CPR IV 90, a debt instrument from the Hermopolite nome dated to 596 CE. Beyond the corpus, fragmentary examples of the SUB formula are also attested in Coptic documents from Antinoopolis.

5.3.2. Forms of the Coptic SUB formula

The Coptic SUB formula is comprised of three distinct elements. Central to all attestations of the formula is a main clause containing a verb of writing. Two other optional elements may also appear: a preceding verbal clause containing a verb of asking/commanding, and a following subordinate clause stating that the witnessing party is illiterate. The combinations of these elements and the variations within them are outlined in Table 5.6. Note in this table the instances of the graphic interchange of ϥ and ⲃ for the 3.M.SG pronoun; a common feature of documentary Sahidic from the Hermopolite nome.

Table 5.6: Forms of the Coptic SUB formulae within the corpus

Broad Code	Ask	I have written	Illiteracy	Narrow Code
		a) <u>Without verb of asking</u>		
SUB.1	-	ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.1.1.
			ⲭⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛϩⲁⲓ)	SUB.1.2
			ⲭⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.1.3†
			ⲭⲉⲛϭⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛϩⲁⲓ	SUB.1.4†
SUB.2	-	ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.2.1†
			ⲭⲉ(ⲛ)ⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.2.2
			ⲭⲉⲙⲁⲃⲛⲟⲉ	SUB.2.3†
SUB.3	-	ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁ-NN	-	SUB.3.1
			ⲭⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ	SUB.3.2
			ⲭⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓⲉ	SUB.3.3†
SUB.4	-	ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ	-	SUB.4.1†
			ⲭⲉⲙⲉⲩⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ	SUB.4.2
			ⲭⲉⲥⲉⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.4.3†

SUB.5	-	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁ̣ⲛⲉⲓⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ	-	SUB.5†
SUB.6	-	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ	ϫⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓ	SUB.6†

b) With ⲕⲱⲣϣ

SUB.7	ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣϣⲧ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	ϫⲛϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.7.1
			ϫⲉⲙⲉⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.7.2†
SUB.8	ⲛⲧⲁϥⲕⲟⲣϣⲧ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	ϫⲛⲃⲛⲟⲓ ϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.8†

c) With ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ

SUB.9	ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ/ⲁⲓⲥⲱϩ-ⲧⲉⲓⲃⲗϫⲉ	-	SUB.9.1
		ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	ϫⲉϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.9.2†
			ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.9.3†
SUB.10	ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲁⲗⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ	-	SUB.10.1†
			ϫⲉⲙⲁⲩⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ)	SUB.10.2
SUB.11	ⲁ-NN ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ-X	-	SUB.11

d) With ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ

SUB.12	ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.12.1
			ϫⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ)	SUB.12.2
			ϫⲉⲛϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ (ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ)	SUB.12.3
			ϫⲉⲙⲁϥϯⲟ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.12.4†
SUB.13	ⲁϥⲉⲓⲇⲉ	ⲁⲓϩⲙⲛϯⲃⲗϫⲉ	-	SUB.13†
SUB.14	ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ-X ⲉⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	ϫⲉϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ	SUB.14†
SUB.15	ⲁ-NN ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.15.1
			ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.15.2
SUB.16	αἰτηθεὶς	ἔγραψα <ὑπὲρ> NN	γράμματα μὴ εἰδότος	SUB.16†
SUB.17	ⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ	-	SUB.17.1
			ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛϩⲣⲁⲓ)	SUB.17.2
			ϫⲉⲛⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.17.3†

e) With ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ

SUB.18	ⲁ-NN ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲓϩⲣⲁⲓ ϩⲁ-NN	ϫⲉⲙⲉⲩⲛⲟⲓ ⲛ̅ϩⲣⲁⲓ	SUB.18†

		f) With ἀξιῶ		
SUB.19	ἀξιωθ(εὶς)	ἔγραψα	-	SUB.19†
		g) With ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ		
	I have written	**Ask**	**Illiteracy**	
SUB.20	ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ	ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ	ⲉⲛⲥⲟⲩⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ	SUB.20†

†Appears only in one text within the corpus

5.3.3. Analysis of the Coptic SUB formula

a) Verb of writing

The main verbal clause of writing appears in all 138 attestations of the Coptic SUB formula. In 135 of these attestations, the verb ⲥϩⲁⲓ is used. The verb is written in the Perfect, as shown in (39a). However, in seven attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus this Perfect clause is modified by the focalising convertor, as shown in (39b). This is discussed in greater depth in 6.3.2.

(39) *Expression of the verb of writing in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲅⲉⲱⲣⲅⲓⲟⲥ	ⲡϣⲏⲣⲉ	ⲙ-ⲫⲏⲩ
INDP.1.SG	Georgios	DEF.M.SG-son	POSS-Pheu

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for=3.PL

"I, Georgios the son of Pheu, it is on their behalf that I have written." (P.KRU 10.70)

(b)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲥⲉⲩⲏⲣⲟⲥ	ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲃ
INDP.1.SG	Severus	FOC-PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for=3.M.SG

"I, Severus, it is on his behalf that I have written." (CPR IV 166.9-10)

Six of the attestations of the focalised Perfect in the SUB formula originate from the Hermopolite nome: CPR IV 35 and P. Ryl. Copt. 191, written in Hermopolis, and P. Ryl. Copt. 129, 207, 215 and CPR IV 166, which are also from the Hermopolite nome but do not have a more specific provenience. The remaining attestation, found in P. Lond. IV 1593, was written in Aphrodito. The focalised Perfect does not appear in any of the 120 formulae from Thebes. As such, it appears to be a non-Theban variation.

One further attestation of the Coptic SUB formula, O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59, contains the verb ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ "to execute/draw up a document" in place of ⲥϩⲁⲓ, shown in (40). The presence of this verb may be explained by the fact that this attestation of the SUB formula appears to be merged with the dating formula, in which ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ is regularly used.

(40) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲙⲱⲩⲥⲏⲥ ⲡⲉ-ⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛ-Ø-ⲛⲁⲅⲛⲱⲥⲧⲏⲥ
INDP.1.SG Moses DEF.M.SG-humblest ATTR-Z.ART-lector

ⲁ=ϥ-ⲉⲓ̈ⲇⲉ ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲥⲙⲛ-ϯ-ⲃⲗⲏⲉ
PERF=3.M.SG-ask.INF PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DTC.F.SG-sherd

ϩⲛ-Ø-ⲥⲟⲩ-ⲇⲉⲕⲁ ⲉⲛ-ⲧⲱⲃⲉ
in-Z.ART-day-twelfth POSS-Tobe

"I, Moses the humblest lector, he asked, and I have executed this sherd on the tenth day of Tobe." (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59.12-15)

In the remaining two attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus, the formula is written entirely in Greek. These will be discussed in more depth below.

In 133 of the 138 attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus, the verb of writing is followed by a prepositional phrase introduced by ϩⲁ- “on behalf of”. The object is either a suffix pronoun, as shown in (41a), the name of the person for whom the subscription is written (SUB.3) shown in (41b), or the phrase ⲛⲉ(ⲓ)ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ/ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ “the(se) representatives/witnesses” (SUB.4) shown in (41c).

(41) *Object of ϩⲁ- in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a)	ⲓⲥⲓⲇⲱⲣⲟⲥ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ
	Isidoros	PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for=3.M.SG

“Isidoros, I have written on his behalf.” (P.KRU 24.113)

(b)	ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲁⲡⲟⲗⲗⲱ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁ-ⲑⲉⲟⲇⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ
	INDP.1.SG	Apollô	PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for-Theodosius

“I, Apollô, I have written on behalf of Theodosius.” (P. Lond. IV 1518.28)

(c)	ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲓⲥⲁⲕ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁ-ⲛⲉ-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲟ̣ⲡ̣ⲟ̣ⲛ̣
	INDP.1.SG	Isak	PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for-DEF.PL-representative

“I, Isak, I have written on behalf of the representatives.” (P.KRU 92.58)

In the remaining five attestations of the SUB formula, the prepositional phrase introduced by ϩⲁ is absent. Rather, the formulae use the pre-nominal form of the verb ⲥϩⲁⲓ followed by the name of the document type, as demonstrated in (42). All five attestations occur in ostraca: O. Medin. Habu Copt. 56, 59, 60 and 73, written in Djême, and SB Kopt. III 1395, written in Aswan. Of these, all but O. Medin. Habu Copt. 60 shown in (42) below designate the document as a ⲃⲗⲭⲉ (sherd or ostracon).

(42) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲡⲁ ⲇⲓⲟⲥ… ⲁ=ϥ-ⲁϊⲧⲓ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ=ϊ
INDP.1.SG Apa Dios… PERF=1.SG-ask.INF DIR.OBJ=1.SG

ⲁ=ϊ-ⲥϩⲁϊ-ⲧⲓ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓⲁ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF-DTC.F.SG-*asphaleia*

"I, Apa Dios… he asked me, and I have written this asphaleia*."* (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 60.8-10)

b) Illiteracy

The subordinate clause of illiteracy occurs in 95 of the 138 attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus. This takes the form of a causal clause containing a verb of knowing which appears in one of two forms: ϫ(ⲉ) + NEG.HAB (66 attestations), as shown in (43a), or ϫ(ⲉ) + NEG.PRS (19 attestations), as demonstrated in (43b). One further variation occurs in P. Ryl. Copt. 137 (SUB.20), in which the subordinate clause of illiteracy is introduced by the circumstantial convertor rather than the morpheme ϫⲉ, as shown in (43c).

(43) *Expression of the clause of illiteracy in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲫⲟⲓⲃ(ⲁⲙⲙⲟⲛ) ⲡⲉ=ϥ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ
INDP.1.SG Phoibammon POSS.ART.M.SG=3.SG-son

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫⲉ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG since

ⲙⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
NEG.HAB=3.SG-know.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter

"I, Phoibammon his son, I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters." (P.KRU 71.66-67)

(b) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲅⲉⲱⲣⲅⲉ… ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ
INDP.1.SG George… FOC.PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG

ϫ-ⲛ=ⲃ-ⲛⲟⲓ	ⲁⲛ
since-NEG=3.SG-know.INF	NEG

"I, George… it is on his behalf that I have written since he is unable." (P. Ryl. Copt. 191.11-12)

(c)

ⲁⲛⲟⲕ	ⲧⲁⲩⲣⲓⲛⲉ	ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲙⲓⲕⲟⲥ	ⲛ-ⲑⲱⲛⲉ
INDP.1.SG	Taurine	DEF.M.SG-notary	POSS-Thone

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ	ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF	for=3.PL	FOC-PERF=3.PL-ask.INF

ⲛⲁ=ⲓ	ⲉ-ⲛ=ⲥⲟⲩ-ⲛⲟⲉⲓ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲁⲛ
IND.OBJ=1.SG	CIRC-NEG=3.PL-know.INF	DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-writing	NEG

"I Taurine, the notary of Thone, I have written on their behalf, and it is because they do not know letters that they asked me." (P. Ryl. Copt. 137.5-6)

The verb of knowing almost always appears as ⲛⲟⲓ(ⲉ) (Greek νοέω). However, the verb ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ is attested five times, as shown in (44). Two attestations occur in P.CLT 5, possibly from the monastery of Apa Paul at Deir el-Bachit and are both written by Psate son of Pisrael. The remaining three occur in O. Medin. Habu Copt. 58 and 60, and P.KRU 44, all from the village of Djême, and are written by Moses the deacon of the church of Terkot, Apa Dios son of Paulos, priest of the church of Terkot, and Georgios the archdeacon of the holy (church of) Victor respectively.

(44)

ⲁ=ϥ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ̈	ⲁ=ⲓ̈-ⲥϩⲁⲓ̈
PERF=3.M.SG-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ=1.SG	PERF=1.SG-write.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ	ϫⲉ	ϥ-ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ	ⲁⲛ	ⲛ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ̈
for=3.M.SG	since	3.M.SG-know.INF	NEG	DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter

"… he has beseeched me and I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters." (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 19-12)

All five attestations of coογⲛ in the SUB formula appear in monastic contexts: three written by members of the clergy, and two written by a village scribe (Psate son of Pisrael) within P.CLT 5 written in the monastery of Apa Paul. However, aside from Moses in O. Medin. Habu Copt. 58 and Apa Dios O. Medin. Habu Copt. 60, both of whom are from the church of Terkot, there is no other factor which links these five attestations together.

In 46 of the 95 attestations of the SUB formula containing a verb of knowing, the verb is followed by the direct object, ⲥϩⲁⲓ "letters/writing", as shown in (45a). In six of these attestations, the direct object marker is omitted: P.KRU 14.92-94; P.KRU 19.92-95; P.KRU 26.26-27; P.KRU 26.28-29; P.KRU 48.69; and P. Ryl. Copt. 159.23-24, shown in (45b). In the remaining 49 attestations, ⲥϩⲁⲓ itself is omitted, as demonstrated in (45c). In these cases, the verb of knowing instead conveys the meaning "to be able to". The presence or absence of ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ in the corpus is not particular to any one region, time period, or scribe. Rather, both options appear to be interchangeable.

(45) *Object of the verb of knowing in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫⲉ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG since

ⲙⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
NEG.HAB=3.SG-know.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter

"...I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters." (P.KRU 71.66-67)

(b) ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫ-ⲛ=ⲃ-ⲛⲟⲓ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG since-NEG=3.M.SG-know.INF

Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ
Z.ART-letter NEG

"...I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters." (P. Ryl. Copt. 159.24)

(c) ⲛⲧⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫ-ⲛ=ⲃ-ⲛⲟⲓ
FOC.PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG since-NEG=3.SG-know.INF

ⲁⲛ
NEG

"...It is since he is unable that I have written on his behalf." (P. Ryl. Copt. 191.11-12)

c) Verb of asking

In 52 of the 138 attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus, the main verb of writing is accompanied by another main clause containing a verb of asking or commanding. Several different verbs may be used in this clause: ⲕⲱⲣϣ, ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ (from παρακαλέω), ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ (αἰτέω), or ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ (ἐπιτρέπω). In all 52 attestations, the clause of asking is coordinated asyndetically with the clause of writing. As with the verb of writing, the verb of asking is written in the Perfect, as shown in (46a). However, in five attestations the Perfect is introduced by a focalising convertor, as shown in (46b). These attestations occur in texts from the Hermopolite nome (P. Ryl. Copt. 137 and 159, and CPR IV 90) and Aphrodito (P. Lond. IV 1494 and 1521), suggesting once again that it is a non-Theban feature of the SUB formula.

(46) *Expression of the verb of asking in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲁⲃⲣⲁϩⲁⲙ ⲡ-ϣⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ-ⲡ-ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ
INDP.1.SG Abraham DEF.M.SG-son POSS-DEF.M.SG-late

ⲕⲁⲣⲁⲕⲟⲥ ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
Karakos PERF=3.PL-ask.INF DIR.OBJ=1.SG PERF=1.SG-write.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ
for=3.PL

"I, Abraham the son of the late Karakos, I was asked and I have written on their behalf." (P.KRU 23.68)

(b) [ⲁ]ⲛⲟⲕ ϊⲱⲥⲏⲡ ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲙⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧ-ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ
INDP.1.SG Joseph DEF.M.SG-notary FOC-PERF=3.PL-beseech.INF

ⲛ̅ⲙⲟ=ϊ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫⲉ
DIR.OBJ=1.SG PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG since

ⲙⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲟϊ ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
NEG.HAB=3.SG-know.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter

"I, Joseph the notary, I was beseeched, and it is because he does not know letters that I have written on his behalf." (CPR IV 90.9)

The subject of the verb of asking takes one of four forms. In 21 attestations, the subject is a 3rd person singular pronoun, anaphorically linked to a singular witness, as shown in (47a). In a further two attestations, O. Medin. Habu Copt. 50.7-8 and CPR IV 90.9, the subject is a 3rd plural pronoun but the subscription is only written for a single witness. As such, these attestations are best understood as passive constructions, shown in (47b). In 13 attestations, the subject of the verb of asking is a 3rd plural pronoun, referring to multiple witnesses as demonstrated in (47c). Consequently, these can be understood either as active or passive. In the remaining 15 attestations, the subject of the verb is nominal, consisting of either the name of the witnessing party, or the noun ⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ "these representatives", as shown in (47d).

(47) *Subject of verb of asking in the Coptic SUB formula*

(a) ⲁ=ⲃ-ⲕⲟⲣϣ=ⲧ ⲁ̣=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ̣=ⲃ
PERF=3.M.SG-ask.INF=1.SG PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.M.SG

ⲛ-ⲧⲁ-ϭⲓϫ
through-POSS.ART.F.SG_1.SG-hand

"...he asked me, and I have written on his behalf by my hand..." (P. Mon. Apollo 25.21)

(b) ⲛ̅ⲧ-ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲙⲟ=ⲓ̈ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
FOC-PERF=3.PL-beseech.INF DIR.OBJ=1.SG PERF=1.SG-write.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ϥ ϫⲉ ⲙⲉ=ϥ-ⲛⲟⲓ̈ ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
for=3.M.SG since NEG.HAB=3.SG-know.INF DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter

"...it is because he does not know letters that I was beseeched and I have written on his behalf ..." (CPR IV 90.9)

(c) ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲛⲙⲟ=ⲓ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
PERF=3.PL-ask.INF DIR.OBJ=1.SG PERF=1.SG-write.INF

ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ
for=3.PL

"... they asked me/I was asked, and I have written on their behalf..." (P.KRU 81.62)

(d) ⲁ-ⲛⲉⲓ-ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ
PERF-DEM.ART.PL-representative ask.INF DIR.OBJ=1.SG

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.PL

"... these representatives asked me, and I have written on their behalf..." (P.KRU 8.32)

In 50 of the 51 attestations of the formula containing a verb of asking, this precedes the clause of writing, as shown in examples (47a-d) above. However, in P. Ryl. Copt. 137, the clause of asking follows, demonstrated in (48). In this case, the focalised Perfect of the verb asking may be shifting the emphasis of the sentence to the subordinate clause of illiteracy.

(48) ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲧⲁⲩⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲙⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲛ-ⲑⲱⲛⲉ
INDP.1.SG Taurine DEF.M.SG-notary POSS-Thone

ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟ=ⲟⲩ ⲛⲧ-ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ
PERF=1.SG-write.INF for=3.PL FOC-PERF=3.PL-ask.INF

ⲛⲁ=ⲓ	ⲉ-ⲛ=ⲥⲟⲩ-ⲛⲟⲉⲓ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ	ⲁⲛ
IND.OBJ=1.SG	CIRC-NEG=3.PL-know.INF	DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter	NEG

"I Taurine, the notary of Thone, I have written on their behalf, and it is because they do not know letters that they asked me." (P. Ryl. Copt. 137.5-6, = (43c) above)

d) Greek formulae in Coptic documents

Of the 138 attestations of the SUB formula within the corpus, two are written entirely in Greek: P.KRU 105.45-47 (SUB.16), shown in (49a), and P. Lond. IV 1509.23-24 (SUB.19), shown in (49b). However, are slightly different to the forms of the Greek SUB formulae identified below (see 5.3.4).

(49) *Greek SUB formulae in Coptic documents*

(a)

Δακιανὸς	γραμμ(ατεὺς)…	
Dakianos.M.NOM.SG	grammateus.M.NOM.SG…	
αἰτηθεὶς	ἔγραψα	<ὑπὲρ>
ask.PTC.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG	write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG	<for>
Παπνουθι		
Papnouthis.M.GEN.SG		

"Dakianos, (the) grammateus… having been asked, I have written <on behalf of> Papnouthis." (P.KRU 105.45-47)

(b)

Μάρκου	Κυρίλλου	σὺν	θ(εῷ)
Marcus.M.GEN.SG	Kyrillos.M.GEN.SG	with	God.M.DAT.SG
πρε(σβύτερος)	ἀξιωθ(εὶς)	ἔγραψα	
priest.M.NOM.SG	ask.PTC.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG	write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG	

"Marcus son of Kyrillos, with God, (the) priest, having been requested, I have written." (P. Lond. IV 1509.23-24)

5.3.4. Structural comparison of Greek and Coptic SUB formulae

The following comparisons are based on a sample of 526 Greek SUB formulae. Within these attestations, eight distinct forms can be identified.

Form 1: ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ

"I have written on his behalf."

Form 1 appears in 22 attestations within the sample. This variation of the formula is attested from at least the 3rd century CE onwards, with the earliest securely dated attestation appearing in BGU XV 2485, a lease from the Fayum dated to 209 CE. The latest attestation with an absolute date appears in SB I 5286, a lease from Panopolis dated to 607 CE. However, a further two attestations which appear in P.NYU II 42 and SB VI 9631, both of which are Hermopolite tax receipts, are dated broadly to the 7th and 8th centuries. This form of the Greek formula is found in texts from in various sites across Egypt: Antinoopolis, Akhmim, the Fayum, the Hermopolite nome, Kysis, Oxyrhynchus, and Thebes.

Form 2: ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδότος γράμματα

"I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters."

Form 2 of the Greek SUB formula appears in 196 attestations in the sample. Unlike Form 1, it contains a statement of illiteracy, expressed through the active participle of the perfect verb οἶδα "to know". This form of the formula is attested from the 1st century CE, with the earliest securely dated attestation found in P. Oxy. X 1281, a loan from the Oxyrhynchite nome dated to 21 CE. The latest securely dated attestation occurs in BGU XVII 2695, a sales document from Hermopolis dated to 608 CE. However, two attestations may be later – found in P.Lips I 90 dated 599/600 or 614/615 CE, and BGU IV 1020 dated between the 6th and 7th centuries. This form appears in

several sites across Egypt, particularly the Fayum, the Herakleopolite and Hermopolite nomes, and Oxyrhynchus, but also in Antinoopolis, Elephantine, Kellis, and Kysis.

Several variations of the Form 2 formula appear which differ in morphology and vocabulary:

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράμματα μὴ ἐπισταμένου, containing the present middle participle of the verb ἐπίσταμαι "to know", which appears only in BGU IV 1020, a lease written in Hermopolis dated to the 6th to 7th centuries.

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι γράμματα, which contains the active infinitive of οἶδα, written as a concessive clause introduced with the construction διὰ τὸ. This variation appears in seven texts in the sample: BGU II 636 (Karanis, 20 CE), P. Brook 5 and SB XVIII 14025 (both attributed to Upper Egypt and dated 214-217 CE and 42 CE respectively), P. Oxy. LVIII 3915 (Oxyrhynchus, 30 CE), P. Ryl. II 122 (the Hermopolite nome, 127 CE), P. Mert. I 10 (Philadelphia, 21 CE), and P. Michael 10 (unknown provenience, 98 CE).

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ φάσκοντος μὴ εἰδέναι γράμματα *"I have written on his behalf, since he states that he does not know letters"*, which appears in six texts: BGU XI 2048 and P. Flor. I 56 (Hermopolite nome, written 217 and 233/234 respectively), P. Bad. II 28 (Hermopolis, 331 CE), P. Lond. III 1164 (Antinoopolis, 212 CE), P. Sakaon 41 (Theadelphia, 323-324 CE), and P. Vind. Sal. 6 (Herakleopolis, 190 CE).

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ φαμένου μὴ εἰδέναι γράμματα *"I have written on his behalf, since he states that he does not know letters"* which appears only once in Chrest. Mitt. 160 (Herakleia, 142 CE).

Form 3: ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀγραμμάτου (ὄντος)

"I have written on his behalf since he is illiterate."

Form 3 appears in 142 attestations in the sample. It is attested from the 1st to the 7th centuries CE, predominately in the Fayum, Herakliopolis, and Oxyrhynchus, but with several examples also appearing in the Hermopolite nome. However, very few examples have been discovered further south of this point, suggesting it is predominantly a Lower and Middle Egyptian variation of the formula. The earliest securely dated attestation appears in P. Flor I 85, a lease from the Hermopolite nome dated to 91 CE.

Forms 4, 5, and 6 correspond to 1, 2, and 3, but are introduced by a verb of asking. The appearance of a verb of asking within the Greek SUB is attested only five times prior to the 4th century, three of which are partially or totally restored by the editor. Most attestations appear in the 6th century or later.

Form 4: ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ NN ἐρωτηθείς

"Having been asked, I have written on his behalf."

Form 4 is attested five times within the sample: three times in P. Nekr. 10, dated to 244 CE, and once each in P. Nekr. 11 and 17, dated to 247 and 265 CE respectively. All three texts are from the Kharga Oasis. One further variation, ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, appears in two texts: P. Mich. XIII 662 and P. Vat. Aphrod. 2, both from Aphrodito and dated to the 6th century. Furthermore, two similar forms of this formula appear in the Coptic corpus, which employ the participles αἰτηθεὶς or ἀξιωθεὶς which are positioned before the verb of asking:

- αἰτηθεὶς ἔγραψα <ὑπὲρ> NN *"Having been asked, I have written on behalf of NN"* (P.KRU 105 = SUB.16).

- ἀξιωθ(εὶς) ἔγραψα *"Having been asked, I have written"* (P. Lond. IV 1509 = SUB.18).

Form 5: ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράμματα μὴ εἰδότον

"Having been asked, I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters."

Form 5 accounts for 124 attestations of the Greek SUB formula in the sample. This version of the formula, attested from the 4th to 7th centuries, appears primarily in texts from Aphrodito and the Hermopolite nome, but is also found in Aswan, Kellis, Oxyrhynchus, and Thebes. The earliest securely dated attestation of this form occurs in CPR XXIII 30, a guarantee from Hermopolis dated to 340 CE. Within these attestations the following variations occur:

- αἰτηθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράμματα μὴ ἐπισταμένου, containing the present middle participle of the verb ἐπίσταμαι, which accounts for eight attestations: P. Apoll. 58 and P. Mich. XV 728 (both of unknown provenience, dated broadly to the second half the 7th century and the 4th to 5th centuries respectively), P. Herm. 31 (Thebes, 6th C), P. Mich. XI 607 (Antinoopolis, 569 CE), P. Mich. XIV 676 and SB XX 14385 (Oxyrhynchus, 272 and 224 CE respectively), and SB XX 14457 and SB XIV 12132 (Hermopolis, 541-557 CE and the 6th C respectively).

- κελευσθείσης μοι ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράμματα μὴ ἐπισταμένου, using the verb κελεύω "to command", which appears only once in P. Lond. I 77 (Hermonthis, 610 CE).

- ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ παρόντος γράμματα οὐκ εἰδότος, containing the negative particle οὐκ in place of μή, which occurs only once in PSI XIII 1340 (the Oxyrhynchite nome, 420 CE).

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτὴν γράμματα, which occurs only once in P. Paris 17 (Aswan, 153 CE).

Form 6: ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀγραμμάτου (ὄντος)

"Having been asked, I have written on his behalf since he is illiterate."

Form 6 accounts for 28 attestations of the formula in the sample. Similar to its Form 3 equivalent which also contains the phrase ἀγραμμάτου (ὄντος), it appears only in Lower and Middle Egypt, with all attestations appearing in either the Fayum or Oxyrhynchus. Form 6 is attested from at least the 3rd to 7th centuries, with the earliest attestation appearing in SB XIV 16074, a birth notice from Soknopaiu Nesos dated to either 178/179 or 210/211 CE.

Form 7: ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ βραδέως γραφοντα

"I have written on his behalf since he writes slowly."

Form 7 appears only five times in the sample: Chrest. Mitt. 82 and PSI VII 802 from Hermopolis, dated to 117 and 85-86 CE respectively, P. Mich. XX 803 and P. Oxy. III 497 from Oxyrhynchus, dated to 366 and 101-125 CE respectively, and P. Tebt. II 316 from Tebtynis, dated to 99 CE. Two further variations occur;

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ βραδέως αὐτὸν γράφειν, which is found in P. Stras. I 19 from Hermopolis and dated to 105 CE.

- ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἐρωτηθὶς διὰ τὸ βραδέως αὐτὸν γράφειν, containing the Aorist passive participle of the verb ἐρωτάω "to ask", which appears in BGU I 69, written in the Fayum in 120 CE.

The interpretation of the phrase βραδέως γράφων in this context, and its significance to understanding notions of literacy in Late Antique Egypt, has been the subject of some discussion.[28] However, as there is no equivalent of this phrase in the Coptic formulae, it is beyond the scope of the present study to comment on these interpretations.

As the above analysis shows, the Greek SUB formula can be divided into the same three distinct components as their Coptic counterparts: a verbal statement of writing, an optional subordinate clause of illiteracy, and an optional verb of asking. As such, it is possible to see parallels between each component of the formula in Greek and Coptic.

a) Relationship to wider document

Unlike the previous formulae examined in this study, both the Greek and Coptic SUB formulae are incorporated into documents in the same way, without any variation. Both stand as complete independent verbal clauses (with or without the additional subordinate clause of illiteracy), following the witness formula or document body which the scribe in question had written. This is unrelated to any linguistic continuity between the Greek and Coptic, but rather represents continuity in the structuring and composition of Egyptian legal documents in which the SUB formula must stand as an independent statement after the piece of writing to which it pertains.

[28] See in particular Kraus, *'Slow Writers'—Βραδεως Γραφοντες*; Youtie, 'Βραδέως Γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy'.

b) Internal Structures

The Greek and Coptic SUB formulae share several similarities, both lexical and grammatical. The clearest relationship can be observed in the verbal clause of writing, which appears in all formulae in both languages. In the Greek, this clause consists of the verb γράφω "to write" expressed through the Aorist indicative active, the preposition ὑπέρ "for/on behalf of", and the object of the preposition (usually the pronoun αὐτός but occasionally the name of the witnessing party), as demonstrated in (50a). Furthermore, Forms 4-6 of the Greek formula include a verb of asking, usually written as ἀξιωθεὶς "having been asked", as shown in (50b).

(50) *Structure of the Greek SUB formula: clause of writing and asking*

(a) Αὐρήλιος Ἀμώνιος ἔγραψα
Aurelius.M.NOM.SG Amonius.M.NOM.SG write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG

ὑπὲρ αὐ(τοῦ)
for 3.M.GEN.SG

"Aurelius Amonius, I have written on his behalf." (BGU I 349.18-19)

(b) Φλ(αούιος) Ἀμμώνιος…
Flavius.M.NOM.SG Ammônios.M.NOM.SG…

ἀξιωθ(εὶς) ἔγραψα ὑπ(ὲρ)
ask.PTC.AOR.PASS.M.NOM.SG write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG for

αὐτῆς
3.F.GEN.SG

"Flavius Ammônios… having been asked, I have written on her behalf…" (P. Amh. II 141.23-24)

There is a clear lexical and structural relationship between the Coptic statement of writing and its Greek counterpart. As demonstrated in Table 5.7, a one-to-one correspondence can be observed between the elements of the clause in both languages.

Table 5.7: Clauses of asking and writing in Greek and Coptic

	Clause of asking	"I have written"	"for"	3.M.SG
Greek	ἀξιωθεὶς	ἔγραψα	ὑπὲρ	αὐτοῦ
Coptic	(ⲛⲧ)ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣⲱⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ (ⲛⲧ)ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ⸗	=ϥ

There are, however, three key structural and grammatical differences between the Greek and Coptic. The first and most obvious lies in the typological difference between the two languages in terms of prepositions and their objects. The Greek preposition does not inflect, and instead remains separate from the following pronoun, while the Coptic preposition ϩⲁ- inflects to incorporate the pronoun as a bound morpheme into its pre-pronominal state.

The second difference between the Greek and Coptic verbal clause of writing pertains to the expression of the main verb. The Greek Aorist ἔγραψα is translated into Coptic either as a Perfect ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ or as the focalised Perfect ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ. All three grammatical categories in both languages are used to express an action completed in the past. However, the focalised Perfect possesses the added nuance of focalising an element of the sentence, in this case either the final subordinate clause of illiteracy or, in its absence, the adverbial phrase ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ "on his behalf". This pattern of emphasis has no equivalent in the Greek. Rather, it appears to be a reinterpretation of the underlying Greek formula based on the similarities in tense and aspect between the Coptic focalised Perfect and the Greek Aorist. Consequently, while the overall meaning of the Greek and Coptic clauses has been replicated, the focus point of the clauses is not. This is discussed in greater detail in 6.3.2.

The final difference lies in the expression of the verb of asking. Similar to the verb of writing, the Aorist verb of asking in Greek is translated into Coptic using either the Perfect or the focalised Perfect. Furthermore, while the Greek verb of asking is expressed as a passive, the Coptic is usually active but can also be passive (see 5.3.3 and 6.3.2). Similarly, while the Greek verb of asking appears as a participle, and is therefore non-finite, the Coptic verb of asking is finite and forms an independent clause. As such, the Coptic formula in these cases can be seen as a replication of the general meaning of its Greek counterpart, but not the grammatical or structural patterns.

A similar relationship between the Greek and Coptic SUB formulae can be observed within the subordinate clause of illiteracy. This clause is expressed in three different ways within the Greek sample: either through a participle of a verb of knowing, as shown in (51a); through a participle of a verb of saying with an infinitive of a verb of knowing, shown in (53b); or through an AcI (*accusativus cum infinitivo*) construction with a verb of knowing, introduced by διὰ τό, as shown in (51c).

(51) *Subordinate clause of illiteracy in the Greek SUB formula.*

(a) Αὐρήλιος Θέων Ἁρπάλου
Aurelius.M.NOM.SG Theon.M.NOM.SG Harpalos.M.GEN.SG

ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ
write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG for 3.M.GEN.SG NEG

ἰδότος γράμματα
know.PTC.PERF.ACT.M.GEN.SG letter.N.ACC.PL

"Aurelius Theon, son of Harpalos, I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters."

(P. Oxy. IX 1201.9-10)

(b) Ἄλκιμος… ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ
Alkimos.M.NOM.SG… write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG for 3.M.GEN.

φαμένου μὴ εἰδέναι γράμματα
say.PTC.PRS.MID.M.GEN.SG NEG know.INF.PERF.ACT letter.N.ACC.PL

"Alkimos… I have written on his behalf since he states that he does not know letters." (Chrest. Mitt. 160.30-32)

(c) Ὡρίων Ἱέρακος ἔγραψα
Horion.M.NOM.SG Hierax.M.GEN.SG write.AOR.IND.ACT.1.SG

ὑπ(ὲρ) αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ
for 3.M.GEN.SG through DEF.N.ACC.SG

μὴ εἰδέναι αὐτὸν γράμμα̣τα̣
NEG know.INF.PERF.ACT 3.M.ACC.SG letter.N.ACC.PL

"Horion son of Hierax, I have written on his behalf since he does not know letters." (P. Michael 10.9-10)

Of these three constructions, the use of the verb of saying in (51b) has no Coptic equivalent. The constructions in (51a) and (51c), however, are similar in content to their Coptic counterparts. Table 5.8 presents a comparison of the Greek and Coptic clauses of illiteracy, dividing them into three principle elements: the marker of causal subordination; the main verb of knowing; and the direct object "letters".

Table 5.8: Subordinate clause of illiteracy in Greek and Coptic

	Causal clause marker	"they do not know"	"letters"
Greek	ø	μὴ εἰδότος/ἐπισταμένου	γράμματα
	διὰ τὸ	μὴ εἰδέναι	
Coptic	ϫⲉ	ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ	ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ
		(ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	

Table 5.8 highlights several important points of contrast between the grammar and structure of the Greek and Coptic clauses. Most obvious are the typological differences between the two languages in terms of the marking of verbal arguments (case inflections for Greek, and word order/bound morphemes in Coptic). Furthermore, of the four constructions, μὴ εἰδότος/ἐπισταμένου lacks overt marking of a causal relationship which is instead ambiguously coded within the participle. However, the remaining constructions overtly mark this causal relationship, through διὰ τό in Greek and ϫⲉ in Coptic. Finally, while both constructions in Greek contain non-finite verb forms, the Coptic constructions consist of finite verbal clauses.

There are also clear differences in the aspect expressed by the Greek and Coptic verb forms. In the Greek clause, the Perfect participle εἰδότος and Perfect infinitive εἰδέναι express either a state or ongoing action, while the Present participle ἐπισταμένου expresses either ongoing or habitual action.[29] On the other hand, the Coptic constructions ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ and ⲛϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ unambiguously express habitual and imperfective aspect respectively. Since the continuous/habitual distinction is not clear in the Greek clauses, the alternation between the Present and Habitual in Coptic can be seen as an attempt by scribes writing in Coptic to navigate this ambiguity. Consequently, as has been seen elsewhere in this study, the Coptic formula draws upon features of the Egyptian language to explicitly express grammatical features which are ambiguous in their Greek counterparts (see 5.2.4).

[29] On the difficulties of determining aspect in the Greek Perfect after the Hellenistic period, see Pang, *Revisiting Aspect and Aktionsart*, 51–52; Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, 245ff; Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative*, 161ff; Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*, 119–20.

One further important distinction between the Greek and Coptic clauses of illiteracy can be seen in the frequent omission of the object ϩⲁⲓ "letters" in Coptic. As stated previously, ϩⲁⲓ is omitted in 49 of the 95 attestations of the Coptic formula in which a subordinate clause of illiteracy appears. In the cases in which ϩⲁⲓ is omitted, the verb of knowing (either ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ or ⲛⲟⲓ) carries the meaning "to be able to". As such, the Coptic clause of illiteracy can be divided into two types: ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ "to know letters" which replicates the Greek phrase οἶδα γράμματα, and ⲛⲟⲓ "to be able to" which uses the same vocabulary but subtly changes the meaning of the clause. This appears to be a synchronic innovation within the Coptic tradition, developing from existing forms of the Coptic SUB formula rather than modelled on contemporary Greek counterparts.

The above discussion reveals a clear link between Greek μὴ εἰδότος γράμματα and Coptic ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ/ϫⲉ(ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ. However, as the variations of the Coptic SUB formula discussed in 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 show, there is no Coptic equivalent of the Greek phrase ἀγραμμάτου (ὄντος) "because he is illiterate". The word ἀγράμματος was not borrowed into Coptic: either in translational/non-translational literature, or in legal/administrative documents.[30] However, the absence of a corresponding expression in the Coptic SUB formula can be readily explained through a comparison of the Greek and Coptic of Acts 4:13. The Greek text, shown in (52a), represents the only attestation of the word ἀγράμματος in the Greek New Testament.[31] The Coptic, rather than borrowing or translating the Greek word, expresses this using the phrase ⲛⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛϩⲁⲓ "they do not know letters", as shown in (52b).

[30] The word is unattested either in Förster's *WB*, or in the digital database of the DDGLC project as of my last search in July 2018.

[31] Kraus, '"Uneducated", "Ignorant", or Even "Illiterate"?', 345.

(52) *Greek and Coptic versions of Acts 4:13*

(a)	ἄνθρωποι	ἀγράμματοί	εἰσιν	καὶ
	man.M.NOM.PL	unlettered.M.NOM.PL	be.PRS.IND.ACT.3.PL	and
	ἰδιῶται			
	uneducated.M.NOM.PL			

"…they are unlettered and uneducated men."

(b)	ϩⲉⲛ-ⲣⲱⲙⲉ	ⲛⲉ	ⲛ-Ø-ϩⲏⲇⲓⲱⲧⲏⲥ	ⲛ=ⲥⲉ-ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
	INDF.PL-man	COP.PL	ATTR-Z.ART-uneducated	NEG=3.PL-know.INF
	ⲁⲛ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲥϩⲁⲓ		
	NEG	DIR.OBJ-Z.ART-letter		

"…they are uneducated men, and they do not know letters."

Although this translation uses the verb ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ rather than ⲛⲟⲓ, the variations within the Coptic SUB in which ⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ is employed show that to some extent the two were interchangeable. Consequently, the two variations of the clause of illiteracy in Greek – ἀγραμμάτου (ὄντος) and μὴ εἰδότος γράμματα – have both been translated into Coptic as ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ/(ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ.

5.3.5. Conclusion

As with the SCR and KYR formula, there is a high degree of continuity between the Greek and Coptic SUB formulae in terms of their content and vocabulary. However, while the formulae in both languages can be divided into the same constituent elements, the structural and grammatical similarities are minimal. Most notably, disparities in the structures of the Greek and Coptic formulae arise as a result of the typological differences between the two languages, particularly

relating to morphology. Furthermore, the Coptic SUB formulae contain some nuanced differences to their Greek counterparts, expressed through the introduction of focalisation in the variation between ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ and ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ, the overt marking of habitual/continuous aspect in the variation between ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ and (ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ, and the distinction between ⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ "to know letters" and ⲛⲟⲓ "to be able to". Nevertheless, the close similarities between the Greek and Coptic formulae suggests that the Coptic was directly replicated from its Greek counterparts, while showing evidence of internal synchronic change.

5.4. Conclusion

As the above discussions show, there is a large amount of legal continuity between the formulae examined in this chapter. The legal stipulations expressed in these Coptic formulae are broadly similar to those expressed in their Greek counterparts, remaining more or less consistent from the Roman period, and in some cases earlier. Similarly, there is a clear sense of linguistic continuity between the Greek and Coptic formulae. Replication of the elements of the Greek formulae into Coptic appears more frequently than in those formulae discussed in Chapter 4. The SCR formula in particular is structured in such a way that it may represent a possible case of Greek interference, discussed in more depth in 6.4.2. Similarly, there is a high level of both lexical and grammatical similarity between the Greek and Coptic SUB formulae. Only the relationship between the Greek and Coptic KYR formulae is less pronounced, in which the lexical relationship between them is clear while the grammatical structures are for the most part unrelated.

Nevertheless, features of the Coptic formulae show a certain level of reinterpretation of their Greek counterparts. Nuanced grammatical differences, such as the introduction of explicit focalising structures in the Coptic SUB formula, are indicative of synchronic changes within

Coptic scribal practices. Such differences require further discussion. As such, the linguistic relationship between the Greek and Coptic formulae is complex, dependent on which element of the formula has been replicated or reinterpreted and differs across the many variations of the Coptic formulae identified in the typologies presented in this and the previous chapter. These various linguistic relationships, possible factors behind their appearance, and the significance of these relationships for understanding the development of legal formulae within Late Byzantine and Early Islamic scribal communities, is synthesised and discussed in Chapter 6.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

The comparative study of Greek and Coptic legal formulae presented in the previous two chapters have demonstrated the complexities of their linguistic relationship. While some Coptic formulae are clearly modelled on their Greek counterparts, others appear to reinterpret the underlying Greek structures, or contain new elements which represent innovations within scribal communities. Furthermore, the data from this study has revealed that there is still much that is obscure about the origins and development of legal formulae, resulting from the incomplete picture of documents in antiquity which the current papyrological records present. This is particularly relevant in the case of the HYP and AOW formulae, which will be discussed in depth in 6.1.1 and 6.3.3.

This chapter presents a synthesis, summary, and discussion of the results of the data presented in Chapters 4 and 5. In particular, it will address the research questions posited in 1.1:

4. To what extent do Coptic legal formulae reflect the content and language of their Greek counterparts?
5. Do Coptic legal formulae exhibit any signs of contact-induced language change as a result of underlying Greek patterns?
6. What do these results reveal about the development of Coptic legal formulae within scribal contexts in Late Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt?

Within the chapter, a method is proposed for categorising the linguistic relationship between Greek and Coptic formula in a way which may be applied to future studies. Furthermore, although for the most part the data does not exhibit any signs of contact-induced grammatical change, several features mentioned in the previous two chapters will be discussed in depth which may represent cases of Greek interference in the language of Coptic legal documents (see 6.4).

6.1. General observations: distributions of the formulae in the study

6.1.1. Regional distributions

As discussed elsewhere in this study, the geographical distribution of Coptic documents in the published papyrological records is uneven, showing strong biases towards certain regions over others. These biases are clearly reflected in data for this study, as in Table 6.1 which presents an overview of the formulae examined and the number of attestations by region.

Table 6.1: Geographic distribution of Coptic formulae in the study

	Fayum	Aphrodito	Hermopolite Nome	Thebes	Elephantine and Aswan
HYP	-	-	-	33	-
AOW	-	-	-	20	-
FRW	-	1	-	36	-
OTH	-	5	11	40	-
SCR	-	5	22	73	-
KYR	-	2	-	66	-
SUB	-	6	13	120	1
Total:	0	19	46	288	1

Several trends exhibited by this geographical distribution need further discussion. To begin, there is an overrepresentation of attestations within Theban material. This is unsurprising, given the bias towards 7th and 8th century Theban documents in the corpus (see 1.3.1). However, in the case of the HYP and AOW formulae, no attestations occur in any other region in the corpus, nor are there traces of these formulae in fragmentary or highly damaged non-Theban texts omitted from the corpus. As such, the data available suggests that these formulae are unique to Thebes.

In general, attestations of the formulae studied are comparatively low in non-Theban texts within the corpus. However, the regions of Elephantine/Aswan and the Fayum are particularly underrepresented. None of the formulae studied appear within the Fayumic texts in the corpus, although traces of the OTH formula are attested in at least fragmentary texts from this region (CPR IV 125 and 205, see 4.4.3). Similarly, in Aswan only one SUB formula is attested in (SB Kopt. III 1395), while traces of the KYR formula are found in one other fragmentary text from the region (P. Lond. Copt. I 447). None of the legal formulae examined in this study appear in texts from Elephantine.

In the case of the Fayum, the scarcity of attestations is most likely a result of the nature of the survival and transmission of papyri from this region. As noted in 1.3.1, almost no Coptic documentary material appears in the Fayum before the mid-8th century, therefore Fayumic texts only begin to appear towards the end of the date range selected for this study.[1] Furthermore, many of the published texts from the Fayum from this period are highly fragmentary, such as

[1] Boud'hors, 'Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts', 433.

those presented in CPR II and IV (the latter of which republishes many from CPR II). As such, the surviving data for Early Islamic Fayumic documents is insufficient for the purposes of observing the legal formula selected for the study.

A similar issue arises in the case of texts from Elephantine and Aswan. As discussed in 1.3.1, very few Coptic texts belong to the Pathermouthis archive of Aswan, and the few that are attested are highly fragmented.[2] Outside of this archive, very few other Coptic texts originate from this region. For documents of private law, these consist of 15 short ostraca which do not have the space for the longer, more stylistic formulae of the papyri.[3] Furthermore, 14 of these ostraca consist of debt instruments which are all similar in content and which contain their own set of genre-specific formulae. As such, both the material and the genre of the texts from this region limit the types of formulae which are attested.

As the above discussion shows, the uneven geographical distribution of the formulae studied in the corpus is influenced by several factors. Most important is the nature of the survival of papyri from antiquity. The high number of documents attested in Thebes compared to the low number of texts from Elephantine and Aswan is the result of change transmission of papyri

[2] On the Coptic texts of the Patermouthis archive, see Clackson, 'Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri', 99; Clackson, 'Papyrology and the Utilization of Coptic Sources', 28–29; Clackson, 'Four Coptic Papyri from the Patermouthis Archive in the British Library'. On Coptic ostraca from Elephantine, see Richer 'O.Louvre AF 12678: Ein koptischer Mietvertrag zwischen Muslimen'; Bacot and Heurtel, 'Ostraca coptes d'Élephantine au musée du Louvre'; Markiewicz, 'Three Coptic Ostraca from Warsaw Private Collections'; Worp, 'Das Berliner Ostrakon P. 14735: Koptisch oder Griechisch?'; Hintze, 'Berliner kopitsche Ostraka aus Elephantine'; Engelbach, 'A Coptic Ostrakon mentioning Ièb (Elephantine)'.

[3] On these ostraca, see Porten, *The Elephantine Papyri in English*, 570–72; texts E4-E17, E19.

into modernity. Similarly, the state in which these papyri survive is a key factor in determining the usefulness of the data they provide, with the highly fragmentary nature of Fayumic papyri contributing to the low number of attestations of the formulae in this region. Finally, genre, which did not play a key role in discussions within the present study, contributes to the low number of attestations of relevant formulae in the Elephantine texts. In order to fully utilise the range of Coptic sources from different regions of Egypt, it will therefore be necessary to extend the parameters of future studies to examine more genre-specific formulae, as well as drawing on unpublished material which may contribute to the body of documentary texts from non-Theban regions.

6.1.2: Diachronic distributions

In order to understand the extent to which Coptic formulae are modelled on their Greek counterparts, consideration must be given to the diachronic distribution of these formulae. In doing so, it is necessary to identify the earliest Coptic and latest Greek attestations of each formula in the study, and the number of years between them. These figures, outlined in Chapters 4 and 5, are summarised in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2: Diachronic points of contact for the Greek and Coptic formulae

Formula	Latest Greek	Earliest Coptic	Difference (years)
HYP	618 *(SB I 5112, Apollonopolis)*	698 *(P. CLT 1, Thebes)*	+80
AOW	n/a	724 *(P.KRU 36, Thebes)*	n/a
FRW	647 *(SB VI 8988, Apollonopolis)*	647/648 *(SB Kopt. III 1369, Aphrodito)*	+0/1

OTH	683 *(P. Grenf. II 100, Krokodilopolis)*	596 *(CPR IV 90, Hermopolite nome)*	-87
SCR	614/615 *(P. Lips. I 90, Hermopolis)*	580–590 *(P. Lond. inv. 2849, Aphrodito)*	-35 to -24
KYR	633 *(P. Lond. III 1012, Hermopolis)*	580–590 *(P. Lond. inv. 2849, Aphrodito)*	-53 to -43
SUB	640-650 (SB XVI 12717, Herakleopolite nome)	596 *(CPR IV 90, Hermopolite nome)*	-54 to -44

As Table 6.2 demonstrates, aside from the AOW formula, which is not attested in Greek, only the Coptic HYP formula has no direct synchronic points of comparison with its Greek counterparts. As discussed in 4.1.4, this makes it difficult to identify the origin and the development of the Coptic formula, as well as its linguistic relationship to Greek. This issue is addressed in depth in 6.2.1 below. In the case of the FRW formula, the latest Greek and earliest Coptic attestations are almost contemporary, and there are close relationships between the Coptic formula and its Greek counterparts, discussed below in 6.2.2. For the remainder of the formulae, there is a significant diachronic overlap between the Greek and Coptic attestations.

It is important to note that the attestations provided in Table 6.2 represent texts with dates secure to a particular decade. However, within the data there are a number of attestations which are dated more broadly, sometimes across several centuries, which may extend the lifespan of these formulae. For example, in the Coptic AOW formula, two attestations appear in texts which may be written earlier than P.KRU 36 (P.KRU 18 dated 700–750, and P. CLT 7 dated 700–775) and, as such, the formula may have arisen at the beginning of the 8th century (see 6.3.3). However, while speculations can be made about these texts and what they may reveal about the origins of Coptic legal formulae, these cannot be used to provide any substantial evidence as to the synchronic distribution of these formulae.

6.2. The development of Coptic legal formulae

Before presenting a synthesis and discussion of the linguistic relationships between Coptic legal formulae and their Greek counterparts observed within the data, it is first necessary to discuss how these Coptic formulae may have arisen. As mentioned in 6.1.2, understanding the development of these formulae depends on whether or not there was direct comparative material in Greek upon which the formulae may have been modelled. The various ways in which Coptic legal formulae may have developed can be discussed with reference to two exemplary case studies: the HYP formula, for which no direct Greek comparative material has survived, and the FRW formula, which has direct points of comparison both synchronically and geographically.

6.2.1. The Coptic HYP formula and its relationship to Greek

The origins and development of the Coptic HYP formula, as well as the related AOW formula, are the most difficult to observe of those formulae studied. As shown in Table 6.2 above, the earliest attestation of the Coptic HYP formula with an absolute date occurs in P. CLT 1, written by Psate son of Pisrael in 698 CE. Similarly, the earliest example of the Coptic AOW formula is found in P.KRU 36, dated to June 4 724 and also written by Psate son of Pisrael. On the other hand, the latest attestation of the Greek HYP formula appears in SB I 5112, written in Apollonopolis and dated to 618 CE, while no Greek parallels for the AOW formula are attested.

As these dates show, there is an 80-year period in which evidence for the formulae in either language is absent from surviving papyrological records. Consequently, it is necessary to establish a model for the development of the Coptic HYP and AOW formulae, and their relationship to earlier Greek documents. The AOW formula, as discussed in 4.2.4, may be an innovation derived from the Coptic HYP formula. However, this is a complex question which

is discussed in more depth below (6.3.2), and therefore this formula will be left aside for the present discussion. This leaves the matter of the development of the Coptic HYP formula and its relationship to its earlier Greek counterparts.

The most likely explanation for the absence of the HYP formula during the 7th century is that it simply has not been preserved. Since Coptic papyri from this period are scarce, it is likely that earlier forms of the Coptic HYP formula existed which more closely resemble their Greek counterparts. This theory is supported by some of the linguistic relationships between the Greek and Coptic forms of the formula presented in 4.1.5. As these discussions showed, there is a certain level of linguistic continuity between them, such as the use of nominalised non-finite verb forms to express the action of scribing and witnessing, seen in the NP pairs shown in (1).

(1) *Nominalised verbs in the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae*

(a) τὸν ὑπογράφοντα - *"the one who scribes"* → ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ - *"the one who will scribe"*

(b) τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας - *"the ones who witness"* → ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ - *"these ones who will witness"*

Nevertheless, there is a certain amount of disconnect between Greek and Coptic formula in terms of their linguistic features. For example, in the NP pairs shown in (1) there is a shift in aspect from the Greek Present participle (ongoing action) to the Coptic relative Future (future action) (see 6.3.2). Furthermore, a major difference can be observed between the opening verb forms of the Greek and Coptic formulae. While the Greek formula consists of a participial clause, dependent on their surrounding context, the Coptic formula generally opens with the finite Performative and thus forms an independent clause.

However, as noted in 4.1.3, two attestations of the Coptic HYP formula in the corpus open with the form ϵϥϯ: P.KRU 74 (HYP.5) and P.KRU 36 (HYP.6). Since these possess a 3rd person subject, they cannot be Performatives and must therefore be circumstantial Presents. These two formulae are similar to their Greek counterparts in that they appear as dependent clauses headed by non-finite verbs which are dependent on their surrounding contexts. A comparison the Coptic structures in these texts with their Greek counterparts is presented in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: (= Table 4.2): Opening of the Coptic HYP.6 and Greek formulae

	SUBJECT	**HYP formula**	
		APPOINTING	*HYPOGRAPHEUS*
Greek (P. Lond. V 1714)	Ἀὐρη[λ]ί[ο]υ Πεκυσίου… *Aurelius Pekusius...*	παρέχοντος δὲ *appointing*	ὑπογραφέα… *a* hypographeus
Coptic (P.KRU 74)	ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲥⲧⲉⲫⲁⲛⲟⲥ *We, Stephanos…*	ⲉⲩϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ *appointing hereafter*	ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ *the* hypographeus…

Based on these similarities, and the early dates of these texts (724 CE for P.KRU 36 and 733/748 for P.KRU 74) it is possible that these formulae are indicative of an earlier form of the HYP formula which was closer in structure to their Greek counterparts but is absent from surviving papyrological records. The use of the Performative in 8th century Theban formulae may be influenced by the fact that its orthography is identical to the circumstantial Present, leading to a reanalysis of the finiteness of the opening verb form and the development of the HYP formula as an independent clause. As such, the following pattern of development may be posited:

παρέχοντος → ϵϥτι/ϵιτι → ϵιτι

Greek PRS.PTC → Coptic CIRC.PRS → Coptic PERF

NON-FINITE → NON-FINITE → FINITE

In view of this model, other grammatical distinctions between the Greek and Coptic HYP formulae, such as the shift in aspect in the NP pairs shown in (1), may represent diachronic developments from an earlier form of the Coptic HYP formula during the 7th century. However, in the absence of 7th century data, this is mere speculation. Nevertheless, although no direct points of comparison between Greek and Coptic HYP formula exist in the papyrological evidence, the similarities between early Theban forms of the Coptic formula are indicative of a certain degree of continuity between the two.

6.2.2. Aphrodito and the development of the Coptic FRW formula

Unlike the Coptic HYP formula, for which no direct points of comparison existed in the Greek, the evidence for the FRW formula provides a clearer picture of the development of Coptic legal formulae. This is facilitated by the existence of Greek and Coptic formulae written by the same scribe, Apa Rasios, appearing in Aphrodito in the mid-7th century. Two FRW formulae can be attributed to him: one in Coptic, contained in SB Kopt. III 1369 written in 647/648 CE, and one in Greek, appearing in P. Mich. XIII 662 written in 645 CE.[4] These formulae are shown in (2a) and (2b) respectively.

[4] Dated by Bagnall and Worp, 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito', 252.

(2) *Greek and Coptic FRW formulae from Aphrodito*

(a) ⲁ=ⲛ-ⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ-ⲡ-ϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲱⲧ
PERF=1.SG-execute.INF DIR.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-copy ATTR-Z.ART-single

ϩⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛ-ⲡ=ⲛ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ
through-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-volition with-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-agreement

ⲙⲛ-ⲧ=ⲛ-ⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲙⲓⲛⲙⲙⲱ=ⲛ ⲁϫⲛ-ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
with-POSS.ART.F.SG=1.PL-choice INTS.PRN=1.PL without-INDF.PRN

ⲛ-Ø-ⲃⲓⲁ ϩⲓ-Ø-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…
ATTR-Z.ART-force or-Z.ART-deceit…

"We have executed the single copy of our own volition and agreement and choice, without any force or deceit…" (SB Kopt. III 1369.100-101)

(b) ἥνπερ ἁπλῆν γραφῖσαν
REL.PRN.F.ACC.SG single_copy.F.ACC.SG write.PTC.AOR.PASS.F.ACC.SG

ἑκοντες καὶ πεπεισμένος
willing.M.NOM.PL and persuade.PTC.PERF.MID.M.NOM.PL

ἐθέμην σοι ἄνευ βίας
execute.AOR.IND.MID.1.SG 2.DAT.SG without force.FEM.GEN.SG

καὶ ἀπάτης…
and deceit.F.GEN.SG…

"...which, written in a single copy, I have executed for you willingly and convinced without force and deceit…" (P. Mich. XIII 662.52-53)

As discussed in 4.3.4, there are several striking similarities between these two formulae. Both open with a verb of execution which expresses a past completed action: the Perfect ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ in Coptic and the Aorist ἐθέμην in Greek. Both formulae state that the document has been drawn up in a single copy (ⲡϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ/ἁπλῆν). In the FRW core, SB Kopt. III 1369 uses

the borrowed Greek word ϫⲓⲁ “force”, reflecting its use in P. Mich. XIII 662, where the later Theban formulae use the Egyptian compound noun ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛϩ.[5] This form of the Greek formula, designated as Form 3 in 4.3.4, is also found in other texts from Aphrodito within the archive of Phoibammon son of Triadelphos. As such, this is indicative of a single regional variation of the FRW formula, in which the Coptic formula is directly modelled on contemporary Greek counterparts.

While the examples from Aphrodito show a clear connection between the Greek and Coptic FRW formula, less clear is the origin of the later 8th century Theban attestations of the formula. As discussed in 4.3.3, the opening form of the formula in SB Kopt. III 1369, ⲁⲛϩⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ… ϩⲛⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ, differs greatly to the Performative phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ found in its Theban counterparts. However, a connection may be made between the two by drawing upon comparative fragmentary texts from the Basilios archive. Within this archive, an early 8th century form of the FRW formula specific to Aphrodito can be observed in which the opening of the FRW formula expresses ⲟⲩⲱϣ both as a verb, written in the Present (ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ), and as a noun in the phrase ϩⲙⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲡⲓⲑⲉ. As shown in (3), traces of these formula appear in two texts from the archive: P. Lond. IV 1576 and 1584, declarations to the ⲇⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ relating to tax dated to 707 and 708 CE respectively.

(3)	ⲧⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	[ⲧⲓ-ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ	ⲛ-ⲧⲉ=ⲧⲛ-ⲙⲛⲧ-ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ
	1.SG-wish.INF	[1.SG-establish.INF	IND.OBJ-POSS.ART.F.SG=2.PL-ABST-lord

[5] The use of ϫⲓⲁ has also been observed in Fayumic documents: see Boud’hors, ‘Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts’, 427.

ⲛ-ⲧⲓ-ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅ]ⲉⲓⲁ ϩⲛ-ⲡⲁ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ
DIR.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-agreem]ent through-POSS.ART.M.SG_1.SG-volition

ⲙⲛ-ⲡⲁ-ⲡⲓⲑⲉ…
with-POSS.ART.M.SG=1.PL-agreement…

"I wish [and I execute for your lordship this agreem]ent through my volition and agreement…" (P. Lond. IV 1584.7-8)

While the restoration in (3) provided in the *editio princeps* cannot be used as reliable evidence, nonetheless the presence of both ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ and ϩⲛⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ are clear. Since these two attestations contain the PP of the earlier Aphrodito FRW formula, but also contain the opening verb ⲟⲩⲱϣ as in the Theban formulae, it is possible that they represent an intermediary form. Furthermore, since the Performative is a function of the focalised Present, the verb form ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ in the Theban FRW is related to the unfocalized Present ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ of the formulae from the Basilios archive in terms of tense and aspect.

This line of development is supported by evidence which points to the possibility of a broad scribal network to which both Aphrodito and Thebes belonged. Connections between the scribes of Aphrodito and Thebes have been noted previously by Cromwell, who observes similarities in the handwriting of Theodore, the writer of a number of early 8th century administrative documents found in the Basilios archive in Aphrodito, and Aristophanes son of

Johannes writing in Djême in around the same time.[6] She suggests that they were part of the same scribal school, although noting differences in their orthography and formulae.[7] As such, the possibility of a shared history between Aphrodito and Thebes in terms of the development of the FRW formula is possible.

However, exactly what pressures, if any, lead the Present ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ and the phrase ϩⲛⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛⲡⲁⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ to shift to the Performative phrase ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ in Thebes is unclear. In the case of the PP, it is possible that it was omitted due to the redundancy in having both ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ and ϩⲛⲡⲁⲟⲩⲱϣ in the same sentence. While there are numerous examples of tautological expressions in Coptic legal texts, these usually involve the use of synonyms, rather than the repetition of the same word root.[8] In the case of the shift from ϯⲟⲩⲱϣ to ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ, it is possible that, since the Performative is a feature particular to documentary texts from Thebes, this phrase was chosen as a distinctly Theban way of rendering the opening of the formula. As such, its development could be a result of regional stylistic pressures.

6.2.3. The development of Coptic legal formulae: summary

As the discussion in the above sections show, connections can be made between Greek and Coptic legal formulae despite the incomplete data with which papyrologists are presented. The two formulae examined represent opposite ends of the spectrum. On one hand is the HYP formula in which there is a gap of 80 years in the papyrological evidence between Greek and

[6] Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 173–74.

[7] Cromwell, *Recording Village Life*, 173–74.

[8] On tautology in Coptic legal formulae, see Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 106ff.

Coptic attestations; on the other is the FRW formula, in which Greek and Coptic examples exist written by the same scribe. Nevertheless, in both cases connections can be posited based on linguistic similarities and models regarding the development of variations within 8th century scribal schools. The linguistic relationships identified in the study, and the motivations behind them, are discussed in the following sections.

6.3. Linguistic continuity in Greek and Coptic formulae

The data presented in Chapters 4 and 5 show that there is a large amount of linguistic continuity between the Greek and Coptic legal formulae examined. However, as evident from the discussions in 6.2, the number of similarities is dependent on the formula in question. Furthermore, the type of relationships observed between Greek and Coptic are not the same across all formulaic elements.

The linguistic relationships between Greek and Coptic presented in the data can be divided into three categories:

- **Replication:** the close copying of the content, vocabulary, and grammatical structures of particular phrases or clauses in the Greek formulae (see also 2.1.1).

- **Reinterpretation:** a similar process to replication, in which there is a close copying of elements of the underlying Greek formula, but in which the Coptic contains nuanced grammatical variations which imply a reanalysis of the Greek structures.

- **Innovation:** phrases and structures within the formulae which are unique to Coptic, but still contribute to expressing the same overall legal function as the underlying Greek formula.

These three categories fall broadly into the categories that Richter identified as leading to the development of language use in Coptic legal texts: synchronic Greek influences (replication and reinterpretation), and innovation by Coptic notaries (innovation).[9] Similar relationships have also been found by Garel and Nowak in their study of the relationship between 8th century Coptic monastic wills and their Late Roman counterparts.[10] In the following sections, the main findings observed in the data will be summarised and discussed according to these three categories.

6.3.1. Replication

Within the study, many examples of the process of replication from Greek to Coptic can be observed. These are as follows:

a) The HYP formula: the circumstantial Present

As discussed in 6.2.1 above, one instance of replication may be seen in the Coptic HYP formula in terms of the opening verbs found in P.KRU 74 (HYP.5) and P.KRU 36 (HYP.6). In these two texts, the HYP formula opens with a circumstantial Present, which is similar to the participles in their Greek counterparts in that both are non-finite verb forms, and both express ongoing aspect (see Table 6.3. above). As such, both the Greek formulae and the HYP.5/6

[9] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 37.

[10] Garel and Nowak, 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?', 122ff; 127–28.

formulae follow the pattern SUBJECT (first party) + NON-FINITE VERB (appointing) + OBJECT (*hypographeus*). This can be classed as an example of replication, although the point of contact between the Greek and Coptic formulae is not present in the papyrological evidence.[11]

b) FRW formula: core

Within the FRW formula, the clearest case of replication occurs in the core, usually consisting of a PP introduced by a subtractive connector modifying a series of coordinated nouns. The Coptic FRW formula core is more or less identical in content and structure to its Greek counterpart, as shown in Table 6.4. The main differences are typological, lying in the connection of the indefinite element to the following noun, which is marked by gender and case agreement in Greek but which requires the attributive marker ⲛ- in Coptic, as well as the flexible word order of Greek in which the position of the prepositions χωρὶς/ἄνευ/δίχα/ἐκτὸς and the indefinite elements παντός/τινός in the Greek formula may vary.

Table 6.4 (= Table 4.6): Correspondence of elements in the Greek and Coptic FRW 'core'

	Guile	*Fear*	*Force*	*Deceit*	*Force*	*Treachery*	*Falsehood*
Greek: P.Cair. Masp. II 67159	δόλου	φόβου	βίας	ἀπάτης	ἀνάγκης	συναρπαγῆς	περιγραφῆς
Coptic: P.KRU.7	ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲟⲧⲉ	ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ	ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ	(-)	ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣⲡⲁⲕⲏ	ⲡⲉⲣⲓⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ

[11] See the discussion of the development of the Coptic HYP formula and its relationship to Greek presented in 6.2.1.

In the case of the FRW formula core, the category of replication applies only to those Coptic formulae in which the core is headed by the prepositions ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ or ⲁϫⲛ-. Several different variations of the core occur which represent internal Coptic developments upon these more common structures, discussed in 6.3.3.

c) FRW formula: discursive structures

More broadly within the FRW formula is the seeming replication of discursive structures from Greek to Coptic. Within 29 of the 38 attestations of the Coptic FRW in the corpus, the flow of discourse is structured through the use of two linguistic markers: the subtractive connector (usual ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ) and the adversative conjunction ⲁⲗⲗⲁ. The formulae adhere to the following pattern:

VERB → ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ (statement x) → ⲁⲗⲗⲁ (statement y)

VERB → "without x" → "but rather y"

This pattern appears to have been replicated from Greek. The conjunction ἀλλά appears in five Greek texts within the sample: P. Münch. I 9, 12, and 13, and P. Lond. V 1733 (which represent four of the nine attestations of the Greek FRW formula found in texts from Aswan), and P. Lond. I 77, written in Hermonthis. In these five attestations, the FRW formula follows the same discursive pattern as their later Coptic counterparts.

This analysis, however, is more tentative than the case of the FRW formula core. As discussed in 4.3.4, the use of ⲁⲗⲗⲁ/ἀλλά in the formula is limited to Thebes in Coptic, and Thebes and Aswan in Greek. Since the earliest attestation of the Coptic FRW formula in Thebes appears

in 698 CE (P. CLT 1) while the latest Greek attestation using ἀλλά appears in Hermonthis in 610 (P. Lond. I 77), there are no direct points of comparison between the two. As such, it is unclear how the pattern ϫωρις… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ entered the Theban Coptic FRW formula, and the matter requires further investigation.

d) OTH formula: main verbal clause

In the OTH formula, similarities can be seen in terms of structure and content between Greek and Coptic within the main verbal clause of swearing. Since this element of the formula consists of a simple verbal clause, its structure is relatively straightforward, consisting of the pattern "swear" + OBJECT, and consequently these similarities are unsurprising.

However, a more pronounced example of replication in the Coptic OTH formula can be seen in the case of five attestations in which the verb of swearing, written as a circumstantial Present, follows the verb ϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ (ὁμολογῶ). In these attestations, appearing in P.KRU 3, 10, and 50, and P.CLT 1 and 6, the formula follows the structure "acknowledge" (PRS) + "swear" (NON-FINITE) + OBJECT. As demonstrated in Table 6.5, the semantic structure and grammatical features of these formulae have been replicated from similar forms of the Greek OTH formula.

Table 6.5 (= Table 4.10): Greek and Coptic OTH formulae with non-finite verbal clause

	"Acknowledge" (PRESENT)	OTH formula	
		'Swear' (NON-FINITE)	'God Almighty' (OBJECT)
Greek (CPR VI 6)	ὁμολογῶ	ἐπομνύμενος	τόν παντοκράτορα Θεὸν…
Coptic (P.KRU 10)	ⲧⲛϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ	ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ	ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲁⲛⲧⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…

However, this analysis is somewhat tentative. As discussed in 4.4.3, the form ϵιωρϰ in these cases is ambiguous, and could reasonably be analysed as a Performative, particularly since the very act of swearing is performative. The relationship between the Coptic examples and their Greek counterparts cited in Table 6.5 suggests that a circumstantial Present is intended, matching the non-finite Greek participle. However, this argument is circular, and does not shed any light on the subject. Further research is needed into the development of the Coptic Performative in Theban material, in order to better assess this question.

e) SCR formula: statement of security

Within the SCR formula, there is a close structural similarity between the Greek and Coptic statement of security, demonstrated in Table 6.6. As in the case of the FRW formula core discussed above, the main differences between the Greek and Coptic phrases is a result of typological differences between the languages, notably the differences between the absence of an article in Greek in contrast to the zero article in Coptic, as well as the differences between a fixed and flexible word order. Nevertheless, there is a clear linguistic relationship between the Greek and Coptic phrases, in which each element of the Greek phrase has a corresponding element in the Coptic.

Table 6.6 (= Table 5.3): Statement of security in Greek and Coptic SCR formula

	Preposition	Determiner	Noun	Indirect Object 2nd person (optional)
Greek	πρὸς	ø τὴν σὴν (or noun + σου)	ἀσφάλειαν	σοι
Coptic	ϵ ϵτβϵ	ογ- π- πϵκ- πϵι-	ωρϫ	ϩⲁϰ

As briefly mentioned in 5.1.4, the close similarity between the Greek and Coptic statement of security, and the use of the prepositions ϵ- and ϵτϩϵ in this sense, may represent an instance of PAT borrowing.[12] This theory is discussed in detail in 6.4.2.

f) SCR formula: statement of composition

Similar to the statement of security, there is a close relationship between the Greek and Coptic statements of composition within the SCR formula. As shown in Table 6.7, there is more or less a one-to-one mapping of elements of the Greek clause into Coptic. Like the other examples cited above, there are some structural differences between the Greek and Coptic phrases as a result of typological differences between the two languages. Nevertheless, this is a clear example of replication, in which the meaning and grammatical nuances of the Greek clause have been copied into the Coptic.

Table 6.7 (= Table 5.4): Statement of composition in Greek and Coptic SCR formula

	Verb	NP (object)		Indirect Object
		Demonstrative	Noun	
Greek	πεποίημαι/ἐξεδόμην/ἐξέδωκα/ἐθέμην	ταύτην	τὴν X	σοι
Coptic	ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-	ⲡⲉⲓ-	X	ⲛⲁⲕ

[12] On PAT borrowing and its definition, see 2.1.1.

g) SUB formula: statement of writing

Similar to the SCR formulae examples cited in (d) and (e) above, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of the Greek and Coptic SUB formulae in terms of their main verbal clause of writing, as shown in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8: Statement of asking and writing in the Greek and Coptic SUB formula

	Clause of asking	"I have written"	"for"	3.M.SG
Greek	ἀξιωθεὶς	ἔγραψα	ὑπὲρ	αὐτοῦ
Coptic	ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣϣⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ⸗	=ϥ

However, while the Coptic clearly replicates the Greek clause of writing, there are inherent differences in the preceding clause of asking, namely the expression of the non-finite Greek Aorist participle as the finite Coptic Perfect, and the change from passive in Greek to active in Coptic. Furthermore, variations within the Coptic formula appear in which the Perfect in both the verb of asking and the verb of writing is replaced by a focalised Perfect which introduces a semantic nuance not expressed by the Greek. These examples, and their relationship to the underlying Greek structures, are discussed in more depth below (6.3.2).

h) SUB formula: subordinate clause of illiteracy

As in the case of the clause of writing, the subordinate clause of illiteracy in the Coptic SUB formula corresponds in meaning, content, and form to its Greek counterpart, shown in Table 6.9. There are clear structural differences between the two languages in terms of the expression of subordinate clauses, since the Coptic creates the clause through the addition of a subordinating connector to a finite verb form, in comparison to the non-finite participle or PREP

+ DEF.ART + INF construction of the Greek. However, since the clauses as a whole are both subordinate and express the same aspectual distinctions (that is, an ongoing or habitual action), and since their semantic structure and vocabulary are more or less identical, the Coptic can still be understood as a replication of its Greek counterpart.

Table 6.9 (= Table 5.8): Subordinate clause of illiteracy in Greek and Coptic SUB formula

	Causal clause marker	"they do not know"	"letters"
Greek	ø	μὴ εἰδότος/ἐπισταμένου	γράμματα
	διὰ τὸ	μὴ εἰδέναι	
Coptic	ϫⲉ	ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ	ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ
		(ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ	

As the above examples show, there are several elements within almost all the Coptic formulae studied which are directly replicated from their Greek counterparts. The absence of any clear instances of replication within the Coptic HYP formula, aside from the opening structures in P.KRU 36 and 74, is notable, and most likely due to the absence of 7th century material which may show closer linguistic links between the two (see 6.2.1). Conversely, the Coptic SCR and SUB formulae, which existed alongside their Greek counterparts for more than 30 years (see above, 6.1.2, Table 6.2), are almost entirely replicated from their Greek counterparts.

In the cases of replication identified in the study, it is not only the content and meaning of the Greek which has been copied, but also the less tangible linguistic features of these elements. Most important is the case of verbal clauses, in which the finiteness, aspect, and (where relevant) tense of the Greek form are mirrored in their Coptic counterparts. Finite verbs in the Greek formula appear as finite verbs in Coptic, seen in the use of the Coptic Perfect to replicate

the Greek Perfect or Aorist (past tense, completed action), shown in (4a-b), or the expression of the Greek Present as a Coptic Present (present tense, ongoing action), as shown in (4c).

(4) *Replication of aspect from Greek to Coptic formulae: finite verbs*

(a) **SCR:** πεποίημαι/ἐξεδόμην/ἐξέδωκα/ἐθέμην → ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ

(b) **SUB:** ἔγραψα → ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ

(c) **OTH:** ὁμολογῶ → ϯϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ

Similarly, non-finite forms in Greek are replicated by non-finite forms in Coptic, which are also identical in terms of aspect. Within the data, this occurs in the expression of the Greek Present participle as a circumstantial Present clause in Coptic, shown in (5a), or the use of ϫⲉ + the Present or Habitual in Coptic to express the Greek Present participle (or Perfect participle/διὰ τό + Perfect infinitive in the case of οἶδα which is structured like a Perfect form but is Present in usage), shown in (5b).

(5) *Replication of aspect from Greek to Coptic formulae: non-finite verbs*

(a) **OTH:** ἐπομνύμενος → ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ

(b) **SUB:** μὴ εἰδότος/μὴ ἐπισταμένου/διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι → ϫⲉ (ⲛ)ϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ/ⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ

The close similarities between Greek and Coptic legal formulae as evidenced by these examples of replication are indicative of continuity in Late Antique scribal practices which were sustained across two genetically unrelated linguistic systems. Furthermore, these instances of replication suggest a level of familiarity of scribes writing in Coptic with the content and formulae of Greek documents. However, as discussed in the following sections,

the formulae studied also show variations from their Greek counterparts which are evidence of developments within Theban scribal communities.

6.3.2. Reinterpretation

Within the formulae studied, there are a number of instances in which specific phrases or clauses in Coptic share certain similarities with their Greek counterparts but contain nuanced grammatical differences which set them apart. These can be observed in the following cases:

a) Shifting aspect: Greek Present participle → Coptic relative/circumstantial Future

Several cases within the Copitc legal formulae studied show a change in verbal aspect from their Greek counterparts. In the Coptic HYP and AOW formulae, three phrasal pairs can be identified in which the Coptic substantivised relative Future corresponds to a Greek articular Present participle, as shown in (6a-c). These cases show a shift in aspect from the expression of an ongoing action in Greek to an action that is yet to be complete in Coptic.

(6) *Shifting aspect: phrase pairs in the Greek and Coptic HYP/AOW formulae*

(a) τὸν ὑπογράφοντα → ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ

(b) ⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ (HYP.4/5) – ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὑπογράφοντος (Greek SCR)

(c) τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας → ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

A similar example of the shift from ongoing aspect to future aspect can be observed in the KYR formula in which the Greek present participle is rendered in a Coptic as a circumstantial Future, as shown in (7).

(7) *Shifting aspect: the Greek and Coptic KYR formula*

(ἁ)πανταχοῦ προφερομένην → ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

In each of these cases, the verbs of scribing, witnessing, and producing refer to an action which has not yet taken place. However, while this sense of futurity is explicitly encoded within the Coptic relative Future, it is only implied by the Greek present participle which expresses ongoing/incomplete action. As such, a process of reinterpretation can be tentatively proposed in which the Coptic formulae do not replicated the grammatical (that is aspectual) information of the underlying Greek forms, but rather render the implied temporal information of the passages. This is most likely the result of differences in the linguistic constraints of the two languages, where futurity cannot be expressed through the Coptic circumstantial/relative Present which is more similar in terms of aspect to the Greek Present participle.

b) HYP/AOW formulae: Greek articular participle → Coptic ⲉ + *INFL.INF*

As discussed in 4.1.4, the verbs of signing and witnessing in the Coptic HYP and FRW formulae may be expressed as purpose clauses as an alternative to the substantivised relative Future constructions discussed above. As shown in (8a-b), these purpose clauses are expressed through the ⲉ + INFL.INF construction, which are both structurally and semantically different to the articular Present participles in the Greek HYP formula to which they correspond.

(8) *Shift from articular participle to purpose clause in the HYP/AOW formulae*

(a) τὸν ὑπογράφοντα → ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ

(b) τοὺς μαρτυροῦντας → ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

The process of reinterpretation of the Greek articular participles is similar to that described for their reinterpretation as substantivised relative Future constructions. Rather than being viewed as an action which will happen in the future, this stipulation is interpreted as an action that is intended to happen. As such, a purpose clause has been selected as the best method for expressing the action of the verbs. However, the observation of this process of reinterpretation is hampered by the lack of contemporaneous Greek attestations with which to compare the Coptic formula.

c) The KYR formula: lexical similarities without replication

As discussed in 5.2.4, there are clear similarities in the use of vocabulary between the Greek and Coptic KYR formula with the main "to be firm/valid" statement, shown in (9a-c).

(9) *Corresponding vocabulary in the Greek and Coptic KYR formula*

(a) κύριος/κύριος εἶναι → ⲟ ⲛ̅ϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ *"to be legally binding/have authority"*[13]

(b) βέβαιος → ⲥⲙⲟⲛⲧ (ⲥⲙⲓⲛⲉ) *"to be valid/secure/established"*[14]

(c) βέβαιος → ⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ *"to be valid"*

However, while there are some superficial similarities in the way these concepts are introduced syntactically within the formula, these are ultimately coincidental, rather than directly modelled from Greek and Coptic. As such, while the content and vocabulary of the formula has been copied, this relationship should be classed as an instance of reinterpretation rather

[13] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 358.

[14] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 120, 123.

than replication, in which scribes have drawn on unique Coptic constructions to carry the meaning of the formula.

d) The SUB formula: Greek Aorist/Aorist participle → Coptic FOC-PERF

As mentioned in 6.3.1 above, the clause of writing in the Coptic SUB formula using the Perfect can be classed as a replication of its Greek counterpart, in which ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ corresponds to the Greek Aorist ἔγραψα. However, within the corpus a focalised Perfect construction is also employed as a common variation in the expression of the verb of writing. This construction only occurs in seven texts in the corpus: CPR IV 35 and 166, and P. Ryl. Copt. 129, 191, 207, 215 from the Hermopolite nome, and P. Lond. IV 1593 from Aphrodito. As such, it appears to be a specifically non-Theban variety. Similarly, the optional preceding verb of asking, which is expressed as a non-finite Aorist passive participle in Greek, is rendered in Coptic either with the Perfect or a focalised Perfect clause. These structures are compared in Table 6.10.

Table 6.10 (= Table 5.7): Clauses of asking and writing in Greek and Coptic

	Clause of asking	"I have written"	"for"	3.M.SG
Greek	ἀξιωθεὶς	ἔγραψα	ὑπὲρ	αὐτοῦ
Coptic	(ⲛⲧ)ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣϣⲧ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ (ⲛⲧ)ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ	ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ	ϩⲁⲣⲟ⸗	=ϥ

The use of a focalising construction may have been intended to shift the emphasis of the clause to the adverbial adjunct of the sentence, that is "it is on his behalf that (I was asked and) I have written". In this way, it could represent an attempt to mirror the change in the role of the subject from actor to patient which is expressed through the use of the Greek passive. This theory may

be supported by the appearance of at least two clear attestations of the SUB formula in the corpus in which the Coptic pseudo-passive construction using a non-referential 3.PL subject is used, as shown in (10).[15]

(10)	ⲁ=ⲩ-ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲅⲁⲗⲉ	ⲙⲙⲟ=ⲓ̈	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥϩⲁⲓ
	PERF=3.PL-beseech.INF	DIR.OBJ=1.SG	PERF=1.SG-write.INF

"I was beseeched, and I have written." (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 50.7-8)

As such, the use of the focalised Perfect to express the verb of asking in the Coptic SUB formula may have arisen as an alternative to this pseudo-passive construction as a way of replicating the thematic roles of the Greek passive participle clause.

The use of the focalised Perfect to express the verb of writing is less easily understood. It is unclear which element of the sentence is being focalised with this construction. It is possibly the subordinate clause of illiteracy, that is "it is because he is illiterate that I have written on his behalf". However, in one example in the corpus, CPR IV 166.9, the focalised Perfect is used in a formula that lacks this element. In this case the focus must be on the PP "on his behalf" (that is, "it is on his behalf that I have written"), and it is possible that it is this element which is emphasised in all other attestations which employ the focalised Perfect. However, neither of these focalisation patterns are expressed by the constructions contained within the Greek SUB formula.

[15] O. Medin. Habu Copt. 50.7-8 and CPR IV 90.9. A further 13 attestations are ambiguous since the subscription has been written for multiple witnesses and therefore the 3.PL subject may be either referential or non-referential; see 5.3.3.

It is possible that the seven attestations of the focalised Perfect in the Coptic clause of writing represents a reinterpretation of the underlying Greek formula, in which scribes have understood that the subject (or other element of clause) is the focus and have attempted to recreate this drawing on focalising constructions available in the Egyptian language which are not present in Greek. However, this suggestion is not confirmed by any existing data. It is also possible that it arose simply as a variation within existing Coptic practices, not based on any patterns within underlying Greek formulae, which did not become productive outside of a few rare occurrences in the Hermopolite nome and Aphrodito. In this scenario, the use of the focalised Perfect to express the verb of writing would be better classed among the examples of innovation described in the next section.

6.3.3. Innovation

As stated previously, the process of innovation involves the creation of material in Coptic formulae which has no direct parallels in Greek. This process has also been identified by Richter as one of three processes leading to the development of Coptic legal formulae.[16] Within the study, two examples of innovation can be observed: the development of the AOW formula as a distinct entity, and the appearance of the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ in the FRW formula.

(a) The AOW formula as a separate entity

The most significant innovation visible within the data is the appearance of the AOW formula. Since it has no parallels in Greek, most likely due to the absence of data from the 7th century, it is difficult to trace its development. It is highly likely, given its similarity to the HYP formula,

[16] Richter, *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik*, 37.

that it represents a diachronic development within Coptic scribal practices in which the AOW formula diverged from the HYP formula. However, it is possible that Greek versions of the AOW formula existed in antiquity which have not survived in the current papyrological records and which provided models for the Coptic formulae. These ideas, however, are mere speculation and cannot be verified without further 7th century data.

If the AOW formula does represent a development from the Coptic HYP formula, it is unclear why this divergence would have occurred. It may have represented an attempt to delineate between the need for a *hypographeus* to scribe and the necessity of witnessing parties, which represent two distinct legal practices. However, this interpretation is hampered by the existence of cases in which both the AOW formula and a HYP formula containing an appointment of witnesses statement appear. This occurs in five texts: P.KRU 5, 20, 21, 24, and 36. It is telling, however, that all five of these texts contain an AOW.1 formula, delineated through the phrase ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ, whose repetition after the HYP formula is less redundant than the AOW.2-4 formulae which are nearly identical to the HYP appointment of witnesses statement (see 4.2.4).

Another explanation is that the AOW formula and HYP formula may have developed independently within different scribal schools. In the absence of earlier data, it cannot be ruled out that the AOW formula appeared concurrently with the Coptic HYP formula as a variant method of expressing the legal stipulations of the Greek HYP formula. This theory can be examined with reference to evidence from the dossier of Psate son of Pisrael and its relationship to other texts from Djême. Within the corpus, two HYP formulae can be attributed to Psate, found in P. CLT 1 (698 CE) and P.KRU 36 (724 CE), both of which contain an appointment of witnesses statement. In P.KRU 36, he also employs an AOW formula, which is the earliest

attestation of the formula with an absolute date. Given therefore that the first attestation of the AOW formula appears alongside the HYP formula in P.KRU 36, this would argue against the independent development of the AOW formula as an alternative to the HYP formula.

However, two other AOW formulae may be have been written earlier than P.KRU 36: P.KRU 18, written by Jeremias son of Athanasios in Djême and dated broadly to the first half of the 7th century, and P. CLT 7, written by an unnamed scribe in Djême and dated broadly between 700 and 775 CE. Furthermore, both texts are among five in the corpus which contain an AOW formula but not a HYP formula, one of which, P.KRU 16, was also written by Jeremias son of Athanasios (dated to either 735/736 or 750/751). If P.KRU 18 and P. CLT 7 were written prior to 724, then the AOW formulae would have first appeared in texts without a HYP formula, used as an alternative to indicate the appointment of witnesses. In the case of the documents of Psate, the shift from the HYP formula in P.KRU 36 to HYP + AOW formula may represent the dissemination of the AOW formula among other scribes of Djême during the early 8th century.

This proposal is quite tenuous, based on only a small data sample and texts which are broadly dated. However, it allows for the redundant repetition of the AOW formula after HYP formulae containing an appointment of witness statement which works against the idea of the AOW formula developing as a way of delineating the separate processes of appointing a *hypographeus* to write a document and acquiring witnesses to witness it. With the current state of the data, it is difficult to make any definitive claims concerning the motivation for the development of the AOW formula. However, it is clear from the available evidence that its development as an entity separate from the HYP formula, particularly the use of the phrase ⲉⲓⲣ-ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ, is an innovation specific to Coptic.

(b) FRW formula: ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ

A further innovation found in Coptic formulae, which again only appears in Theban texts, is the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ "there being no (single) force placed/existing upon me" which appears in 26 of the 37 attestations of the FRW formula in the corpus. As stated in 4.3.4, this construction has no parallels in Greek. Rather, it fulfils the same function as the prepositional phrase of the FRW "core", which negates the existence of external pressures influencing the first party to enter the contract through the use of a subtractive connector ("without guile or fear or force, etc.").

The relationship between the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ and the FRW core is strengthened by the fact that in one attestation, P. CLT 7 (FRW.2), the construction ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ- is used in place of a subtractive connector, as shown in (11a), while in a further three, P.KRU 66 and 76 (FRW.17) and P. CLT 4 (FRW.18), the core is headed by the full phrase ⲉⲙⲛ(ⲗⲁⲩ ⲛ̅)ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ, as shown in (11b).

(11) *Variations of the Coptic FRW core using* ⲉⲙⲛ-

(a)	ⲉ=ⲓ-ⲟⲩⲱϣ	ⲁⲩⲱ	ⲉ=ⲓ-[ⲡⲓⲑⲉ]
	PFRM=1.SG-desire.INF	and	PFRM=1.SG-[be_persuaded.INF]

ⲉ̣-ⲙ̣ⲛ̣-ⲗⲁⲩ	ⲛ-Ø-ⲕⲣⲟϥ	ϩⲓ-Ø-ϩⲟⲧⲉ
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.PRN	ATTR-Z.ART-guile	or-Z.ART-fear

ϩⲓ-Ø-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ…
or-Z.ART-force…

"I desire and I [am persuaded], there being no guile or fear or force…" (P.CLT 7.13-14)

(b) ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲧⲓⲁⲑⲏⲕⲏ…
now ENCL PERF=1.SG-seek.INF DIR.OBJ-DTC.F.SG-testament…

ⲉ-ⲙⲛ-ⲟⲩ-ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛ-Ø-ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲕⲏ
CIRC-NEG.EXT-INDF.ART.SG-force ATTR-Z.ART-single place.QUAL

ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ Ø-ϫⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ
IND.OBJ=1.SG down nor Z.ART-force nor

Ø-ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…
Z.ART-deception…

"And now I have sought the testament… no single force being placed upon me, nor force nor deception…" (P.KRU 66.14-16)

As these variations show, the constructions ⲉⲙⲛ + ADVERBIAL PREDICATE (11a) and ⲉⲙⲛ + VERBAL PREDICATE (11b) are semantically similar in Coptic to the more common phrase ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ-. As such, the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ fulfils a similar semantic and legal function to the Coptic FRW core. In this way, it can be seen as a further extension of the core, drawing upon grammatical structures unique to Coptic.

It is not entirely clear why this construction developed in the Coptic formula. It possibly arose as a way of emphasising the role of the first party within the formula. In other words, while the core simply negates the existence of coercion in the creation of the contract, the Coptic negative Present specifically states that the first party has not been coerced. However, there does not appear to be a reason why this distinction would be necessary, nor why a similar feature never developed in the Greek formula. As such, while the presence of the phrase ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ (ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ) ⲕⲏ/ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ in the Coptic FRW formula is clearly an innovation unrelated to Greek, the reasons for this innovation are still a matter of some speculation.

6.3.4. Summary

As the discussions above show, the linguistic relationship between Greek and Coptic legal formulae is complex. The level of similarity between formulaic elements ranges from the copying of vocabulary and broad concepts only, to the direct mapping of grammatical features and structural patterns. In many cases, the motivations behind the reinterpretation of Greek elements, or the innovation of new elements, is unclear. However, the result is the development of 8th century Coptic formulae which are clearly linked to earlier Greek practices, but which contain features which create distinctly Coptic (or at least distinctly 8th century) forms. The categorisations of replication, reinterpretation, and innovation which have been developed in response to these trends can be applied to future studies of a wider range of legal formulae.

Significantly, in practically all cases of replication, the Coptic formulae continue to adhere to the linguistic constraints of Egyptian. As such, there is little to no evidence of contact-induced interference within the data (although one instance may be visible in the SCR formula, discussed below in 6.4.2).[17] This result may seem unsurprising, given that the process of developing Coptic formulae from Greek models is inherently different, in terms of the exertion of contact pressures, to the process of the translation of literature which is thought to have led to some of the structural changes in Coptic discussed in 2.3. However, while the lack of contact-induced change in the data is a null result for the second research question of this study, this in itself is significant, as discussed in the following sections.

[17] On the use of the term "interference" in this study, see 2.1.1.

6.4. Contact-induced change in Coptic legal formulae

The lack of evidence of widespread contact-induced grammatical change in Coptic legal texts is indicative of the socio-linguistic context in which they were written. While Greek continued to be used in text production in the post-conquest period, its position of prestige began to diminish as Arabic replaced it as the language of the ruling class (see 1.2.5). As such, the same social pressures which had led to contact-induced change in earlier periods no longer existed. Furthermore, by this stage of the history of Greek-Egyptian contact, the contact-induced features which had begun to develop in earlier stages of the language would have stabilised and become productive in the language. This can be demonstrated by examining a feature of Coptic legal formulae which has only been discussed briefly in this study: the use of borrowed enclitic conjunctions.

6.4.1. Enclitic conjunctions and pragmatic structures

The borrowed Greek enclitic conjunctions ϧⲉ (δέ), ⲅⲁⲣ (γάρ), ⲙⲉⲛ (μέν), and ⲟⲩⲛ (οὖν) (also "discourse markers", "discourse particles", etc.), are prevalent in Coptic legal formulae.[18] Within the formulae examined in this study, ⲟⲩⲛ commonly occurs in the SCR formula, shown in (12a), while ϧⲉ appears in the OTH formula, as shown in (12b). ϧⲉ also appears in the AOW formula. However, since this is not modelled on any visible Greek counterparts, it can be left aside for the present discussion.

[18] For the use of the term 'enclitic conjunction', see 3.3.3; see also Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'.

(12) *Enclitic particles in the legal formulae studied*

(a) <u>SCR formula: ⲟⲩⲛ</u>

ⲉ-ⲡⲉ-ⲟⲩⲣϫ	ⲟⲩⲛ	ⲁ=ⲓ-ⲥⲙⲛ-ⲧⲉ-ⲁⲥⲫⲁⲗⲓⲁ
as-DEF.M.SG-security	ENCL	PERF=1.SG-execute.INF-DEF.F.SG-*asphaleia*
ⲛⲏ		
IND.OBJ_2.F.SG		

"As the security (of you), therefore, I have executed this asphaleia *for you."* (O. Medin. Habu Copt. 57.16-18)

(b)

ⲉ=ⲛ-ⲟⲣⲕ	ⲇⲉ	ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲟ=ⲥ
PFRM=1.PL-swear.INF	ENCL	after=3.M.F.SG
ⲛ-ⲡ-ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ	ⲡ-ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲱⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ…	
IND.OBJ-DEF.M.SG-God	DEF.M.SG-Almighty…	

"And I swear hereafter to God the Almighty… that (the church of) the holy martyr Apa Phoibamon will be lord of our beloved son." (P.KRU 84.13)

In these formulae, as mentioned in Chapters 4 and 5, the enclitic conjunctions are used to herald changes in topics and to highlight key turning points in the discursive structures of the documents, much like their Greek counterparts. In Cook (2015), it was suggested that the appearance and use of Greek enclitic conjunctions may have been modelled on their use in their underlying Greek counterparts.[19] However, as the data presented in Chapters 4 and 5 reveal, this is not the case, with the same enclitic conjunctions absent from the corresponding Greek formulae.

[19] Cook, 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'.

This observation is important in understanding the extent to which earlier processes of contact-induced change had permeated into the Coptic language. As discussed in 2.3.1, the use of these enclitic conjunctions has been argued to be a case of structural PAT replication. Similar to the observations made regarding its use in legal formulae, Reintges notes that in literary Coptic ⲇⲉ possesses the same discourse-organising and text-creating functions in Coptic as its Greek counterpart.[20] This he cites as an example of the "Hellenisation of Egyptian syntax", arguing that the use of ⲇⲉ in Coptic represents not only a lexical borrowing, but also an example of pragmatic code-mixing in which Greek discourse structures have been mapped onto Egyptian.[21]

It is important to note that the data Reintges used for the study comes from literary texts, representing an instance where PAT borrowing from Greek has been influenced by the process of translation. Significantly, the fact that the same pragmatic structures are present through the use of enclitic conjunctions within Coptic legal texts shows not only that this example of contact-induced change had become a productive feature of Coptic, but also that it had spread beyond the literary register and into the register of private law.

The use of enclitic conjunctions in Coptic legal formulae discussed in this section reveals a clear instance in which processes of contact-induced language change had become widespread centuries after they began. However, these changes begin with single instances of variations, or "interference", which appear in certain contexts before spreading to others leading to its

[20] Reintges, 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian', 208–20.

[21] Reintges, 220; see also Zakrzewska, '"A Bilingual Language Variety" or "the Language of the Pharaohs"? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics', 131.

development as a productive linguistic feature of the language more generally. One such example of interference can possibly be observed in the data: the case of the statement of security in the Coptic SCR formula.

6.4.2. The SCR formula and the use of prepositions

As discussed in 6.3.1, the statement of security in the Coptic SCR formula can be classed as a replication of its Greek counterpart. As reiterated in Table 6.11, there is a one-to-one correspondence between each element of the Greek and Coptic phrase.

Table 6.11 (= Table 6.6): Statement of security in Greek and Coptic SCR formula

	Preposition	Determiner	Noun	Indirect Object 2nd person (optional)
Greek	πρὸς	ø τὴν σὴν (or noun + σου)	ἀσφάλειαν	σοι
Coptic	ϵ ϵτβϵ	ⲟⲩ- ⲡ- ⲡϵⲕ- ⲡϵⲓ-	ⲱⲣϫ	ⲛⲁⲕ

The function of πρός in this formula is to express derivational relationships, that is "x is as y", although this is normally used with the genitive rather than accusative.[22] However, the use of the preposition ϵ- to express such a derivational relationship has not been previously described in the literature.[23] The preposition ϵτβϵ- only occurs in a few Hermopolite attestations of the

[22] LSJ 1497a

[23] On the functions of ϵ-, see CD 50a-52a

formula, which itself needs further investigation. As such, it will be left aside for the purposes of this discussion.

A potential argument exists to interpret the use of ϵ- in this context as a case of interference. The prepositions ϵ- and πρός have a number of similar uses, such as expressing locative or temporal relations, or to express the indirect object of certain verbs.[24] It is therefore possible that the construction ϵ + DETERMINER + ωρϫ is a calque of Greek πρός + DETERMINER + ἀσφάλειαν, in which ϵ- has been selected as a morpheme equivalent to πρός based on their shared functional domains, despite lacking the derivational function expressed by πρός in this context. As such, at least within the SCR formula, ϵ- acquired this same derivational function.

This process falls under the category of functional PAT borrowing, and is similar to the example of the redistribution of the grammatical functions of the comitative case in Basque through contact with Spanish described by Meakins and discussed in 2.1.2.[25] In this example of contact-induced language change, the function of the Basque comitative case is expressed by the Spanish preposition '*con*'. Since '*con*' also possesses an instrumental function, by reanalysis and extension the Basque comitative case has also taken on the functions once

[24] For the uses of πρός, see LSJ 1496a-1499a. For the use of πρός to express the indirect object in Greek, and particularly Koine, see Pompeo, 'Dative'; Cooper and Georgala, 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek', 280; Papanastassiou, 'Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine', 611; Luraghi, *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases*, 112–13 see also 2.2.3.

[25] Meakins, 'From Absolutely Optional to Only Nominally Ergative: The Life Cycle of the Gurindji Ergative Suffix', 191–92.

expressed by the instrumental case.[26] By the same process, the Coptic preposition ϵ- may have extended its use to the expression of derivational relationships by analogy with the Greek preposition πρός.

It is important to note that this analysis is tentative and is dependent on a deeper understanding of the uses of ϵ- than is currently available in the literature. This preposition is versatile, possessing a range of functions which are not all clearly described. For example, one of the functional categories of ϵ- described by Crum is its use in adverbial expressions, such as those expressing time, manner, means, and so forth, which is a broad category that is not well investigated.[27] It is therefore possible, but currently unclear, whether the expression of derivational relationships was a function of ϵ- which existed before the development of the Coptic SCR formula. As such, to better investigate whether this constitutes an example of interference, a more extensive examination of the preposition ϵ- within Coptic more broadly would be required, which is beyond the scope of the present study.[28]

6.4.3. Summary

While the absence of contact-induced change in the data is a null result, this itself is significant for what it reveals about the processes behind developing Coptic legal formulae from

[26] Meakins, 191–92; Heine and Kuteva, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, 149–50.

[27] CD 52a

[28] In terms of Biblical Coptic, the function of ϵ- has been studied extensively in the recent PhD of Eliese-Sophia Lincke, the results of which have yet to be published: Lincke, *Verotung in Raum und Zeit im Ägyptischen und Koptischen.*

underlying Greek models. The lack of any more concrete examples of interference than the one tentatively proposed for the SCR formula suggests that the contact pressures exerted through the replication of Greek formulae were not as great as those for the translation of Greek literature, which is thought to have contributed to a number of contact-induced changes in Egyptian. Furthermore, the use of discourse-structuring Greek enclitic conjunctions in Coptic formulae which were not present in the underlying Greek formulae reveals that the pragmatic structures of Coptic legal documents were not necessarily influenced by their Greek counterparts.

The independent inclusion of Greek enclitic conjunctions in Coptic legal formulae is itself an example of a contact-induced grammatical feature identified in literary texts which had spread to the domain of private law. As discussed in 2.3, research on contact-induced grammatical change in Coptic has focused on data from literary texts, while their presence in Coptic documents, and language use in these documents more broadly, has been largely overlooked. It is possible that further research into other legal formulae beyond those examined in this study, as well as broader investigations into non-formulaic elements of Coptic documents, may reveal other such examples of the dissemination and adoption of contact-induced grammatical change outside of literary registers.

6.5: Conclusion

The results of the study show that there is a clear sense of legal continuity between the Greek and Coptic formulae examined. Six of the seven formulae studied have a counterpart in Greek which corresponds in position within the document, broad meaning, and legal function. The only exception is the Coptic AOW formula, which has no direct counterpart in Greek. However, since this formula mirrors the function of the appointment of witnesses statement in the Coptic

HYP formula, it too represents a certain level of continuity in terms of its legal significance and the legal practices it represents. This result is perhaps unsurprising; rather, it helps to reaffirm the position of scholars of the last century that the law and formulae of Coptic legal texts should not be viewed as a separate entity, but rather are highly related to Byzantine Greek practices, forming part of an overarching Egyptian legal system spanning two languages (see 3.1.3).

Furthermore, since most attestations of the legal formulae studied are post-conquest, this demonstrates that the domain of private law in the Early Islamic period remained largely consistent with pre-conquest practices. In the context of the formulae studied, there is consistency in the practices and stipulations which reinforced the legal validity of a document. This consistency is particularly true of: the FRW formula declaring that the document has been entered into of the first party's own free will; the swearing of a Christian oath in the OTH formula; the SCR formula stating that the document has been drawn up as a surety for the second party; and the KYR formula emphasising that the document has legal validity if required to be produced in disputes.

This study also has also revealed a clear linguistic relationship between Greek and Coptic legal formulae. Almost all Coptic formulae in the study exhibit a large amount of replication of the content, meaning, and grammatical structures of their Greek counterparts. This is particularly true in the case of the SCR and SUB formulae, in which virtually every element of the Greek formula is replicated into Coptic. Comparatively, very few instances of reinterpretation and innovation occur. In the case of reinterpretation, these elements are still closely linked to their Greek counterparts, arising mostly through attempts to express concepts written in Greek within a typologically different and genetically unrelated language. In the cases of innovation,

these features still express the same broad meanings and legal functions found in Greek formulae but do so within structures which are distinctly stylistically Coptic.

To build upon the results of this study, future research can address some of the issues which have been raised. Most importantly, this study may be replicated and applied to a larger variety of legal formulae, including those specific to certain genres of legal texts, in order to observe whether these results are consistent more broadly across Coptic documents. In particular, more research is needed to see if the two distinct models for the development of the HYP and FRW formulae can be applied to other legal formulae. In terms of the uneven geographical distribution of formulae in the corpus, more focused studies should be carried out on formulae from other regions, such as the use of formulae in the debt instruments of Elephantine. It is necessary to draw upon unpublished material from non-Theban regions, particularly Coptic material from the bilingual archives of Dioscorus of Aphrodito, in which relationships can be observed between Greek and Coptic formulae written by the same or closely connected scribes. A future volume of currently unpublished material from this archive could help to investigate this question further. Finally, further investigations need to be made more broadly of language use and linguistic features in the small number of 6th and early 7th century Coptic papyri to better understand the development of Coptic legal formulae. It is hoped that future studies may create a clearer picture of the origin and development of linguistic features and legal formulae and their relationship to Greek, which has only just begun to be uncovered in this study.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Aikhenvald, A. 'Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective'. In Aikhenvald, A. and R. M. W. Dixon eds, *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Aikhenvald, A., and R. M. W. Dixon, eds, *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Aikhenvald, A., and R. M. W. Dixon, eds, *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*. 1st edition. Oxford ; New York: OUP Oxford, 2001.

Alcock, A., and P. J. Sijpesteijn. 'Early 7th Century Coptic Contract from Aphrodito (P. Mich. Inv. 6898)'. *Enchoria* 26 (2000): 1–19.

Allan, R. 'Voice'. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 29 October 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/voice-COM_00000373#d140109783e1298.

Allen, J. P. *The Ancient Egyptian Language: An Historical Study*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Almond, M. 'A Comparative Study of Loanword Integration in Fourth-Century Coptic Literature'. PhD, Macquarie University, 2011.

Almond, M., J. Hagen, K. John, T. S. Richter, and V. Walter. 'Kontaktinduzierter Sprachwandel des Ägyptisch-Koptischen: Lehnwort-Lexikographie im Projekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)'. In Hafemann, I. ed., *Perspektiven einer Corpusbasierten Historischen Linguistik und Philologie. Internationale Tagung des Akademienvorhabens „Altägyptisches Wörterbuch" an der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 12. – 13. Dezember 2011*, Thesaurus Linguae Aegyptiae 4. 283–315. Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013.

Austin, M. M. *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society Supplement no. 2 1970 edition. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1970.

Ayad, M. 'The Death of Coptic?' In Ayad, M. ed., *Coptic Culture: Past, Present and Future*, Stevenage. UK: Oakville, CT: Coptic Orthodox Church Centre at Shephalbury Manor, 2012: 11–42.

Azzoni, A., and S. L. Lippert. 'An Achaemenid Loanword in the Legal Code of Hermopolis: ϫbykrm'. *Enchoria* 26 (2000): 20–30.

Bacot, S. and C. Heurtel. 'Ostraca coptes d'Élephantine au musée du Louvre'. In Bosson, N. ed., *Études coptes VII. Neuvième journée d'études, Montpellier 3–4 juin 1999*. Cahiers de la bibliothèque copte 12, Paris; Louvain; Sterling; Virginia: Peeters, 2000, 17–45.

Bagnall, R. S. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

———. *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Bagnall, R. S., and K. A. Worp. 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito'. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 148 (2004): 247–52.

———. *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2nd edition, Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Baker, M. C. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bakker, S. J. *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.

Bauer, G. *Konkordanz der nichtflektierten griechischen Wörter im bohairischen Neuen Testament*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975.

Beaucamp, J. 'Byzantine Egypt and Imperial Law'. In Bagnall, R. S. ed., *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*, 271–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Behlmer, H. *Die Häufigsten Griechischen Lehnwörter Im Sahidischen Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Institut für Ägyptologie und Koptologie: Reader, 1999.

Bell, H. I. 'Syene Papyri in the British Museum'. *Klio* 13/13 (2015): 160–174.

Bell, H. I., and W. E. Crum, eds, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum Vol. IV: The Aphrodito Papyri (= P. Lond. IV)*. London: British Museum, 1910.

Bentein, K. 'Finite vs. Non-Finite Complementation in Post-Classical and Early Byzantine Greek: Towards a Pragmatic Restructuring of the Complementation System?' *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17/1 (2017): 3–36.

Bergeron, M. 'Pots and People: Greek Trade and Votive Rituals at Naucratis'. In Robinson, D. and F. Goddio eds, *Thonis-Heracleion in Context*, 267–81. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Maritime Archaeology, 2014.

Berg-Onstwedder, G. van den. 'The Use of Demotic Phrases from Legal Texts of the Ptolemaic Period in Coptic Legal Texts'. *Bulletin de La Société d'archéologie Copte* 35 (1996): 101–16.

Berkes, L. 'The Latest Identified Greek Documentary Text from Egypt: A Papyrus from 825 AD (SPP III2 577 Reconsidered)'. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 209 (2019) 242–244.

Berkes, L. and K. M. Younes. 'A Trilingual Scribe from Abbasid Egypt? A Note on CPR XXII 17'. *Archiv Für Papyrusforschung Und Verwandte Gebiete* 58/1 (2012): 97–100.

Biedenkopf-Ziehner, A. *Koptische Schenkungsurkunden aus der Thebais: Formeln und Topoi der Urkunden, Aussagen der Urkunden, Indices*. Göttinger Orientforschungen 41. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.

Bissing, F. W. von. 'Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kulturellen Bedeutung der Griechischen Kolonie Naukratis in Ägypten'. *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 25 (1949): 1–2.

———. 'Naukratis'. *Bulletin de la société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie* 39 (1951): 33–82.

———. ‘Naukratis: Studies in the Age of the Greek and Egyptian Settlements at Naukratis’. *BSRAA* 39 (1951): 65–66.

Boas, F. ‘The Classification of American Languages’. In *Race, Language, and Culture*, 219–25. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Böhlig, A. *Die Griechischen Lehnwörter im Sahidischen und Bohairischen Neuen Testament.* Studien zur Erforschung des Christlichen Ägyptens 2. Munich: Lerche, 1954.

———. *Ein Lexikon der Griechischen Wörter im Koptischen. Die Griechischlateinischen Lehnwörter in den Koptischen Manichäischen Texten*. Studien zur Erforschung des Christlichen Ägyptens 1. Munich: Lerche, 1953.

Bolonyai, A. ‘The Hidden Dimensions of Language Contact: The Case of Hungarian-English Bilingual Children’. Ph.D, University of South Carolina, 1999.

Boswinkel, E. and P. W. Pestman. *Les archives privées de Dionysios, fils de Kephalas: P.L. Bat. 22: textes grecs et démotiques*. Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, v. 22A-22B. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982.

Botta, A. F. *The Aramaic and Egyptian Legal Traditions at Elephantine: An Egyptological Approach*. Library of Second Temple Studies 64. London; New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2009.

Boud’hors, A. ‘Greek Loanwords in Fayyumic Documentary Texts’. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 423–439. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

———. ‘Les particules ϩⲁⲣ et ⲕⲁⲓⲡⲉⲣ dans les textes documentaires coptes’. In Bosson,N., A. Boud’hors, and S. H. Aufrère eds, *Labor Omnia Uicit Improbus. Miscellanea in Honorem Ariel Shisha-Halevy*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 256, 93–110. Leuven; Paris; Bristol: Peeters, 2017.

Boud’hors, A., and F. Calament. ‘Pour une étude des archives coptes de Medinet el-Fayoum (P.Louvre E 10253, R 6893, E 6867 et E 7395)’. In Kaplony, A., D. Potthast, and C. Römer eds, *From Bāwīṭ to Marw. Documents from the Medieval Muslim World*, 23–58. Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2015.

Boulard, L. ‘La vente dans les actes coptes’. In *Études d’histoire juridique offertes à Paul Frédéric Girad par se élèves)*, 1-94. Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1912.

Bowden, H. ‘The Greek Settlement and Santuaries at Naukratis: Herodotus and Archaeology’. In Hansen, M. H. and K . Raaflaub eds, *More Studies in the Ancient Greek ‘Polis’*, 17–37. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996.

Bowern, C. ‘Relatedness as a Factor in Language Contact’. *Journal of Language Contact* 6/2 (2013): 411–32.

Braunmüller, K., and J. House eds, *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2009.

Bresciani, E., and R. Pintaudi. ‘Textes Démotico-Grecs et Greco-Démotiques Des Ostraca de Medinet Madi : Un Problème de Bilinguisme’. In Vleeming, Sp. ed., *Aspects of Demotic Lexicography: Acts of the Second International Conference for Demotic Studies, Leiden, 19-21 September 1984*, 123–26. Louvain: Peeters, 1987.

Briant, P. *Histoire de l’Empire Perse: De Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris: Fayard, 1996.

Brixhe, C. ‘Linguistic Diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: Koine and Non-Greek Languages’. In Baker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 228–52. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Brockopp, J. E. ‘Early Islamic Jurisprudence in Egypt: Two Scholars and Their Mukhtasars’. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 30/2 (1998): 167–82.

Brody, J. ‘Particles Borrowed from Spanish as Discourse Markers in Mayan Languages’. *Anthropological Linguistics* 29/4 (1987): 507–21.

Bubenik, V. ‘Koine, Origins Of’. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 24 September 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/koine-origins-of-COM_00000198.

———. ‘Verbal System (Tense, Aspect, Mood)’. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 29 October 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/verbal-system-tense-aspect-mood-COM_00000367#d139869662e722.

Campbell, C. R. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. New York: Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers, 2007.

Campbell, L. ‘Areal Linguistics: A Closer Scrutiny’. In Matras, Y., A. McMahon, and N. Vincent eds, *Linguistic Areas: Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective*, 1–31. New York, N.Y: AIAA, 2006.

———. ‘On Proposed Universals of Grammatical Borrowing’. In Aertsen, H. and R. J. Jeffers eds, *Historical Linguistics 1989: Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Rutgers University, 14-18 August 1989*, 91–109. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993.

———. ‘Syntactic Change in Pipil’. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53/3 (1987): 253–80.

Carrez-Maratray, J. Y. ‘Le “monopole de Naucratis” et la “bataille de Péluse”: rupture ou continuité de la présence grecque en égypte des saïtes aux perses’. *Transeuphratène* 19 (2000): 159–72.

Černý, J., ed., *Coptic etymological dictionary*. Cambridge Library Collection Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Chamoreau, C.. ‘On the Development of Analytic Constructions in Purepecha’. In Chamoreau, C., Z. E. Fernández, and Y. Lastra eds, *A New Look at Language Contact in Amerindian Languages*, 71–88. Munich: Lincom Publishers, 2010.

Chamoreau, C., Z. E. Fernández, and Y. Lastra. ‘Introduction’. In Chamoreau, C., Z. E. Fernández, and Y. Lastra eds, *A New Look at Language Contact in Amerindian Languages*, 3–8. Munich: Lincom Publishers, 2010.

Chamoreau, C., and L. Goury, eds, *Contact de Langues et Changement Linguistique*, Paris: CNRS Editions, 2012.

Choat, M., and R. Yuen-Collingridge. ‘A Church with No Books and a Reader Who Cannot Write The Strange Case of P.Oxy. 33.2673’. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 46 (2009): 109–38.

Christidis, A. F. 'Part IV: Ancient Greek Structure and Change - Introduction'. In Christidis, A. F., M. Arapopoulou, and M. Χρίτη eds, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 521–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Clackson, S. J. 'Coptic or Greek? Bilingualism in the Papyri'. In Papaconstantinou, A. ed., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 73–104. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. 'Four Coptic Papyri from the Patermouthis Archive in the British Library'. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 32/3/4 (1995): 97–116.

———. 'Papyrology and the Utilization of Coptic Sources'. In Sijpesteijn, P. and L. Sundelin eds, *Papyrology and the History of Early Islamic Egypt*, Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts 55, 21–44. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

———. 'The Genesis of Greek'. In Christidis, A. F., M. Arapopoulou, and M. Χρίτη eds, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 185–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Clackson, S. J., and P. J. Sijpesteijn. 'A Mid-Eighth-Century Trilingual Tax Demand to a Bawit Monk'. In Clackson, S. and A. Boud'hors eds, *Monastic Estates in Late Antique and Early Islamic Egypt: Ostraca, Papyri, and Essays in Memory of Sarah Clackson*, 102–19. Cincinnati: American Society of Papyrologists, 2009.

Clarysse, W. 'Bilingual Papyrological Archives'. In Papaconstantinou, A. ed., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 47–72. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek'. *Chronique d'Égypt* 68 (1993): 186–201.

———. 'Some Greeks in Egypt'. In Johnson, J. H. ed., *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 51, 51–56. Chicago, Ill: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1992.

———. 'The Use of Demotic in the Ptolemaic Administration'. In Bussi S. ed., *Egitto: dai faraoni agli arabi: atti del Convegno Egitto, amministrazione, economia, società, cultura dai faraoni agli arabi = Égypte, administration, économie, société, culture des pharaons aux arabes: Milano, Università degli studi, 7-9 gennaio 2013*, Studi ellenistici, Supplementi 1, 69–80. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2013.

Cook, R. M. 'Amasis and the Greeks in Egypt'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 57/2 (1937): 227–37.

Cook, S. 'Greek Conjunctions in Non-Literary Coptic in the Late Byzantine/Early Islamic Period'. Masters, Macquarie University, 2015.

Cooper, A., and E. Georgala. 'Dative Loss and Its Replacement in the History of Greek'. In Kemenade, A. M. C. van and N. de Haas eds, *Historical Linguistics 2009: Selected Papers from the 19th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Nijmegen, 10-14 August 2009*, 277–92. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012.

Coulson, W. D. E. *Ancient Naukratis*. Oxbow Monograph 60. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1996.

Cowley, A. E. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Cribiore, R. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2001.

———. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, American Studies in Papyrology 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Cristofaro, S. *Aspetti sintattici e semantici delle frasi completive in greco antico*. Florence: Nuova Italia, 1996.

Cromwell, J. 'A Potential Case of Sibling Scribes'. *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 22 (2011): 67–82.

———. 'Aristophanes Son of Johannes: An 8th Century Bilingual Scribe?' In Papaconstantinou, A. ed., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 221–32. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. 'Coptic Documents in Two Copies: A Study of Corrections and Amendments'. In Derda, T., A. Łajtar and J. Urbanik eds, *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology, Warsaw 29.07—3.08 2013*, The Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement 28 1055–76. Warsaw: University of Warsaw, Institute of Archaeology, 2016.

———. 'Following in Father's Footsteps: The Question of Father-Son Training in Eighth Century Thebes'. In Schubert, P. ed., *Actes Du 26e Congrès International de Papyrologie. Genève, 16-21 Août 2010 (Geneva: University of Geneva)*, 149–57. Geneva: University of Geneva, 2012.

———. 'Identifying New Scribes in Old Documents: P.KRU 34 and 55'. *Enchroria: Zeitschrift Fur Demotisk Und Koptologie* 34 (2014/2015): 46–66.

———. 'Keeping It in the Family: Property Concerns in Eighth Century A.D. Thebes'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 72/2 (2013): 213–32.

———. *Recording Village Life: A Coptic Scribe in Early Islamic Egypt*. New Texts from Ancient Cultures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.

———. 'EN ONOMATI TOY ΘEOY TOY ΠANTOKPATOPOΣ: Variation and Specificity in Christian Invocation Formulae from Jeme'. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 174 (2010): 151–55.

Cromwell, J., and E. Grossman. 'Condition(al)s of Repayment: P. CLT 10 Reconsidered'. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 96 (2010): 149–60.

Crum, W. E. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 1905.

———. *Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca and Papyri*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

———. *Varia Coptica: Texts, Translations, Indexes*. Aberdeen: The University Press, 1939.

Crum, W. E., and J. L. L. Crawford. *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1909.

Crum, W. E., and G. Steindorff. *Koptische Rechtsurkunden Des Achten Jahrhunderts Aus Djême (Theben): Texte Und Indices (= P.KRU)*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1912.

Curnow, T. J. 'What Language Features Can Be "Borrowed"?' In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and R. M. W. Dixon eds, *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*, 412–36. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Cuzzolin, P. ‘Subordination’. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 23 December 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/subordination-COM_00000328.

Dahlgren, S. ‘Outcome of Long-Term Language Contact: Transfer of Egyptian Phonological Features onto Greek in Graeco-Roman Egypt’. Ph.D, University of Helsinki, 2017.

———. ‘Towards a Definition of an Egyptian Greek Variety’. *Papers in Historical Phonology* 1 (2016): 90–108.

Darnell, R., and J. Sherzer. ‘Areal Linguistic Studies in North America: A Historical Perspective’. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 37/1 (1971): 20–28.

Delattre, A. ‘Un Contrat de Prêt Copte Du Monastère de Baouît’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 79 (2004): 385–89.

Demaria, S. ‘Die Griechischen Entlehnungen in Den Koptischen Manichäischen Texten’. In Tongerloo, A. V. and L. Cirillo eds, *Il Manicheismo : Nuove Prospettive Della Ricerca : Quinto Congresso Internazionale Di Studi Sul Manicheismo, Atti : Dipartimento Di Studi Asiatici, Università Degli Studi Di Napoli ‘L’Orientale’, Napoli, 2-8 Settembre 2001*, 96–114. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

Depauw, M. ‘Autograph Confirmation in Demotic Contracts’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 78 (2003): 66–111.

———. *The Demotic Letter: A Study of Epistolographic Scribal Traditions against Their Intra- and Intercultural Background*. Demotische Studien 14. Sommerhausen: Zauzich, 2006.

Depauw, M., T. Kruse, J. G. Manning, T. Markiewicz, T. S. Richter, K. Vandorpe, and U. Yiftach-Firanko. ‘The Historical Development of the Form, Content, and Administration of Legal Documents’. In Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning and U. Yiftach-Firanko eds, *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*, 31–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Depuydt, L. ‘Coptic and Coptic Literature’. In Lloyd, A. B. ed., *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Ancient History, 732–54. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

———. ‘For the Sake of ογωϣ, 'Love': An Exception to the Stern-Jernstedt Rule and Its History’. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 79 (1993): 282-6.

Dijkstra, J. H.F. ‘New Light on the Patermouthis Archive from Excavations at Aswan When Archaeology and Papyrology Meet’. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 44 (2007): 179–209.

Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel, eds., *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Edgar, C. C. *Catalogue general des antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Caire N° 59140-59297, Zenon Papyri, t.II*. Le Caire impr. de l’institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1926.

———. *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du musée du Caire N° 59298-59531, Zenon Papyri, t.III*. Le Caire impr. de l’institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1928.

El Shamsy, A. 'The First Shāfiī: The Traditionalist Legal Thought of Abū Ya Qūb Al-Buwaytī (d. 231/846)'. *Islamic Law and Society* 14/3 (2007): 301–341.

Emde B., E. van, and L. Huitink. 'Syntax'. In Bakker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, 134–50. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Emmel, S. 'Coptic Literature in the Byzantine and Early Islamic World'. In Bagnall, R. S. ed., *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*, 83–102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Engelbach, R. 'A Coptic Ostrakon mentioning Ièb (Elephantine)'. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 38 (1938): 47–51.

Evans, T. V. 'Complaints of the Natives in a Greek Dress: The Zenon Archive and the Problem of Egyptian Interference'. In Mullen, A. and P. James eds., *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, 106–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———. 'The Last of the Optatives'. *Classical Philology* 98/1 (2003): 70–80.

———. 'Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri'. In Gagos, T. and A. Hyatt eds., *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology: Ann Arbor, July 29-August 4, 2007*, American Studies in Papyrology, 197–206. Ann Arbor: Scholarly Publishing Office, The University of Michigan Library, 2010.

Fanning, B. M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Farber, J. J. 'Family Financial Disputes in the Patermouthis Archive'. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 27/1/4 (1990): 111–22.

Farber, J. J., and B. Porten. 'The Patermouthis Archive: A Third Look'. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 23/3/4 (1986): 81–97.

Farrar, K. 'Some Constraints on the Borrowability of Syntactic Features (and Why None of Them Work)'. In Hogg, R. M. and L. van Bergen eds, *Historical Linguistics 1995: Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*, 89–100. Amsterdam: Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1998.

Faure, R. 'Argument Clause'. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/argument-clause-COM_00000035.

Ferrara, S. 'Mycenaean Texts: The Linear B Tablets'. In Bakker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, 11–24. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Fewster, P. 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt'. In Adams, J. N., M. Janse and S. Swain eds, *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, 220–45. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Filppula, M. *The Grammar of Irish English: Language in Hibernian Style*. ESA Studies in Germanic Linguistics 5, London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

———. 'The Quest for the Most "Parsimonious" Explanations: Endogeny vs. Contact Revisited'. In Hickey, R. ed., *Motives for Language Change*, 161–73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Forsten IV, B. W. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Chicester: Wiley-Blackewell, 2011.

Förster, H. 'Ein Weg für ein besseres Verständnis von P.Mich. inv. 6898'. In Gagos, T. and A. Hyatt eds, *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology: Ann Arbor, July 29-August 4, 2007*, 239–242. Ann Arbor: Scholarly Publishing Office, The University of Michigan Library, 2010.

———. *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Fournet, J. L. 'Archive ou archives de Dioscore? Les dernières années des "archives de Dioscore"'. In Fournet, J. L. ed., *Les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte. Histoire et culture dans l'égypte byzantine*. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, 17-30. Strasbourg: De Boccard, 2005.

———. 'Du nouveau dans les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité'. In Andorlini, I., G. Bastianini and M. Manfredi eds, *XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*. Atti Del XXII Congresso Internazionale Di Papirologia, 475–85. Florence: Università di Firenze; Instituto papirologico G. Vitelli, 1998

———. 'Sur les premiers documents juridiques coptes'. In Boud'hors, A. and C. Louis eds, *Actes des 13e Journées Coptes de Marseille (Juin 2007)*. Cahiers de La Bibliothèque Copte, 17:125– 137. Paris: De Boccard, 2010.

———. 'Sur les premiers documents juridiques coptes (2): Les archives de Phoibammôn et de Kollouthos'. In Boud'hors, A. and C. Louis eds, *Seizième journée d'études: (Genève, 19-21 juin 2013)*, 115–41. Paris: De Boccard, 2016.

Fournet, J. L., and C. Magdelaine, eds, *Les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte: histoire et culture dans l'Egypte byzantine: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 8-10 décembre 2005*. Paris: De Boccard, 2008.

Fournet, J. L., T. S. Richter, and H. Förster. 'Une misthôsis copte d'Aphrodité (P.Lond. Inv. 2849): Le plus ancien acte notarié en copte?' *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 58/2 (2013): 344–359.

Gardani, F. *Borrowing of Inflectional Morphemes in Language Contact*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008.

———. 'Plural across Inflection and Derivation, Fusion and Agglutination'. In Johanson, L. and M. I. Robbeets eds, *Copies versus Cognates in Bound Morphology*, 71–97. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.

Gardani, F., P. Arkadiev, and N. Amiridze. 'Borrowed Morphology: An Overview'. In Gardani, F., P. Arkadiev, and N. Amiridze eds, *Borrowed Morphology*, 1–26. Berlin; Boston; Munich: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.

Garel, E., and M. Nowak. 'Monastic Wills. The Continuation of Late Roman Legal Tradition?' In Choat, M. and M. Giorda eds, *Writing and Communication in Early Egyptian Monasticism*, 108–28. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017.

George, C. 'Verbal Valency'. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 29 October 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/verbal-valency-COM_00000368#d139371291e92.

Gignac, F. T. ‘Grammatical Developments of Greek in Roman Egypt Significant for the New Testament’. In Porter, S. E. and A. W. Pitts eds, *The Language of the New Testament*, 401–419. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Gómez-Rendón, J. ‘Grammatical Borrowing in Imbabura Quichua (Ecuador)’. In Matras, Y. and J. Sakel eds, *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 481–522. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

Gonis, N. ‘Five Tax Receipts from Early Islamic Egypt’ 143 (2003): 149–57.

———. ‘Recent News from Flavius Magistor and Sons’. *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 37 (2007): 125–33.

———. ‘SB VI 8986 and Heraclius’ Sons’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 166 (2008): 199–202.

Goodwin, C. W. ‘Curiosities of Law, 1. Conveyancing among the Copts of the Eighth Century’. *The Law Magazine and Law Review* 6 (1859): 237–48.

———. ‘Topographical Notes from Coptic Papyri’. *Zeitschrift Für Ägyptische Sprache Und Altertumskunde* 7/1–6 (1869): 73–75.

Goodwin, C. W. ‘XXIII. —Account of Three Coptic Papyri, and Other Manuscripts, Brought from the East by J. S. Stuart Glennie, Esq.’ *Archaeologia* 39/2 (1864): 447–56.

Grant, A. ‘Contact-Induced Change and the Openness of “Closed” Morphological Systems: Some Cases from Native America’. *Journal of Language Contact* 2 (2008)

Gregorios, A. ‘Greek Loan Words in Coptic: Greek Conjunctions in Coptic’. *Bulletin de La Société d’archéologie Copte* 30 (1991): 77–92.

Grenoble, L. ‘Morphosyntactic Change: The Impact of Russian on Evenki’. In Nerbonne, J., J. Schaeken, and D. Gilbers eds, *Languages In Contact*, 105–120. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000.

Griffith, F. LL. ‘The Old Coptic Magical Texts of Paris’. *Zeitschrift Für Ägyptische Sprache Und Altertumskunde* 38/1 (1900): 85–93.

Grimstad, M. B., T. Lohndal, and T. A. Åfarli. ‘Language Mixing and Exoskeletal Theory: A Case Study of Word-Internal Mixing in American Norwegian’. *Nordlyd* 41/2 (2014): 213–37.

Grohmann, A. ‘Die Papyrologie in ihrer Beziehung zur arabischen Urkundenlehre’. In Otto, W. G. A., L. Wenger, and B. Staatsbibliothek eds, *Papyri und Altertumswissenschaft: Vorträge des 3. Internationalen Papyrologentages in München vom 4. bis 7. September 1933*, 327–50. Munich, C. H. Beck, 1934.

Grohmann, A. *Arabic Papyri in the Egyptian Library*. Cairo: Egyptian Library Press, 1934.

Grossman, E. ‘Argument Clauses in Sahidic Coptic’. *Zeitschrift Für Ägyptische Sprache Und Altertumskunde* 136 (2009): 19–32.

———. ‘No Case before the Verb, Obligatory Case after the Verb in Coptic’. In Haspeltmath, M., E. Grossman, and T. S. Richter eds, *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55, 203–26. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015.

Grossman, E., and E. Polis. ‘Polysemy Networks in Language Contact. The Borrowing of the Greek-Origin Preposition κατά/ⲕⲁⲧⲁ in Coptic’. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S.

Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 229–262. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Grossman, E., and T. S. Richter. 'The Egyptian-Coptic Language: Its Setting in Space, Time and Culture'. In Haspeltmath, M., E. Grossman, and T. S. Richter eds, *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55, 69–102. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015.

Gumperz, J. J. and R. Wilson. 'Convergence and Creolization: A Case Study from the Aryan/Dravidian Border in India'. In Hymes, D. ed., *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 151–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Haeberli, E. 'Syntactic Effects of Inflectional Morphology and Competing Grammars'. In Fuß, E. and C. Trips eds, *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*, 101–30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.

Haig, G. 'Linguistic Diffusion in Present-Day Anatolia: From Top to Bottom'. In Aikhenvald, A. Y. and R. M. Dixon eds, *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*, 195–224. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Hale, K. L. 'Gaps in Grammer and Culture'. In Kinkade, M. D., K. L. Hale, and O. Werner eds, *Linguistics and Anthropology in Honor of C. F. Voegelin*, 295–315. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1971.

Harris, A. C., and L. Campbell. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Haspelmath, M. 'A Grammatical Overview of Egyptian and Coptic'. In Haspeltmath, M., E. Grossman, and T. S. Richter eds, *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55, 103–44. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015.

———. 'Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues'. In Haspelmath, M. and U. Tadmor eds, *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 35–54. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009.

———. 'Loanword Typology: Steps toward a Systematic Cross-Linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowability'. In Stolz, T., D. Bakker, and R. S. Palomo eds, *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*, 43–62. Berlin: Bod Third Party Titles, 2008.

———. 'The Three Adnominal Possessive Constructions in Egyptian-Coptic: Three Degrees of Grammaticalization'. In Haspeltmath, M., E. Grossman, and T. S. Richter eds, *Egyptian-Coptic Linguistics in Typological Perspective*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 55, 261–88. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Moutoy, 2015.

Hasznos, A. 'A Greek Accusativus Cum Infinitivo Construction and Its Equivalents in Coptic'. *Zeitschrift Für Ägyptische Sprache Und Altertumskunde* 132 (2005): 92–93.

———. *Graeco-Coptica: Greek and Coptic Clause Patterns*. Göttinger Orientforschungen. IV. Reihe, Ägypten 52. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.

———. 'Syntactic Patterns after Verbs of Exhorting'. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 237–64. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Hayward, R. J. ‘Afroasiatic’. In Heine, B. and D. Nurse eds, *African Languages: An Introduction*, 74–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Heath, J. *Linguistic Diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 1978.

Heine, B., U. Claudi, and F. Hünnemeyer. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. 2nd ed. edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1991.

Heine, B., and T. Kuteva. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. ‘On Contact-Induced Grammaticalization’. *Studies in Language* 27/3 (2003): 529–72.

Hildebrandt, K. A. ‘Grammatical Borrowing in Manange’. In Matras, Y. and J. Sakel eds *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 283–300. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

Hintze, F. ‘Berliner koptische Ostraka aus Elephantine’. *ZÄS* 14 (1977): 97–122.

Hock, H. H. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.

Höckmann, U., and D. Kreikenbom, eds. *Naukratis: die Beziehungen zu Ostgriechenland, Ägypten und Zypern in archaischer Zeit: Akten der Table Ronde in Mainz, 25.-27. November 1999*. Möhnesee: Bibliopolis, 2001.

Hoenigswald, H. M. ‘Greek’. In Ramat, A. G. and P. Ramat eds, *The Indo-European Languages*, 228–60. Oxon; New York: Routledge, 1998.

Hoijer, H. ‘Linguistic and Cultural Change’. *Language* 24/4 (1948): 335–45.

Hombert, M. ‘La papyrologie grecque’. *Revue de l’Université de Bruxelles* 31 (1925): 167–89.

Hopkins, N. A. ‘The Noun Classifiers of Cuchumatán Mayan Languages: A Case of Diffusion From Otomanguean’. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78/3 (2012): 411–27.

Hopper, P., and S. Thompson. ‘Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse’. *Language* 56 (1980).

Horrocks, G. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

———. ‘Syntax: From Classical Greek to Koine’. In Christidis, A. F., M. Arapopoulou, and M. Χρίτη eds, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 618–31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hunt, A. S. ‘Papyri and Papyrology’. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 1/2 (1914): 81–92.

Husson, G. ‘Houses in Syene in the Patermouthis Archive’. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 27/1/4 (1990): 123–37.

Hymes, D. H. ‘Na-Dene and Positional Analysis of Categories’. *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956): 624–38.

———. ‘Positional Analysis of Categories: A Frame for Reconstruction’. *WORD* 11/1 (1955): 10–23.

Hyvernat, H. *Les actes des martyrs de l'égypte*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1886.

Jakobson, R. 'Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques des langues'. In Munksgaard E. ed., *Actes du quatrième congrès de linguistes*, 48–59. Copenhagen, 1938.

Johnson, J. H. *The Demotic Verbal System*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2004.

———. *Thus Wrote 'Onchsheshonqy: An Introductory Grammar of Demotic*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 45. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986.

Junge, F. *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*. 2nd English ed. Griffith Institute Publications. Oxford: Griffith Institute, 2005.

Kahle, P. E. *Bala'izah: Coptic Texts from Deir El-Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*. Vol. 1., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Kaimio, J. 'Latin in Roman Egypt'. In Bingen, J. and G. Nachtergael eds, *Actes du XVe congrès international de papyrologie III*, Papyrologica Bruxellensia18, 27–33. Brussells: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1979.

Kammerzell, F. *Sprachkontakte und Sprachwandel im alten Ägypten*. Göttingen: Habilitationsschrift Universität Göttingen, 1998.

Kaplan, P. 'Cross-Cultural Contacts among Mercenary Communities in Saite and Persian Egypt'. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18/1 (2003): 1–31.

Karttunen, F. 'Uto-Aztecan and Spanish-Type Dependent Clauses in Nahuatl'. In Steever, S. B., C. A. Walker, and S. S. Mufwene eds, *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, April 22, 1976*, 150–58. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1976.

Kasser, R. 'Alphabets, Coptic'. In Atiya, A. S. ed., *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, 8:33–41. New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1991.

Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning, B. Muhs, T. S. Richter, and K. Vandorpe. 'The Languages of Law'. In Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning and U. Yiftach-Firanko eds, *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*, 96–144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning, and U. Yiftach-Firanko, eds. *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning, U. Yiftach-Firanko, and T. S. Richter. 'Introduction and Historical Framework'. In Keenan, J. G., J. G. Manning and U. Yiftach-Firanko eds, *Law and Legal Practice in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest: A Selection of Papyrological Sources in Translation, with Introductions and Commentary*, 1–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Kim, L. 'The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic'. In Bakker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. 468–82. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Kim, R. 'Uriel Weinreich and the Birth of Modern Contact Linguistics'. In Chruszczewski, P. P. and Z. Wąsik eds, *Languages in Contact 2010*. Philologica Wratislaviensia. Acta

et Studia 4, 99–112. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Filologicznej we Wrocławiu, 2011.

King, R. E. *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French Case Study*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000.

Krall, J. 'Ägyptische Abtheilung'. In Krall, J., C. Wessely, and J. Karabacek eds, *Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer: Führer durch die Ausstellung*, 27–60, Wien: Hölder, 1894.

Kramer, B. *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, Band XVIII, Griechische Texte XIII, Das Vertragsregister von Theogenis (P. Vindob. G. 40618), Textband und Tafelband*. Wien: Hollinek, 1991.

Kraus, Th. J. '(Il)Literacy in Non-Literary Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Further Aspects of the Educational Ideal in Ancient Literary Sources and Modern Times'. *Mnemosyne* 53/3 (2000): 322–42.

———. 'Slow Writers'—Βραδεως Γραφοντες: What, How Much, and How Did They Write?' In Kraus, Th. J. ed., *Ad fontes: Orginal Manuscripts and their Significance for Studying Early Christianity – Selected* Essays, 130-47. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Kraus, Th. J. '"Uneducated", "Ignorant", or Even "Illiterate"? Aspects and Background for an Understanding of ΑΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΟΙ (and ΙΔΙΩΤΑΙ) in Acts 4.13'. *New Testament Studies* 45/3 (1999): 434–49.

Kriegel, S. *Grammaticalisation et réanalyse : Approches de la variation créole et française*. Paris: CNRS Editions, 2003.

Labov, W. *Principles of Linguistic Change: Internal Factors*. Language in Society 20. Oxford; Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Layton, B. *A Coptic Grammar: With Chrestomathy and Glossary; Sahidic Dialect*. 3. ed., rev. Porta Linguarum Orientalium, N.S., Bd. 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.

Lefebvre, C. 'Grammaires en contact: définition et perspectives de recherches'. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 14 (1984): 11–48.

Lefort, C. *Concordance Du Nouveau Testament Sahidique, I. Les Mots d'origine Grecque. Subs. 1.* Louvain: Peeters Publishers, 1950.

Leiwo, M. 'Substandard Greek: Remarks from Mons Claudianus'. In Kennell, N. M. and J. E. Tomlinson eds, *Ancient Greece at the Turn of the Millennium: Recent Work and Future Perspectives: Actes Du Symposium d'Athèns: Proceeding of the Athens Symposium, 18-20 May 2001 = La Grèce Antique Au Tournant Du Millénaire ; Travaux Récents et Perspectives d'avenir*. Publications of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens 4, 237–62. Toronto: Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens, 2005.

Lewis, N. 'The Demise of the Demotic Document: When and Why'. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 79 (1993): 276.

Lincke, E. S. *Verotung in Raum und Zeit im Ägyptischen und Koptischen: Präpositionen, Positions- und Bewegungsverben als Mittel zum Ausdruck spatialer und temporaler Relationen.* Ph.D, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, in progress.

Lindenberger, J. M. *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003

Lipski, J. M. ‘Structural Linguistics and Bilingual Interference: Problems and Proposals’. *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 3, no. 3 (1976): 229–237.

Loprieno, A. *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. ‘From VSO to SVO? Word Order and Rear Extraposition in Coptic’. In Sornicola, R., E. Poppe, and A. Shisha-Halevy eds, *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 213, 23–39. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000.

Love, E. O. D. *Code-Switching with the Gods: The Bilingual (Old Coptic-Greek) Spells of PGM IV (P. Bibliothèque Nationale Supplément Grec. 574) and Their Linguistic, Religious, and Socio-Cultural Context in Late Roman Egypt*. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2016.

Lüddeckens, E. ‘Demotische und koptische Urkundenformeln’. *Enchoria* 2 (1972): 21–31.

Luraghi, S. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2003.

MacCoull, L. S. B. ‘The Coptic Archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodito’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 56 (1981): 185–93.

———. *Coptic Legal Documents: Law as Vernacular Text and Experience in Late Antique Egypt*. Tempe; Turnhout: Mrts Arizona State University, 2009.

———. *Dioscorus of Aphrodito: His Work and His World*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 16. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

———. ‘Further Notes on Interrelated Greek and Coptic Documents of the Sixth and Seventh Centuries’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 70 (1995): 341–53.

———. ‘More on Documentary Coptic at Aphrodito’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 82 (2007): 381–90.

———. ‘P. Mich. Inv. 6898 Revisited: A Sixth-Century Coptic Contract from Aphrodito’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 141 (2002): 199–203.

———. ‘The Sudden Death of Coptic Culture’. In MacCoull, L. S. B. ed. *Coptic Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, 35–45. Brookfield, Vt.: Routledge, 1993.

Mackey, W. F. ‘Bilingual Interference: Its Analysis and Measurement.’ *Journal of Communication*, 15/4 (1965): 239-249

Maehler, H. ‘Die griechische Schule im ptolemäischen Ägypten’. In van ’t Dack, E., P. van Dessel, and W. van Gucht eds, *Egypt and the Hellenistic world: proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24-26 May 1982*, 191–203. Leuven: Orientaliste, 1983.

Mairs, R. ‘Κατὰ Τὸ Δυνατόν: Demotic-Greek Translation in the Archive of the Theban Choachytes’. In Cromwell, J. and E. Grossman eds, *Scribal Repertoires in Egypt from the New Kingdom to the Early Islamic Period*, 211–26. Oxford; New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Manning, J. G.. *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Structure of Land Tenure*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305 - 30 BC*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Manolessou, I.. ‘The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek’. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2/1 (2002): 119–48.

Markiewicz, T. ‘Three Coptic Ostraca from Warsaw Private Collections’. *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 28 (1998): 95–8.

Masliyah, Sadok. ‘Four Turkish Suffixes in Iraqi Arabic: -li, -lik, -siz and −çi’. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 41/2 (1996): 291–300.

Matras, Y. ‘Layers of Convergent Syntax in Macedonian Turkish’. *Mediterranean Language Review* 15 (2004): 63–86.

———. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. ‘Universals of Structural Borrowing’. In Siemund, P. ed., *Linguistic Universals and Language Variation*, 200–229. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.

———. ‘Utterance Modifiers and Universals of Grammatical Borrowing’. *Linguistics* 36/2 (1998): 281–331.

Matras, Y., and J. Sakel. ‘Investigating the Mechanisms of Pattern Replication in Language Convergence’. *Studies in Language* 31/4 (2007): 829–65.

Matthews, R., and C. Roemer. ‘Introduction: The Worlds of Ancient Egypt – Aspects, Sources, Interactions’. In Matthews, R. and C. Roemer eds, *Ancient Perspectives on Egypt*. Encounters with Ancient Egypt, 1–20. London: Portland, Or: UCL Press, 2003.

McMahon, April M. S. *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Meakins, F. ‘From Absolutely Optional to Only Nominally Ergative: The Life Cycle of the Gurindji Ergative Suffix’. In Gardani, F., P. Arkadiev and N. Amiridze eds, *Borrowed Morphology*, 189–218. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015.

Meillet, A. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*. Paris: É. Champion, 1921.

Menchetti, A. *Ostraka Demotici e Bilingui a Narmouthis*. Pisa, 2005.

Menchetti, A., and R. Pintaudi ‘Ostraka Greci e Bilingui Da Narmuthis’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 82 (2007): 227–80.

———. ‘Ostraka Greci e Bilingui Da Narmuthis (II)’. *Chronique d’Egypte* 84 (2009): 201–38.

Meyerhoff, M. ‘Replication, Transfer, and Calquing: Using Variation as a Tool in the Study of Language Contact’. *Language Variation and Change* 21/3 (2009): 297–317.

Milroy, J. ‘Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization’. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5/4 (2001): 530–55.

Milroy, J., and L. Milroy. *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. 3rd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

Minnen, P. van. ‘Dioscorus and the Law’. In MacDonald, A. A., M. W. Twomey, and G. J. Reinink eds, *Learned Antiquity: Scholarship and Society in the Near-East, the Greco-Roman World, and the Early Medieval West*, 115–33. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2003.

Mithun, M. ‘The Grammaticization of Coordination’. In Haiman, J. and S. A. Thompson eds, *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 331–59. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988.

Mitteis, L. *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs, mit Beiträgen zur kentniss des griechischen Rechts und der spätrömischen Rechtsentwicklung*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891.

Möller, A. *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece*. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Moravcsik, E. A. ‘Universals of Language Contact’. In Greenberg, J. H., C. A. Ferguson, and E. A. Moravcsik eds, *Universals of Human Language, I: Method and Theory*, 94–122. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1978.

Morenz, S. ‘Die ⲛⲥⲓ-Konstruktion als sprachliche und stilistische Erscheinung des Koptischen’. *Annales du service des antiquités de l’Égypte* 52 (1954): 1–15.

Muffs, Y. *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri from Elephantine*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Muhs, B. ‘The Grapheion and the Disappearance of Demotic Contracts in Early Roman Tebtynis and Soknopaiu Nesos’. In Lippert, S. L. and M. Schentuliet eds, *Tebtynis Und Soknopaiu Nesos: Leben Im Römerzeitlichen Fajum: Akten Des Internationalen Symposions Vom 11. Bis 13. Dezember 2003 in Sommerhausen Bei Würzburg*, 93–104. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2005.

Mullen, Alex. ‘Introduction: Multiple Languages, Multiple Identities’. In Mullen, A. and P. James eds, *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, 1–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Müller, F. M. *Lectures on the Science of Language*. London : Longmans, Green, 1862.

Müller, M. ‘Contrast in Coptic I: Concessive Constructions in Sahidic’. *Lingua Aegyptia* 17 (2009): 139–82.

———. ‘Greek Connectors in Coptic: A Contrastive Overview I’. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 265–315. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

———. ‘Greek Connectors in Coptic. A Contrastive Overview II. Semantically Subordinating Connectors’. *Lingua Aegyptia* 20 (2012): 111–64.

Muysken, P. ‘Language Contact Outcomes as the Result of Bilingual Optimization Strategies’. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16/4 (2013): 709–30.

Myers-Scotton, C. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley, 2006.

———. ‘Way to Dusty Death: The Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis’. In Grenoble, L. A. and L. J. Whaley eds, *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*, 289–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Nagel, P. ‘Die Einwirkung Des Griechischen auf Die Entstehung der Koptischen Literatursprache’. In Altheim, F. and R. Stiehl eds, *Chritentum Am Roten Meer*, 327–55. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

Ó Sé, D. ‘The Perfect in Modern English’. *Ériu* 43 (1992): 39–67.

Oréal, E. ‘Contact linguistique: le cas du rapport entre le grec et le copte’. *Lalies* 19 (1998): 289–306.

———. ‘Greek Causal Discourse Markers in Coptic Letters: A Case Study in the Pragmatics of Code-Switching’. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 317–33. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Otto, W. *Beiträge zur Hierodulie im hellenistischen Ägypten von Walter Otto: Aus dem Nachlas herausgegeben von Friedrich Zucker*. Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1950.

Packman, Z. M. ‘Epithets with the Title Despotes in Regnal Formulas in Document Dates and in the Imperial Oath’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 90 (1992): 251–57.

———. ‘Notes on Papyrus Texts with the Roman Imperial Oath’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 89 (1991): 91–102.

———. ‘Regnal Formulas in Document Date and in the Imperial Oath’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 91 (1992): 61–76.

Pang, F. G. H. *Revisiting Aspect and Aktionsart: A Corpus Approach to Koine Greek Event Typology*. Leiden: Boston; Brill, 2016.

Papaconstantinou, A. ‘“Notes Sur Les Actes de Donation d’Enfant Au Monastère Thébain de Saint-Phoibammon”, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 32 (2002): 83-105’.

———. ‘'What Remains behind’: Hellenism and Romanitas in Christian Egypt after the Arab Conquest’. In Cotton, H. ed., *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, 447–66. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. ‘Why Did Coptic Fail Where Aramaic Succeeded? Linguistic Developments in Egypt and the Near East after the Arab Conquest’. In Mullen A. and P. James eds, *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, 58–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———. ‘Θεῖα Οἰκονομία: les actes Thébains de donation d’enfants ou la gestion monastique de la pénurie’. *Travaux et Mémoires* 14 (2002): 511–26.

Papanastassiou, G. C. ‘Morphology: From Classical Greek to the Koine’. In Christidis, A. F., M. Arapopoulou, and M. Χρίτη eds, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 610–17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Papanastassiou, G. C., and E. B. Petrounias. ‘The Morphology of Classical Greek’. In Christidis, A. F., M. Arapopoulou, and M. Χρίτη eds, *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 571–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Parker, R. A. ‘The Durative Tenses in P. Rylands IX’. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20/3 (1961): 180–7.

Pernigotti, S. ‘Qualche Osservazioni Sugli Ostraka Di Medinet Madi’. In Capasso, M. ed., *Da Ercolano all’Egitto: Ricerche Varie di Papirologia* 7, 117–30. Lecce: Papyrologica Lupiensia, 1998.

Petrie, W. M. Flinders 'The Egyptian Bases of Greek History'. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 11 (1890): 271–77.

Peyraube, A. 'L'évolution des structures grammaticales.' *Langages* 36/146 (2002): 46–58.

Pintaudi, R., and Pieter J. Sijpesteijn. 'Ostraka di Contenuto Scolastico Provenienti da Narmuthis'. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 76 (1989): 85–92.

Pompeo, F. 'Dative'. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/dative-COM_00000086#d139581840e70.

Porten, B., ed. *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change*. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and Civilization. Leiden; New York; Cologne: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996.

Porten, B., and J. C. Greenfield. 'The Aramaic Papyri from Hermopolis'. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 80/2 (1968): 216–31

Porter, S. E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

Preisendanz, K. *Papyrusfunde Und Papyrusforschung*. Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1933.

Preisigke, F. *Wörterbuch Der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden*. Berlin: Selbstverlag der Erben, 1925.

Quack, J. F. 'How the Coptic Script Came About'. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 27–96. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Quaegebeur, J. 'De La Préhistoire de l'écriture Copte'. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica Leuven* 13 (1982): 125–136.

Rāġib, Y. 'Un Papyrus Arabe de l'an 22 de l'hégire'. In Alleaume, G., S. Denoix, and M. Tuchscherer eds, *Histoire, archéologies littératures du monde musulman: melanges en l'honneur d'André Raymond*, 363–72. Cairo: Institut Francais d'Archeologie Orientale, 2009.

Rapp, C. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkley; Los Angeles; London: University Of California, 2013.

Reintges, C. H. 'Code-Mixing Strategies in Coptic Egyptian'. *Lingua Aegyptia* 9 (2001): 193–237.

———. 'Coordination, Converbs and Clause Chaining in Coptic Egyptian: Typology and Structural Analysis'. In Bril, I. ed., *Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy: Syntax and Pragmatics*, 203–68. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010.

———. 'Coptic Egyptian as a bilingual language variety'. In de la Peña, P. B. ed., *Lenguas en contacto: el testimonio escrito*. Manuales y anejos de 'Emerita' 46, 69–86. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2004.

Revillout, E. 'Les prières pour les morts dans l'épigraphie égyptienne'. *Revue égyptologique* 4 (1885).

———. *Précis du droit égyptien comparé aux autres droits de l'antiquité*. Paris : V. Giard & Brière, 1903.

Riaño R. D. *El complemento directo en griego antiguo: un estudio sobre los argumentos verbales de objeto en la prosa del griego antiguo*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2006.

Richter, T. S. 'Coptic Legal Documents, with Special Reference to the Theban Area'. In Gabra, G. and H. N. Takla eds, *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt: Nag Hammadi - Esna*, 124–121. Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2010.

———. 'Coptic Letters'. *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 62 (2008): 739–70.

———. 'Coptic Papyri and Juristic Papyrology' *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 43 (2013): 27.

———. 'Die koptischen Papyri aus dem „Ankauf aus Edfû (Apollinopolis magna) vom Jahre 1911" der Jenaer Papyrussammlung (P.Ien. Inv. 446–453)'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 65/1 (2019): 156–175.

———. 'Greek, Coptic, and the "Language of the Hijra": Rise and Decline of the Coptic Language in Late Antique and Medieval Egypt'. In Cotton, H. ed., *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, 401–46. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. 'Language Choice in the Qurra Dossier'. ' In Papaconstantinou, A. ed., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 189–220. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. 'O.Louvre AF 12678: Ein koptischer Mietvertrag zwischen Muslimen'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 58/2 (2012): 360–365

———. *Rechtssemantik und forensische Rhetorik: Untersuchungen zu Wortschatz, Stil und Grammatik der Sprache koptischer Rechtsurkunden*. 2., überarb. Aufl. Philippika 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.

———. 'What's in a Story? Cultural Narratology and Coptic Child Donation Documents'. *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 35 (2005): 237–64.

———. 'Zur Sprache thebanischer Rechtsurkunden: Auffällige Konstruktionen im Bereich der zweiten Tempora'. In Immerzeel, M., J. van der Vliet, M. Kersten, and C. van Zoest eds., *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium: Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Coptic Studies, Leiden, August 27-September 2, 2000*, 145–54. Leuven; Paris; Dudley, MA: Peeters Publishers, 2004.

———. 'Zwei Urkunden des koptischen Notars David, des Sohnes des Psate'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 44 (1998): 69-85.

———. '»Zwischen der Epoche der Pyramidenbauer und den Anfängen des Christenthums« Sprachwandel im ägyptischen Wortschatz und das Leipziger Projekt Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (DDGLC)'. *Denkströme. Journal der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 11 (2013): 67–80.

Rießler, M. 'Grammatical Borrowing in Kildin Saami'. In Matras, Y. and J. Sakel eds, *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

Rijksbaron, A. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Ritner, R. K. 'Third Intermediate Period Antecedents of Demotic Legal Terminology'. In Ryholt, K. ed., *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies:*

Copenhagen, 23-27 August 1999. CNI Publications 27, 343–60. Copenhagen: The Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Near Eastern Studies, University of Copenhagen, 2002.

Romaine, S. *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Rowlandson, J. 'Administration and Law: Graeco-Roman'. In Lloyd, A. B. ed., *A Companion to Ancient Egypt I*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, 237–54. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Rozencvejg, V. J. *Linguistic Interference and Convergent Change*. The Hague; Paris: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2017.

Rutherford, I. 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt? Exploring the Archive of Phatres of Narmuthis'. In Evans, T. V. and D. Obbink eds, *The Language of the Papyri*, 198–207. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Šabec, N. 'Language Change in a Contact Situation: The Case of Slovene in North America'. *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 2 (1999): 33–46.

Sakel, J., and Y. Matras. *Database of Convergence and Borrowing*. Manchester: University of Manchester, 2004.

Sakel, J. 'Types of Loans: Matter and Pattern'. In Matras, Y. and J. Sakel eds, *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 15–29. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

Salmons, J. 'Bilingual Discourse Marking: Code Switching, Borrowing, and Convergence in Some German-American Dialects'. *Linguistics* 28 (1990): 453–80.

Sankoff, G. 'The Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact'. In Chambers, J. K., P. Trudgill, and N. Schilling-Estes eds, *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 638–68. Malden, MA; Oxford; Carlton: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

Sapir, E. *Language an Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, 1921.

———. 'The Hokan Affinity of Subtiaba in Nicaragua'. *American Anthropologist* 27/4 (1925): 491–527.

Satzinger, H. 'An Old Coptic Text Reconsidered: PGM 94ff'. In Giversen, S., M. Krause, and P. Nagel eds, *Coptology – Past, Present, and Future: Studies in Honour of Rodolphe Kasser*, 213–24. Leuven: Peeters, 1994.

———. 'The Old Coptic Schmidt Papyrus'. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 12 (1975): 37–50.

———. 'Zero Article, Bare Noun, Absolutive Case'. In Bosson, N., A. Boud'hors, and Sydney H. Aufrère eds, *Labor Omnia Uicit Improbus: Miscellanea in Honorem Ariel Shisha-Halevy*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 256, 331–48. Leuven; Paris; Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2017.

———. 'ⲕⲁⲑⲁⲣⲱⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲁⲡⲟⲕⲣⲟⲧⲱⲥ in Koptischen Urkunden'. *Chronique d'Egypte* 45 (1970): 417–20.

Schaten, S. 'Ein weiteres Familienarchiv aus Djeme: KRU 66 und KRU 76, die Testament der Susanna'. In Kramer, B. ed., *Akten des 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.-19.8. 1995 [= Pap.Congr. XXI]*, 902–13. Stuttgart; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1997.

Schentuleit, M. ‘Die spätdemotische Hausverkaufsurkunde P. BM 262: Ein bilingues Dokument aus Soknopaiu Nesos mit griechischen Übersetzungen’. *Enchoria* 27 (2001): 127–54.

———. ‘Satabus aus Soknapaiu Nesos: Aus dem Leben eines Priesters am Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit’. *Chronique d’Égypte* 82 (2007): 101–25.

Schiller, A. A. ‘Coptic Law’. *Juridical Review* 43 (1931): 211–40.

———. ‘The Courts Are No More’. In Volterra, E. ed., *Studi in Onore di Edoardo Volterra* 1, 469–502. Milan: A. Giuffrè, 1971.

———. ‘The Fate of Imperial Legislation in Late Byzantine Egypt’. In Hazard, J. N. and W. J. Wagner eds, *Legal Thought in the United States of America under Contemporary Pressures*, 41–60. Brussells: Émile Bruylant, 1970.

———. ‘Koptisches Recht. Eine Studie auf Grund der Quellen und Abhandlungen’. *Kritische Vierteljahrresschrift für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft* 25 (1932): 250–96.

———. ‘Review of Amelotti and Luzzatto 1972’. *Gnomon* 47 (1975): 582–87.

———. *Ten Coptic Legal Texts (= P. CLT)*. Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York, NY). Department of Egyptian Art. Publications 2. New York: Arno Press, 1932.

———. ‘Zum gegenwartigen Stand der juristischen Papyrusforschung: Coptic Documents: A Monograph on the Law of Coptic Documents and a Survey of Coptic Legal Studies, 1938-1956’. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* 60 (1957): 190–211.

Schmid, M. S. ‘The Debate on Maturational Constraints in Bilingual Development: A Perspective from First-Language Attrition’. *Language Acquisition* 21/4 (2014): 386–410.

Schuchardt, H. *Dem Herrn Franz von Miklosich zum 20. November 1883*. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1884.

Schultze-Berndt, E. ‘Recent Grammatical Borrowing into an Australian Aboriginal Language: The Case of Jaminjung and Kriol’. In Matras, Y. and J. Sakel eds, *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 363–86. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2007.

Seidl, E. *Der Eid im römisch-ägyptischen Provinzialrecht*. 2 vols. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1933.

Shisha-Halevy, A. ‘A Definitive Sahidic Coptic Grammar’. *Orientalia* 71/4 (2002): 424–59.

———. *Coptic Grammatical Categories: Structural Studies in the Syntax of Shenoutean Sahidic*. Analecta Orientalia 53. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1986.

———. *Topics in Coptic Syntax: Structural Studies in the Bohairic Dialect*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 160. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007.

Sijpesteijn, P. M. ‘Multilingual Archives and Documents in Post Conquest Egypt’. In Papaconstantinou, A. ed., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 105–26. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. ‘New Rule over Old Structures: Egypt after the Muslim Conquest’. In Crawford, H. E. W. ed., *Regime Change in the Ancient Near East and Egypt: From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*. Proceedings of the British Academy 136, 183–200. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 2007.

———. Seals and Papyri from Early Islamic Egypt'. In Duistermaat, K., I. Regulski, and P. Verkinderen eds, *Seals and Sealing Practices in the Near East. Developments in Administration and Magic from Prehistory to the Islamic Period: Proceedings of an ... 2-3, 2009*, 171–82. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

———. 'The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Beginning of Muslim Rule'. In Bagnall, R. S. ed., *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*, 437–59. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Silva-Corvalán, C. 'The Study of Language Contact: An Overview of the Issues'. In Silva-Corvalán, C. ed., *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*, Washington, D..C: Georgetown University Press, 1997.

Smith, E. M. *Naukratis: A Chapter in the History of the Hellenization of Egypt*, Ph.D thesis, Bryn Mawr College, 1926.

Spalinger, A. 'Psammetichus, King of Egypt: I'. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 13 (1976): 133–47.

Stein, A. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Aegyptens unter roemischer Herrschaft*. Stuttgart, Metzler, 1915.

Steinwenter, A. 'Kindesschenkungen an Koptische Klöster'. *Zeitschrift Der Savigny-Stijiung, Kanonistische Abteitung* 11 (1921): 175–207.

Steinwenter, A. *Studien zu den koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Oberägypten.* Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyrusforschung XIX. Leipzig: Verlag Haessel, 1920.

———. *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*. Munich: Beck, 1955.

———. *Recht und Kultur: Aufsätze und Vorträge eines österreichischen Rechtshistorikers*. Graz; Cologne: H. Böhlaus Nachf., 1958.

Stern, L. 'Das Testament der Susanna nach einem koptischen Papyrus im Britischen Museum'. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 26 (1888): 128–32.

———. 'Zwei koptische Urkunden aus Theban auf einem Papyrus des Ägyptischen Museums Zu Berlin'. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 22 (1884): 143–52.

Stolk, J. V. 'Dative and Genitive Case Interchange in Greek Papyri from Roman-Byzantine Egypt'. *Glotta - Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache* 93 (2017): 182–212.

———. 'Subscriptions to a Renunciation Contract'. *Journal of Coptic Studies* 19 (2017): 53–56.

Stolz, C., and T. Stolz. 'Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika Spanisch-Amerindischer Sprachkontakt (Hispanoindiana II)'. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49/1 (1996): 86–123.

Storch, A. 'How Long Do Linguistic Areas Last? Western Nilotic Grammars in Contact'. In Aikhenvald, A. and R. M. W. Dixon eds, *Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 94–113. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Tarallo, F., and J. Myhill. 'Interference and Natural Language Processing in Second Language Acquisition'. *Language Learning* 33/1 (1983): 55–76.

Taubenschlag, R. ‘Die materna Potestas im gräko-ägyptischen Recht’. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 49/1 (1929): 115–128.

———. ‘Geschichte der Rezeption des römischen Privatrechts in Ägypten’. In Albertario, E., P. Ciapessoni, and P. De Francisci eds, *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante nel XL anno d’insegnamento*, 367–440. Milano: Fratelli Treves, 1930.

———. ‘Prozesse Aus Pacht-, Miet-, Dienst- und Werkverträgen in den griechischen Papyri’. *ArchPF* 12 (1937): 187–93.

———. ‘The Legislation of Justinian in Light of the Papyri’. *Byzantion* 15 (1940): 280–95.

Taubenschlag, R. *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: 332 B. C.-640 A.D.*, New York: Herald Square Press, 1944.

Tervoort, B. T. ‘Bilingual Interference’. In Schlesinger, I. M. and L. Nami eds, *Sign Language of the Deaf*, 169–240. New York; San Francisco; London: Academic Press, 1978.

Tesnière, L. ‘Le mélange des langues’. *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague* 8 (1939).

Thissen, H. J. ‘Koptische Kinderschenkungsurkunden. Zur Hierodulie im Christlichen Ägypten’. *Enchoria* 14 (1986): 117–28.

Thomas, R. I, and A. Villing. ‘Naukratis Revisited 2012: Integrating New Fieldwork and Old Research’, *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 20, (2013): 81-125.

Thomason, S. G. ‘Contact as a Source of Language Change’. In Janda, R. D. and B. D. Joseph eds, *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 687–712. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

———. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.

Thomason, S. G., and T. Kaufman. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Thompson, D. J. ‘Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt’. In Bowman, A. K. ed., *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, 67–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Till, W. *Erbrechtliche untersuchungen Aufgrund der koptischen Urkunden*. Vol. 229.2. Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte. Vienna: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1954.

———. ‘Die Koptischen Eheverträge’. In Stumvoll, J. ed., *Die Österreichische Nationalbibliothek: Festschrift Für Josef Bick*, 627–38. Vienna: H. Bauer-Verlag, 1948.

———. ‘Die koptischen Arbeitsverträge’. In Biezunska-Malowist, I. ed., *Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae* I, 273-329. Warsaw: Ossolineum, 1956.

———. ‘Die koptische Stipulationsklausel’. *Orientalia* 19/1 (1950): 81–87.

———. *Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Text, Übersetzungen, Indices. (= CPR IV)*. Vienna: A. Holzhausens Nachfolger, 1958.

———. *Die koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Theben*. Vienna; Graz; Cologne: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1964.

———. 'Koptische Parallelurkunden'. In Arangio-Ruiz, V. ed., *Studi in Onore Di Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz*, 197–208. Naples: Jovene, 1952.

———. 'Zum Eid in den koptischen Rechtsurkunden'. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 76/1 (1940): 74–79.

Till, W., and A. Steinwenter. 'Neue koptische Rechtsurkunden'. *Aegyptus* 13/1/2 (1933): 305–22.

Torallas Tovar, S. 'Egyptian Lexical Interference in the Greek of Byzantine and Early Islamic Egypt'. In Sijpesteijn, P. and L. Sundelin eds, *Papyrology and the History of Early Islamic Egypt*. Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts, v. 55, 143–78. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

———. 'Greek in Egypt'. In Bakker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, 253–66. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

———. 'Koine, Features Of'. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 24 September 2013. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics/koine-features-of-COM_00000197.

———. 'Linguistic Identity in Graeco-Roman Egypt'. In Papaconstantinou, A., *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*, 17–46. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

———. 'The Reverse Case: Egyptian Borrowing in Greek'. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 97–113. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

Trubetzkoy, N. S. 'Gedanken Über Das Indogermanenproblem'. *Acta Linguistica* 1/1 (1939): 81–89.

Trudgill, P. *Sociolinguistic Typology: Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Tubach, J. 'Griechische Lehnwörter in den koptischen Manichaica. Zur Problematik eines Lehnwortschatzes in einer Übersetzung aus einem anderen Kulturbereich'. In Grunert, S. and I. Hafemann eds, *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur ägyptischen Lexikographie*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 14, 329–43. Leiden: Berlin: Cologne: Brill, 1999.

Vachek, J. 'On the Interplay of External and Internal Factors in the Development of Languages'. In Malmberg, B. ed., *Readings in Modern Linguistics*, 209–23. Stockholm: De Gruyter Mouton, 1972.

Vanderheyden, L. 'Les lettres coptes des archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité'. In Schubert, P. ed., *Actes Du 26e Congres International de Papyrologie: Genève, 16 - 21 Août 2010*. Recherches et Rencontres 30, 793–800. Geneve: Droz, 2012.

———. 'Les Lettres Coptes Des Archives de Dioscore d'Aphroditê (VIe Sièecle; Égypte)'. PhD, École pratique des hautes études, 2015.

Viti, C. 'Rheme before Theme in the Noun Phrase: A Case Study from Ancient Greek'. *Studies in Language* 32/4 (2008): 894–915.

Vittmann, G.. ‘Semitisches Sprachgut Im Demotischen’. *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Des Morgenlandes* 86 (1996): 435–47.

Voigt, R. ‘Ägyptosemitischer Sprachvergleich’. In Grunert, S. and I. Hafemann, *Textcorpus und Wörterbuch: Aspekte zur Ägyptischen Lexikographie*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 14. 345–66. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.

Wagner, E.-M., B. Outhwaite, and B. Beinhoff. ‘Scribes and Language Change’. In Wagner, E. M., B. Outhwaite, and B. Beinhoff eds, *Scribes as Agents of Language Change*, Studies in Language Change 10, 3–18. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 2013.

Weinreich, U. *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.

Weiss, M. ‘Morphology and Word Formation’. In Bakker, E. J. ed., *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 104–19. Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Wenger, L.. *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Vienna: A. Holzhausens Nfg., 1953.

Whitney, W. D. ‘On Mixture in Language’. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12 (1881): 5–26.

Wilfong, T. G. ‘Western Thebes in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries: A Bibliographic Survey of Jême and Its Surroundings’. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 26/1/2 (1989): 89–145.

Wilson, M. R. *Coptic Future Tenses: Syntactical Studies in Sahidic*, The Hague; Paris: Mouton, 2011.

Winford, D. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley, 2003.

Wipszycka, E. *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IVe au VIIIe siècle*. Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1972.

———. ‘Καθολική et les autres épithètes qualifiant le nom Έκκλησία: Contribution à l’étude de l’ordre hiérarchique des églises dans l’Égypte Byzantine’. *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 24 (1994): 191–212.

Worp, K. A. ‘Byzantine Imperial Titulature in the Greek Documentary Papyri: The Oath Formulas’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 45 (1982): 199–223.

———. ‘Das Berliner Ostrakon P. 14735: Koptisch oder Griechisch?’. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 36 (1990): 74–7

———. ed. *Greek Papyri from Kellis: P.Kell.G. 1: Nos. 1 - 90*. Oxbow Monograph 54. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1995.

———. ‘Town Quarters in Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Early Arab Egypt’. In Sijpesteijn , P. and L. Sundelin eds, *Papyrology and the History of Early Islamic Egypt*. Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts 55, 227–48. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.

Worp, K. A., and J. M. Diethart. *Notarsunterschriften im Byzantinischen Ägypten (Byz.Not.)*. Leiden: Broder Hollinek, 1986.

Yamuza, E. Ruiz. ‘Mood and Modality’. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, 2013. <http://dx.doi.org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000240>

Yiftach-Firanko, U. ‘Who Killed the Double Document in Ptolemaic Egypt?’ *Archiv Für Papyrusforschung Und Verwandte Gebiete* 54/2 (2008): 203–18.

Younes, K. M. and J. Bruning. ‘Arabic Documents from the First Two Islamic Centuries’. *The Formation of Islam: The View from Below*, version 13.4.2015, January 2017, https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/binaries/content/assets/geesteswetenschappen/onderzoeksprojecten/foi-arab.-docs..pdf

Youtie, H. C. ‘Because They Do Not Know Letters’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 19 (1975): 101–8.

———. ‘Αγραμματος: An Aspect of Greek Society in Egypt’. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75 (1971): 161–76.

———. ‘Βραδέως Γράφων: Between Literacy and Illiteracy’. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 12, no. 2 (1971): 239–61.

———. ‘Ὑπογραφεύς: The Social Impact of Illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt’. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 17 (1975): 201–21.

Zakrzewska, E. D. ‘“A Bilingual Language Variety” or “the Language of the Pharaohs”? Coptic from the Perspective of Contact Linguistics’. In Dils, P., E. Grossman, T. S. Richter, and W. Schenkel eds, *Greek Influence on Egyptian-Coptic: Contact-Induced Change in an Ancient African Language*, 115–61. Hamburg: Widmaier Verlag, 2017.

———. ‘Complex Verbs in Bohairic Coptic: Language Contact and Valency’. In Nolan, B. and E. Diedrichsen eds, *Argument Realisation in Complex Predicates and Complex Events: Verb-Verb Constructions at the Syntax-Semantic Interface*. Studies in Language Companion Series 180, 213–44. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2017.

———. ‘[Review of: A. Hasznos (2012) Graeco-Coptica: Greek and Coptic Clause Patterns]’. *Lingua Aegyptia* 23 (2015).

Appendix A: Corpus

All texts are dated according to Trismegistos (or the *editio princeps* in the absence of a TM number), unless otherwise indicated:

Bagnell and Worp = Bagnall, R. S., and K. A. Worp. 'Dating the Coptic Legal Documents from Aphrodito'

Cromwell = Cromwell, J., *Recording Village Life: A Coptic Scribe in Early Islamic Egypt*

Text	Date	Document type	Written	Dialect	Scribe
CPR IV 35	7th C	Delivery contract	Hermopolis	S	Johannes
CPR IV 37	8th C	Supply agreement	Fayum	F	Neilammonos
CPR IV 48	625	Delivery contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	Apollo
CPR IV 55	8th C	Debt instrument	Fayum	F	Moses
CPR IV 62	8th C	Debt instrument	Fayum	F	n/a
CPR IV 74	7th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolis	S	Marcus s. Paulos
CPR IV 75	7th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
CPR IV 80	8th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolis	S	Apa Kyri s. Theodore
CPR IV 81	7th C	Debt instrument	Fayum	F	Mena
CPR IV 85	7th–8th	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
CPR IV 86	7th C	Debt instrument	Fayum	F	Mena
CPR IV 90	596	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	Joseph
CPR IV 93	7th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolis	S	n/a
CPR IV 122	7th C	Lease	Hermopolite Nome	S	Athanasios
CPR IV 126	7th–8th C	Lease	Krokodilopolis (Fayum)	F	Khael
CPR IV 130	7th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
CPR IV 133	7th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a

CPR IV 148	7th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
CPR IV 149	7th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	Apa Theodoros
CPR IV 160	7th C	Work contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
CPR IV 161	7th C	Work contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	Neilammonos
CPR IV 166	7th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	Cyrus
CPR IV 169	8th C	Work contract	Fayum	F	Khael
CPR IV 177	7th C	Testament	Hermopolis	S	n/a
CPR XXXI 9	675–725	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
O. Crum ST 91	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	Makarios s. Dios
O. Medin. Habu Copt. 50	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Isaac s. Paulos
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 51	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 52	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Daniel
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 53	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Stephanos s. Jacob
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 54	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 55	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Methuselah
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 56	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Abraham
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 57	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 58	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Moses
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 59	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Moses
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 60	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Apa Dios s. Paulos
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 61	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Joseph
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 62	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Enoch s. Abraham
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 63	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 64	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a

O. Medin.Habu Copt. 65	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 67	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 69	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 70	7th–8th C	Receipt	Djême (Thebes)	S	Jeremias s. Samuel
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 72	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 73	7th–8th C	Transfer of security	Djême (Thebes)	L	Jeremias s. Samuel
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 75	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Moses
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 78	7th–8th C	Receipt	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 79	7th–8th C	Receipt	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 80	7th–8th C	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 82	7th–8th C	Shipping	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
O. Medin.Habu Copt. 83	7th–8th C	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	L	Joseph s. David
P. CLT 1	698	Release	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. Pisrael
P. CLT 4	702	Release	Djême (Thebes)	S	Kalapesios s. Shenoute
P. CLT 5	711/712	Discharge	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	S	Psate s. Pisrael
P. CLT 6	02.02.724 (Cromwell)	Communal agreement	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P. CLT 7	700–775	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P. CLT 8	700–750	Sale	Thebes	S	Johannes s. Lazaros
P. CLT 10	740/755?	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Zacharias
P. Hermitage Copt. 4	6th–8th	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	Joannakios
P.KRU 1	25.02.750	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 2	07.10.749	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus
P.KRU 3	728 /729? 743/744?	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Moses s. Senouthios
P.KRU 4	19.11.749	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus

P.KRU 5	24.03.748 (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate
P.KRU 6	14.08.758	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Soua s. Philotheos
P.KRU 7	730–739	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Moses s. Shenoute
P.KRU 8	730–739	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 9	715/730	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 10	08.12.737 (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 11	07.11.753	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 12	08.12.733	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios
P.KRU 13	30.11.733	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios
P.KRU 14	29.04.756	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 15	08.11.756	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 16	735/736 750/751	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Jeremias s. Athanasios
P.KRU 17	early 740s (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 18	700–750	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Jeremias s. Athanasios
P.KRU 19	05.11.747	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate
P.KRU 20	759/760	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Marcus s. Anastasios
P.KRU 21	725/726	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Lazaros
P.KRU 22	8th C	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate
P.KRU 23	8th C	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 24	29.06.763 (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate
P.KRU 25	737/738	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 26	c. 740 (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 27	740s (Cromwell)	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 28	735–763	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	Kyriakos s. Petros

P.KRU 31	6th–8th C	Sale	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 35	701–725	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Lazaros
P.KRU 36	04.06.724	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. Pisrael
P.KRU 37	724	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. Pisrael
P.KRU 38	700–750	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Lazaros
P.KRU 39	749/750	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 40	749/750	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 41	29.04.749	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 42	725/726	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Lazaros
P.KRU 43	748/749	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 44	10.09.728	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. Pisrael
P.KRU 45	24.04.740, (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 46	24.04.740 (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes son of Johannes
P.KRU 47	737/738 (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 48	c. 740 (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 50	22.08.738 (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Kyriakos s. Petros
P.KRU 54	25.09.763/ 24.09.748	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus
P.KRU 55	701–750	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Shenoute s. Elias
P.KRU 56	730–739	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 57	733–735	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Christophoros s. Demetrios
P.KRU 58	736–748 (Cromwell)	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 59	09.08.733/ 09.08.748	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Komes s. Abraam
P.KRU 62	726–775	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	Paulos
P.KRU 63	8th C	Settlement	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a

P.KRU 65	c. 695	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Theodoros
P.KRU 66	749	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Komes
P.KRU 67	6th–7th C	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Paham s. Epiphanius
P.KRU 68	26.05-24.06.723	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Abraam s. David
P.KRU 69	729/730 744/745	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Cyrus s. Samuel
P.KRU 70	July 4, 750	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Isaac son of Zacharias
P.KRU 71 *= SB I 5592*	May 8, 765	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Soua s. Philotheos
P.KRU 72	726-775	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 74	733/748 (Tris)	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 75	626-675 (Tris)	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 76	c. 749	Testament	Djême (Thebes)	S	Komes
P.KRU 78	700–725	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 79	767–785	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 80	12.03.776	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 81	26.05.771	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 82	771/772	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 83	770	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Polukratos s. Johannes
P.KRU 84	26.03.770	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 85	767/768	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. David
P.KRU 86	29.08.766	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 87	756–758 (Cromwell)	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 88	08.03.734	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Job s. Alex
P.KRU 89	770–780	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Zacharias
P.KRU 90	after 747/748	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate

P.KRU 91	27.03-25.04.781	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 92	770–780	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Isaac
P.KRU 93	770–780	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Papas s. Kleonikos
P.KRU 94	c. 748–759	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Daniel s. Theodotos
P.KRU 95 + 101	750s (Cromwell)	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 96	19.08.775	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Helisaios
P.KRU 97	770/771	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 98	753/754	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	David s. Psate
P.KRU 99	05.10.780	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Thomas s. Sabine
P.KRU 100	after 799	Donation: Child	Djême (Thebes)	S	Apa Apater
P.KRU 103	Mid-750s	Donation: Child	Djême, (Thebes)	S	Aristophanes s. Johannes
P.KRU 104	771/772	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 105	7th C	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	Dakianos
P.KRU 106	31.05.734	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	Chemtsneus s. Shenoute
P.KRU 107	767/768	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	Psate s. David
P.KRU 108	6th–7th C	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 109	771	Donation: Other	Djême, (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 110	770–771	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P.KRU 111	590–732	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	Marcus s. Anastasios
P.KRU 112	749–771	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	Petros s. Antonius
P.KRU 113	6th–8th C	Donation: Other	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
P. Lond. inv. 2849	580–590	Lease	Aphrodito	S	Georgios
P. Lond. IV 1494	08.04.706	Guarantee	Aphrodito	S	Theodoros
P. Lond. IV 1509	8th C	Guarantee	Aphrodito	S	Theodoros

P. Lond. IV 1518	22.05.708	Guarantee	Aphrodito	S	Theodoros
P. Lond. IV 1521	708–709	Guarantee	Aphrodito	S	Theodoros
P. Lond. IV 1593	701/716?	Payment	Aphrodito	S	n/a
P. Lond. V 1709	566–568	Dispute	Aphrodito	S	n/a
P. Mon. Apollo 24	8th C	Sale	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	S	Mena
P. Mon. Apollo 25	8th C	Renunciation	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	S	Georgia s. Mine
P. Mon. Apollo 26	8th C	Lease	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	S	n/a
P. Mon. Apollo 36	early 6th (?)	Sale	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	S	Paulos s. Joseph
P. Mon. Apollo 50	7th C	Guarantee	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 128	8th–9th C	Delivery contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 129	7th–8th C	Guarantee	Hermopolite Nome	S	Johannes
P. Ryl. Copt. 137	575–625	Guarantee	Hermopolite Nome	S	Taurine
P. Ryl. Copt. 144	600–650	Sailing contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	Johannes
P. Ryl. Copt. 158	7th C	Lease	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 159	6th–7th C	Lease	Hermopolite Nome	S	Koullothe s. Biktor
P. Ryl. Copt. 191	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolis	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 196	8th–9th	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 207	7th C	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
P. Ryl. Copt. 215	8th C	Receipt	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 24	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 25	6th–8th	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	Loustros
SB Kopt. I 27	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	Thekla s. Tanaga
SB Kopt. I 29	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	Hello s. Torsh
SB Kopt. I 30	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Elephantine	S	n/a

SB Kopt. I 50	8th–9th	Guarantee	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 51	6th–8th C	Work contract	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 235	6th–8th C	Receipt	Elephantine	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 236	27.12.721	Receipt	Djême (Thebes)	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 243	7th–8th C	Receipt	Hermopolis	S	n/a
SB Kopt. I 270	7th–8th C	Receipt	Thebes	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 922	590–632	Debt instrument	Monastery of Apa Phoibammon, Deir el-Bahri, (Thebes)	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 933	7th–8th	Marriage	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 934	7th–8th C	Divorce	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 937	6th–7th C	Mortgage	Thebes	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 945	775–779	Sale	Thebes	S	n/a
SB Kopt. II 949	6th–8th	Sale	Fayum	F	n/a
SB Kopt. III 1369	647/648 (Bagnall and Worp)	Sale	Aphrodito	S	Apa Rasios
SB Kopt. III 1381	7th–C	Debt instrument	Hermopolite Nome	S	n/a
SB Kopt. III 1395	575–599	Debt instrument	Aswan	S	Petros
SB Kopt. III 1398	7th–8th C	Rent	Hermopolis	S	n/a
SB Kopt. III 1401	7th C	Lease	Hermopolis	S	n/a
SB Kopt. III 1406	8th C	Lease	Thebes	S	n/a
SB Kopt. IV 1786	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Helias s. Johannes
SB Kopt. IV 1787	7th–8th C	Debt instrument	Djême (Thebes)	S	Johannes s. Methusala
SB Kopt. IV 1791	6th–8th C	Debt instrument	Deir el-Rumi (Thebes)	S	n/a
SB Kopt. IV 1803	early 7th C	Work contract	Monastery of Saint Mark, Qurnat Mar‘i (Thebes)	S	n/a
SB Kopt. IV 1805	6th–7th C	Lease	Hermopolite Nome	S	Victor

Appendix B: Coptic formulae attestations

Attestation	Provenience	Date	Scribe	Dialect	Genre
1. Appointment of *Hypographeus* (HYP)					
HYP.1.1: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ					
P.KRU 1.15-20	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 2.6-9	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.10-13	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 7.6-9	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Moses s. Shenoute	S	Sale
P.KRU 12.6-9	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 14.8-11	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 39.4-6	Djême (Thebes)	749-750	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 45.7-11	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	n/a	S	Settlement
P.KRU 50.5-8	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.738	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 99.4-6	Djême (Thebes)	05.10.780	Thomas s. Sabine	S	Donation: Child
HYP.1.2: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ					
P.KRU 5.2-7	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.14-19	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale
HYP.1.3: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣ-ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ					
P.KRU 13.9-13	Djême (Thebes)	30.11.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 27.7-9	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 47.3-8	Djême (Thebes)	737/738	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

HYP.1.4: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ... ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 71.8-11	Djême (Thebes)	08.05.765	Soua s. Philotheos	S	Testament
P.KRU 85.2-5	Djême (Thebes)	767-768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Child

HYP.1.6: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 15.7-11	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

HYP.2.1: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 86.5-9	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	n/a	S	Donation: Child

HYP.2.2: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ϩⲉⲛ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧ̄ⲣⲉ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.CLT.1.6-10	Djême (Thebes)	698 (Tris)	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Release

HYP.3: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 35.18-21	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 38.14-17	Djême (Thebes)	700–750	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement

HYP.4.1: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ

P.KRU 42.2-4	Djême (Thebes)	725–726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement

HYP.4.2: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 9.18-24	Djême (Thebes)	715/730	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.16-23	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.13-16	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale

HYP.4.3: ⲉⲓⲧⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲧϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 6.6-9	Djême (Thebes)	14.08.758	Soua s. Philotheos	S	Sale

HYP.5: ⲉϥϯ ⲛⲧ[ϩⲩ]ⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏ ⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ… ⲙⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 74.8-11	Djême (Thebes)	733/748	n/a	S	Testament

HYP.6: ⲉⲩϯ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲙⲡϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲩⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ... ⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 36.9-11	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement

HYP.7: ⲉⲩⲧⲣⲉⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ

P.KRU 23.3-4	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	n/a	S	Sale

HYP.8: ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛⲟⲩϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉϥϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ⲙⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲟⲥ... ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 80.2-5	Djême (Thebes)	12.03.776	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 81.5-8	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	n/a	S	Donation: Child

HYP.9: ⲉⲓϩⲩⲡⲟⲅⲣⲁⲫⲉ ϩⲛⲛⲁϭⲓϫ ⲙⲙⲓⲛ ⲉⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ… ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ

P.KRU 41.8-11	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.749	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement

2. Appointment of Witnesses (AOW)

AOW.1.1: (ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ) ⲉⲓⲣ ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ

P. CLT 7.8-10	Djême (Thebes)	700-775	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 1.20-25	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 2.9-10	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale

P.KRU 4.14-16	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 5.8-10	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 12.9-12	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 14.11-13	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.19-23	Djême (Thebes)	725-726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.19-23	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 36.11-13	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.7-9	Djême (Thebes)	749-750	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 45.11-13	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	n/a	S	Settlement
P.KRU 50.8-10	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.738	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Settlement

AOW.1.2: (ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ) ⲉⲓⲣ ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲁⲓⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉ-X ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ

P.KRU 3.3-7	Djême (Thebes)	728/729 743/744	Moses s. Senouthios	S	Sale

AOW.1.3: (ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ) ⲉⲓⲣ ϩⲟⲩⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲁϫⲣⲟ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϩⲓⲧⲛϩⲉⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲉⲩⲛϩⲟⲧ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉ-X

P.KRU 20.31-35	Djême (Thebes)	759760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale

AOW.2: (ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ) ⲉⲛⲏⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲥⲟⲡⲥ ⲛⲛⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲱⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲛ

P.KRU 16.8-10	Djême (Thebes)	735/736 750/751	Jeremias s. Athanasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 18.5-7	Djême (Thebes)	700–750	Jeremias s. Athanasios	S	Sale

AOW.3: ⲉⲓⲉⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲛ ⲛϩⲉⲛⲕⲉⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲉⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ

P.KRU 7.9-11	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Moses s. Shenoute	S	Sale

AOW.4: ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲁⲓⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲛϩⲉⲛ(ⲕⲉ)ⲙⲛⲧⲣⲉ ⲛⲁϫⲓⲟⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲙⲁⲣⲧⲩⲣⲓⲍⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ

P.KRU 12.50-52	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 87.43-46	Djême (Thebes)	756–758	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child

3. Free Will formula (FRW)

FRW.1.1: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…

P.KRU 21.16-19	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale

FRW.1.2: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 20.23-31	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.38-42	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.26-29	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale

FRW.1.3: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 35.56-60	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement

FRW.1.4: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P. CLT 1.56-58	Djême (Thebes)	698	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Release
P.KRU 2.11-14	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.19-23	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale

FRW.1.5: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲭⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩ ϩⲓ ϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ

P.KRU 81.32-34	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	n/a	S	Donation: Child

FRW.2: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P. CLT 7.13-16	Djême (Thebes)	700–775	n/a	S	Sale

FRW.3: ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧⲉ ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 6.9-12	Djême (Thebes)	14.08.758	Soua s. Philotheos	S	Sale

FRW.4: ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲙⲡⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 9.28-32	Djême (Thebes)	715/730	n/a	S	Sale

FRW.5: ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲛⲁⲧⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 99.6-9	Djême (Thebes)	05.10.780	Thomas s. Sabine	S	Donation: Child

FRW.6: ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲉⲓϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲅⲉ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 7.13-18	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Moses s. Shenoute	S	Sale

FRW.7: ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁϫⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲅⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 3.9-14	Djême (Thebes)	728/729 743/744	Moses s. Senouthios	S	Sale

FRW.8: ⲁⲓⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 80.29-33	Djême (Thebes)	12.03.776	n/a	S	Donation: Child

FRW.9.1: ⲁⲓⲉⲓ (ⲟⲩⲛ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ

P.KRU 36.46-48	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement

FRW.9.2: ⲁⲓⲉⲓ (ⲟⲩⲛ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲩ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P. CLT 5.106-110	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge

FRW.9.3: ⲁⲓⲉⲓ (ⲟⲩⲛ) ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 27.15-18	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

FRW.10: ⲁⲛⲉⲓ ⲉ-Ⲭ ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟⲩϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P. CLT 6.18-21	Djême (Thebes)	02.02.724	n/a	S	Communal agreement

FRW.11: ⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ-Ⲭ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 98.32-36	Djême (Thebes)	753/754	David s. Psate	S	Donation: Child

FRW.12.1: ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ

P.KRU 11.13-16	Djême (Thebes)	07.11.753	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

FRW.12.2: ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 15.19-23	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.33-41	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale

FRW.12.3: ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 1.30-37	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 5.15-19	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale

FRW.13.1: ⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉ-Ⲭ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…

P.KRU 107.9-12	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Other

FRW.13.2: ⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓ ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉ-Ⲭ ⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱϣⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 85.5-9	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Child

FRW.14: ⲁⲓⲧⲓ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ϩⲛⲟⲩⲥ̀ⲃ̀ⲱ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ… ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 14.20-25	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

FRW.15.1: …ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ

P.KRU 12.16-18	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale

FRW.15.2: …ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 93.24-27	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Papas s. Kleonikos	S	Donation: Child

FRW.15.3: …ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲉⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲓⲑⲉ ⲁϫⲛ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ… ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲛⲁⲕⲏ ϣⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 50.33-36	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.724	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Settlement

FRW.16: …ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲉⲓⲟⲛϩ ϫⲱⲣⲓⲥ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲕⲣⲟϥ ϩⲓϩⲟⲧⲉ…

P.KRU 86.38-45	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	n/a	S	Donation: Child

FRW.17.1: ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲓ ⲉ-Ⲭ… ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϫⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 76.7-9	Djême (Thebes)	c. 749	Komes	S	Testament

FRW.17.2: ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲓⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲛ-Ⲭ ⲉⲙⲛⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ⲕⲏ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϫⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ… ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P.KRU 66.14-16	Djême (Thebes)	749	Komes	S	Testament

FRW.18: ⲁ̈ⲓ̈ⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧ̅ⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲙⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̅ⲁⲛⲁⲅⲕⲏ ⲕⲏ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ̈ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ ϩⲟⲧⲉ ϩⲓϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ…

P. CLT 4.5-6	Djême (Thebes)	702	Kalapesios s. Shenoute	S	Release

FRW.19: ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛⲡϩⲓⲥⲟⲛ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲧ ϩⲛ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲱϣ ⲙⲛ ⲡⲛⲡⲓⲑⲉ ⲙⲛ ⲧⲛⲡⲣⲟϩⲉⲣⲥⲓⲥ ⲙⲛⲓⲛ ⲙⲙⲱⲛ ⲁϫⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛⲃⲓⲁ ϩⲓⲁⲡⲁⲧⲏ…

SB Kopt. III 1369.100-101	Aphrodito	647/648	Apa Rasios	S	Sale

4. Oath formula (OTH)

OTH.1.1: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-…

P.KRU 1.37-44	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 2.14-16	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 3.15-17	Djême (Thebes)	728/729 743/744	Moses s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.23-26	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 5.19-20	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 11.17-18	Djême (Thebes)	07.11.753	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 12.18-19	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 14.26-28	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 15.23-25	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.43-46	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.29-31	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.41-45	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 27.18-20	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 82.16-21	Djême (Thebes)	771/772	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 93.27-30	Djême (Thebes)	770-780	Papas s. Kleonikos	S	Donation: Child

OTH.1.2: ϯϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-

P.KRU 10.28-29	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.737	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 50.37-41	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.738	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Settlement

OTH.1.3: ⲉⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲙⲛⲛⲥⲱⲥ ⲛ-

P.KRU 16.6-8	Djême (Thebes)	735/736 750/751	Jeremias s. Athanasios	S	Sale

OTH.2: ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲛⲉⲛⲧⲁⲓϫⲟⲟⲩ…

P.KRU 20.102-109	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.78-81	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 42.41-43	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement

OTH.3: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ-

P.KRU 9.86-92	Djême (Thebes)	715/730	n/a	S	Sale

OTH.4: ⲉⲓⲧⲁⲣⲕⲟ ⲛ-… ⲉⲧⲙⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ϣⲁⲉⲛⲉϩ

P. CLT 4.21-23	Djême (Thebes)	702	Kalapesios s. Shenoute	S	Release

OTH.5.1: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ (ⲛⲁⲕ)

P.KRU 37.84-88	Djême (Thebes)	724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 44.96-101	Djême (Thebes)	10.09.728	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 55.18-22	Djême (Thebes)	701–750	Shenoute s. Elias	S	Settlement
P.KRU 58.21-24	Djême (Thebes)	736–748	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 92.38-41	Djême (Thebes)	770-780	Isaac	S	Donation: Child

OTH.5.2: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̀-… ⲉⲧⲣⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲧⲁⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ

P. Lond. IV 1494.18-19	Aphrodito	08.04.706	Theodoros	S	Guarantee
P. Lond. IV 1509.19-20	Aphrodito	8th C	Theodoros	S	Guarantee
P. Lond. IV 1518.17-18	Aphrodito	22.05.708	Theodoros	S	Guarantee
P. Lond. IV 1593.7-11	Aphrodito	701/716?	n/a	S	Payment
SB Kopt. III 1369.97-99	Aphrodito	647/648	Apa Rasios	S	Sale

OTH.6: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̀-… ⲉⲧⲣⲛ̀ⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲟϥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓⲍⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.KRU 82.42-44	Djême (Thebes)	771/772	n/a	S	Donation: Child

OTH.7.1: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̀-… ⲉⲧⲙ̀ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̀ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ…

P.KRU 35.71-76	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 38.49-53	Djême (Thebes)	700–750	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement

OTH.7.2: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̀-… ⲁⲩⲱ ⲟⲛ ϯⲧⲁⲣⲕⲱ ⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲛⲓⲁⲛⲁϣ… ⲉⲧⲙ̀ⲧⲣⲉⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲙ̀ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁⲥⲓⲥ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ…

P.KRU 66.17-18	Djême (Thebes)	749	Komes	S	Testament
P.KRU 76.10-12	Djême (Thebes)	c. 749	Komes	S	Testament

OTH.8.1: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲉ̀-… ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲕ

P. Ryl. Copt. 144.14-15	Hermopolite nome	600-650	Johannes	S	Sailing contract
P. Ryl. Copt. 191.9-10	Hermopolis	7th–8th C	n/a	S	Debt instrument
P. Ryl. Copt. 196.10-11	Hermopolite nome	8th–9th C	n/a	S	Debt instrument

OTH.8.2: ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̀-… ⲧⲉⲣⲉⲛⲣⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ

P. Mon. Apollo 24.9	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	8th C	Mena	S	Sale

OTH.9: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲉ-… ⲧⲁⲣⲛϕⲩⲗⲁⲥⲥⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲧⲉⲥϭⲟⲙ

P. Ryl. Copt. 128.4-5	Hermopolite nome	8th–9th C	n/a	S	Delivery contract

OTH.10: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ⲧⲁⲣⲛϣⲱⲡⲉ ϩⲁ-

P.KRU 87.9-12	Djême (Thebes)	756–758	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child

OTH.11: ⲧⲛ̅ϩⲟⲛⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ̅-… ϩⲱⲥⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲛ… ⲧⲁⲣⲛ̅ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲛⲟ ⲛ̅ⲕⲟⲓⲱⲛⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲛⲉⲣⲏⲩ

P. CLT 6.22-26	Djême (Thebes)	02.02.724	n/a	S	Communal agreement

OTH.12: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-… ⲧⲁϩⲁⲣⲉϩ ⲛⲁⲕ

CPR IV 80.12-13	Hermopolis	8th C	Apa Kyri s. Theodore	S	Debt instrument

OTH.13.1: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-… ϫⲉⲛⲉⲛⲉϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲉ ⲙⲉⲕ

CPR IV 48.19-21	Hermopolite nome	625	Apollo	S	Delivery contract

OTH.13.2: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲛⲛⲉⲓⲉϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛⲗⲁⲁⲩ ⲛϣⲁϫⲉ ⲉϥⲥⲏϩ ϩⲛⲧⲓⲙⲓⲥⲑⲱⲥⲓⲥ

P. Ryl. Copt. 159.21-22	Hermopolite nome	6th–7th C	Koullothe s. Biktor	S	Lease

OTH.13.3: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲉⲕ ⲉ-… ϫⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲓϣⲡⲁⲣⲁⲃⲁ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲧⲥⲉϩ ϩⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲓ-Ⲭ

CPR IV 74.6-9	Hermopolis	7th C	Marcus s. Paulos	S	Debt instrument

OTH.14: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲛⲛⲓ̈ⲉ̈ⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

P. Mon. Apollo 25.9-11	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	8th C	Georgia s. Mine	S	Renunciation

OTH.15: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲉⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲓϣⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ

CPR IV 90.5-6	Hermopolite nome	569	Joseph	S	Debt instrument

OTH.16: ⲉⲓⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲉⲛⲛⲉⲓϩⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲛⲛⲉⲓⲉϣϭⲙϭⲟⲙ ⲉⲉⲛⲁⲅⲉ

P.KRU 98.37-38	Djême (Thebes)	753/754	David s. Psate	S	Donation: Child

OTH.17: ⲉⲛⲟⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲉⲕⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲉ-X ϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟ ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲉ-Y

P.KRU 84.13-14	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.770	n/a	S	Donation: child

OTH.18: ⲉⲓϩⲟⲙⲟⲗⲟⲅⲉⲓ ⲉⲓⲱⲣ̅ⲕ̅ ⲛ-… ϫⲉⲡⲛ̅ⲧ<ⲁⲓⲧ>ⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲁϥ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ̈

P. CLT 1.59-63	Djême (Thebes)	698	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Release

OTH.19: FRW + ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲱⲣⲕ ⲛ-… ϫⲉⲁⲛϫⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙⲱϩ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧⲧⲏⲩⲧⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲁⲛϣ

P.KRU 36.48-51	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement

OTH.20: FRW + ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲛ ⲉⲛⲱⲣ̅ⲕ̅ ⲛ̅-… ϫⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲧϭⲟⲙ ⲛ̅-Y

P. CLT 5.110-177	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge

5. Security formula (SCR)

SCR.1.1: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ (ⲟⲩⲛ)… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)

CPR IV 48.22-23	Hermopolite nome	625	Apollo	S	Delivery contract
CPR IV 74.15-16	Hermopolis	7th C	Marcus s. Paulos	S	Debt instrument
CPR IV 161.11-12	Hermopolite nome	7th C	Neilammonos	S	Work contract
CPR IV 166.7-8	Hermopolite nome	7th C	Cyrus	S	Receipt
P. Lond. IV 1593.5-7	Aphrodito	701/716?	n/a	S	Payment
P.KRU 1.104-106	Djême (Thebes)	27.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 2.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.81-82	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale

P.KRU 12.49	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 27.60	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 35.76-77	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 37.53-54	Djême (Thebes)	724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 48.54	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 54.16-17	Djême (Thebes)	25.09.763/ 24.09.748	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Settlement
P.KRU 55.23-24	Djême (Thebes)	701–750	Shenoute s. Elias	S	Settlement
P.KRU 56.23	Djême (Thebes)	730-739	n/a	S	Settlement
P.KRU 59.12-13	Djême (Thebes)	09.08.733/ 09.08.748	Komes s. Abraam	S	Settlement
P.KRU 63.9-10	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	n/a	S	Settlement
P.KRU 81.48-49	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P. Ryl. Copt. 128.4-5	Hermopolite Nome	8th–9th C	n/a	S	Delivery contract
P. Ryl. Copt. 144.13	Hermopolite Nome	600–650	Johannes	S	Sailing contract
P. Ryl. Copt. 159.22	Hermopolite Nome	6th–7th C	Koullothe s. Biktor	S	Lease
P. Ryl. Copt. 196.11-12	Hermopolite Nome	8th–9th C	n/a	S	Debt instrument
P. Ryl. Copt. 215.10-11	Hermopolite Nome	8th C	Shenoute	S	Receipt
SB Kopt. II 933.6-7	Hermopolite Nome	7th–8th C	n/a	S	Marriage contract
SB Kopt. III 1398.2-3	Hermopolis	7th–8th C	n/a	S	Rent

SCR.1.2: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ (ⲟⲩⲛ)…ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ

P.KRU 8.27	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 10.58-59	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.737	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 17.43-44	Djême (Thebes)	early 740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

P.KRU 39.69	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 41.96-97	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.749	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 47.67	Djême (Thebes)	737/738	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

SCR.1.3: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ (ⲟⲩⲛ)…

P. CLT 7.63-64	Djême (Thebes)	700–775	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 45.60-61	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	n/a	S	Settlement

SCR.1.4: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲛ (ⲟⲩⲛ)…ⲁⲓⲥⲏⲛ-Χ (ⲛⲁⲕ)

CPR IV 160.7-10	Hermopolite nome	7th C	n/a	S	Work contract
P. CLT 6.44-45	Djême (Thebes)	02.02.724	n/a	S	Communal agreement

SCR.2.1: ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)… ⲁⲓⲥⲏⲛ-Χ (ⲛⲁⲕ)

CPR IV 35.6	Hermopolis	7th C	Johannes	S	Delivery contract
CPR IV 122.8-9	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	Athanasios	S	Lease
O. Medin. Habu Copt. 57.16-18	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	n/a	S	Debt instrument
P. Lond. inv. 2849.8-9	Aphrodito	580–590	Georgios	S	Lease
P.KRU 6.33	Djême (Thebes)	14.08.758	Soua s. Philotheos	S	Sale
P.KRU 19.78-80	Djême (Thebes)	05.11.747	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.109-110	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.81-82	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 57.12-13	Djême (Thebes)	733–735	Christophoros s. Demetrios	S	Settlement
P.KRU 92.52	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Isaac	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 111.19-20	Djême (Thebes)	590-732	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Donation: Other

P.KRU 112.8-9	Djême (Thebes)	749–771	Petros s. Antonius	S	Donation: Other
P. Ryl. Copt. 129.1-2	Hermopolite nome	7th–8th C	Johannes	S	Guarantee
SB Kopt. I 51.11-13	Hermopolite nome	6th–8th C	n/a	S	Work contract

SCR.2.2: ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)…ⲁⲓⲥⲛⲛⲧϥ

P.KRU 5.58-59	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 11.56-57	Djême (Thebes)	07.11.753	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 15.88	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 22.52	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 58.24	Djême (Thebes)	736–748	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement

SCR.2.3: ⲉⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)…ⲁ̈ⲥϩⲁⲓ-X ⲛⲁⲕ

O. Medin. Habu Copt. 61.15-16	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Joseph	S	Debt instrument

SCR.3: ⲉⲡⲉⲓⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ)… ⲁⲓⲥⲛⲛⲧⲥ

P.KRU 24.116-117	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 25.46-47	Djême (Thebes)	737/738	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 26.23	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

SCR.4: ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲡⲉⲕⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ… ⲁⲓⲥⲛⲛ-X ⲛⲁⲕ

CPR IV 148.8-9	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	n/a	S	Receipt
CPR XXXI 9.6-7	Hermopolite Nome	675-725	n/a	S	Receipt
P. Ryl. Copt. 158.45	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	n/a	S	Lease

SB Kopt. I 243.12-14	Hermopolis	7th–8th C	n/a	S	Receipt
SB Kopt. III 1381	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	n/a	S	Debt instrument

SCR.5: ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲙⲉⲛ… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ̄-X

SB Kopt. II 945.16	Thebes	775-779	n/a	S	Sale

SCR.6.1: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Y… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲏⲧⲛ)

P.KRU 78.72-77	Djême (Thebes)	700–725	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 80.50-52	Djême (Thebes)	12.03.776	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 82.39-42	Djême (Thebes)	771/772	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 84.30-32	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.770	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 86.36-37	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 89.38-42	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Zacharias	S	Donation: Child

SCR.6.2: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Y… ⲁⲓϯ ⲡⲁⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓ ⲉ-X + FRW

P.KRU 80.29-33	Djême (Thebes)	12.03.776	n/a	S	Donation: Child

SCR.6.3: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Y… ⲁⲓϣ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲁϥ ⲛⲧⲏⲧⲛ̄ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈

P. CLT 4.23-24	Djême (Thebes)	702	Kalapesios s. Shenoute	S	Release

SCR.7.1: ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Y… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-X (ⲛⲁⲕ)

P.KRU 83.16-17	Djême (Thebes)	770	Polukratos s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 85.50-51	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 93.23-24	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Papas s. Kleonikos	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 94.39-42	Djême (Thebes)	c. 748–759	Daniel s. Theodotos	S	Donation: Child

P.KRU 99.44-46	Djême (Thebes)	05.10.780	Thomas s. Sabine	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 107.27-31	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Other

SCR.7.2: ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Ⲩ… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ

P.KRU 87.38-40	Djême (Thebes)	756–758	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 95+101.31-32	Djême (Thebes)	750s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child

SCR.7.3: ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ-Ⲩ… ⲁϣⲱⲓⲛⲉ ϩⲓⲧⲟⲟⲧ ⲛⲥⲁ-Ⲭ

P.KRU 86.36-38	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	n/a	S	Donation: Child

SCR.8: ⲉϥⲱⲣϫ (ⲟⲩⲛ) (ⲛⲁⲕ)… ⲁⲓⲥⲙⲛ-Ⲭ (ⲛⲁⲕ)

P.KRU 88.17-19	Djême, (Thebes)	03.08.734	Job s. Alex	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 109.13	Djême, (Thebes)	771	n/a	S	Donation: Other

SCR.9.1: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲙⲛⲧϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ… ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛ-Ⲭ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ

P. Lond. IV 1518.15-17	Aphrodito	22.05.708	Theodoros	S	Guarantee

SCR.9.2: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲙⲛⲧⲓⲱⲧ… ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛ-Ⲭ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ

P. Mon. Apollo 24.8	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	8th C	Mena	S	Sale

SCR.10: ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲟⲩⲛ ⲡⲁⲏⲙⲟⲥⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲉⲛⲁ(ⲟϫⲟⲧⲏⲥ) ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ… ⲁⲛⲥⲙⲓⲛ-Ⲭ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ ⲉⲛⲕⲓⲛⲁⲩⲡⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ…

P. Lond. IV 1494.16-18	Aphrodito	08.04.706	Theodoros	S	Guarantee
P. Lond. IV 1509.16-18	Aphrodito	8th C	Theodoros	S	Guarantee

SCR.11.1: ⲁϊⲥⲙⲛⲧⲥ… ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ…

O. Medin. Habu Copt. 58.14-16	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Moses	S	Debt instrument

SCR.11.2: ⲉⲁϊⲥⲙⲛⲧ-X… ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ…

O. Medin. Habu Copt. 59.8-10	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Moses	S	Debt instrument

SCR.12.1: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ… ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ

P.KRU 13.62-66	Djême (Thebes)	30.11.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 23.61-62	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 28.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	735–763	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 37.89-91	Djême (Thebes)	724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement

SCR.12.2: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ… ⲉⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛ-Y

P. CLT 5.134	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge
P.KRU 93.46-47	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Papas s. Kleonikos	S	Donation: Child

SCR.12.3: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ… ⲉⲡⲉⲧⲛⲱⲣϫ

P.KRU 36.62	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. David	S	Settlement

SCR.12.4: ⲡⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲁⲛⲥⲙⲛⲧϥ… ⲉⲡⲱⲣϫ̅ ⲛ-Y

P. CLT 1.102	Djême (Thebes)	698	Psate s. David	S	Release

SCR.13.1: ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲉ

SB Kopt. II 937.16	Thebes	6th–7th C	n/a	S	Mortgage

SCR.13.2: ⲟⲩⲱⲣϫ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲧⲉ X

P.KRU 9.93-94	Djême (Thebes)	715/730	n/a	S	Sale

6. *Kyria* clause (KYR)

KYR.1.1: ϥⲟⲣϫ…

O. Medin. Habu Copt. 61.16	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Joseph	S	Debt instrument
P.KRU 82.39-42	Djême (Thebes)	771/772	n/a	S	Donation: Child

KYR.1.2: ϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ

P.KRU 12.50	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 85.51	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Child

KYR.1.3: ϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲛⲏⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.CLT 1.103-104	Djême (Thebes)	698	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Release
P.CLT 5.135-136	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge
P.CLT 7.64-65	Djême (Thebes)	700–775	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 1.106-108	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 2.48-49	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.82-83	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 5.59-60	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 7.56-57	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Moses s. Shenoute	S	Sale
P.KRU 8.27-28	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

P.KRU 11.57-58	Djême (Thebes)	07.11.753	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 13.66-67	Djême (Thebes)	30.11.733	Chemtsneus s. Senouthios	S	Sale
P.KRU 19.80-83	Djême (Thebes)	05.11.747	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 22.52-54	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 23.62-63	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	n/a	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.117-119	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	David s. Psate	S	Sale
P.KRU 25.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	722/723	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 36.62-63	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 37.91-92	Djême (Thebes)	724	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.69-71	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 41.98-100	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.749	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 42.43-44	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 44.117-118	Djême (Thebes)	10.09.728	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Settlement
P.KRU 46.35-37	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	Johannes son of Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 47.67-68	Djême (Thebes)	737/738	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 48.55-56	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 57.13-14	Djême (Thebes)	733–735	Christophoros s. Demetrios	S	Settlement
P.KRU 58.24-25	Djême (Thebes)	736–748	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement
P.KRU 66.64-65	Djême (Thebes)	749	Komes	S	Testament
P.KRU 86.49	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 87.41-42	Djême (Thebes)	756–758	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 93.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Papas s. Kleonikos	S	Donation: Child

P.KRU 95+101.32-33	Djême (Thebes)	750s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 96.87-89	Djême (Thebes)	19.08.775	Helisaios	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 98.43-45	Djême (Thebes)	753/754	David s. Psate	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 99.46-47	Djême (Thebes)	05.10.780	Thomas s. Sabine	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 107.31-32	Djême (Thebes)	767/768	Psate s. David	S	Donation: Other
P.KRU 112.9	Djême (Thebes)	749–771	Petros s. Antonius	S	Donation: Other

KYR.1.4: ϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϣⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ

P.KRU 15.88-90	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 27.60-62	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

KYR.1.5: ϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧⲥ ⲉⲙⲁⲩ

P.KRU 6.33-34	Djême (Thebes)	14.08.758	Soua s. Philotheos	S	Sale

KYR.1.6: ϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲉⲛⲧⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ

P.KRU 9.94-97	Djême (Thebes)	715/730	n/a	S	Sale

KYR.2.1: ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ/ⲉⲥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙϣⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.CLT 4.24-25	Djême (Thebes)	702	Kalapesios s. Shenoute	S	Release
P.KRU 21.82-84	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 35.77-79	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 89.38-42	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Zacharias	S	Donation: Child

KYR.2.2: ⲉϥⲛⲁϣⲟⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ/ⲉⲥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲛⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲛⲁϩⲣⲛ ⲉⲓⲉ̀ϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉϥϫⲟⲥⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥϩⲁⲉⲟⲟⲩ

P.KRU 81.49-51	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	n/a	S	Donation: Child

KYR.2.3: ϵϥⲛⲁϣⲟⲟⲡϵ ϵϥⲟⲣϫ/ϵⲥⲛⲁϣⲱⲡϵ ϵⲥⲟⲣϫ… ⲛϩⲣⲛⲟⲓϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ (sic) ⲛⲓⲙ ⲕⲁⲛ ϩⲛ ⲡⲟⲗ(ⲓⲥ) ⲕⲁⲛ…

P.KRU 84.33-36	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.770	n/a	S	Donation: Child

KYR.3.1: ϵϥⲉϣⲱⲡϵ ϵϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϵⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.KRU 100.64-66	Djême (Thebes)	after 799	Apa Apater	S	Donation: Child

KYR.3.2: ϵϥⲉϣⲱⲡϵ ϵϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϵⲩⲛⲁⲛⲧⲥ ϵⲃⲟⲗ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.KRU 75.125-126	Djême (Thebes)	626–675	n/a	S	Testament

KYR.4.1: ϵϥⲟ ⲛϫⲟⲉⲓⲥ…

P.KRU 55.24	Djême (Thebes)	701–750	Shenoute s. Elias	S	Settlement

KYR.4.2: ϵϥⲟⲣϫ ϵϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϵⲩⲛⲁⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.KRU 20.110-114	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Sale
P.KRU 38.54-55	Djême (Thebes)	700–750	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 63.10-12	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	n/a	S	Settlement
P.KRU 80.52-53	Djême (Thebes)	12.03.776	n/a	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 92.52-54	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Isaac	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 111.20-21	Djême (Thebes)	590–732	Marcus s. Anastasios	S	Donation: Other

KYR.4.3: ϵϥⲟⲣϫ ϵϥϭⲙϭⲟⲙ… ϩⲛⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϵⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧϥ ϵⲣⲟϥ

P.KRU 97.81-82	Djême (Thebes)	770–771	n/a	S	Donation: Child

KYR.5: ⲡⲉⲓ ϵⲧⲛⲁϣⲱⲡϵ ϵϥⲱⲣϫ…ⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ϵⲩⲛⲁⲉⲙϕⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲙⲙⲱ ϩⲓⲧⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲓⲙ ϩⲓϵϫⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ

P.KRU 105.22-24	Djême (Thebes)	7th C	Dakianos	S	Donation: Other

KYR.6.1: ⲛⲧⲉ-Ⲭ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ…

P.KRU 50.69-71	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.738	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Settlement

KYR.6.2: ⲛⲧⲉ-Ⲭ ϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲣϫ… ϩⲙⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫ(ⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ) ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

P.KRU 28.46-48	Djême (Thebes)	735–763	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 76.68-69	Djême (Thebes)	c. 749	Komes	S	Testament

KYR.7: ⲉⲧⲣⲉ-Ⲭ ⲡⲁⲓ ϣⲟⲡⲉ ⲉϥⲥⲙⲟⲟⲧ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉϥⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ… ϩⲛⲛⲁ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲙⲫⲁⲛⲓϫⲉ ⲙⲙⲟϥ ⲛϩⲏⲧϥ

SB Kopt. III 1369.91-93	Aphrodito	647/648	Apa Rasios	S	Sale

KYR.8: ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲥϣⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲥⲃⲉⲃⲁⲓⲟⲩ… ϩⲙ̅ⲙⲁ ⲛⲓⲁ̀ ⲉⲩⲛⲁϫⲓⲧⲥ́ ⲉⲣⲟⲟ̀ϥ

P. Lond. inv. 2849.8-9	Aphrodito	580-590	Georgios	S	Lease

7. Subscription formula (SUB)

SUB.1.1: ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ

P.CLT 1.127	Djême (Thebes)	698 (Tris)	Shenoute priest of the Holy Church of Djême	S	Release
P.CLT 6.70	Djême (Thebes)	02.02.724	Thomas s. Victor	S	Communal agreement
P.KRU 4.89-90	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Prese s. Kollouthos	S	Sale
P.KRU 6.36-37	Djême (Thebes)	14.08.758	Leontios s. Aristophanes	S	Sale
P.KRU 7.60	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Shenoute the archbishop	S	Sale
P.KRU 7.64	Djême (Thebes)	730–739	Moses s. Senthis the archibishop	S	Sale
P.KRU 10.70	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.737	Georgios s. Pheu	S	Sale
P.KRU 13.73-74	Djême (Thebes)	30.11.733	Johannake s. Johannes	S	Sale

P.KRU 19.98	Djême (Thebes)	05.11.747	Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.137-139	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Hamos s. Stephanos	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.110	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.133	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	Isidoros	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.148-150	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	Isaac s. Constantine	S	Sale
P.KRU 35.93-95	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Andreas s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 36.69-70	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Abraham s. David	S	Settlement
P.KRU 36.72	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate	S	Settlement
P.KRU 36.73	Djême (Thebes)	04.06.724	Psate	S	Settlement
P.KRU 37.62	Djême (Thebes)	724	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.76-77	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Markos s. Anastasios	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.81	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Prase s. Kollouthios	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.82-83	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Psannake s. Kosma	S	Settlement
P.KRU 39.85	Djême (Thebes)	749/750	Prese s. Kollouthos	S	Settlement
P.KRU 55.28	Djême (Thebes)	701–750	Senouthios s. Helias	S	Settlement
P.KRU 66.68-75	Djême (Thebes)	749	Zakharias the archpriest	S	Testament
P.KRU 76.83-84	Djême (Thebes)	c. 749	Zakharias the archpriest	S	Testament
P.KRU 86.51	Djême (Thebes)	29.08.766	Senaga	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 98.55	Djême (Thebes)	753/754	David s. Psate	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 112.17	Djême (Thebes)	749–771	Pisenthios s. Joseph	S	Donation: Other
SB Kopt. II 945.20-21	Thebes	775–779	Pathermouthis s. Joseph	S	Sale

SUB.1.2: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)

P.CLT 1.136	Djême (Thebes)	698 (Tris)	Eiôt the priest	S	Release
P.CLT 6.52-53	Thebes	02.02.724	David s. Severus	S	Communal agreement
P.CLT 6.66	Thebes	02.02.724	Preshe s. Jeremias	S	Communal agreement
P.KRU 2.56	Djême (Thebes)	07.10.749	Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 4.93	Djême (Thebes)	19.11.749	Samouel s. Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 14.92-94	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Isaac s. Constantine	S	Sale
P.KRU 14.101-102	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.756	Papnoute s. Stephanos	S	Sale
P.KRU 15.100-101	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Petros the priest	S	Sale
P.KRU 15.104	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Mena s. Kiamoulis	S	Sale
P.KRU 19.92-95	Djême (Thebes)	05.11.747	Petros the priest	S	Sale
P.KRU 20.123-124	Djême (Thebes)	759/760	Peseos	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.89-90	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Pcheris s. Epiphaneios	S	Sale
P.KRU 24.135-137	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	Komes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 26.26-27	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Enoch s. Ello	S	Sale
P.KRU 26.28-29	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Enoch	S	Sale
P.KRU 35.84-86	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 35.104-105	Djême (Thebes)	701–725	Andreas s. Lazaros	S	Settlement
P.KRU 41.105-106	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.749	Leontios s. Epiphaneios	S	Settlement
P.KRU 42.50-51	Djême (Thebes)	725726	Thomas	S	Settlement
P.KRU 44.135-138	Djême (Thebes)	10.09.728	Kyriakos	S	Settlement
P.KRU 46.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	Thomas s. Victor	S	Settlement

P.KRU 47.81-82	Djême (Thebes)	737/738	Phoibammon the priest	S	Settlement
P.KRU 48.69	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Johannes s. Kyriakos	S	Settlement
P.KRU 54.20-21	Djême (Thebes)	25.09.763/ 24.09.748	Isaac s. Constantine	S	Settlement
P.KRU 54.22-23	Djême (Thebes)	25.09.763/ 24.09.748	Isaac	S	Settlement
P.KRU 71.64	Djême (Thebes)	08.05.765	Gennadios	S	Testament
P.KRU 71.66-67	Djême (Thebes)	08.05.765	Phoibammon s. Ananias	S	Testament
P.KRU 83.29	Djême (Thebes)	770	Petros s. Apa Kyre	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 83.30-31	Djême (Thebes)	770	Pathermouthis s. Joseph	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 83.33-34	Djême (Thebes)	770	Pathermouthis s. Joseph	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 83.37-38	Djême (Thebes)	770	Pagene s. Phlemon	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 87.51-52	Djême (Thebes)	756–758	Isaac s. Constantine	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 89.56-57	Djême (Thebes)	770–780	Chael s. Kyriakos	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 112.14-15	Djême (Thebes)	749–771	Pros s. Apa K…	S	Donation: Other
SB Kopt. II 945.23-24	Thebes	775-779	… s. Serenus	S	Sale

SUB.1.3: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ

P.KRU 105.31	Djême (Thebes)	7th C	Daniel the priest	S	Donation: Other

SUB.1.4: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲛⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ

P.KRU 44.124-127	Djême (Thebes)	10.09.728	Georgios the archdeacon of the Holy (Church of) Victor of Djême	S	Settlement

SUB.2.1: ⲛⲧⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ

CPR IV 166.9	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	Severus	S	Receipt

SUB.2.2: ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉ(ⲛ)ⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ

CPR IV 35.6	Hermopolis	7th C	… s. John, man of Shmoun	S	Delivery contract
P. Ryl. Copt. 129.v5	Hermopolite Nome	7th–8th C	Johannes the notary	S	Guarantee
P. Ryl. Copt. 191.11-12	Hermopolis	7th–8th C	George s. Mena, man of Shmoun	S	Debt instrument
P. Ryl. Copt. 207.8-10	Hermopolite Nome	7th C	Enoch s. Pinoute	S	Debt instrument
P. Ryl. Copt. 215.14	Hermopolite Nome	8th C	Shenoute	S	Receipt

SUB.2.3: ⲛⲧⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲁⲃⲛⲟⲉ

P. Lond. IV 1593.13-15	Aphrodito	701/716?	Pkore s. Pakos	S	Payment

SUB.3.1: ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁ-NN

P.CLT 8.19	Thebes	700–750	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Sale
P.KRU 17.48-49	Djême (Thebes)	early 740s	Markos s. Papnoute	S	Sale

SUB.3.2: ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁ-NN ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ

P.CLT 1.120	Djême (Thebes)	698	Leontios s. Kyriakos	S	Release
P.CLT 1.124	Djême (Thebes)	698	Victor s. Papnouthios	S	Release
P.KRU 71.61-62	Djême (Thebes)	08.05.765	Gennadios s. Constantine	S	Testament

SUB.3.3: ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁ-NN ϫⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲓ ϩⲱⲱⲧ

P. Lond. IV 1518.28-29	Aphrodito	22.05.708	Apollo	S	Guarantee

SUB.4.1: ⲁⲓϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲙⲉⲩⲛⲟⲓ ⲛϩⲁⲓ

P.KRU 92.58	Djême (Thebes)	770-780	Isaac	S	Donation: Child

SUB.4.2: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲙⲉⲩⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ

P.KRU 10.67-68	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.722	Psate s. Constantine	S	Sale
P.KRU 87.55-56	Djême (Thebes)	756-758	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Donation: Child

SUB.4.3: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ϫⲉⲥⲉⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ

P.KRU 37.125-126	Djême (Thebes)	724	Abraam s. David	S	Settlement

SUB.5: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲛ̀ⲉⲓⲙⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ

P.KRU 37.71-73	Djême (Thebes)	724	Anastasios the deacon of the God-loving mother Mary		Settlement

SUB.6: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϫⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓ

P.KRU 24.139	Djême (Thebes)	29.06.763	Isidoros	S	Sale

SUB.7.1: ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣⲱϯ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ̈ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲛϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ

CPR IV 48.28-29	Hermopolite nome	625	Apollo the scribe of the village	S	Delivery contract
CPR IV 122.9-10	Hermopolite nome	7th C	Athanasios the priest	S	Lease

SUB.7.2: ⲁϥⲕⲟⲣⲱϯ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ̈ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲉⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲗⲱⲥ

P. Mon. Apollo 25.21-22	Monastery of Apa Apollo (Bawit)	8th C	George s. Minos	S	Renunciation

SUB.8: ⲛⲧⲁϥⲕⲟⲣⲱϯ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲛⲃⲛⲟⲓ ⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ

P. Ryl. Copt. 159.23-24	Hermopolite nome	6th–7th C	Kollouthe the priest, s. Victor	S	Lease

SUB.9.1: ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲛⲟ̈ⲓ̈ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ/ⲁⲓⲥⲱϩ-ⲧⲉⲓⲃⲗϫⲉ

O. Med. Habu Copt. 50.7-8	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Isaac s. Paulos	S	Debt instrument

O. Med. Habu Copt. 56.7-9	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Abraam the priest of Apa Kyriekos	S	Debt instrument

SUB.9.2: ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ

O. Med. Habu Copt. 58.16-21	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Moses the deacon of the holy church of Terkot	S	Debt instrument

SUB.9.3: ⲁϥⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲉϥⲥⲓϫ

SB Kopt. III 1381.6-7	Hermopolite nome	7th C	Psha s. Hermes	S	Debt instrument

SUB.10.1: ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲁⲗⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ

SB Kopt. III 1369.111-112	Aphrodito	647/648	Pachôm s. Apollo, the priest, *hegoumonos*	S	Sale

SUB.10.2: ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲡⲁⲗⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ ϫⲉⲙⲁⲩⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)

CPR IV 90.9	Hermopolite nome	596	Joseph the notary	S	Debt instrument
P. Lond. IV 1494.33-34	Aphrodito	08.04.706	Georgios s. Psate	S	Guarantee
P. Lond. IV 1521.28-29	Aphrodito	708-709	Phoibammon s. Patose	S	Guarantee

SUB.11: ⲁ-NN ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲕⲁⲗⲉ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟⲓ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ-X

SB Kopt. III 1395.7-8	Aswan	575–599	Petros the deacon	S	Debt instrument
O. Med. Habu Copt. 73.21-25	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Jeremias s. Samouel	S	Transfer of security

SUB.12.1: ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ

P.CLT 6.50-51	Thebes	02.02.724	David s. Severus	S	Communal agreement
P.CLT 7.76-77	Thebes	700-775	Abraham s. David	S	Sale
P.KRU 21.108	Djême (Thebes)	725/726	Nohe	S	Sale
P.KRU 23.68	Djême (Thebes)	8th C	Abraham s. Karakos	S	Sale

P.KRU 26.30-31	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 41.108-110	Djême (Thebes)	29.04.749	Apa Victor s. Panachore	S	Settlement
P.KRU 82.47-48	Djême (Thebes)	771/772	Theodoros s. Mena, the priest	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 95+101.36-39	Djême (Thebes)	750s	Nohe the priest, *hegoumonos*	S	Donation: Child

SUB.12.2: ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲁϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)

P.CLT 1.131	Djême (Thebes)	698 (Tris)	David s. Severus	S	Release
P.CLT 6.84-85	Thebes	02.02.724	Isaac s. Zacharias	S	Communal agreement
P.CLT 8.22	Thebes	700–750	Kyriakos s. Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 1.125-127	Djême (Thebes)	25.02.750	Souai s. Petros	S	Sale
P.KRU 35.101-102	Djême (Thebes)	701-725	Komes the prieset	S	Settlement
P.KRU 45.69-70	Djême (Thebes)	24.04.740	Thomas s. Victor	S	Settlement
P.KRU 81.56-59	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	Theodoros the priest, s. Basileios, man of Tbo	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 81.62	Djême (Thebes)	26.05.771	Theodoros	S	Donation: Child
P.KRU 93.48-53	Djême (Thebes)	770-780	Zacharias the archpriest in Ermont	S	Donation: Child

SUB.12.3: ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲛϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)

P.CLT 5.156	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge
P.CLT 5.161-162	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711/712	Psate s. Pisrael	S	Discharge

SUB.12.4: ⲁϥⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲁϥϯⲟ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ

P.CLT 5.158	Monastery of Apa Paul, Deir el-Bachit, (Thebes)	711-712	Komes	S	Discharge

SUB.13: ⲁϥⲉ̈ⲇⲉ ⲁ̈ⲥⲙⲛϯⲃⲗϫⲉ

O. Med. Habu Copt. 59.12-16	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Moses the lector	S	Debt instrument

SUB.14: ⲁϥⲁ̈ⲧⲓ ⲙ̅ⲙⲟ̈ⲓ ⲁ̈ⲥϩⲁ̈-Ⲭ ⲉⲁ̈ⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉϥⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ

O. Med. Habu Copt. 60.8-11	Djême (Thebes)	7th–8th C	Apa Dios s. Paulos, the priest of the church of Terkot	S	Debt instrument

SUB.15.1: ⲁ-NN ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ

P.CLT 1.111-112	Djême (Thebes)	698	Johannes s. Lazaros	S	Release
P.KRU 3.65-66	Djême (Thebes)	728/729? 743/744?	George s. Kosma	S	Sale

SUB.15.2: ⲁ-NN ⲉⲓⲧⲉ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ

P.KRU 17.52-54	Djême (Thebes)	early 740s	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 76.87-88	Djême (Thebes)	c. 749	Komes the priest	S	Testament

SUB.16: αἰτηθεὶς ἔγραψα <ὑπὲρ> NN γράμματα μὴ εἰδότος

P.KRU 105.45-47	Djême (Thebes)	7th C	Damian the notary	S	Donation: Other

SUB.17.1: ⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ

P.KRU 10.61-62	Djême (Thebes)	08.12.737	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 50.75-77	Djême (Thebes)	22.08.738	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Settlement

SUB.17.2: ⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲙⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ (ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ)

P.KRU 5.66-70	Djême (Thebes)	24.03.748	Senouthios s. Chemtsneus	S	Sale
P.KRU 8.31-33	Djême (Thebes)	730-739	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale
P.KRU 15.106-109	Djême (Thebes)	08.11.756	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Sale

P.KRU 27.64-65	Djême (Thebes)	740s	Markos s. Papnoute	S	Sale
P.KRU 48.64-66	Djême (Thebes)	c. 740	Markos s. Papnoute, the deacon of the church of Djême	S	Settlement
P.KRU 94.46-48	Djême (Thebes)	c. 748–759	Johannes s. Helias	S	Donation: Child

SUB.17.3: ⲁⲛⲉⲓⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲁⲓⲧⲉⲓ ⲙⲙⲟⲓ ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ϫⲉⲛⲉϥⲛⲟⲓ ⲁⲛ

P.CLT 6.57-58	Thebes	02.02.724	Aristophanes s. Johannes	S	Communal agreement

SUB.18: ⲁ-NN ⲕⲉⲗⲉⲩⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁ̈ⲓⲥϩⲁ̈ⲓ ϩⲁ-NN ϫⲉⲛⲉⲩⲛⲟ̈ⲓ ⲛ̄ⲥϩⲁⲓ

P.CLT 1.116-117	Djême (Thebes)	698	David	S	Release

SUB.19: ἀξιωθ(εὶς) ἔγραψα

P. Lond. IV 1509.23-24	Aphrodito	8th C	Markos s. Kyrillos, the priest	S	Guarantee

SUB.20: ⲁⲓⲥϩⲁⲓ ϩⲁⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲉⲡⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲛⲥⲟⲩⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲛⲥϩⲁⲓ ⲁⲛ

P. Ryl. Copt. 137.5-6	Hermopolite nome	575–625	Taurine the notary of Thone	S	Guarantee