

**DOCUMENTARY PAPYRI
FROM
ROMAN AND BYZANTINE OXYRHYNCHUS**

by

MARGARET MOUNTFORD

UCL

Submitted for the degree of PhD in Papyrology

DECLARATION

I, Margaret Mountford, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

.....

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to publish and so make available for scholars and others interested in Roman and Byzantine Egypt 32 documentary papyri, dated from 107 AD to the early 7th century, which are part of the Oxyrhynchus collection belonging to the Egypt Exploration Society.

The papyri cover a range of subjects. The summonses (**03** to **09**) and declarations of uninundated or artificially irrigated land (**010** to **014**) are documents of which many examples have already been published; they confirm, clarify and expand information gleaned from other documents. Contracts between private individuals for irrigation works (**01**) and leasing a workshop and mill (**02**) are more unusual, as is the agreement under which town councillors share out their liturgical duties (**017**). A letter concerning the corn dole (**015**) and a complete list of Oxyrhynchite *praepositi pagorum* (**016**) also relate to Oxyrhynchite administration. Three circus programmes (**018** to **020**) double the number of such documents known and include a number of words not previously attested in papyri. The last twelve papyri relate to aspects of administration and life on the large estates of Byzantine Egypt, mainly those of the well-attested Apion family; they include contracts of employment of a door-keeper and a rent-collector (**021** and **022**) and documents relating to the collection of rents (**023** and **024**) and payment for wine (**025**). **026** to **031** concern monasteries, two of which, Abba Petros and Abba Castor, are previously unattested; the latter is also listed as a payer in **032**. All contribute to the picture of social and economic conditions in Roman and Byzantine Egypt built up by previous scholarship.

The conventions used are those required for publication in the P. Oxy. series, although the commentaries which follow are much more detailed than is usual in such volumes.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements		5
01	Contract for the provision of irrigation services	107 6
02	Sub-?) lease of a workshop containing a mill	138-160 20
03-09	Summonses	39
03	Summons to an <i>archepbodos</i>	2 nd century 45
04	Summons to an <i>archepbodos</i> to appear	2 nd /3 rd century 49
05	Summons from a <i>beneficiarius</i>	mid 3 rd /early 4 th century 52
06	Summons from a <i>canalicularius</i>	245-275? 55
07	Summons from a <i>canalicularius</i>	mid/late 3 rd century 58
08	Summons from a <i>decurio</i>	mid/late 3 rd century 60
09	Summons from a <i>decurio</i>	mid/late 3 rd century 63
010-014	Declarations of uninundated or artificially irrigated land	66
010	Declaration of uninundated and artificially irrigated land	212 75
011	Declaration of uninundated land	225 83
012	Declaration of uninundated land	225 85
013	Declaration of uninundated land	225 89
014	Declaration of uninundated land	240 93
015	Letter regarding the corn dole	272? 98
016	List of assistants of <i>praepositi pagi</i>	338-340? 103
017	Agreement concerning irrigation administration	358 117
018-020	Three circus programmes	128
018	Circus programme	6 th century 136
019	Circus programme	5 th /6 th century 141
020	Circus programme	6 th century 143
021-032	Documents relating to estates	145
021-022	Two employment contracts	160

021	Contract of a door-keeper	569	161
022	Contract of a rent-collector	596	170
023	Letter to a <i>pronoetes</i>	6 th century	182
024	Receipt for rent	507	193
025	Receipt from a <i>zygostates</i> to a wine steward	552	198
026-032	Documents relating to monasteries		206
026	Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Andrew	548	212
027	Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Petros	553?	219
028	Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Castor	6 th century	235
029	Receipt for ropes from the monastery of Abba Castor	549	238
030	Receipt for ropes from the monastery of Abba Castor	583	243
031	Order to the monastery of Abba Castor to supply ropes	6 th century	247
032	List of payments of money	early 7 th century?	249
Bibliography			256
APPENDIX			274
Plates of papyri 01 to 032			

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I joined UCL in 1999, after 25 years as a lawyer, with some trepidation; more than 30 years had elapsed since I had studied any Latin or Greek. I was reassured by an interview with a very enthusiastic Robert Ireland and it was a delight, after the City, to be with so many scholars with a great knowledge and love of their subject. My thanks are due in particular to Simon Hornblower, Alan Griffiths and Michael Crawford, three exceptional scholars and teachers, who made my BA in Ancient World Studies and MA in Classics such enjoyable and intellectually stimulating experiences.

I am fortunate to have studied with two outstanding papyrologists. For my interest in the subject I owe thanks to Cornelia Römer, whose MA classes I attended as an “extra” and who showed me that in the study of documentary papyri I could combine my interest in history with the challenge and fun of deciphering and interpreting new material. When Cornelia left UCL the baton passed to Nick Gonis, to whom I owe a huge debt of gratitude for his patient, expert and inspiring supervision.

I am grateful to Riet van Bremen for her support as my second supervisor.

Thanks to the “new” friends whom I met during my studies at UCL for their encouragement: Caro Schofield, Jools Newton, Maggie Robb, Netti Farkas and Fiona Haarer. And thanks to my “old” friends, from my earlier undergraduate days at Cambridge, who alternated between telling me to do more work and complaining that I was boring when I did, and particularly to Zarine Kharas, for their constant support.

01 Contract for the provision of irrigation services

45. 5B/F(2-5)a

12 x 19.5 cm

26 May to 24 June 107

Introduction

01 contains a contract for the provision of irrigation services by Amois, a *zeugelates* or teamster, who agrees to supply to Harthoönis the necessary oxen and workmen to irrigate a newly-planted vineyard, using a *saqiya* owned by a third party. The contract is in the form of a private protocol (see p. 21). The last few lines, including the signatures, are missing. The papyrus is interesting because few Roman period contracts for the provision of services have been published, and because it adds to our knowledge on the tending of vineyards.

The nature of the contractual relationship

Amois is not an employee of Harthoönis and his services are not engaged full-time; he is an independent contractor. There have been a number of attempts to classify “work contracts”. Montevocchi distinguished “*contratti di lavoro propriamente detti*” (which included agreements for the performance of agricultural tasks, like harvesting, and for services of craftsmen) from “*contratti di servizio*”; in the former, the engaged person was not at the disposal of the other, whereas in the latter he was—the emphasis was on the obligation to remain, *παραμένειν*, with the employer.¹ The contract in **01** would have fallen into her first category. In the standard work on the topic, *Private Arbeitsverträge freier Personen in den hellenistischen Papyri bis Diokletian*, Hengstl divided “work contracts” into two broad categories: those which involved “*Personenrechtliche Beziehungen*”, by which he appears to mean some form of service relationship involving the obligation to *παραμένειν*, and those which did not; “*Dienstverträge*”, which included contracts of service, were in his first category and “*Werkverträge*”, which in his view usually involved an object which was to be worked on and then returned to the owner, were in the second.² Jördens identified problems with Hengstl’s stress on an “object” in her work on contracts from the Byzantine period.³ The contract in **01** does not fall happily into any of Hengstl’s categories. It is closer to a “*Dienstvertrag*” than a “*Werkvertrag*” but there is no obligation to *παραμένειν* and the “personal” relationship aspect which Hengstl finds important is absent; someone engaging

¹ Montevocchi 1973/1988, 219-220.

² Hengstl 1972, 35-60.

³ Jördens 1990, 148-151.

an artist (or a wet-nurse or a long-term employee) might want to ensure the exclusive services of a particular individual, but I cannot see why Harthoönis would care who irrigated his vineyard or how many other jobs that person undertook at the same time, as long as his irrigation was done properly. Hengstl's classifications are in my view unnecessarily complex; this contract constitutes simply what we would call a contract for services, rather than a contract of service.

Amois is to be paid a fixed fee of 220 drachmas plus one *keramion* of wine in return for watering the property at set intervals for a period of up to three months, from a date in Pauni to shortly after the start of the new year. The obligation was probably to water every four days until 26th August and twice thereafter, a total of some 24 or 25 times. I have been unable to find an exact parallel. Harvesting contracts tend to involve groups of workers who are occupied full-time while they are engaged, and are paid in kind (e.g. P. Flor. I 101 (78-91), P. Sarap. 49-51 (123, 124 and 125 respectively). In some ways this papyrus is not dissimilar to LI **3641** (544), where a millstone cutter contracted to supply millstones for his lifetime but was not prevented from carrying out work for others, or to III **498** (2nd century), a contract with stone-cutters, and P. Col. X 255 (131, Theadelphia), an agreement to transport dung and *sebakb* to a vineyard. All of these however were at agreed "piece-work" rates (plus in **498** a daily loaf and relish, with a daily rate of 4 drachmas for extra work) while in **01** there is a fixed fee, or *μισθός*, for the whole job. This agreement also has similarities to P. Lond. III 1166 (p. 104 f., 42, from Hermopolis, a contract for the supply of heating to a gymnasium), although those workers may have been required full-time. Closest in kind to **01** is P. Mich. V 349 (30, Tebtunis), an agreement to plant mulberry trees and water them five times a month. SB VI 9459 (7th century, from the Fayum) is a receipt for the first instalment of a fee for irrigation services to be provided to a vineyard for a year (or perhaps to the end of the then current year) from 7 Tubi (2 January); although centuries later, it may have been paid pursuant to a contract like **01**.⁴ See also (although they contain little information about the tasks to be undertaken) P. Flor. I 70 (7th century, Hermopolis), which records the receipt of six *solidi* in anticipation of irrigation work, SB VI 9284 (533, also from Hermopolis), another receipt for a payment for vineyard irrigation, and SPP III 349 (Fayum, 5th or 6th century: this papyrus does not mention a vineyard expressly).

⁴ See Gerstinger 1958.

Vineyard irrigation

Artificial irrigation was needed wherever land was outside the immediate area of the Nile flood, and therefore was vital for vineyards, which were commonly so situated. Leases of vineyards or of vineyard works (see below), where the property owner had a long-term interest in the state of the vines, usually contained detailed instructions as to the work to be carried out by the “tenant” (see for example IV **729**, XIV **1631** and **1692**, XLVII **3354**),⁵ but most imposed only a general duty to irrigate without specifying the intervals. A number of papyri provide information about the intervals at which vineyards were to be watered:⁶ every five days (πεμπταίους) in **729** 24 (138), every fourth day in LV **3803** (411, the relevant line (l.13) being restored by analogy with **729**), every two days in P. Soter. 1.32 and 2.25-26 (69 and 71 respectively, both from Theadelphia), daily between 1 Sebastos and 26 Phaophi (September and October) and continuing into the following month in SB VIII 9699 (= P. Lond. I 131 re-ed., Hermopolite, 78/79),⁷ twice a month in winter and three times a month in summer in P. Hamb. I 23.25 (569), and every 12 days in winter and eight days in summer in the case of a newly-planted vineyard in P. Vind. Sal. 9.11 (509).⁸ P. Ryl. II 157.16 n. shows a *saquiya* being available for use on alternate days in neighbouring vineyards (see P. Soter.1.29-30 n.), but each need not have been irrigated every other day. A number of matters will have determined the extent to which irrigation was required, including the location, the age and type of the vines and the type of soil.⁹ In **01**, a fixed fee was payable; other papyri show payment for irrigating by the aroura (SB XII 10922 =P. Mil. Vogl. III 153 re-ed.(166/7)) or daily or monthly labour rates (P. Lond. III 1177 (113),¹⁰ P. Mil. Vogl. II 69 (2nd century) and VII 308 (150-200)). In the Oxyrhynchite nome, from the late 2nd century, it was not unusual for an owner to “let out” all the work on his vineyard by an agreement in the form of a lease of *ampelika erga*, where the tenant

⁵ See Rowlandson 1996, App. I, Table 16.

⁶ Other types of land had different requirements. Arable land was to be watered twice a month in winter (P. Grenf. I 57), newly-planted mulberry trees five and date palms three times a month ((P. Mich. V 349, P. Soter. 4). See Schnebel 1925, 273 and Ruffing 1999, 136-140.

⁷ Ruffing 1999, 137-138 following Swiderek 1960, 75-76 and 84-86. Here irrigation was by means of a *shaduf* (and subsequently an Archimedes screw); no oxen were involved, so presumably the irrigation would have taken longer.

⁸ The translation of P. Vind. Sal. 9.11 “τῷ μὲν χειμῶνι δι’ ἡμερῶν δώδεκα, τῷ δὲ θέρει δι’ ἡμερῶν ὀκτώ” as 12 days watering in winter and 8 in summer, which the editor explains by suggesting that the contract did not run through the entire summer, is probably wrong; more likely the obligation was to water every 12 days in winter and every 8 in summer.

⁹ On vineyards and their upkeep generally see Schnebel 1925, 239-281 and Ruffing 1999, *passim*, and for references to irrigation Kloppenborg 2006, 572.

¹⁰ See Habermann 2000, 6-35.

undertook to do specified tasks in exchange for a fee called a *μισθός*: these agreements use the terminology of a lease but the tenant does not pay rent.¹¹ **01** is 80 years earlier than XIV **1692** (188), the earliest lease of *ampelika erga* of which we know.¹² It is not clear why this simpler form was overtaken by the more complex lease format; perhaps there were problems of enforceability, with advance payments required from the employer (see 19-20 n.), or perhaps there were more absentee landlords who wanted all the vineyard work to be carried out by someone else and the property to be maintained generally in a proper state, for which leases made standard provision.¹³ The term *ὑδροπάροχοι* is attested in papyri from 138 (**729**). These contractors seem to have had two distinct functions, first supplying water to privately-owned vineyards and later being involved in metropolitan water supplies.¹⁴ They were responsible for maintaining the water system as well as delivering the water, and perhaps with the development of such specialists the need for independent teamsters to be involved in the type of work provided for in **01** fell away.

The vineyard was to be irrigated from some date in Pauni (26 May to 24 June) until the third intercalated day (26 August), and twice more after 28th August.¹⁵ The vintage usually took place in Mesore and Thoth (August and September),¹⁶ but this newly-planted vineyard would not have produced a harvest (11 n.). In P. Soter. 1.31-32 and 2.25-26, irrigation was to take place from 1 Pharmouthi (27 March) *μέχρι τοῦ ἔσομένου (ἀπὸ) ποδὸς ποτισ[μο]ῦ μίαν παρὰ δύο ἡμέρας*, interpreted (P. Soter. 1.29ff n., with P. Tebt. I 120 and P. Flor. III 369 cited in support) as meaning once every two days until the ground was thoroughly watered by the Nile flood. Ruffing, giving examples which show that the Nile flood did not reach those Fayum vineyards but only entered the canal system, noted that

¹¹ Hengstl 1972, 52ff, for whom these are “*Werkeverträge*”; Jördens 1990, 222-232; Rowlandson 1996, 229-232 and Tables 15 and 16 in App. 1, 324-326; Nielsen 1995; Ruffing 1999, 172; Hickey 2001, 97-100. Leases of vineyard works are XIV **1631** (353) and **1692** (188), XLVII **3354** (257), PSI XIII 1338 (299), P. Laur. IV 166 B 3 (289-290), CPR VIII 23 (320) and SB XIV 12186 (366); Ruffing omits these last two, presumably because so little remains that it is uncertain that they are this type. Some hybrid agreements combine a “real” lease with a lease of works: P. Vind. Sal 8 (325, where the landlord was responsible for the irrigation) and 9 (509, where the *ὑδροπάροχος* received a 2-year lease of arable land as well as a fee in money and wine for agreeing to irrigate a newly-planted vineyard for 1 year) and P. Col. X 284 (including P. Heid. V 343) (311, see Nielsen 1995). P. Col. X 280 (Oxyrhynchus?, 269-277) should probably also be included (see Introduction, p. 141). Some may be leases only of irrigation works: P. Heid. V 344 (see Nielsen 1995), L **3582** (heavily restored) and P. Grenf. I 58. See also P. Mich. XVIII 792 (Oxyrhynchus, 221, a receipt for advances under a vineyard lease), Introduction, 286-289.

¹² Jördens 1990, 226.

¹³ See Rowlandson 1996, 101, 281-284, for the trend towards absentee landlords. Jördens (1990, 232) suggests that the lease form avoids the legal uncertainty of the other forms.

¹⁴ Bonneau 1993, 216-220, and see also LXX **4773** 4 n.

¹⁵ For dates of irrigation in the Fayum see Rathbone 1991, 251-2, 261-2.

¹⁶ See Schnebel 1925, 275-278, Rathbone 1991, 250, Ruffing 1999, 165-167. Dates differ from place to place.

the meaning of ἀπὸ ποδὸς ποτισμοῦ was unclear; the flood coincided with the harvest, and there was evidence for artificial irrigation then.¹⁷ The irrigation in SB VIII 9699 took place during or immediately after the vintage and just after the peak of the flood, showing that, as one would expect, the vineyards were not under water then. Swiderek suggested, in relation to SB VIII 9699, that the *shadyf* was sufficient to raise water for the vineyards when the canals were full but that in spring, when the levels were lower, an Archimedes' screw was required.¹⁸ A similar explanation probably applied here. Harthoönis' vines would have been planted in January or February (11 n.), so he must have had other means of irrigating before this contract, and the water in the canals would have been at its lowest level in Pauni and Epeiph, during the cereal harvest. 01 shows that the determining factor for the dates of irrigation here was not the needs of the vines (which must have required water most of the year) but the water level in the canals, and that the *saquiya* was needed only twice after the intercalated days because the canals were then full enough to permit irrigation by *shadyf* or other cheaper means. In BGU I 33 (Fayum, 2nd/3rd century) a father instructs his son by letter dated 15 Mesore (8 August) not to water a vineyard more than twice more. The precise location in relation to the canal system will have determined when mechanical watering was needed.

Description

This mid-brown papyrus, comprising two fragments, contains 33 lines of text. It looks as if the document was folded once vertically, down the middle, and then folded over again. It is torn where the outer fold would have been. The top (apart from a small tear) and side margins are intact, with a 1 cm margin at the top and 1.5 cm on the left; the writing extends to the edge of the papyrus on the right. The top and sides have been neatly cut. The bottom is torn; l. 33 is very fragmentary and some lines are missing. The writing is cursive and fluent, with several abbreviations; the initial letters on each line are considerably larger than the others. It is written in black ink along the fibres.

1 Ὁμ[ο]λ[ο]γεῖ Ἄμοις Ἄβριος τοῦ Φιλοξένου ζευγηλ(άτης)

2 τῶν ἀπ[ὸ] Χύσ[ε]ως, Πέρσ[η]ς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, [Ἀ]ρθοῶνει Ἄπιος

¹⁷ Ruffing 1999, 95-96, 138-140, 168. See also Swiderek 1960, 84-86.

¹⁸ Swiderek 1960, 86.

3 τοῦ Ἀρσιή[σιος] τῶν ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύ[γ]χ(ων) πόλ(εως), ἱερεῖ Θοήρ[ι]δος καὶ Ἴσιδος
4 καὶ Σαράπιδος καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγί(στων), ἐκουσίως παρέξασθ(αι)
5 τὰ αὐτάρκη βοικὰ κτήνη καὶ τοὺς αὐτάρκεις μηχαναρίους
6 πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνεστῶσης ἡμέρας ἕως ἐπαγο(μένων)
7 τρίτης τοῦ ἐνεστ[ῶ]τος δεκάτου ἔτους Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος
8 τοῦ κυρί[ου] ποτισμοὺς καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἐπαγομένας ἄλλους
9 ποτισμοὺς δύο τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος τῶι Ἀρθοῶνει περὶ τῆ[ν]
10 Χῦσιν ἐν το(ῖς) Ἑρμοπολ(ιτικοῖς) ἐδάφεσι ἐκ το(ῦ) Πτολ(εμαίου) ἱπ(π)άρχου
κλ(ήρου) ἀμπελ(ῶνος)
11 ν[εο]φύτου ἀ[ρ]ουρῶν ὅσων ποτ' ἐστὶν τοῦ Ἀρθοῶνιος
12 παρεχομέ[ν]ου μηχανὴν Ἀμοίτος Ἀρπάλου ἐφεστῶ-
13 [σ]αν πρὸς τῶι ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀμοίτος ἐξηρτισμένην
14 τῆι ἄλλῃ καταρτεία καὶ κλουίοις ἐν ἐπιδέσει, ἦι καὶ
15 ὁ Ἀμοιτᾶς κ[αὶ ὁ] Λόλλιος χρῶνται. μισθῶν δὲ τῶν συμ-
16 φωνηθέντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπὲρ τῶν ποτισμῶν ἀργ(υρίου)
17 δραχμῶν διακοσίων εἴκοσι καὶ παρὰ ληνῶ(ν) τῆι τρύγῃ
18 σπονδῆς [οἴ]νου κεραμίου ἐνὸς ἀφ' ὧν αὐτόθι ἐσχηκέναι
19 τὸν ὁμολογοῦντα παρὰ τοῦ Ἀρθοῶνιος δραχμὰς τεσ-
20 σαρὰ[κ]οντα, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰ[ς] χορηγείτω αὐτῶι ὁ Ἀρθοῶ(νις)
21 τῆι μὲν τριακάδι τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς Παῦνι δραχμὰς
22 ὀγδοήκοντα, Ἐπεὶφ λ̄ δραχμὰς ἐξήκοντα, Μεσο-
23 ρῆι κε̄ τὰς λοιπ(ὰς) δραχ(μὰς) τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ παρὰ ληνῶ(ν)
24 τὸ τοῦ οἴνου κεράμιον ἐν. τοὺς δὲ ποτισμοὺς ποιείσθω

- 25 ὁ ὁμολογῶ[ν] ἕως τῶν ἐπαγομένων συν . . []ων τὸ κτῆ-
- 26 μα δ[ι'] ἡμερῶ[ν] τεσσάρων ποτισμῶι ἐνὶ καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἐπαγο(μένας)
- 27 τοὺς δύο [π]οτισμοῦ[ς] ἀνεμπο[δ]ίστως καὶ ἀνεγκλήτως.
- 28 π [] . ἐκάστο[υ] ποτισμοῦ οὔ ἂν μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ δέοντο(ς)
- 29 καιροῦ ἐπιτέλεση το . αἴτου τὸ βλάβος διπλοῦν καὶ ἐπί-
- 30 τιμον ἄλ(λας) ἀ[ρ]γ(υρίου) (δραχμὰς) ἑκατὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ δη(μόσιον) τὰς ἴσας καὶ
ἢ πρᾶξις
- 31 ἔστω Ἄρθ[ο]ώνει ἕκ [τε] τοῦ ὁμολογ(οῦντος) καὶ ἐκ τῶν βοικῶν
- 32 [α]ύτ[οῦ] κτ[η]νῶν ὑπ[ο]ζυγ[ί]ων [πά]ντων, τοισ[] . [] . [] . .
- 33 [] ὑπαρ [] . [] . . []

Back, along the fibres:

34 (m. 2) ὁμολ(ογία) ποτι(σμοῦ) Ἀμό[ι]το(ς) . Ἀρθ[ο]ώνιος

1 ζευγη^λ οξυρ[]^χ πο^λ 4 μεγ| παρεξας^θ 5 βοϊκα 6 επαγο 7 τραϊανου 9 τη
10 το ερμποπο^λ πτο^λ κ^λ αμπε^λ 16 αγ^ω 17 λνη^ο 20 αρθο^ω 23 λοι| δραχ
λην^ο 26 επαγο 28 δεοντ^ο 30 αλ^λ α[]γ^τ 31 ομολογ 34 ομο^λ ποτι αμοιτ^ο

“Amois, son of Habron, grandson of Philoxenus, a teamster, of those from Chysis, Persian of the *epigone*, agrees with Harthoönis, son of Apis, grandson of Harsiesis, of those from the city of Oxyrhynchus, priest of Thoeris and Isis and Sarapis and the associated most mighty gods, of his own free will to provide the necessary bovine beasts and the necessary machine-men to irrigate, from today until the third intercalated day of the present 10th year of Emperor Trajan the lord, and twice more after the intercalated days, the newly planted vineyard which belongs to Harthoönis near the said Chysis in the Hermopolite fields, in the *kleros* of Ptolemaeus the Hipparch, of however many arourae it may be; Harthoönis is to make available the *saquiya*, which Amoitias and Lollius also use, belonging to Amois son of Harpalus and which stands next to his (Amois’) vineyard, equipped with the other machinery and with water containers attached. The wages agreed between the parties for the irrigation services are 220 silver drachmas and, at the wine vat at the harvest, as an extra, one *keramion* of wine. The contracting party has received 40 drachmas immediately

from Harthoönis, and Harthoönis will give him the remainder as follows: 80 drachmas on the 30th day of the current month of Pauni, 40 drachmas on the 30th of Epeiph, and the remaining 60 drachmas on the 25th of Mesore, and at the wine vat the single *keramion* of wine. The contracting party is to water the property until the intercalated days [once every 4 days?] and twice after the intercalated days without hindrance and blamelessly. If he does not complete any irrigation at the appointed time double the damage and a penalty of 100 silver drachmas and the same amount to the public funds and Harthoönis shall have the right of execution against the contracting party and all the yoked beasts belonging to him

Back: Agreement of irrigation of Amois . . . Harthoönis.

1 Ἀβρίος. Ἀβρόν and Ἀβρων are possible names for Amois' father (see Clarysse and Thompson 2006, I, 589). Both are unusual.

ζευγηλ(άτης). This occupation, a driver of a yoke of oxen, is known from a number of papyri from the 3rd century BC onwards, mostly appearing in lists of payments or receipts. The term did not relate specifically to irrigation; a *zeugelates* was remunerated for general transport activities in SB XIV 12203.9.

2 Χύσιεως. I have restored this here because the reference to τῆ[ν] Χύσιω at 9-10 indicates that the name appeared earlier. For Chysis see 10 n., Benaissa 2009, 364-366 and 03.1 n.

Πέρσ[η]ς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς. This expression appears frequently in papyri until the mid-2nd century but disappears by the late 2nd/early 3rd. It originally designated descendants of Persians who came to Egypt with the Macedonians, but its import, in both Ptolemaic and Roman times, is unclear (Wolff 1968/1998, 73-74). There are two principal conflicting views of its precise origin. Oates, supported by Vandersleyen, believed that it applied to non-Egyptians living in Egypt who were ordinary citizens and neither military nor state functionaries; Pestman believed in a military origin, and that it referred either to soldiers or to the class from which soldiers were drawn (see Oates 1963, 116-117; Vandersleyen 1986, 199-200; Pestman 1963, 16, 21; 1982, 57; La'da 1995). Since 1924 it has been generally acknowledged that in the Roman period it was a legal fiction (Tait 1924, 175; Oates 1963, 9; Pestman 1982, 56), whose usage may have derived from the inability of persons

originally so designated to use asylum as a means of avoiding submission to legal jurisdiction or execution of process (Tait 1924, 180-181, following van Woess, *A sylwesen* 63ff), but in Pringsheim's view this was too narrow a construction (Pringsheim 1924, 411 ff, 513). Oates described it as "a status the debtor assumes by which he makes himself subject to some kind of exceptional execution for non-payment of debts" (Oates 1963, 9) and the majority of writers on the topic agree that the expression in some way increases the liability of the party so designated, and bears some relation to the *praxis* clause and the right of the other party to levy execution (Pringsheim 1924, 396, 488-489; Oates 1963, 9). Wolff disagreed, because the term was sometimes applied to the creditor (Wolff 1968/1998, 74). Its precise correlation with the *praxis* clause is not clear, nor can one say with certainty whether its use obviated the need for an express provision entitling the other party to levy execution without having first obtained a court judgment.

2-3 [Ἀ]ρθοῶνει Ἄπιος τοῦ Ἄρσιή[σιος]. The name Harthoönis is derived from Horus and Thonis, a cult name of Horus in his aspect as the falcon god; the cult is attested only in Oxyrhynchus where Harthoönis and other derivatives are common names (Whitehorne 1995, 3083). I have not found any other reference to this Harthoönis, son of Apis and grandson of Harsiesis, but the name is frequently encountered among holders of the priestly office described below (3-4 n.): see SB X 10256.1-3 (54-68), where rent is received by one Harthoönis son of Harsiesis son of Harthoönis, II **242** 3-6 (77, which also contains a reference to an Apis in the priestly family), P. Turner 19.4 (101), XXII **2351** 1-4 (112), P. Mich. XVIII 788.1-3 (173: Thonis son of Phatres and grandson of Harthoönis may be the grandson of our vineyard-owner, but note the alternative suggestion at 788.1 n.) and XII **1550** 3-8=C. Pap. Gr. II 1.26 (156: a temple construction supervisor here so not necessarily a priest). On theophoric names see Clarysse and Thompson 2006, II, 332-341 and Lüddeckens 1985.

3-4 ἱερεῖ Θοήρ[ι]δος καὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Σαράπιδος καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγί(στων). This office is attested from 20 (SB X 10222.4) to the end of the 2nd century (P. Lips. I 31.21 (193/198)). The names of the gods are always in the same order. Oxyrhynchus had at least three temples of Thoeris, the hippopotamus goddess. Harthoönis would have been a priest at the Thoereum, the largest, which is attested from 250 BC (P. Hib. I 35) and which gave its name to a quarter of Oxyrhynchus attested until 462 (PSI III 175). See Whitehorne 1995, 3080, superseding Otto (1905, I 21), who had suggested that the multiple priesthood might have indicated that Harthoönis was a member of a college of priests of the town,

rather than a priest of all the named deities, and P. Mich. XVIII 788.2 n. Priests are rarely attested as owners of vineyards and this is the first known example of a priest owning a vineyard in the Oxyrhynchite nome (see Ruffing 1999, 307-8). As owner of a vineyard, which would have entailed initial capital expenditure, Harthoönis was probably of at least middling wealth and status but not sufficiently wealthy to pay someone else to do all the work (see Kloppenborg 2006, 298-299, 316).

5 βοικὰ κτήνη. The animals would have operated the *saquiya*; either singly or yoked together, they would have walked round and round on a circle of beaten earth turning a circular wheel attached to a vertical axis that drove the gear mechanism (see 12 n.). Their presence is a determining factor in establishing that the *mechane* is a *saquiya* and not some other form of irrigation equipment (Oleson 1984, 380). Amois is a self-employed teamster, owning or having access to a team of beasts and to the specialist machine-men engaged in the operation and maintenance of a *saquiya*. We do not know how many animals he would have required to fulfil this contract. The writer of a 2nd century letter, XLII **3063**, expressed surprise that three teams were required for irrigating a vineyard and was particularly concerned because of the feed and expenses. Two teams (four animals) working in shifts would have been needed for efficient use of the *saquiya* (LV **3803** 7 n.) and would have been normal, but one may have sufficed here (see e.g. XIV **1675**), as other users of the same *saquiya* may have used other workers and teams. For a list of references to bovine animals in vineyards see Ruffing 1999, 102-3 and add SB XVI 12382. For rates of hiring a team see 17 n. below. If Amois owned the animals he must have been relatively wealthy; the cost of buying such beasts obviously depended on their age and condition as well as on economic conditions, but prices recorded some 30 years later show two span costing 460 drachmas (IV **707** 8-9 n.: 136-8) and three beats and five calves were valued at 2,500 drachmas in 138 (IV **729** 39-40). In P. Mich. XVIII 792 (Oxyrhynchus, 221) a tenant of two vineyards acknowledges receipt of βοικὰ κτήνη with a value of 1,500 drachmas, used for irrigation work. See Drexhage 1991, 301-304; Rowlandson 1996, 23.

μηχαναρίους. A *mechanarius* usually means a worker who repairs and maintains *saquiya* on site, a kind of specialist carpenter, but can also mean the man who looks after the oxen that turn the axle (Reil 1913, 80-81). These men may have been employed by Amois or been independent contractors like him.

8 ποτισμούς. The usual term for irrigation which is carried out at all times of the year (Bonneau 1993, 210).

10 Χῦσις ἐν το(ῖς) Ἐρμπολ(ιτικοῖς) ἐδάφεισι. See 2 n. Chysis is described in the same way in C. Pap. Gr. II 1 App. I 3-4 (178), a report of an accidental death, which mentions a vineyard.

ἐκ τοῦ Πτολ(εμαίου) ἱπ(π)άρχου κλ(ήρου). Ptolemaeus was a relatively common Macedonian name. There are attestations of several *kleroi* of Ptolemaeus (but none of Ptolemaeus the hipparch) in the Oxyrhynchite nome, but only two in the Upper toparchy: in P. Hamb. I 19.8 (225/6), near Monimou, and in SB XVIII 14067.26 (mid-3rd century), near Thosbis. See Pruneti 1975, 196-199 and **013.10** n.

11 ὕ[εο]φύτου. The regular word for a newly planted vineyard, not on a cultivated piece of land but in a cultivated area (see Schnebel 1925, 245 and Bonneau 1993, 59). New vines would have been planted, and shoots layered, in January and February (Schnebel 1925, 250; Rowlandson 1996, 325). The term applied to vineyards in the first year of their planting; there would not have been a full harvest for four or five years (P. Vind. Sal 9, at pp. 105-6; Kloppenborg 2006, 326-330; IV **707** (no rent payable for the first four years)).

ὄσων ποτ' ἐστίν. Rowlandson (1996, 229) explained that precise areas did not need to be stated for vineyards as these were clearly defined by an embankment or mud-brick walls; the only exception she noted was XLVII **3354**. (See also P. Hamb. I 23.) Large vineyards were the exception rather than the rule and in the Oxyrhynchite most of those whose size is known were smaller than four arouras (Ruffing 1999, 255). As the size of this vineyard is not specified we cannot tell how long the irrigation would have taken.

12 μηχανήν. For a description of how the *saqiya* worked see Oleson 1984, 370-385 and figures 7-9 and 40, and Bonneau 1993, 105-111. The land on which it stood, as well as the adjacent vineyard, must have belonged to Amois son of Harpalus (Bonneau 1993, 220-221, relying on IX **1220** 17-20 (3rd century) and SB XIV 11281.26-29 (172)). Bonneau suggests (1993, p.221) that land irrigated by a *saqiya* had no other way of getting water; why else would a land-owner have incurred the expense? We cannot tell what arrangements Harthoönis had made with the *saqiya*'s owner about its use: there was a right to take water across another's land if there was no direct access to an irrigation canal (Bruun 2000, 554), but there may have been a charge for using the *saqiya*.

13-14 ἐξηρτισμένην τῇ ἄλλῃ καταρτεία. For references to this technology see **02.5-6** n.

κλούιους ἐν ἐπίδῃσει. I have not found this exact expression elsewhere. A *klouion* is a container used for eggs (VI 936 14-15), pieces of meat (XXIV 2424 18) and apples (PSI IV 428.51). It appears in the context of water-lifting equipment in SB VIII 9921.24, a 7th century lease of a public bath (ζευκτηρίας χλοῦια (=κλούια) σχ[οιν]ία), and 9900.8 (a 3rd century lease fragment from Oxyrhynchus). P. Lond. III 1177 viii. 164 (see Habermann 2000) shows a payment for σχοινία λεπτά εἰς ἐπίδῃσειν κεραμίδων. Oleson translates this as light twine for tying on the *keramides*, but casts doubt on whether it is definitely a reference to the fastenings which attach pots to the wheel, partly because clay saquiya pots are not found in the archaeological record until about 300; because of the high level of breakages he suggested that *keramides* may have meant tiles (Oleson 1984, 154-5, 353-6). Habermann (2000, 187-188: P. Lond. III 1177.158-163 n.) was definite that *keramides* were the earthenware vessels used on the wheel and calculated a not unreasonable daily breakage rate of three or four per *saquiya*. Oleson acknowledged (p. 363) that leather bags could have been used as buckets and I think that κλούιους in this papyrus is a reference to some form of container that was not made of clay, but of leather or possibly tightly-woven reeds. As the water would have been lifted and emptied out quickly they would not have had to remain water-tight for long periods of time. This term indicates that this was a pot-wheel *saquiya*; for a description see Oleson 1984, 11-12 and Figure 6 and Habermann 2000, Plate 26.

15 μισθῶν. μισθός is the usual term for remuneration in work contracts.

17 The agreed remuneration in money, 220 drachmas, is for a maximum of some three months' work, and Amois was responsible for any payments required for the animals and the mechanics. Without knowing the precise number of days to be worked it is difficult to assess the level of this payment but assuming 25 days' work the rate would be just under nine drachmas a day. In IV 729 (138), 2,000 drachmas were to be paid to the *hydroparochoi* for supplying water for a year, but that would have included maintenance work as well as irrigation; even so the editors (13-16 n.) suggested that the high level of payment might indicate that the water was to come from a newly-made channel. In P. Mich. V 349 (30), 144 drachmas was paid for planting mulberry trees and watering them five times a month, probably for a year: less than 2.4 drachmas a time after taking planting time into account (see Hengstl 1972, 54-55). Rates for hiring cattle ranged considerably (see Drexhage 1991, 313-319); a team for ploughing cost between 1 dr. 3 ob. and 5 dr. 3 ob. a day, and up to 8 dr. a day for sowing, in Hermopolis in 78/79 (SB VIII 9699; Drexhage 1991, 316) and 6 dr.

a day for ploughing in Tebtunis in 142 (P. Mil. Vogl. IV 248). P. Würz. 22=P. Sarap. 97 (90-133) shows 10 beasts (without men) costing 3 dr. a day. The rate may have depended on the use to which the beasts were put. P. Lond. III 1177.347, 353, 366-368 (see Habermann 2000) shows that 4 drachmas was the usual daily rate for a team for *saquiya* work in Ptolemais Euergetes in 113. There is also a considerable range of rates of pay for men. P. Lond. III 1177 shows payments in 113 to men involved in pumping: the βοηλάται got between 3.4 and 5.8 obols a day, the contractors got 36-40 drachmas a month and the ἀντληταί, who may have been equivalent to the μηχανάριοι, 8-10 obols a day (Habermann 2000, 271). P. Mil. Vogl. II 69 and VII 308 (2nd century, from Tebtunis) show labourers paid between 6 and 8 obols a day for irrigation work, and up to 9 obols a day was paid in VI 971 (late 1st or 2nd century). Amois' payment of 9 drachmas a day, assuming 25 days of irrigation work, may show that he had to supply two teams, but without knowing how much work was required, and how many animals and men were needed, it is not possible to evaluate whether these payments were generous.

παρὰ ληνὸ(ν). ληνός can mean a winepress or a fermentation vat. Here in the context of delivery of wine as part payment it has the latter meaning. It was normal in Roman and Byzantine times for wine to be sold from the vat for future delivery when fermentation was complete; it remained in the vat until fermented. See Kruit 1992 (1), 268-269 and 273, Ruffing 1999, 113-114 and 116. No indication is given as to its location, which suggests either that it was well-known or (but there is no proof of this) that the village had communal vats; possibly smaller growers pooled their wine.

τῆι τρύγη. The vintage probably took place in August, at the end of the contract period. For dates of the vintage in Egypt see Ruffing 1999, 165-167. The expression is used in a similar context in e.g. XLVII 3354 28. Harthoönis may have bought the wine or supplied it from another vineyard which he owned.

18 σπονδῆς [οἴ]γου κεραμίου ἐνός. Originally a portion of the new wine to be sacrificed to Dionysus, in the present case the *keramion* of wine is merely an extra payment for Amois' services. See Eitrem 1937 for comments on such payments generally and, on similar payments in leases, Herrmann 1958, 116-117. In the 1st and 2nd centuries a *keramion* of wine in the Oxyrhynchite would probably have cost between 6 and 10 drachmas (see Drexhage 1991, 59-66, noting that the size of the container is not clearly established), so this seems to have been a token rather than of much economic value.

19-20 40 drachmas were paid in advance on signature of the contract; the balance was payable in instalments but always in advance. Hengstl (1972, 127-128) considered that advance payment was needed to perfect this type of contract and so make the damages clause enforceable against the “employee”: in a service contract the “perfection” was achieved by the employee arriving for work and so putting himself into an employment situation.

25-26 κτῆμα. This is the usual word for a vineyard. The missing word before it is a participle but it is not obvious what it might be. συνβρέχων looks possible but is not attested.

28 The word at the beginning of the line should be the verb that governs βλάβος but none of the obvious candidates matches the traces. In the Oxyrhynchite the most common verb used in this context is ἐκτίνειν, but προσαποτίνειν occurs at least nine times. There is probably a *pi* at the beginning of l. 28 but προσαποτεισάτω does not fit.

29 τὸ βλάβος διπλοῦν. This expression is not common, but it appears in IV 729 20 (138), XLVII 3354 49 (257) and P. Col. X 280.18 (269-277) in relation to damages if work is not properly done in a vineyard.

30-32 Hengstl (1972, 131-134) asserted that the *praxis* clause was included in work contracts only where, as here, there had been a prepayment, and therefore that its use in the context of these types of contracts did not support Wolff’s view (Wolff 1941, *passim*) that without such a clause it was not possible to take proceedings against the party in default. See 02.16-17 n. for comments on *praxis* clauses and the relationship to the “Persian of the *epigone*” designation.

32 ὑπ[οζυγ]ίωv. I have found only four papyrological instances of this word AD: P. Cair. Masp. I 67002.3 and III 67279.2 (both 567), SB VIII 9920.2, 7 (6th century) and SB I 3924 12, 27 (19). It is more common in third century BC papyri.

34 The letter between the two names looks like a *psi*, or an abbreviated form of διά, but that does not make sense. Could it be καί?

02 (Sub-?)lease of a workshop containing a mill

45.5B.59/C(1)

28 (max) x 22.5 (max) cm

3 September 138-160

Introduction

This is a copy of a 3-year lease (or, if the restoration of lines 3 and 4 is correct, a sub-lease) of an ἐργαστήριον, a workshop, containing a grain mill. The parties are all from Oxyrhynchus and the property was situated there. The document is of interest for a number of reasons. It relates to business premises and published examples of such leases are much less common than leases of agricultural land; if, as I suggest, it is a lease of a grain mill without a bakery it is the first which is known to be from Oxyrhynchus.¹⁹ It contains some unusual provisions, including a restrictive covenant preventing the premises from being used (a) as a bakery and (b) for the rearing of poultry; the former would be normal and the latter not unusual in the case of a grain mill. It is also unusually favourable to the tenant: an interest-free cash advance, a προχρεία, of 400 drachmas is to be made to the tenant, only 300 drachmas of which are repayable (8), the condition in which the premises are to be returned to the landlords on the expiry of the term is not stipulated (see 15 n.) and the landlords (as well as the tenant) have to pay a penalty in the event of certain breaches (18 to 20). It is possible that the usual presumption that the landlords were in the stronger economic position does not apply here, although the three criteria suggested by Rowlandson as indicating this are either absent (rent paid in advance, tenant taking responsibility for taxes) or unknown (tenant with a higher social status than the landlords).²⁰

The papyrus is dated 6 Thoth (3 September) in the reign of Antoninus Pius (10 July 138 to 7 March 161); the letters (or, more probably, single letter) signifying the precise regnal year are missing from line 3 and only a trace remains in line 20. News of Hadrian's death had reached the Fayum by 23 August 138 at the latest (SPP XXII 183, dated in Mesore in the first year of Antoninus' reign) and presumably it was known in Oxyrhynchus at around the same time, so **02** could have been written in any of the years 138 to 160.

¹⁹ XVI **1890** (508) and P. Rein. II 108 (6th century) are both leases of a mill and bakery.

²⁰ Rowlandson 1996, 264-266, citing in particular XLI **2973**.

This lease is in the so-called “private protocol” form, a term coined by Herrmann;²¹ the body of the document is written objectively, in the third person,²² and would have begun ἐμίθωσαν. In the Oxyrhynchite nome these “private protocols”, which have been found from 19 BC (II 277),²³ were the predominant form of lease documents in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD; *hypommemata* become more popular during the 3rd century, when private protocols began to become common in the Fayum although for different types of documents.²⁴ This shows independence of form between the nomes and is probably due to “local predilection” rather than any deeper economic or sociological reason.²⁵ For information about leases of buildings generally see Hansgünter Müller, *Untersuchungen zur ΜΙΣΘΩΣΙΣ von Gebäuden im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri*, Cologne 1985.²⁶ For a list of Oxyrhynchite leases in private protocol form see P. Yale I 70, Introduction and XLIX 3489, to which should be added, *inter alia*, L 3589 and 3591, LV 3800, LXVII 4594, 4595, LXIX 4739 and 4745, LXXI 4827, SB XX 14290, 14295, 14337 and 14464, and P. Mich. XVIII 788.

Parties

The description of the parties at the start of 02 is badly damaged and none of the names there can be read with certainty. There was a single male lessee, whose name is missing (2, 25); his mother was called Tausiris (2), and he was literate and signed on his own behalf (25). Based on the subscription details (20-26), there were three joint lessors, one of whom was female. It is not unusual to have multiple parties to leases, although in the Roman period multiple tenants are more common in buildings leases than multiple landlords.²⁷ One lessor, Heras son of Heras, is literate and signs for himself (1, 26). The female lessor participates with her *kurios*, Heraclas, her brother and husband, who also signs for her (1-2, 25-26).²⁸ We do not have the name of the female lessor or of the lessor who was the first-named subscriber, who is also illiterate (1, 21-24). Unusually, the order of the parties in the subscription is different from that at the start and the principal obligations are repeated by

²¹ Herrmann 1958, 22 (Wolff 1974, 353 n. 6). No particular form was required: Wolff 1946, 58. There is no indication of any issuing authority and no description of the parties’ distinguishing physical characteristics and the date is inserted at the end of the substantive part of the document.

²² After the date, in the signature clauses, the first person is used.

²³ See Wolff 1978, 124 n. 87.

²⁴ Wolff 1974, 350-352.

²⁵ Wolff 1974, 352.

²⁶ For private protocols see 1974, Müller 1985, 76-79 and general works on law such as Wolff 1978 122-127.

²⁷ Müller 1985, 110.

²⁸ Women appear as parties in one-sixth of leases of living accommodation in the Roman period, more frequently as landlords than as tenants (Müller 1985, 102).

a lessor rather than the lessee. The entire subscription clause, which probably begins ὑπογραφή (23 n.), seems to be written in one hand (a different hand from the body of the document) and does not contain the original signatures; possibly the signatories were not all present when the document was prepared so that some signatures were collected subsequently and this copy reflects the order in which that was done.

The property

It is normal in private protocol leases of buildings for a description of the lessor's title to the property and its location to follow the statement of the term of the lease.²⁹ This would have been set out in lines 4 to 6, where the papyrus is badly damaged. The references to an ἐργαστήριον ((4(?), 6, 9, 11, 15 and 17) show that this is a lease of premises to be used for commercial purposes and not (merely) for habitation. They contained a μηχανή (15 and 21), with a στρόβειλος (21) and καταρτεία (5 (?), 22), which, with the reference to donkeys (10), evidence a grain-mill. In the Roman period mills and bakeries were usually found together; the same person would have milled the flour and baked the bread.³⁰ I have found only two papyri which may be leases of grain mills without bakeries: P. Mil. Vogl. II 53 (152/3, from Tebtunis, with BL VIII p. 221 and XI p. 135) and Chr. Wilck. 323 =P. Lond. II 335 (p. 191), a lease of a temple mill from Socnopaiou Nesus (166/7 or 198/9).³¹ In 02 ἀρτοποιίαν appears in a negative context with a reference to hens and cocks (11), the rearing of which is prohibited (17). Although the meaning of l.11 is not entirely clear, this appears to be a lease of a grain-mill where the tenant is prohibited from baking bread or feeding poultry. It is very unusual to have a restrictive covenant in a lease; in BGU IV 1117 (3 BC), the tenant agreed not to set up in competition (as a baker) within five *plethra* of the leased premises during or at any time after the term of the lease, but that is the only example of such a restriction published so far.³² We cannot tell why such provisions were included, although the obvious assumption is that the landlords wished to protect their commercial interests elsewhere. Perhaps there were too many bakeries in Oxyrhynchus at the time, although by 199 there was a shortage, as the eutheniarchs, officials charged with

²⁹ See e.g. III 502, VI 912, P Merton II 76, P Yale I 69 (especially Introduction p. 224).

³⁰ Reil 1913, 150; Müller 1985, 168. Drexhage (1991, 99-101) listed six Roman period examples of leases of mills and bakeries combined (BGU IV 1117 and 1067, P Mich X 586, P. Ryl. II 167, PSI VII 787, P. Mil. Vogl. II 53 (but see above)), none of which is from Oxyrhynchus. Some bread production took place in the home or private sector (Husson 1983, 175-177). For bread-making generally see Battaglia 1989, esp. 137-161.

³¹ The same mill may be mentioned in P. Louvre I 25 (see Introduction).

³² SPP XXII 177 (136/7, Socnopaiou Nesus) contains the converse—a provision that the tenant shall have the sole right to deal in oil in the village—which may have related to a state monopoly, else it is difficult to see how such a right would be in the landlord's gift (Müller 1985, 254-255).

ensuring that sufficient bread was available for the people, were then organising the provision of six new ones (VI 908). Hygiene in relation to poultry is unlikely to have been a concern; P. Strasb. VIII 706 (Arsinoite, 122/3) shows that birds could be raised in a mill, perhaps to utilise left-over grain. When cocks are mentioned in leases, as in P. Ryl. II 167 (39, a mill and bakery), BGU IV 1067 (101/2, a mill) and Chr. Wilck. 323 (166/7 or 198/9, a mill), it is usually as part of the requirement for the tenant to pay a **θαλλός**, possibly as part of an offering to Asclepius.³³

Rent

The rent was 120 drachmas a year (7, 22), the same figure as in Chr. Wilck. 323, although there were additional payments in kind in that case, and rather lower than the 200 drachmas plus in P. Mil. Vogl. II 53. Rentals in 2nd century leases of milling bakeries are higher too: BGU IV 1067 has 180 drachmas plus payments in kind, and PSI VII 787 has rent increased from 160 to 200 drachmas. The differences may be explained by the narrower use permitted in **02**, the size and/or state of the premises, local market conditions or some special relationship between the parties; we have no comparable lease from Oxyrhynchus for the period so cannot assess accurately how the rent relates to the market. It is described as both **ἐνοίκιον** and **φόρος** in ll. 7 and 22 and as **φόρος** alone in l. 12. According to Müller, **φόρος** is used when rent derives from premises used for business, i.e. where income derives from them, and **ἐνοίκιον** where they are used for habitation.³⁴ The word **ἐνοίκιον** is the only indication in **02** that the premises might be so used, although that may have been apparent from missing words in ll.4-6. Müller also distinguished between workshops already fitted out for use and those which the tenant had to render suitable for trade; rent would be **φόρος** for the first and **ἐνοίκιον** for the second, which would be unable to generate revenue initially.³⁵ In **02** the term **ἐνοίκιον** may be evidence that the tenant was required to fit out the premises and that the partially non-refundable advance was made to him for that purpose (6 n.). Alternatively a lack of precision or an abundance of caution on the part of the draftsman may be the reason for the double usage.

³³ On **θαλλοί** in Roman times generally see Herrmann 1958, 115-118 and Müller 1985, 214-217.

³⁴ Müller 1985, 196-203, esp.199, citing VIII **1127** (183); where there was clearly no living accommodation **ἐνοίκιον** may have meant house-tax (as in BGU IV 1117) (see Müller, 1985, 281).

³⁵ Müller 1985, 201, contrasting BGU IV 1116 (**φόρος** payable for living accommodation with workrooms attached) with P. Turner 37 and P. Merton II 76 (**ἐνοίκιον** payable where the work parts of the premises were not able to generate income immediately).

Description

This dark brown papyrus contains 26 lines. The top and the left side are quite badly damaged; there are three large holes in the first six lines, approximately 25-30 letters are missing from the start of the first 14 lines (where the papyrus is 3-4 cm narrower than below) and about 10-14 letters missing from the start of the remaining 12 lines. Four vertical fold lines are visible where it is frayed, and there would have been a fifth fold in the missing part on the left. Margins have been left clear at the top (approximately 2.3 cm) and bottom (approximately 3.5 cm). The right margin is largely intact; the papyrus is torn at the end of the first five lines, but no writing seems to be lost except at the end of line 5, and there is a hole of 1.5 x 2.5 cm from lines 16 to 19, but elsewhere the lines are complete to the edge of the page. The last written line is intact apart from 3 smaller holes. Below the writing the bottom of the papyrus is badly frayed. The writing is along the fibres. The back is blank.

The writing, with a pen and black ink, is cursive, medium-sized and flows freely. It is a typical documentary hand of a professional scribe, using a variety of letter forms; the writing becomes less neat, and slightly larger, as the document progresses. The subscription clause is written in a second hand. Abbreviations are used only in the subscription clause, at the end of ll. 20 and 24.

1 [ἐμίσθωσαν . . . 14? Ἡ]ρᾶς Ἡρατοῦς . . [. . . 12 . . .]εναρχος[] .ο[..... καὶ
..13? μητ]ρὸς Θατρῆτος κ.[..9? ..]ου μ[ε]τὰ κυρίο[υ]

2 [τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀνδρ]ὸς Ἡρακλᾶτ[ος πάντες ἀπ' Ὀξύρυγχ]ων πόλεως [. . . .15? . . μη]τρὸς Ταυσίριος ἀ[πὸ τῆς αὐτ]ῆς πόλεως

3 [Πέρση τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, εἰς ἔτη τρί]α ἀπὸ νεομηνία[ς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μη]νὸς Θῶθ
τ[οῦ ὄντος . . ἔτους Ἀν]τωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου [ὀ] καὶ αὐ[τοῖ

4 [ἔχουσι ἐν μισθώσει παρὰ ..7?..] . . Ἀνδρονίκου . [. . . 12? . . .]εωνος καὶ ἄ[λλων
ἐπ' ἀμφοδου ρ]ύμης Ὀνώφριος ἐργ[αστήρι]ον σὺν τη[.3?

5 [. . . . 28?]νη[. . . .]τιε. [. . . . 12?]καλλ[] []ιη.κα[. . . 11? . . .].
ουξ. . .υης καταρ[τε]ί[α] . [. . . 10? . . .]

- 6 [. . . . 20? . . . ὁ μεμισθ]ωμένος ὃς [κ]αὶ ποιήσει τ[ὸ ἐ]ρ[γαστ]ήριον καθ' ἡμέραν ἐνεργ[ὸν ὑ]πὲρ τῶν μεμισθωκότω]ν, πα]ρέχων
- 7 [. 28] ὑπηρεσίαν, [ἐ]νοικίου καὶ φόρου πάντων κατ' ἔτος ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι. ὁμολογεῖ δε ὁ με-
- 8 [μισθωμένος ἔχειν διὰ χειρὸς πα]ρὰ τῶν μεμισθωκότων ἀργυρ[ί]ου [δ]ραχμὰς τετρακοσίας ἀφ' ὧν [δρ]αχμὰς μὲν ἑκατὸν ἀναποδότους τὰς δ' ἄλλας
- 9 [δραχμὰς τριακοσίας εἰς λόγον προχρ]εῖας ἐργαστηρίου ἄσπερ δραχμὰς τ[ρι]ακοσίας ἀποδώσει ὁ μεμισθωμένος ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς τριετίας, τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐρ-
- 10 [γαστηρίου . . . 12? . . . πελωχι]κοῦ καὶ ἑξαδραχμίας ὄνων καὶ ἄλλων πάντων δημοσίων ἢ ἰδιωτικῶν ὄντων πρὸς τοὺς μεμισθωκότας.
- 11 [οὐκ ἐξέεται τῶ μεμισθωμένῳ ἐν τῶ ἐ]ργαστηρίῳ ἀρτοποιίαν γενέσθαι ἢ ὄρνειθας ἢ ἀλέκτορας ἢ ἄλλο τι παρασχεῖν εἰς παρουσίαν τῆς πόλεως ἢ ἄλλου τι
- 12 [.νός . 25?] γτας. βεβαιουμένης δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως ἀποδότω ὁ μεμισθωμένος τὸν μὲν φόρον κατ' ἔτος ἐν προθεσίαις τρισὶ
- 13 [διὰ τετραμήνου δραχμὰς τεσσ]αράκοντα, τὰς δὲ τῆς προχρείας δραχμὰς τριακοσίας ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου ὡς ἐπάνω δεδήλωται χωρὶς ὑπερθέ-
- 14 [σεως. ἐὰν δὲ . . .18? . . .] . μηχανὴ ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν προκειμένων τὸ ἴσον παρέξονται οἱ μεμισθωκότες. ἐὰν δὲ κατέαγμα γένηται τὸ ἴσον
- 15 [παρέξεται ὁ μ]εμισθωμένος καὶ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον παραδότω ὁ αὐτὸς μεμισθωμένος τὴν μηχανὴν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ τὸ ἐργαστήριον ἢ ἀπο-
- 16 [τεισάτω ὃ ἐὰν] προσοφειλέση ἀπὸ τοῦ φόρου καὶ τῆς προχρείας μεθ' ἡμιολίας, οὗ δ' ἐὰν μὴ παραδῶ τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ ἢ πρᾶξις ἔστω ἕκ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκ
- 17 [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων α]ὐτῶ πάντων. οὐκ ἐξόντος οὐδ[ἐ] τῶ μεμισθωμ[ένω] τρέφειν ἐν τῶ ἐργαστηρίῳ ὄρνειθας οὐδὲ ἀλέκτορας οὐδὲ ἐγκα[ταλείπειν
- 18 [τὴν μίσθωσ]ιν ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου οὐδὲ το[ῖς] μεμισθωκόσι ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὸν τῆς μισθώσεως ἐντὸς τοῦ α[ὐ]τοῦ χρόνου ἢ ἀ[ποτεισάτω

19[ό παραβησόμε]νος τῷ ἐμμένοντι ἐπίτειμον δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἴσας μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τὰ προγεγραμμένα κύ-

20 [ρια μένειν. κυρία ἢ μίσθωσις. [ἔτους .] Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτ[ου] Αἰλίου Ἀδρ(ι)ανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς Θῶθ ὅθ ὅθ (m. 2) ὑπογρ(αφ-)

21 [. . . 10? . .]σμ.[. . . 14? . . .] μ]εμίσθωκα σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπὶ τὰ τρία ἔτη τὸ ἐργαστήριον καὶ τὴν μηχανὴν σὺν στροβείλῳ καὶ

22 [. . . 9? . . . θ]ύη καὶ .[] . . . []η καταρτεία παρέξ κτηνῶν ἐνοικίου καὶ φόρου κατ' ἔτος δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ

23 παραδέδωκα] αὐτόθι τῷ μεμισθω[μέ]νω [τὰ]ς δραχμὰς τετρακοσίας ἀφ' ὧν δραχμὰς μὲν ἑκατὸν ἀναποδότους τὰς δ' ἄλλας δραχμὰς τρια-

24 [κοσίας εἰς λόγῳ]ν προχρείας ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τ[οῖς πρ]οκειμένοις οἷς καὶ εὐδοκῶ. Ἀπίων Εὐδαίμονος ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδότος γρά[μματα].

25 [. . . 10? . .] . μεμίσθωμ[α]ι ἐπὶ πᾶσι το[ῖς π]ροκειμένοις. Ἡρακλᾶς ἐπιγέγραμμαι τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ γυναικὸς μου κύριος καὶ [ἔγρα-

26 [ψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆ]ς μὴ εἰδυῖης γράμματα. Ἡρᾶς Ἡρᾶτος συνμεμίσθωκα ὡς πρόκειται.

11, 17 l. ὄρνιθας 19 l. ἐπίτιμον ἴσας 20 υπογρς 21 l. Στροβείλῳ 22]ύη 24 γρᾱ

“ Heras, son of Heras,, whose [mother is] Thatres, daughter of K....., with her guardian, [who is her brother and husband], Heraclas, all from the city of Oxyrhynchos, [have leased to X son of X], whose mother is Taurisis, from the same city, [a Persian of the descent, for three years from the] 1st day of the [present] month of Thoth in the ... year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, the workshop in the district of Onnophris Street, which they themselves hold on lease fromAndronicus, and others, together with the and equipment

(6)The tenant shall, on behalf of the landlords, make the commercial premises operative every day, providing service, the rent for everything being 120 drachmas in silver a year. The tenant acknowledges [that he has received by hand from] the landlords 400 drachmas in silver, of which 100 drachmas are not repayable, while the other [300 drachmas are by way of an] advance on the workshop, which 300 drachmas

the tenant will repay at the end of the three years,, [the milling tax] and the six drachma donkey tax and all other public and private taxes in connection with the premises being for the account of the landlord. [The tenant shall not be permitted] to use the premises as a bakery or to provide hens or cocks or other things like that for the [property] of the city or.....

(12)..... If the lease is confirmed, the tenant shall pay the rent annually in three instalments, every four months, of 40 drachmas, and the 300 drachmas of the advance at the end of the period as is set out above, without delay. [If]the mill or any of the rest of the foregoing, the landlords will provide the same. If there is a breakage the tenant [will provide] the same and when the time expires the tenant shall hand over the mill and the other things and the premises or will forfeit any amount he fails to pay of the rent and the advance plus one half of the amount in default, and execution may be levied against him and all his possessions. The tenant shall not be permitted to rear birds or cocks in the workshop or to abandon the lease within the term and the landlords shall not evict him from the leased premises during the term; any party in default shall forfeit to the party not in default a fine of 500 drachmas, and shall pay the same amount into the public funds, and after that the provisions written above shall remain in effect. This lease is valid. In theyear of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, 6th Thoth. Subscriptions.

(21) I,....., have leased out with the others for three years the workshop and the mill with the lower millstone and.....equipment except animals at the rent each year of 120 drachmas and [I have given] immediately to the tenant 400 drachmas of which 100 drachmas are non-returnable, while the other 300 drachmas are by way of advance on the other terms set out above, with which I agree. Apion son of Eudaimon has written for him as he is illiterate. I,, have taken the lease on all the terms set out above. I, Heraclas, have been registered as guardian of my sister and wife and I have written for her as she is illiterate. I, Heras son of Heras, am co-lessor as stated above.”

1 ἐμίσθωσαν. The standard beginning for private protocol leases with more than one lessor (e.g. P. Mert. II 76 (181)), which would have been followed by the names of the three lessors, each with patronymic and, probably, mother’s name. The difficulty lies in working out whether Heras Heratos (whose name appears clearly in l.26, showing that

Heras is not an alias) is the first or second named lessor; the female lessor is clearly named third. There is space for only some 14 letters immediately after ἐμίσθωσαν, while the name of the other male lessor seems to be longer, as some 27 letters are missing at the start of l. 21. If we assume that other words and not just the name are missing from the start of 21, the first-named lessor must either have a short name and patronymic or be a brother of Heras; alternatively there may be another word before Heras, but I cannot think what this might be.

]εναρχος. This may have been followed by an office held by one of the lessors, such as ἀγορανόμος (P. Coll Youtie I 28.24, 169-173?); alternatively the second lessor may have been called Ζέναρχος.

2 [τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ και ἀνδρ]ός. For the restoration see l. 25. P. Kron. 20.4 (146, a loan agreement from Tebtunis) contains τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ [τοῦ] δὲ και ἀνδρὸς(ς) but the τοῦ has been restored and the expression is awkward. As the first two legible letters are clearly ος, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ και ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς (SPP XXII 60.4, 2nd/3rd century, Athribites) does not fit. τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς και ἄνδρὸς is possible but unattested. It was normal for a woman to contract with her *kurios* when she was undertaking continuing obligations (Pringsheim 1924, 426, 451; Müller 1985, 103-108). For a long time scholars have accepted that marriage between brothers and sisters was common in Roman Egypt, particularly in the 1st and 2nd centuries; it is attested in census returns, wedding invitations, marriage agreements and documents, like **02**, where a woman's *kurios* is her husband and brother. Clearly there was no social stigma attached. Reasons advanced for this phenomenon, which in its extension beyond the ruling class seems unique to Egypt, include that it was an indigenous Egyptian tradition, or arose from a desire to avoid paying a dowry and/or to keep property in the family or to ensure purity of the Greek race; only the first is, of course, restricted to Egypt, while the others would apply equally anywhere, and the first does not explain why it took place. The issue, including reasons for the general prohibition of such marriages, an analysis of the statistical evidence based on census returns and a discussion of the treatment of women and availability and consequences of divorce, was discussed at length by Hopkins in 1980, who concluded that in Roman Egypt brother-sister marriage was voluntary, common and taken for granted, but was unable to identify anything unique to that society that explained it. See Hopkins 1980 *passim*. In a more recent study, Huebner proposed that one of the siblings concerned was an adopted rather than a natural child. Pointing to the high incidence of adoption in the Classical and Hellenistic

Greek world and the unusually high proportion in Roman Egypt of men aged over 50 who had sons living in their household, she suggested that adoption was common but not disclosed in the census returns as there was no requirement for such disclosure. Adopted children were treated for all purposes as natural children of their adoptive parents and Greek law did not prohibit marriage between natural and adopted children; under Roman law, this was possible only if one child was emancipated. Brother/sister marriage ceased to be attested in Egypt in the 3rd century in consequence of the application of Roman law pursuant to the *Constitutio Antoniniana*. See generally Huebner 2007 and her references for earlier literature; she lists the papyrological sources (apart from census returns, where she relies on Bagnall and Frier 2006, p.23, nn. 15-24), to which should be added P. Kron. 20 and, as examples where a child of siblings is attested although marriage is not explicit, XLIII 3096 and SB XXVI 16803 (discussed briefly below). I have not carried out an exhaustive study and there may well be more. Huebner's explanation is attractive; it is the only one which does not have to explain away the natural aversion to incestuous relationships. However, she does not analyse the papyri in detail so there is no consideration whether, for example, there is any difference in meaning between ὁμοπάτριος and ὁμομήτριος on the one hand and ὁμογνήσιος on the other. Nor does she consider the intriguing case of the so-called "incestuous twins" from Arsinoe (SB XXVI 16803: see Gonis 2000 (3)) and whether the word δίδυμος would be used of non-natural siblings. (It is of course possible, if unlikely, that an adopted child might have the same birthday as a natural one or that false claims were made to twins (because they were lucky?): see Scheidel 1996, 48-57.) Remijsen and Clarysse convincingly disputed Huebner's explanation on two main grounds. First, they cited a number of ancient authors who regarded brother/sister marriage as a common Egyptian practice which was contrary to normal laws against incest; this suggested that it was not the permitted Greek practice of marrying an adopted sibling. Secondly, while agreeing that marrying an adopted son to a natural daughter was common practice in the eastern Mediterranean and that adoption was probably more frequent in Egypt than our sources suggest, they maintained that most adoptees would have been adopted as adults, when a couple who wanted a male heir knew that they would not have a male child of their own, and so would be the only male children of the family. In addition, such adoptees would probably have retained their original names and while they might have taken their adoptive father's name as a second name, they would be unlikely to have taken also the name of their adoptive grandfather. The available evidence showed that brother-sister marriage often took place in large families with several

sons and that a higher proportion than would have been expected of brothers so marrying (even allowing that some would have been nephews) had the same name as their paternal grandfather. They did not explain why Egypt alone had this custom, but suggested that perhaps it was not so great a step from the permitted marriages between paternal half-siblings (Athens) and maternal half-siblings (Sparta) and both paternal and maternal half-siblings (Egypt). See Remijsen and Clarysse 2008, *passim*. Census returns attest brother/sister marriage less frequently in the Oxyrhynchite nome than in the Arsinoite, but I do not think that any conclusions as to the relative frequency between the nomes can be drawn from this.

3 Words describing the tenant are missing from the beginning of this line. The description Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς was commonly applied to the tenant in Oxyrhynchite leases in the 1st and until the mid-2nd century but its usage became less frequent as the 2nd century progressed, although it appears in P. Mil. Vogl. III 145, a building lease from 174. The following Oxyrhynchite leases from the reign of Antoninus Pius include the term: I **101**, VII **1035** (143), IL **3490** and P. Ross.-Georg. II 19. See **01.2** n. and, for the possible connection between these words and the *praxis* clause, 16-17 n. below.

ἐνεστῶτος. The lease is for three years (see l. 21) from 1 Thoth (29 August), the first day of the Egyptian New Year, a common date for commencement of leases (Müller 1985, 180-181). Leases in Roman times were more often signed after than before their start-date and a delay of nearly a year between signature and commencement would have been extremely unusual; there was no provision then for the tenant to take possession at a future date and as such contracts were not “consensual”, possession would have been given on signing: Wolff 1946, 59-60. Accordingly, I have restored ἐνεστῶτος rather than εἰσιόντος.

3-4 [ὁ] καὶ αὐ[τοὶ ἔχουσι ἐν μισθώσει παρὰ ...]. Inserted by analogy with VI **912** 9-12 (235, lease of a cellar: ἀφ’ ἧς καὶ αὐτὴ ἔχει ἐμ μισθώσει παρὰ Αὐρηλ(ίου) Ἰσιδώρου Χαιρήμονος ἐπ’ ἀμφοδου Νότου Κρηπείδος οἰκίας. See also P. Sarap. 45 (127), XLI **2974** (162), BGU VII 1646 (3rd century), XLV **3260** (323) and P. Prag. II 159 (5th century). παρὰ would have been followed by the names of the property owners, the father of one of whom was called Andronicus.

4 ἐπ’ ἀμφοδου ῥ]ύμης Ὀννώφριος. A district or quarter of Oxyrhynchus named after a street called Onnophris is attested in LXIV **4440** (a first century list of sacred fishermen,

whose names are listed by district) and in P. Mich. X 580 (19/20), a notification of the disappearance of a son who was registered ἐπὶ λαύρας ρύμ[ης] Ὀννώφ(ρεως). The street is also attested in PSI IX 1034 (2nd to 3rd century). ἄμφοδον had replaced λαύρα as the usual term for quarter or district by the second half of the 1st century (Rink 1924, 11).

ἐργ[αστήρι]ον. A general term in the Roman period for commercial premises, including workshop and retail uses. See SB XIV 11978 (187) generally and, from Oxyrhynchus, VI **908** (199: mill and bakery), VI **989** (late 3rd/4th century: metal-working), XII **1455** (275: oil-seller), **1461** (222: vegetable shop) and **1488** (2nd century: oil factory), XIV **1648** (176-200: dyeing workshop), P. Mert. II 76 (181: pottery), SB XVI 12695.19-20 (143: bakers of fine bread and (separately) a brothel), PSI VI 692 (52-54: general store).

5-6 These lines would have included a description of the fixtures and fittings in the premises, possibly using the same vocabulary as in 21-22.

καταρ[τε]ί[α]. A term frequently used in connection with a μηχανή when it means a water-wheel: see **01.14**, P. Michael I 19.6 (3rd century), IX **1208 14**(291), XXXIV **2723 10** (201-250), LV **3803 7** (411), P. Mil. Congr. XIV 74.27 (172), SB XX 14290 (3rd century), PSI IX 1072 (mid-3rd century) and P. Oxy. Hels. I 41.12 (223-4), as μηχαν[αν]ή ἐξηρτισμένη πάση ξυλικῆ καταρτεία καὶ σιδη[ρ]ώσει (**1208 14**). Its use is not exclusive to water-wheels, although the editors of P. Laur. IV 163 (279) assumed, possibly erroneously, that because of the reference to καταρτεία a water-wheel was to be installed on the land leased in that document. καταρτεία is also attested as part of an oil-press in PSI IX 1030 (109) and in connection with a ship (P.Köln. V 229 (178) and P.Lond. III 1164 h (212: p.163)). It means part of the equipment, either wooden or metal, of the apparatus or installation to which it relates.

6 ἐνεργ[όν]. This term, meaning in working order or operating, is applied to milling or oil-press equipment in BGU IV 1067 (101-2) and XI 2066 (73-74), P. Amh. II 93 (181), P. Prag. I 38 (96) and II 159 (5th century), PSI VII 787 (176-177), SB XVI 12518 (104-5) and P. Ryl. II 167 (39) and 321 (2nd century). It is also used for installations such as baths, granaries and workshops (see Reekmans 1985, 278) and for an ἐργαστήριον that served as a shop in XII **1461** (222). In SB XXII 15762.13-16 (210 BC), it was used to describe a working mill, contrasted with another one which was ἀργόν, idle (Reekmans, *loc. cit*). Here, coupled with καθ' ἡμέραν, it probably means that the lessee has to ensure that the mill is open for business and capable of being used every day: see 9 n.

7 [...28?] ὑπηρεσίαν. The missing words describe something which the tenant had to supply, perhaps πᾶσαν εἰς τοῦ ἐγαστηρίου or the like. In P. Col. X 280 (269/277) (which may be part of a lease or a contract for labour: see p. 9, n. 11) and P. Mich. XVIII 792 (221), both Oxyrhynchite, the word ὑπηρεσία is used to describe the provision of irrigation services for which a tenant has been given an advance (see 9 n.). Alternatively, there may have been a reference to the animals which the landlords did not provide (10 n.) and which would have been needed to operate the mill, such as τὰ αὐτάρκη κτήνη (by analogy with P. Michael 24.18-19, τὰ αὐτάρκη σπέρματα) or ἐαυτῶ κτήνη (P. Oxy. Hels 41.22).

[ἐ]νοικίου καὶ φόρου. See p. 23.

8 ἔχειν διὰ χειρὸς πα]ρᾶ. See L 3589 13-17 n. διὰ χειρὸς is used frequently in Roman period contracts to indicate receipt of a cash payment, preceded by ἔχειν, as XXXVI 2774 4 (129) and suggested here, or ἔσχηκέναι, as VII 1039 6 (210).

ἀναποδότους. Used in a similar context in XIV 1628 (73 BC), P. Tebt. I 105 (103BC) and 106 (101 BC), P. Ryl. II 171 ((56/57) and possibly CPR I 47. Also found in inheritance cases (as P. Lond. III 932 (pp.148-9) and SB I 5761).

9 [εἰς λόγον προχρ]είας. See also l. 24. This phrase appears in a number of papyri, including IV 729 13 (a lease of a vineyard from 137). The tenant in 02 acknowledges that he has been given an advance or προχρεία of 400 drachmas, of which 100 drachmas are non-repayable; the remaining 300 are to be paid back at the end of the term. There is no provision for interest. Leases of agricultural land often provide for loans or advances of seed (as VI 910 (197), XXII 2351 (256/7)) but provisions for money loans to tenants are relatively infrequent. Few are known from the Oxyrhynchite; to L 3589 (2nd century) and those listed there at 13-17 n., namely PSI IX 1078 (356), 729 (137, a lease of a vineyard), VIII 1125 (2nd century) and SB X 10274 (99) (and as a possibility, but there is nothing to suggest it is a lease, XXXI 2583) should be added XIV 1628 (73 BC, where the word προχρεία is not used), XVI 1890 (506, a lease of a mill and bakery) and P. Berl Zill. 7 (574), and see also P. Mich. XVIII 792 (221), a receipt of advance payments under a lease. In those examples, except 1628 and P. Berl. Zill. 7, the advance was repayable in full; in 1125, it carried interest. Similar to the present are P. Tebt I 105 (103 BC, a non-repayable advance to a tenant for breaking up dry land) and P. Ryl. II 171 (56/57, a non-repayable grant of money towards the tillage and upkeep of embankments). In P. Tebt II 378 (256), a

landlord gave a tenant 300 drachmas, which had been provided by the outgoing tenant, to restore land. It is not entirely clear in **02** why the advance was made, but it was probably to enable the tenant to put the mill into working order (6 n.); perhaps he was unwilling to spend his own money initially because of the restricted use of the premises or unable to fund capital works which were necessary and/or in the landlord's interest. See generally Herrmann 1958, 129-133.

9-10 ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐρ[γαστηρίου . . . 12? . . . πελωχι]κοῦ. Restored by analogy with ὑπὲρ τοῦ μύλαίου in P. Ryl. II 167.18-19. In **02** the landlords seem to be undertaking responsibility for all taxes, although, apart from the 6-drachma donkey tax, the words for specific taxes are missing. It was normal for leases to stipulate that certain taxes were to be borne by specified parties, although this would not have affected any legal obligation to pay the fiscal authorities (Müller 1985, 248-253, 280-281). In PSI VII 787 (176-177) the tenant may have been responsible for the taxes; in P. Ryl. II 167 (39) and P. Mil. Vogl. II 53 (152/3) the liability was shared. The πελωχικόν is the only specific mill tax known from Roman times (see P. Ryl. II 167.20, PSI VII 787.16, P. Louvre I 25 (113) Introduction, XVII **2128** (176-200), LXX **4777** (232), P. Rainer. Cent. 60.10 n. (164), BGU III 771.6 (3rd century) and IV 1062 (236), Wallace 1938, 222 and Reiter 2004, 165-9 (who considers mills and bakeries combined)). There may have been a reference to a τετάρτη σιτοποιῶν, attested for Ptolemaic times (P. Fay. 15, P. Petrie III 117), by analogy with the τετάρτη ἀρτοποιῶν (P. Ryl II 167.22 n.: see Wallace 1938, 222 and Reiter 2004, 166). It is also possible that the police tax was mentioned instead of the πελωχικόν; the normal term for this in the Oxyrhynchite is ὑπὲρ φυλάκτρον (Wallace 1938, 146-148). That tax was payable by the landlord in III **502** 43 (164, a lease of a house) and P. Mert. II 76.30 (181, a lease of a workshop, as restored following **502**).

10 ἑξαδραχμίας ὄνων. The six drachma donkey tax is known in the Oxyrhynchite and Hermopolite nomes from 4-3 BC (XII **1457**) to the late 2nd/3rd century (XXIV **2414**, P. Mich. XV 709) (see Wallace 1938, 90-93). As a fixed rate tax it was probably a licence tax and not related to value (as Adams 2007, 131, on the 10 dr. camel tax). As in the three known ἀπογραφαὶ ὄνων the animals were expressed to be used by their owners and not rented out, the tax may have been payable only when the animals were hired out or used in nomes different from the ones in which their owners lived (Sijpesteijn 1979, 244-248). Donkeys would have been used for grinding the corn (as in VI **908**). The lease or rental was παρέξ κτηνῶν, excluding animals, so the tenant had to provide them himself.

11 ἄρτοποιίαν γενέσθαι. The ending of ἄρτοποιίαν is not clear; if it is correct the preceding word should be ἐργαστήριον, in the nominative. ἄρτοκόπος is the more usual word for baker but ἄρτοποιός, which is possible here, is attested in SB XX 14197 (253) and in P. Athen. 55 (undated). ἄρτοποιία (or ἄρτοποιεία) usually means baking (as in PSI VII 787).

εἰς παρουσίαν τῆς πόλεως. I have not found this phrase in any other papyrus. παρουσία may be used in the sense of substance or property (LSJ, meaning II) or this may be a reference to a contribution or tax: see Preisigke, Ab. 11 and SB X 10311 (15, a receipt on an ostrakon). The usual meanings, “presence” or “visitation”, do not make sense.

12 βεβαιουμένης δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως. This expression of the so-called βεβαίωσις clause is standard in 2nd century Oxyrhynchite leases. It encompasses the landlord’s obligation to ensure that the tenant has quiet enjoyment of the premises free from interference not merely by third parties but also by the landlord himself, particularly when, as here and as usual in the Oxyrhynchite, it is expressed to be the condition to which the obligation to pay rent is subject. In the Ptolemaic period leases commonly included a detailed βεβαίωσις clause, providing what would happen in the event of default, but in the Roman period this was dropped. See Herrmann 1958, 157-160, Müller 1985, 227-233, Yiftach-Firanko 2003, 356-7.

12-13 ἐν προθεσμίαις τρισὶ [διὰ τετραμήνου. Similar rental payment periods are found in two other Roman period mill leases, P. Ryl. II 167 (39) and PSI VII 787 (2nd century), as well as P. Oslo III 136 (141, from Euhemeria, an application for division of profits under a sub-lease of an olive-grove) and SB XVI 13011 (144-2, an Arsinoite house lease). It was more usual for payments to be six-monthly (Berger 1913, 387).

14 μηχανή. This term usually means a *saqiya* and, in later papyri, the land irrigated by one, as in P. Flor. I 65.16-17 (570) (see Oleson 1984, 11-12, Figures 7–9 and Bonneau 1993, 105-111). Originally it meant the gearing equipment used in the *saqiya* (Oleson 1984, 127, 131, 380), and so it appears in non-irrigation contexts also: as a roller used in agriculture (P. Warr. I, 2nd century); in oil production in SPP XXII 173 (40: Socnopaiou Nesus), Chr.Wilck. 312 (55: Arsinoite), BGU XI 2066 (73-4: Socnopaiou Nesus), P. Prag. I 38 (96: Heraclea), P. Fay. 122 (100: Euhemeria), SB XVI 12518 (104-5: Theadelphia), P. Vindob. Tandem. 24.8 (145: Socnopaiou Nesus) and P. Prag. I 94 (3rd century: Arsinoite); as part of a grain mill in P. Mil. Vogl. II 53 (=SB VI 9265) (52-53: Tebtunis), P. Ryl. II

321.5 (2nd century: Arsinoite; ἀλαιτική [μηχανή]), PSI VII 787(2nd century: Arsinoite), SB XIV 11705 (213, location unknown, μηχανή σιταλητική), CPR VI 73 (222-235: Heracleopolite, where ἀλετικήν was restored), P. Cair. Isid. 64 (c. 298: Karanis, μηχανή ἀλετική) and BGU II 405 (348: Philadelphia, a μηχανή σιταλετική). In the present context, where (a) the lease was of commercial premises in the town, (b) donkeys, not oxen, were used to turn the machine (6 and 22) and (c) there is a *strobilus* (21), it means a grain mill.

κατέαγμα. This word is used for a breakage of leased equipment in P. Amh. II 93.18-20 (181, Arsinoite, lease of an oil-press): ἐὰν δέ τις <γένηται> ἐπισκευῆς ἢ ἀνοικοδομῆς ἢ καταιάγματος ξυλικῶν ἢ ἀργαλίων ὁμοίως ὄντων πρὸς) σὲ τὸν Στοτοῆτιν (the landlord). See also PSI IX 1030.16-17 (109, Oxyrhynchite, lease of an oil-press): ἐὰν τέ τ[ι μέρος?]ς κατιακῆ τοῦ ὀργάνου, τόσον δώσωσι αὐ[τῷ οἱ μεμισθωκ]ότες, where although the landlord had to provide replacement wood etc. the tenant was responsible for the repairs, and P. Mil. Congr. XIV p. 74, 28-29 (172, Oxyrhynchite, lease of land with a water-wheel): ἐὰν δέ τι τῶν τῆς μηχανῆς κατεαγῆ ἢ παλαιωθῆ τὸ ἴσον δώσουσι οἱ γεοῦχοι. In **02** the tenant was responsible for supplying a replacement if there was a breakage but the landlords had a similar obligation in other circumstances (l. 14).

15 παραδότης ὁ αὐτὸς μεμισθωμένος τὴν μηχανὴν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ τὸ ἐργαστήριον. This clause, obliging the tenant to return the property, was probably unnecessary in real estate leases, as that obligation arose automatically at the end of the term; its only purpose would have been to specify the condition in which it was to be returned (Wolff 1946, 67-68. See also Herrman 1958, 174-5.) Surprisingly, there are no such stipulations in **02**, not even the usual one as to cleanliness (see Müller 1985, 274-280).

15-16 ἀπο[τεισάτω ὃ ἐὰν] προσοφειλέση. The usual construction in the Oxyrhynchite nome, which is the only nome where this use of προσοφειλέση is attested, is ὃ δ' ἂν προσοφειλέση, ἀπο[τεισάτω] μεθ' ἡμιολίας as in e.g. PSI VII 739.27-28 (163) and IV **730** 25-27 (130), but that does not fit here. See I **101** (142), III **502** (164), VI **912** (235), VIII **1127** (183), XIV **1694** (280), XLIV **3200** (2nd/3rd century) and P. Yale I 69 (214) for variations in similar wording.

16 μεθ' ἡμιολίας. See Hennig 1967, 77, who claims that this provision in leases is unique to Oxyrhynchus, where it is common in the late 1st and 2nd centuries, applying only to the tenant. It is common in other sorts of documentation from other areas.

16-17 ἡ πράξις ἔστω ἕκ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων α]ὐτῶ πάντων. These words are frequently included in Roman period and later contracts (e.g. P. Mert. II 76, II 499). Greek contracts did not automatically create liability where there was a duty—*Schuld* and *Haftung* were not combined—and so a *praxis* clause, giving one party a right to proceed against the person or possessions of another if that other was in default, had to be expressly stated (Wolff 1941, 427-428 and generally). Whether these words alone entitled a landlord to levy execution on a tenant’s property without a court order or other form of legal process is not clear. The addition of the words καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης (not included here) was generally accepted to render a document executory (an *Executivurkunde*) and to permit a claimant to levy execution without the need (which implicitly would otherwise have arisen) for a court judgement or other legal process. See Wolff 1968, 527 n. 3 and Müller 1985, 137 and n. 5. Wolff advanced a different view in 1968, namely that the added words merely expressed the procedural steps which should be followed and “did not really change the effect of the *praxis*-provision”; on this basis it was not surprising that they were not always included (Wolff 1968 *passim*, followed by Rupprecht and Kränzlein: see Müller 1985, 136-139). The better view, I believe, is that the words did have the effect generally acknowledged and that in their absence, as here, a court action would be needed before execution could be levied, unless there was some other contractual stipulation, or law, which had the same effect (Müller 1985, 139). Müller suggested (following Pringsheim) that the words Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς had the same effect, in which case there would be no need to include both phrases (Müller 1985, 139-140; Pringsheim 1924, 494 (although Pringsheim thought there was little foundation for this)).

In addition, Müller considered, following Wolff, that the numerous examples, after the time when the Persian of the *epigone* clause ceased to be widely used (mid 2nd century), of leases without a *praxis* clause may indicate that, at least after a certain date, a lease was a type of document which as a matter of law entitled the lessor to levy execution (Pringsheim 1924, 439, Wolff 1941, 429-431 esp n.,41, Müller 1985, 130-141 esp. 140-141). The sources are not clear. There are examples from the Roman period of Oxyrhynchite leases, in the private protocol form and containing a *praxis* clause, where the expression Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς is used both with and without the words καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης, and also where neither expression appears, as may be the case in **02** also, if l. 2 is incorrectly restored. Both expressions: II **278** (chattel lease, 17), III **499** (121). Only Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς: I **101** (142), IV **730** (130), XXII **2351** (112), LXIX **4739** (127). Neither expression: III **502** (164), VI **910** (197), VI **912** (235), VIII **1127** (183). Perhaps by the mid-2nd century, neither

expression was required in order to render a lease executory but in conservative Oxyrhynchus (see Wolff 1946, 58 n.10 but note Yiftach-Firanko 2003, 360-362) the expressions continued to be used when they were no longer technically necessary. It is a bold lawyer who deliberately omits a clause proven over the years to be effective, even if practice or law generally has changed.

17-18 ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν μίσθωσιν. As in P. Ross.- Georg II 19.45 (141, Oxyrhynchite) and PSI I 32.18 (208, Heracleopolite).

18 ἐκβάλλειν. This verb means eviction from leased premises in P. Tebt. I 105 (103BC) but it is more common in documents recording other rights of habitation (for example P. Fouad I 44 (44), XIV **1641** (68), SB XVI 13041 (1st/2nd century) and 13042 (29), CPR VII 3 (150)).

19 [ὁ παραβησόμε]νος. It would be more usual to find ὁ παραβάς here (as in P. Aberd. I 53.12, CPR I 11.29 and P. Mich IX 559.2, X 584.31) but the letters νος are clearly readable. I have not found ὁ παραβησόμενος in this precise context elsewhere, but the accusative form appears in six Oxyrhynchus documents, P. Lips. II 149.18 (199), III **491** 11 (126) and **494** 28 (156), LXVI **4533** 8 (76-125), BGU IV 1123.12 (30-14) and P. Köln II 100.17 (133), in τὸν δὲ παραβησόμενον ἀποτίνειν τῷ ἐμμένοντι τό τε βλάβος καὶ ἐπίτιμον or similar. Before 212 the obligation for a defaulting tenant to pay an additional fine to the state is common (Müller 1985, 284-285); less common is a provision, as here, for the landlord also to pay such a penalty if in default (Hennig 1967, 76). Müller (1985, 256) cites only one example in a building lease: P.Mil.Vogl. III 143 (147-148).

19-20 μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τὰ προγεγραμμένα κύ[ρια μένειν]. This is a rare provision in leases; Hennig (1967, 85) cites only IV **729** from the Roman period. Starting χωρίς rather than μετὰ, it is found in a range of other documents from the period including a will (III **493** (90-99) and a house sale (P. Mich VI 428 (154)).

20 ὑπογρ(αφ-). It is rare to find a subscription clause introduced by this word in Oxyrhynchite documents. In XXII **2348** (224, the Greek version of a Roman will) the words ἀντίγραφον ὑπογραφῆς make it plain that the document concludes with a copy of the subscription. As indicated above (p. 22) the subscription clause is in a single hand and cannot be the original. By analogy with P. Mich. V 340 (45/46, Tebtunis) and P. Heid.

VII 399 (149, Karanis), and relying on Youtie 1974 and 1975, I would expect it to read ὑπογραφαί, not ὑπογραφεύς. The word probably did not appear in the original contract.

21 This must start with the name of the male lessor who is not Heras Heratos: see 1 n.

στροβείλω. A *strobilos* is the lower stone in a mill for grinding grain or seeds for oil; see LI **3639** 10-11 n. (412), for a detailed analysis of the term and Moritz 1958, 74-77 for a description of the Pompeian donkey-mill, which was probably the type of mill concerned here. The word appears in the context of milling bakeries in XVI **1983** (535), SPP XX 131 (508) and P. Rein. II 108 (6th century), a grain mill in XIV **1704** (298, as amended by the editor of **3639**) and XVI **1912** (late 6th century) and an oil factory in **3639** 11 (412), and in contexts which involve either a grain mill or an oil factory in P. Laur. IV 164.10 (4th to 5th centuries; see 10 n.), P. Mert. I 39 (late 4th to 5th century) and P. Cair. Isid. 137.12 (3rd or 4th century). The *strobilos* is never found with μηχανή when μηχανή means a water-wheel.

22 θ]ύίη. This is a reference to a mortar used in the mill. The word occurs with a *strobilos* (21 n.) in P. Mert. I 39.6, LI **3639** 11-12 and P. Laur. IV 164.10-11. It is found in the context of a milling bakery in XVI **1890** (508) and of an ἐργαστήριον in XII **1488** (2nd century). See also SB XVI 12518 (104/5, oil mill), P. Vindob. Tandem. 24.8 (145, sale of a building with an oil press), P. Amh. II 93 (181, oil press) and XLVII **3354** (257, wine press).

23 παραδέδωκα is unparalleled at this point, and is a stop-gap only.

03 to 09 Summonses

Introduction

This section contains seven summonses. Unusually for such a document before the mid-3rd century, **03** specifies the reason for the summons. **04** requires the presence of the *archepbodos*, the officer usually entrusted with carrying out requests to deliver someone else. **05** to **09** are sent by military officers stationed in Oxyrhynchus; **06** and **07** are particularly interesting because of the evidence of the *canalicularius* (**06.1 n.**).

More than 125 summonses, documents traditionally classified as “orders to arrest”, have been published, dating from the 1st century BC to the 6th to 7th century AD,³⁶ but only P. Lond. III 1309 (p. 251), an instruction to eirenarchs of the village of Ares to secure the murderers of an *agrophylax*, is actually an order to arrest. In their simplest and most common form, they comprise an instruction to a village official to send one or more specified individuals to the metropolis, at the request of another named person or persons. It is now generally accepted that they are more appropriately described as “summonses” or orders to produce someone (*Überstellungsbefehle* rather than *Haftbefehle*).³⁷

In 1986, Bülow-Jacobsen published a list of 78 orders (*ZPE* 66, 95-98). Ten years later, Gagos and Sijpesteijn published *addenda* to Bülow-Jacobsen’s list, naming 16 additional papyri,³⁸ but omitting three mentioned in the introduction to LXI **4114-4116**: P. Mich. inv. 3773 (=SB XVIII 13109), P. Strasb. V 309 and P. Yale inv. 1347 (=SB XXII 15628).³⁹ They distinguished SB XVIII 13109 on the grounds that it was a request to a higher authority to issue an order for arrest (as was the similarly excluded P. Köln VI 281), but P. Strasb. V 309 and SB XXII 15628 should have been included.⁴⁰ Those published since then are summarised, together with P. Strasb. V 309 and SB XXII 15628, in LXXIV at pp. 134-135 and P. Poethke App. I. Three (I **65**, XIX **2229** and SB XIV 11264) are distinguishable as

³⁶For general discussion see G. M. Browne (P. Mich. X 589-591, Introduction, pp. 47-51), Hagedorn 1979, Drexhage 1989 and Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996. For the latest update see LXXIV **5001-5012** Introduction and P. Poethke Appendice I.

³⁷ The reasons for the change in nomenclature are set out by Gagos and Sijpesteijn (1996, 77-79, with a list of earlier authorities at n.7 on p.78).

³⁸ Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 95-96.

³⁹ 13 papyri, not included in Bülow-Jacobsen’s list, were noted in the introduction to LXI **4114-4116**, one of which (SB XIV 11264) had been included but under reference P. Med. 71.39.

⁴⁰ P. Strasb. V 309 (1st half of the 4th century), from an *exactor* to the eirenarch of Philadelphia, requires him to despatch two corn-debtors to the metropolis; the words used (“*φρόντισον, ἄνυε, ἐπὶ τῆς πόλε[ως]*”) are unusual in this context. SB XXII 15628, 3rd century from Oxyrhynchus, is damaged but appears to follow the Oxyrhynchite format set out overleaf.

relating to individuals who had already been arrested and two others (P. Amh. II 146 and P. Oslo II 20) concern individuals whose guilt may already have been established.

These documents are rarely dated but can be divided into two broad classes, those before and those after the mid-3rd century. The standard formats for such summonses in the earlier period were identified by U. Hagedorn in 1979, namely

Oxyrhynchite	Arsinoite
“Adresse, πέμψον τὸν δεῖνα ἐντυχόντος τοῦ δεῖνος”	“Adresse, ἀνάπεμψον(-πέμψατε) τὸν δεῖνα ἐγκαλούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος ἑξαυτῆς.” ⁴¹

The first two papyri described below are from the early period, the others are later.

It is rare for the short form summonses normal before the middle of the third century to specify the reason for the summons. Exceptions are VI **969**, LXV **4485**, SB VI 9630 and SB XVI 12707. In some, the nature of the complaint may be surmised from the description of the parties: P. Grenf. II 66, XXXI **2575**, P. Oslo II 20. The later summonses more often contain details of the subject-matter of the enquiry, such as XII **1505** and **1506** (debts), P. Turner 46 (crop receipts), P. Strasb. V 309 (people who owe grain), SB XX 15095 (the corn levy), SB XXIV 16006 (a man accused of attacking a carpenter and taking his tools), P. Amh. II 146 (stolen property), PSI I 47 and P. Milan inv. 105 (negligent field guards and damage to property), P. Lond. III 1309 (p. 251) (murder of an *agrophylax*) and XLII **3035** (a man’s Christian beliefs, but note Drexhage 1989, 116-7). The main areas of complaint, as far as we can tell, were land and money, including tax issues (see Drexhage 1989, 117-118), and, in the later papyri, violence and theft.

Of the more than 80 summonses which date from the earlier period, the sender is specified in eight. The strategus is identified as sender in only four of these, SB XVIII 13172, P. Mich. X 590, P. Tebt. II 290 and LXXIV **5002**,⁴² but it is accepted that such documents emanated from the office of the strategus, ordering a specified individual or office-holder to be brought to him in the course of an investigation pursuant to a petition presented or

⁴¹ Hagedorn 1979, 63.

⁴² The others whose senders are specified are sent by an individual called Artemidoros (P. Tebt. II 535 = SB XXII 15130 and SB XIV 11264), a *decurio* (SB XVI 12649) and an *epitropos* (P. Wisc. I 24).

accusation made to him; see P. Bon. I 20 and P. Mich. V 229.⁴³ Most of these earlier cases, like **03** and **04**, are issued to the *archepbodos* of a named village. Later summonses usually specify the sender as well as the recipient.⁴⁴ **05** to **09** were sent by holders of military office able to command soldiers, a *beneficiarius*, a *decurio* and a *canaliclarius*, and were addressed to comarchs, *epistatai eirenes*, *demosioi* and *pediophulakes*. **05**, **06** and **09**, which relate to peace-keeping or law enforcement, may have been issued pursuant to petitions submitted to these officers, in the process of adjudication of a case or the preparation of a preliminary report for onward transmission to higher authorities, or on the instructions of a more senior official such as a provincial governor or prefect to whom a petition had been addressed.

The documents reflect the structure of public order officialdom. In the earlier period the strategus was based in the metropolis and was head of the police force of the nome, while the *archepbodos* gradually succeeded the Ptolemaic *epistates* as the village official responsible for police functions.⁴⁵ The fact that the strategus did not need to identify himself in the earlier summonses suggests that there would have been no doubt as to the identity or *locus standi* of the sender. After the mid-3rd century there were changes; the strategus' powers were probably starting to decline, although the office did not disappear,⁴⁶ and comarchs and then village eirenarchs gradually took over the *archepbodos*' police functions.⁴⁷ The military authorities' role in peace-keeping in Egypt has been widely acknowledged but its extent, and the role played by the different ranks, is not entirely clear.⁴⁸ Prior to Diocletian's reforms, the prefect of Egypt was the senior civil and military authority, and there did not need to be a clear distinction in the roles occupied by civilian and military in the police or civil service/state bureaucracy. The prefect's military power was reduced at some time

⁴³ Oates, Samuel and Welles (P. Yale I 62, Introduction). See also Browne (P. Mich. X 589-591, Introduction at 51); Hagedorn 1979, 61; Drexhage 1989, 104-106. Senders expressly identified are indicated at Bülow-Jacobsen 1986, 95-98, Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 95-96 and LXXIV, pp. 134-5.

⁴⁴ Senders include a *procurator*, *prytanis*, *decurio*, *centurio*, *beneficiarius*, *riparius*, *praepositus*, *comes*, eirenarch, *exactor*, a *vir egregius* (exact function not specified), an *archiereus* and a *proestos*; most recipients are comarchs or eirenarchs.

⁴⁵ P. Tebt. II 290 (late 1st/early 2nd century) was addressed to the *epistates* of Tebtunis. The Oxyrhynchite nome appears to have adopted the office of *archepbodos* later than some other nomes (see Introduction to XXXI 2572-6, p.124 n. 1).

⁴⁶ Gagos (Introduction to LXI 4114-4116). The strategus was specified as sender of LXI 4116 and P. Mich. X 590 (both late 3rd/early 4th century) and P. Turner 46 (4th century).

⁴⁷ See Milne 1924, 139, 144, 150; Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 80; Thomas 1975, 115-119. The office of *archepbodos* was still in existence in the 4th and possibly 5th century (P. Horak 11, BGU VII 1630.24). Eirenarchs appear first as officials at the nome level; in this capacity they sent XII 1507 and BGU XVII 2701. They appear as village officials from about the first quarter of the 4th century and in that capacity several summonses are addressed to them, from XII 1506 (early 4th century) to SB XX 14967 (6th to 7th century). See Sängler 2005 *passim*.

⁴⁸ See generally Lallemand 1964, 72-74, 139-167, MacMullen 1967, 66-71, Davies 1989, Bagnall 1993 (1), 161-176, Aubert 1995, Palme 2006 and 2007, esp. 256-260.

between 295 and 309 with the appointment of a *dux* (first attested 308-9).⁴⁹ Numerous papyri, particularly from the Fayum and mainly from the 1st to 3rd centuries, contain petitions to military officers: to *beneficiarii* and *decuriones* as well as, more commonly, to centurions stationed in a province.⁵⁰ These officers did not have any judicial competence but were asked to carry out investigations or to ensure that an accused was arrested or would appear for questioning.⁵¹ Petitions to military officers decline by the late 3rd/early 4th centuries, probably as the separation of civil and military authority took effect.⁵² *Riparii* held office as chief police officers of the Oxyrhynchite nome by 346 (VI **897**) so by then the role of military officers in the administration of justice was reduced although not eliminated.⁵³

Like the seven considered here, summonses were commonly written against the fibres;⁵⁴ this was so in 80% of those analysed by Gagos and Sijpesteijn where the relevant information was available, and in half of those listed in LXXIV, pp. 134-135, another five of which are on reused pieces of papyrus.⁵⁵ Summonses were often written on scraps of papyrus cut from rolls already used on the *recto*, perhaps as an economy measure; the majority are long rectangles, between 15 and 30 cm. wide, possibly indicating the height of the original rolls.⁵⁶ BGU XI 2081 and 2082, XLIII **3130** (possibly), LXV **4486** i and ii, SB XXIV 16006, LXXIV **5005** and **5006** and P. Kell. Inv. D/1/75.25 all have writing which predated the summonses, as do P. Oslo II 20 (see P. Oslo II 42), XXXI **2574** and P. Prag. II 126 (writing on the same side) and P. Horak 11 (writing on the back probably connected with the original subject-matter). Browne noted that although the majority of the orders were long rectangles, a number from the Oxyrhynchite nome were more square, while those from the Byzantine period were frequently much wider than the average.⁵⁷ These statistics were confirmed by the measurements of those published subsequently.

03 to **09** were found in Oxyrhynchus but relate to different villages; they may have been copies, retained in the sender's office, of documents sent to the villages (which would explain the reuse of papyrus) or, less likely, originals returned to that office on attendance

⁴⁹ Lallemand 1964, 41-54, 58-70; Palme 2006, 386.

⁵⁰ See Whitehorne 2004, with a list of such petitions at 161-169.

⁵¹ Palme 2006, 381-390; Davies 1989, 175-184.

⁵² See Palme 2006, 382-386; Aubert 1995, 259.

⁵³ Bagnall 1993 (1), 173; Aubert 1995, 264.

⁵⁴ See Browne (P. Mich X 589-591, Introduction, pp. 50-51).

⁵⁵ Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 81-82.

⁵⁶ Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 82-85, citing P. J. Parsons.

⁵⁷ P. Mich X 589-591, Introduction, p. 50.

of the person summonsed. IX **1212** contains, on the *verso*, a list of vegetables delivered to the *archepbodos* of Pela, the addressee of the summons, suggesting that the original orders were retained by the *archepbodos* or other addressee (and, in this case, reused in his office).

None of these summonses can be dated accurately. **03** and **04** are addressed to an *archepbodos* of an Oxyrhynchite village and must be from the 2nd or first half of the 3rd century (**03.1** n.). The references to comarchs in **05**, **06** and **09** suggest a date after 245, the mention of an *epistates eirenes* in **05** may mean a date after 256 (see **05.2** n.), and the separation of military and civil powers under Diocletian (see p. 42) suggests that **05** to **09** should not be later than the early 4th century. Published summonses from *beneficiarii* and *decuriones* (see **05.1** n. and **08.1** n.) have been dated to the 3rd or early 4th century and the writing in **05** to **09** is consistent with those dates. If the identification of the person summonsed in **06** is correct, it may date from the third quarter of the 3rd century (**06.2-3** n.), and **08** may also be 3rd rather than 4th century (**08.1** n.). There is no absolute proof that **05** to **09** were close in dates, and all the hands are different, but the inventory numbers show that they were found near one another in the same excavation season,⁵⁸ **07** and **08** both refer to a soldier called Dioscorus, and **06** and **07** were probably sent by the same person (see **06.1** n.). I think it possible therefore that they were all written around the same time.

05 to **09** attest a *beneficiarius*, a *decurio* and a *canalicularius* stationed in Oxyrhynchus, probably officers who had been seconded to duties in the office of the governor of the province. There are many examples of a *beneficiarius* being described as in the service of a provincial governor, such as P. Lond. III 1157v.4-5 (248) and VIII **1121** 2 (295): the prefect of Egypt, P. Lips. I 20.4-5 (381) and Chr. Mitt. 277.2 (388): the governor of the Thebaid, XLIX **3480** 1-2 (c.360-390): the governor of Augustamnica and Stud. Pal. XX 117.3 (411): the governor of Arcadia. The provincial structure of the country of Egypt was changed a number of times between the mid-3rd and late 4th century and the Oxyrhynchite nome was at various times part of the provinces of Aegyptus, Herculia, Mercuriana, Augustamnica and Arcadia.⁵⁹ It is not possible to say to which province it belonged when these papyri were written.

⁵⁸ But note that at least one unpublished papyrus from the same folders, which mentions a *logistes*, must be early 4th century.

⁵⁹ See p.109.

It would be surprising if five officers were stationed in Oxyrhynchus at the same time but these papyri may show only two: a *beneficiarius* called Areios who held the rank of *decurio* (see **05.1** n.) and a *canalicularius*, probably a lower-ranking officer who operated more as a clerk (see **06.1** n.). In their introduction to P. Cair. Isid. 63 (296, Arsinoite), a petition to a **βενεφικιάριος στατίζων**, Boak and Youtie suggest that such an officer was in fact a *decadarch* or *decurio* in the military sense of the word. They drew this inference from I **64** and **65** and from the reference in P. Cair. Isid. 63.18-19 to another *beneficiarius*, not the addressee of the petition, who had been entrusted with the decadarchy. They believed that such a person (*beneficiarius* or *decurio*) would have had jurisdiction over an entire nome and so two would not have been in office in the same place at the same time, citing P. Tebt. II 304 (167-168), PSI III 184 (292) and P. Cair. Isid. 62 (also from 296 and addressed to another individual whose only title given is **στατίζων ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοίτῃ**). Rankov's interpretation was different: if the addressee of P. Cair. Isid. 62 was a *decurio*, then taken together with P. Cair. Isid. 63 this showed that there could be a *beneficiarius* and a *decurio* in the same nome at the same time.⁶⁰ I doubt that the addressee of P. Cair. Isid. 62 was a *decurio*: I have found no reference to a *decurio* who is described as **στατίζων** and at XVII **2130** 21 n. the editor assumed that a person described as **στατίζοντος** was a *beneficiarius*.⁶¹ I see no reason to assume that all *beneficarii* held the rank of *decadarch* or *decurio* because of evidence that one did, nor why someone should sometimes describe himself as one grade of officer and sometimes as another, while fulfilling what appears (in **64** and **65**, and LXXIV **5005-5009** and **5011**) to be the same function. Nor is there any reason why different officers should not have been on duty in the same nome at the same time: a *decurio*, as a cavalry officer, probably had more of a roving brief (**08.1** n. and P. Meyer 20) while the *beneficiarius* remained in the metropolis. **05** to **09** would accordingly indicate the presence of three officers, one of whom would not have been full-time in the city, which does not indicate any particular civil unrest or law and order problems at the time.

⁶⁰ Rankov 1994, 230.

⁶¹ See also LXIII **4372** 5n and **4378** 2 n.

03 Summons to an *archephodos*

34 4B. 76/C (1-5) a

12 cm x 7.6 cm

2nd century

This mid-brown papyrus contains a complete text of 3 ½ lines on one side. The writing, across the fibres, covers only the top third of the piece. The back is blank except for part of a letter or sign at the bottom, slightly right of centre, indicating that it had already been used; either it was no longer required or this piece was cut carelessly from the roll. The papyrus is slightly narrower than average. It was folded twice horizontally and three times vertically (five creases); there are holes where the folds were, but the creases are more visible on the back.

The writing is small with even spaces between the lines; it looks almost like a book hand, similar to XXVI 2441 and XVIII 2161 (see Turner 1987, Plates 22 and 24, and P. Oslo III 71). That such hands were not exclusively book hands is evidenced by P. Köln IX 374 (Plate XXXIX), a mummy-tablet. There is a short dash at the end of line 2 and a slightly longer line beneath the start of line 4, possibly to signal that the document was complete. As it follows closely the format identified by Hagedorn (p. 40 above) it is not later than mid-3rd century. The *iota* adscript at the end of ἀρχεφόδωι in line 1 (there is one also in LXXIV 5001) may indicate an early date, but does not necessarily do so (Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 86, on SB XXIV 16005, citing Gignac, *Grammar*, vol. I, 183-6 and 194-5; see also vol. II, 3). Based on the handwriting, it is probably 2nd century.

1 ἀρχεφόδωι Χύσεως· πέμψον Ἀσπάσιον

2 Φατρεῦς καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ Θατρῆν

3 γαμβρὰν αὐτοῦ ἐντυχ[] ὄντος Ἀμόϊτος

4 δημοσίων χάριν.

“To the *archephodos* of Chysis: send Aspasius son of Phatres and his mother and Thatres his daughter-in-law, on the petition of Amoïs, on behalf of/for the sake of the public officials (or “in a matter involving taxes”).”

1 ἀρχεφόδωι The *archepbodos* was one of the liturgical officials or δημόσιοι κώμης responsible for maintaining public order (Browne, P. Mich. X 589-591, Introduction, p. 51). *Archepbodoi* held office in Oxyrhynchite villages from the beginning of the 2nd century to 244 or 245 (Hagedorn 1979, 68 n.18, and 73); the office seems to have survived longer elsewhere (P. Mich. X 590 (Arsinoite, 3rd to 4th century). See P. Horak 11.2 n. and n. 47 above, and, for general information, Oertel 1917, 275-277, Drexhage 1989, 108-111, Lewis 1997, 15 and LXXIV 5000 4-5 n.

Χύσεως Chysis, modern Šūša, was situated on the left bank of the Bahr Yousuf close to the border between the Oxyrhynchite and Hermopolite nomes; it is attested from 250 BC (P. Hibeh II 248 II 15) to the 8th century (P. Bal. 355 re-ed.: see Gonis 2003 (2), 177) and is also mentioned at 01.10. Most of the papyri which refer to it show it as in the Upper toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome, but five clearly place it, or land in its vicinity, in the Hermopolite: XVII 2134 (170), C. Pap. Gr. II (1988), App 1.6 (178), XIV 1724 (3rd century), P. Lips. I 99 (4th century) and now 01.10. See Drew-Bear 1979, 322-326, Pruneti 1981, 219, Benaissa 2009, 365. (Drew-Bear cites a fifth papyrus, PSI IV 281 (138-9), as indicating a Hermopolite origin because of the use of ἐκτήμορος, a term otherwise known only in Hermopolite papyri, but that papyrus has many references to Oxyrhynchus.) Chysis was probably treated sometimes as in one nome and sometimes as in the other (as Drew-Bear, Pruneti, Gonis and Benaissa (references above) but *contra* Rea (LV 3792 1 n.)); it must have moved on at least two separate occasions. There is no other published reference to an *archepbodus* of Chysis. See generally Benaissa 2009, 364-366.

Ἀσπάσιον I have found six attestations of this name in papyri, always as a patronymic.

2 Φατρεῦς. The name Phatres appears frequently in Roman period papyri, but the genitive form Φατρεῦς is only attested once, at I 104 7 (96), where it was corrected to the more usual form Φατρέως. Four genitive forms of Phatres are known from 2nd century documents: Φατρέους, Φατρέως, Φατρήους and Φατρῆτος (Gignac, *Grammar* II 74). Preisigke (*Wörterbuch*) postulates that Φατρεῦς may be a nominative (gen. Φατρέω(ς)). Many Egyptian names were used indeclinably (Gignac, *Grammar* II 103); this may be an early example of such usage but more likely the scribe omitted a letter in error. The name derives from the Egyptian goddess Hathor, preceded by the letter φ signifying the Egyptian masculine article.

Θατρῆν. Thatres, the female version of Phatres, is also a common name. Many orders require the presence of more than one accused (e.g. LXI **4115**, LXV **4485** and **4486**(ii), LXXIV **5003**, **5008-5009**). Women are less frequently summonsed than men; Drexhage (1989, 114), considering the Roman period summonses published by 1988, identified only 10 women out of 95 persons whose sex was clearly determinable, seven of whom were summonsed together with others. Of the early papyri identified subsequently and not analysed by him, only three clearly have female “defendants” (LXI **4114** (a woman alone) and **4115**, and **5008**). Thatres (daughter of Ptolion), from Ision Panga, a village, like Chysis, in the Upper toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome was summonsed alone in SB XVI 12534 (3rd century), but there is no reason to suppose she was named here.

μητέρα. Other examples of family members summonsed together include P. Amh. II 146, P. Harris II 196 and SB XXVI 16429 (brothers), XLIV **3190** (a man and his mother), P. Cair. Preis 5, PSI XV 1536 and LXXIV **5010** (father and son(s)), P. Tebt II 290 and BGU II 374 (man and wife) and BGU XI 2083 (husband, wife and daughter). The nature of the offence cannot be established from the family relationships concerned.

3 Ἀμόιτος. There is a tiny hole at the top of the *iota*, which may have been there before the summons was written. The letter looks more like a *rbo* than an *iota*; the loop at the top would be tiny but no smaller than in the *rbo* in γαμβρᾶν. I have found no name whose genitive would be “Amortos”, while Amois is a well-known Oxyrhynchite name (e.g. LV **3786** 36, 37, 40, 42)), and what appears to be a loop on a *rbo* is probably a small curve at the top of the *iota*, as in χάριν in line 4.

4 δημοσίων χάριν. This phrase is not attested elsewhere. δημοσίων may be a reference to public officials (δημόσιοι) or taxes (δημόσια); χάριν can follow a noun representing people or objects (LSJ). Unusually therefore, the reason for the summons may be specified: the closest parallels are VI **969** (περὶ κατασπορᾶς, about the sowing) and LXV **4485** (περὶ δημοσίας γῆς, about public land). SB XXIV 16005 (2nd century), published by Gagos and Sijpesteijn (1996, 86-87), is translated as a summons of one Pammounis on the petition of Apion, a “collector of public taxes”, “ἐ[ν]τυ[χό]ντος Ἀπίωνος / πράκτορος δημοσίων ...[.]ν”(3-4). It is difficult to read the end of the 4th line (Plate 3), but the online photograph shows that the word after δημοσίων in line 4 could be χάρ[ι]ν. (I have no suggestion to make as to what follows at the end of that line.) πράκτωρ is a common term for an official; often the nature of the office is specified, as in πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν

or σιτικῶν (the most common usages), or στεφανικῶν, but the term is frequently used on its own, particularly where the context of the office is clear. πράκτωρ δημοσίων, a collector of taxes, appears less frequently (see Preisigke *Wörterbuch* and Supplements, and P. Ryl. II 141 (37), X **1258** (45) and BGU I 72 (191)). If χάριν is correct in SB XXIV 16005, πράκτορος describes Apion, who made the request on behalf of public officials or in a matter relating to taxes. The editors of P. Cair. Isid. 129 (308-9) suggest (2 n.), in the context of a summons addressed to comarchs and *demosioi* of Karanis, that *demosioi* were “most probably all officials with police functions, in orders of this kind” (following Wilcken, *Archiv* 5 (1913) 441). In SB XXIV 16005, it was specified that the “accused” should be sent διὰ φύλ[α]κος. Later summonses sent by military officers often provide that the “accused” should be sent with a soldier or guard despatched for the purpose (as I **64**, LXXIV **5005** and **5006**, P. Wisc. I 24 and **05-09**), but it is very unusual to specify that a guard should be provided (see Drexhage 1989, 117); the same wording appears only in SB XII 11107, which contains no information about the complaint. If, as seems likely, guards were specified in earlier papyri only for dangerous prisoners, SB XXIV 16005 may have concerned a public order offence rather than a fiscal matter. By analogy the same interpretation could apply in **03**, so that δημοσίων χάριν would be a reference to public order officials rather than to taxes.

04 Summons to an *archepodos* to appear

103/145 (b)

8.5 cm x 10.8 cm

2nd/3rd century

04 is not the normal form of Oxyrhynchite summons (see p. 40). Usually the *archepodos* is ordered to produce a third party but in this document he himself is summoned to appear; whether this is in his official capacity is not clear.

The papyrus, mid-brown in colour, contains four lines of writing against the fibres; the back is blank. A short line below the text may have been to indicate that the document is complete. All margins are intact apart from where one letter is missing from the beginning of line 3. There are five horizontal folds.

The writing is medium-size, in ink with a thick-nibbed pen, cursive and untidy. The spaces between the lines are irregular. There is one abbreviation, at the end of line 3.

The papyrus cannot be dated accurately from the script, but as it is addressed to the *archepodos* of an Oxyrhynchite village it must be from the 2nd century or the first half of the 3rd (**03.1** n.).

1 ἀρχεφόδω Μονίμου·

2 ἀνελθε προσελθόν-

3 [τ]ος Θεώνος εὐθ(ηνιαρχ.)

4 Ἀλ[ε]ξανδρείας.

3 ευθ

“To the *archepodos* of Monimou; come up on the petition of Theon, (ex-?)eutheniarch of Alexandria.”

1 ἀρχεφόδω. See **03.1** n.

Μονίμου. A much-attested village in the Upper toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome. Most references are to the ἐποίκιον or κτῆμα Μονίμου, but the genitive form also appears on

its own. There is no other attestation of an *archepbodos* of Monimou. See Benaissa 2009, 159-161.

2 ἀνελθε. It is rare for a summons to demand only the presence of the official to whom it is addressed. I have found no other papyrus where only an *archepbodos* is ordered to appear. Some later summonses order different officials to appear: in SB XX 15095, a *praepositus* orders the *kephalaiotai* of the village of Prektis to appear (ἀπαντήσατε) in a matter concerning *annonae* and in P. Kellis inv. D/1/75.25, the chief priest ordered the recipient Stonius to appear immediately (not necessarily on a law and order issue). Most similar to **04** are LXXIV **5005** and **5006**, where officials are ordered to come with the soldier who has been despatched, and **5007**. Some summonses require the *archepbodos* or *archepbodoi* to come if the “accused” was not duly produced; see Drexhage (1989, 109-110) and add P. Cair. Isid. 129, SB XII 11106 and LXXIV **5004**. I **64**, BGU XVII 2701, LXXIV **5011** and **09** contain similar instructions to other officials. PSI XV 1536 (2nd century, Oxyrhynchite) orders the *archepbodos* of Ibion Ammon to attend with the “accused”, ἀνελθε σὺν; see also P. Kellis inv. D/1/75.13.1 and 2, where comarchs were ordered to come with a priest and others in charge of the temple. In I **65**, a *beneficiarius* invited the comarchs of Teruthis to come and speak on behalf of the “accused” if they wished. **04** may have been sent because the *archepbodos* had failed to comply with an earlier summons to deliver up someone else; alternatively he may himself, either in an official or a personal capacity, have been the subject of a complaint. The prefix ἀν(ἀ) indicates an instruction to come up from a village to the metropolis of a nome; here this is Oxyrhynchus, where the strategus’ seat was located (P. Cair. Isid. 129.3 n.).

προσελθόντος. This appears in only two other summonses, SB XII 11108, from Karanis, and LXXIV **5010**. Its use may indicate that Theon had lodged a petition (see for example P. Strasb. I 57.6 (207)) or made a formal appearance before a tribunal.

3 εὐθ(ηνιαρχου) or εὐθ(ηνιαρχήσαντος). While ἐξαυτῆς appears frequently in orders to arrest, particularly from the Arsinoite (Hagedorn 1979, 62-63), I can find no example with εὐθέως or εὐθύς. Coupled with the reference to Alexandria in line 4, the abbreviation means that Theon is or was a eutheniarch. These officials, who were drawn from the bouleutic class and in Alexandria may have ranked between the *agoranomos* and the *kosmetes*, were responsible for bread production in the metropolis to which they were appointed; the office is known for Oxyrhynchus (VI **908**), Hermopolis (P. Princ. II 38), Heracleopolis (P. Lund. VI. 8 and 9) and Euergetis (P. Köln I 55) as well as, frequently, for Alexandria. The

office is attested as a compulsory public service from 199 (**908**) until the early 4th century (XII **1417** 13, 21); the *euthenia* existed earlier as a non-liturgic post. It was sometimes difficult, probably during food shortages, to find people willing to accept the office: in Oxyrhynchus it was combined with the gymnasiarchy in 248 (XXXVIII **2854**) and suspended from c.257-287 (X **1252** 15-18) (Lewis 1970, 113-4). For information on eutheniarchs see Oertel 1917, 339-343, Lewis 1997, 31 and Delia 1991, 102. A eutheniarch of Alexandria had no direct authority over the *archepbodos* of an Oxyrhynchite village and the summons was probably issued from the office of the strategus in Oxyrhynchus (pp. 40-41). Theon's title may have been specified because he had made a complaint in his official capacity, or to indicate that the *archepbodos* should not delay, because an important and wealthy person had demanded his presence. XLIII **3131** (c.218-225), an incomplete letter from a strategus of Oxyrhynchus, refers to an Aurelius Theon, also known as Ammonius, who was a *bouleutes* and had been a eutheniarch and *agoranomos* of Alexandria, who had submitted a claim in a matter of which we do not have any information; he may be the complainant in **04**. He is not listed as a eutheniarch or *agoranomos* of Alexandria by Delia (1991, App 5: she lists no Theon as eutheniarch and includes him as a councillor only), but the description γενομένου εὐθηνιάρχου καὶ ἀγορανόμου, βουλευτοῦ τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων (**3131** 6-8) makes it clear that the first-named offices were also Alexandrian. A Theon who was a eutheniarch of Oxyrhynchus appears in **908** 10-17 (199), but in **04** the office was an Alexandrian one.

4 Ἀλ[ε]ξανδρείας. All other published references to Alexandrian holders of the office of eutheniarch are in more formal contexts where the honorific title τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων is given, but Ἀλεξανδρείας is frequently used of titles where the office-holder is not being formally addressed (e.g. I **100** 2 (133), XII **1498** 5 (pre-299), XL **2904** 3 (272), XLII **3031** 1 (302) and two later summonses, BGU XVII 2700.5-6 and 2701.4).

05 Summons from a *beneficiarius*

16 2B.48 /E(a)2

13 x 5.5 cm

mid 3rd/early 4th century

This is a summons from a *beneficiarius* to village officials to deliver a named individual to a soldier, on the petition of a third party. All margins are intact and the document is written by a practised hand in a medium-sized script with a thick pen. It may have been folded once horizontally but there is no evidence of vertical folds. The writing is against the fibres and the back is blank.

1 π(αρά) τοῦ β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίου)

2 κωμάρχαις καὶ ἐπιστάτης εἰρήνης κώμης

3 Σινκέφα. ἐξαυτῆς παράδοτε τῷ στρατιώτῃ

4 Νεικήρατον υἱὸν Ἑλένης ἐντυχόντος

5 Μαξίμου.

1 π' βφ 21. ἐπιστάτη

“From the *beneficiarius* to the comarchs and *epistates eirenes* of the village of Sincepha. Immediately hand over Niceratus, son of Helena, to the soldier, at the request of Maximus.”

1 β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίου). Two other summonses were sent by a *beneficiarius*: I 65 and LXXIV 5011 (both dated to 3rd/early 4th century). A *beneficiarius* was a military officer (probably not of a very high rank: Rankov 1994, 225) who was relieved from normal military duties to assist the prefect or governor of a province, more as a general representative or aide-de-camp/liaison officer than with the detective role suggested by Davies (1989, 175). P. Cair. Isid. 63.18-19 (296) mentions a *beneficiarius* entrusted with the decarchy, τῷ ἐνπεπιστευμένῳ τῆν δεκαδαρχίαν β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίῳ), but they may not all have held this rank: see p. 44. A number of petitions (none of which is from Oxyrhynchus) were addressed to a *beneficiarius* ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων, but I think that term was used in the general sense of “on the spot” or with responsibility for the relevant area, not the more technical

sense of a part of a toparchy. A *beneficiarius*' appointment would probably have been in respect of a particular nome and in normal circumstances there may only have been one *beneficiarius* in each nome (Rankov 1994, 227): see e.g. P. Cair. Isid. 139 (296, Arsinoite) and PSI VII 807.1-3 (280), where a *beneficiarius* is addressed as β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίω) ἐπάρχου Αἰγύπτου διακειμένω ἐν τῷ Ὀξυρυγχ(ίτη). As well as carrying messages and acting as intermediary with the local populace in relation to petitions, the *beneficiarius* had an administrative role in security and law enforcement: in BGU II 388 I (157-159) a *beneficiarius* was responsible for ensuring that an accused appeared at a hearing with all necessary documents. Dated papyri attest the existence of a *beneficiarius* in Oxyrhynchus at several times in the later 3rd and early 4th centuries: 267 (XVII **2130** 21, assuming στατίζοντος means *beneficiarius*), 280 (PSI VII 807), 284/5 (PSI XXI Congr 13), 295 (VIII **1121**), 301 (XLVI **3304**), 304 (XVIII **2187**), 338 (XXXI **2571**, not in a law and order context): see also P. Laur. III 60 (3rd century), I **64** and **65** and LXXIV **5011**. I have found no reference, in any petition to a *beneficiarius*, to any of the persons named in **05**. Unlike in **65**, the *beneficiarius* in **05** is not described as στατίζων (normally translated as “on duty”), but his position would have been the same. Later in the 4th century such *beneficarii* may have held military rank in name only, while their function remained broadly the same (Rankov 1994, 222: see also MacMullen 1967, 69-71). On *beneficarii* see generally Lallemand 1964, 74-75, Rankov 1994, Ott 1995 (1) and (2), 113-126, Dise 1995, Nelis-Clément 2000 and P. Louvre II 120.27 n. and, in relation to petitions, Whitehorne 2004, 161-169.

2 κωμάρχαις καὶ ἐπιστάτηι εἰρήνης. These officials are the addressees of LXXIV **5011** and the six other papyri listed there at 4 n., which include I **65**. Comarchs are known from c.245 (see Thomas 1975, 113-119) to at least the 6th century, although their role may have changed over the period. *Epistatai eirenes* are known to have held office from 256 (XLII **3035** and XXXIV **2714**) to some time in the 4th century (BGU XVII 2700). Both categories had a police function. See Lallemand 1964, 134-137 and references at LXXIV **5010** 6 n.

3 Σινκέφα. A village in the Upper toparchy and 2nd *pagus*: see Benaissa 2009, 288-289.

τῷ στρατιώτη. It is unusual for soldiers to be dispatched with summonses other than those sent by military officers: see LXXIV **5005** 3 n., **5006** 5, I **64** and P. Wisc. I 24.3. A soldier was sent with each of **05** to **09**. An unspecified official is despatched with both published summonses from a *beneficiarius*, I **65** and LXXIV **5011**.

4 Νεικήρατον υἰὸν Ἑλένης. The name Niceratus occurs fairly often BC but is rarely attested AD (I have found only one instance, P. Heid. VII 397, but that is a reference to the name of a *kleros* and so originated BC). This Niceratus is identified only by his mother's name, Helena, a common name in both Roman and Byzantine times.

5 ἐντυχόντος. The usual verb in the Oxyrhynchite nome to indicate the petitioner who had instigated the action (Hagedorn 1979, 63).

Μαξίμου. A common name.

06 Summons from a *canalicularius*

16 2B.48/E(b)

20 x 7.25 cm

245-275?

06 contains an instruction from a *canalicularius* to village officials to come with a certain person and number of named slaves or servants (3 n.). A soldier has been sent to accompany them. All margins are intact. There may have been five vertical folds, evidenced by a number of holes and fraying of the papyrus. The hand is regular. The writing is against the fibres and the back is blank. For the date see p. 43 and 2-3 n. below.

1 π(αρά) τοῦ καναλικλαρί(ου)·

2 ἦκετε ἅμα τῷ ἀποσταλέντι στρατιώτῃ ἐπαγόμενοι Πάριν τὸν

3 καὶ Ζευξιανὸν καὶ τοὺς τούτου οἰκέτας Ἑρμῆν καὶ Σαραπίωνα καὶ

4 Εὐχάριστον καὶ Διογένην καὶ Βερνεικιανόν.

5 κωμάρχ(αις) καὶ δημοσίοις κώμη[ς Π]έλα.

1 π̄ 5 κωμαρχ̄

“From the *canalicularius*. Come with the soldier who has been sent, bringing with you Paris also called Zeuxianus and his slaves(?) Hermes and Sarapion and Eucharistus and Diogenes and Ber(e)nicianus. To the comarchs and *demosioi* of the village of Pela.”

1 καναλικλαρί(ου). This official was first attested in papyri in XL **2925** 1 (not long after 270-271), which was addressed to a *κανανικλαρίωι*, and whose editor suggested that he might be equivalent to a *canonicarius* or “collector of grain taxes”. The only other papyrological reference is in P. Coll. Youtie II 66 (=XLVII **3366**) (258), whose editor, Peter Parsons, considered (28 n.) that it could not mean *canonicarius*: the papyrus was too early and the reading too clear. His view, that the closest approximation was *canalicularius*, is substantiated by **06** and **07**; I doubt that there would have been two officials with such similar and rarely-attested titles in Oxyrhynchus at the same time. Gilliam noted that *-κλάριος* was the standard Greek transliteration of the Latin *-cularius* and cited five inscriptions from the second half of the 3rd century containing the word *canalicularius* or

canalicularius, giving evidence of between two and four *canaliclarii* who were based in *castra peregrina* (a camp where men were stationed for special duties in Rome, detached from their units) and who worked in the office or chancellery. He suggested that the *cananiclarius* in **2925** might be “the head of a clerical bureau serving in circumstances which were in some respect exceptional”, perhaps “on detached duty as a high-ranking member of some official’s staff” (Gilliam 1976, 51). Clauss (1973, 44) puts him at the level of a *cornicularius*. We have no petitions addressed to a *canaliclarius* and (as Parsons) I think he was more like a clerk, ranking below a *beneficiarius* or *decurio*. **3366** refers to a *cananiclarius* whose brother is an *optio* (a more junior rank) of the *beneficiarii*, but “brother” does not necessarily indicate a family relationship. See generally Clauss 1973, 41-45, who notes that in Byzantine times a *κανίκλειον* was a writing instrument (citing du Cange, *s.v. caniclinus*).

2 ἦκετε ἄμα. The only summonses where the officers (here not specified until l. 5) are ordered to appear with the people to be delivered are PSI XV 1536 and P. Kellis inv. D/1/75.13.1 and .2 (where the word *ἐπαγόμενοι* is also used): see **04.2 n.**

2-3 Πάριν τὸν καὶ Ζευξιανὸν. This is probably the person mentioned in VI **970** (c.244/5; for the date see LXII **3046** 6 n.), a declaration made *παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Πάριδος τοῦ καὶ Ζευξιανοῦ Νερουιανείου τοῦ καὶ Γεναρχείου ἀποδεδειγμ(ένου) ἀρχιερέως τῆς λαμπρᾶς Ἀντινοέων πόλεως*. **970** implies that he had land-holdings at Seryphis, the number of slaves or servants mentioned here accords with his status, in **970** he is represented by a man from Pela (the village to which this summons was sent) and Zeuxianus is a rare name (the only other papyrological attestation is in P. Oxy. Hels. 24 (217)). That suggests a date for **06** after, but not long after, 245 (see **05.2 n.**).

στρατιώτη. See **05.3 n.**

3 οἰκέτας. This can mean members of a household or slaves, not necessarily with a household function; the meaning has to be derived from the names or the context. It clearly means slaves in XXVII **2474** (3rd century) and PSI V 452 (4th century). Slaves were frequently given names based on religion or mythology or history. Berenika and Berenike, Hermes, Sarapion and Diogenes were among the slave-names on manumission inscriptions from mainland Greece and the islands (Reilly 1978) and examples of slave names given by Straus (1976, 337) from the third and fourth centuries include Hermaios, Sarapion, Berenike and Diogenes. Except Eucharistus (4 n.), the names listed here are all common; all could be of slave or free. See Straus 2004, 246 and, regarding names given to slaves, 249-

260, and Straus 1988, 848-9. Two summonses of slaves are known; these use *δοῦλος* (P. Aberd. 60 (probably)) or *δούλη* (IX **1212**); in the latter the slave is named. Five slaves would not be an abnormally large number: see Bagnall 1993 (2), 228-229, citing XIV **1638** (282) and P. Lips. I 26 (early 4th century), which show families who do not appear exceptionally wealthy having four slaves. For complaints against slaves (not named) see XLIX **3480** (c.360-390) and VI **903** (4th century). **06** may have been issued after an investigative hearing such as the one in P. Lips. I 40 (end 4th/beginning of 5th century: *οἰκέται* and *δοῦλοι* are used interchangeably), where a slave accused of having attacked someone is being questioned in an attempt to establish the names of other slaves alleged to have accompanied him.

4 *Εὐχάριστον*. Eucharistus, an epithet (beneficent) of Ptolemy V, appears rarely in later papyri. P. Select. (P. Lugd Bat XIII) 18.15 (c.312-318) mentions a slave or servant called Eucharistus; the term *οἰκέτης* is used there in relation to another individual with what appears to be a similar function. The context there is Christian but the name need not have a Christian connotation, particularly in earlier papyri.

5 *κωμάρχ(αις) καὶ δημοσίοις*. It is unusual for the addressees to be described at the end of the summons: LXXIV **5005**, **5010** and **5011** are the only other published examples. These officials are the addressees of a number of summonses; on them and their police duties see LXXIV **5010** 6 n. and **05.2** n.

Πιέλα. A village in the Western toparchy: see Benaissa 2009, 225-228.

07 Summons from a *canaliclarius*

16 2B.48/E(a)3

13.5 x 4 (max) cm

mid/late 3rd century

This document is not in the usual format for a “summons”; there is no addressee and the person summonsed, a carpenter, does not seem to have been identified by name. Although a soldier has been sent to accompany the carpenter, **07** (and **08**) may relate to building work at the office or post where the senders were stationed.

The top, bottom and left margins are intact but the document is torn down the right-hand side and we cannot tell how much is missing. There are a number of round holes but no evidence of folding. The hand is fluent but untidy. The writing is against the fibres and the back is blank.

1 π(αρά) τοῦ κανανικλαρίου

2 τὸν Ἀμμωνίωνος τέκτονα παραπέμψαι εἰς .[

3 Διοσκόρω στρατιώτη (*vac.*) ἐν κώμῃ Ἐπισή[μου

1 π/ 1. καναλικλαρίου

“From the *canaliclarius*. Send Ammonion’s carpenter to[..... with]
Dioscorus the soldier. In the village of Episemou [.....

1 κανανικλαρίου. See **06.1** n. The use of ν for λ can be seen in P. Got. 7 (4th century), which has νουμενάρια instead of λουμενάρια: see other examples in Gignac I 109-110 and Mayer I (1st ed.), 188 and the additional note on **3366** 28, at p.139.

2 τὸν Ἀμμωνίωνος τέκτονα. Individuals summonsed are often described by their profession or occupation as well as their name (e.g. weavers in BGU XI 2083 and XXXI **2575** (both 2nd/3rd century), a priest in LXXIV **5011** (and see 2 n.: 3rd/4th century)). Officials were summonsed by their titles in SB XX 15095 and P.Turner 46 in relation to tax matters in which they were involved. A proper name followed by a person’s name in the genitive can designate a slave (Straus 1976, 339, with references), but **07** does not include the name of the person summonsed and I doubt that that he was a slave: few slaves in Egypt are

known to have engaged in a craft (Bagnall 1993 (2), 232) and carpenters were skilled craftsmen with their own guilds (see e.g. I 53). This carpenter must have been an employee in a workshop or on an estate owned by Ammonion. As the addressee is not known it is not clear that the summons was issued in connection with a petition or other complaint; the carpenter may have been needed for work in the office or post of the sender, possibly in connection with the wood mentioned at 08.2. The letters remaining at the end of line 2 are illegible and we cannot tell how much is missing.

παραπέμψαι. This verb is not used in other published summonses, whilst πέμπω and the compounds ἐκπέμπω and ἀναπέμπω are common, which may be another indication that 07 is not a legal summons. However, it is used in the context of a person required to attend court or to appear before a judge to give evidence or be examined in a matter the subject of a petition (Chr. Mitt. 77.3 and 78.8 (376/378), P. Abinn. 51.16 (346)).

3 Διοσκόρω στρατιώτη. He may be the same soldier as in 08.3. See 05.3 n. and 08.1 n.

ἐν κώμη Ἐπισή[μου]. It is unusual to find this phrase at the end of a summons, but see also 09.7. Words may be missing at the end of the line, but I would not expect to see the titles of the officials to whom the summons was addressed after this phrase; the genitive would usually be used after the titles. Possibly this was a shortened way of referring to village officials; alternatively there may not have been any specific addressee. Episemou is a village in the Upper toparchy and 3rd *pagus*: see Benaissa 2009, 56-58.

08 Summons from a *decurio*

16 2B.48 /E(a)1

20.25 x 5.5 cm

mid/late 3rd century

08 is not a normal summons; it relates primarily to a quantity of wood and the addressee, a gardener, is not named, while the name of the sending *decurio* is given. Both *decurio* and soldier may be attested in P. Meyer 20: see 1 n. As suggested on p. 58, 08 probably does not relate to law and order.

All margins are intact. The writing is irregular and untidy, and difficult to read. There is no evidence of folds. It is written against the fibres and the back is blank.

1 π(αρά) Ἀρείου (δεκαδάρχου)·

2 τὰ ἐρίκινα ξύλα α . . α ἐθέμην ἐν ἐριθμῶ ζ̄

3 παράδος Διοσκόρω στρ(ατιώτη) καὶ σὺν αὐτῶ ἀνάβα.

4 κηπουρῶ Ἀκτῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ.

1 π̄ [sign for *decadarch*] 2 l. ἀριθμῶ 4 l. πάραυτα?

“From Areios *decurio*. Give to Dioscorus the soldier the eight pieces of brushwood which(?) I have put [aside] and come up with him. To the gardener of Akte. Immediately(?)”

1 Ἀρείου (δεκαδάρχου). The only summonses from a *decurio* published so far are I 64, SB XVI 12649 (an ostrakon) and LXXIV 5005-5009, in which the same sign as here is used for the *decurio*: see Blanchard 1974, p.43 n.17. In P. Meyer 20 (from Antinoopolis), a soldier wrote to his sister that he was serving in the Arsinoite, Herakleopolite and other nomes with Areios the *decurio* and a fellow soldier named Dioscorus. The editor dated that papyrus to the first half of the 3rd century on the basis of the hand and particularly the apostrophes between double consonants, citing in relation to the latter point Wilcken, *Archiv* III, 380, and Gardthausen 1911, 397. These are not conclusive: Wilcken used the presence of apostrophes to suggest an early 3rd rather than 2nd century date for a papyrus and Gardthausen does not restrict the usage to the early 3rd century. Such usage was mainly during and after the 3rd century, with many examples from the 4th century or later (Gignac,

Grammar I 162-164). P. Meyer 20 may accordingly be from a later date and (although neither Areios nor Dioscoros is a particularly unusual name) contain references to the *decurio* and soldier who are named in **09**, who would have been stationed in the Heptanomia. As a cavalry officer, the *decurio* may have had a roving brief that covered a wide area, while the *beneficiarius* stayed in the nome or provincial capital (Hobson 1993, 202). If these are the same Areios, an earlier and 3rd rather than 4th century date is likely for **08**; the money sent by the writer to his “sister” in P. Meyer 20, 30 *denarii* or 120 drachmas, about a day’s wages for a skilled worker under Diocletian’s price edict of 301 (see LXIII **4352** 15 n.), would not perhaps have merited so much concern about its safe arrival in the later period. Other attestations of a *decurio* in the Oxyrhynchite nome, which range from the late 2nd century to 376, are in the summonses referred to above (I **64** and LXXIV **5005** – **5009**) and IV **747**, XVII **2133**, XLII **3028**, XLVIII **3416**, L **3580**, XLI 2951, P. Turner 41 (possibly: new reading in *Tyche* 19, p.259), SB XX 14289 and P. Princ. II 22. None of these is a petition to a *decurio*. The only evidence of a law and order role comes from the summonses: **3580** is a list of soldiers and in all the others except **747**, an invitation to a dinner, and **2951**, the sale of a slave, the *decurio*’s role seems to relate to the collection of grain taxes, presumably for the army. For information on the rank and function of this cavalry officer see Melaerts 1994. The name of the dispatching official is given in only seven other published summonses: SB XIV 11264, SB XXII 15130, BGU XIX 2772, P. Amh. II 146, XII **1505**, XIX **2229** and LXXIV **5010**.

2 τὰ ἐρίκινα ξύλα. Usually translated as brushwood or heath, as in leases of agricultural land where it has to be cleared in order to permit planting (e.g. XLI **2973**), it must have been more like a small tree than those terms suggest to us today: see P. Mich. IX 588.9 n. (98-117) and CPR XIV 52.21 n. (7th century, where it is suggested it can grow to four metres in height, if rarely). Its value may have fluctuated according to weight: see **2973** 36, BGU 731.8, XX **2272** 35, 38, CPR XIV 52.22 and Drexhage 1991, 116. It was used *inter alia* in the construction of ships (VI **921**, 3rd century) and in buildings, including doors (BGU III 731 (180), XX **2272**, (2nd century). See also P. Köln VII 318.5 n. For other uses see CPR XIV 52.22 n. and Reil 1913, 73.

α . . να. ἄτινα would give acceptable sense but is hard to make out.

ἐν ἀριθμῶ ζ. This probably indicates a number of trunks or small branches or beams (as in BGU III 731.8). I have not found this expression in any other papyri.

3 Διοσκόρω στρ(ατιώτη). See 1 n., 05.3 n. and 07.3 n.

καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀνάβα. See 06.2 n.

4 κηπουρῶ Ἄκτῆς. It may have been usual to describe a gardener by his location: see BGU XVII 2703 (283) and P. Sarap. 79f 5, 24 (late 1st/early 2nd century). Akte is attested in two papyri, P. Köln IV 189 (a summons) and L 3598: see Benaissa 2009, 20, who suggests that it may have been close to Seryphis, a much-attested village in the Western toparchy and 3rd *pagus*.

παρ' αὐτοῦ. This does not make sense and may be a misspelling of πάραυτα, “immediately”.

09 Summons from a *decurio*

16 2B.48/E(a)4

8.5 x 12 cm

mid/late 3rd century

The top, bottom and left margins are intact; the papyrus is torn on the right margin so that the final letters are not entirely preserved. There is a hole near the centre affecting lines 1 and 2. There is no evidence of folding. The writing is large. The subscription is smaller and in a different hand. The writing is against the fibres. The back contains a list of amounts, some of the letters of which seem to continue beyond the edges, suggesting that this was an earlier use before the papyrus was cut.

09 is very like I 64, set out in full for ease of comparison:

π(αρά) τοῦ (δεκαδάρ)χ(ου) | κωμάρχαις καὶ ἐπιστάτῃ εἰρήνης κώμης Τήεως. |
ἐξαυτῆς παράδοτε τῶ ἀποσταλέντι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ στρατιώτῃ | Ἀμμώνις ἐπικαλούμενος
Ἄλακερ ἐπέλεγ' ἄχοντος | ὑπὸ Πτολλᾶ, ἢ ὑμῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνέρχεσθε.

σῆση(μείωμαι)

If the restoration below is correct the sender and village of the addressees are the same, both contain a reference to a soldier sent “by me” (albeit they use different verbs) and both give the addressees the option of attending themselves. Unusually, both may be signed (see 8 n.): the editors of I 64 noted (6 n.) that the final line was “a mere scrawl” and suggested that it was a subscription on the basis of the word being certain in I 65.

1 παρὰ [το]ῦ[(δεκαδάρ)]χ(ου) κωμάρχαις

2 καὶ πε[διοφύ]λαξι. ἐξαυτῆ[ς]

3 παράδοτε τῶ πεμθέν-

4 τι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ στρατιώτῃ

ἄλη . . .

5 τοὺς παρ' ἡμῖν αλ.ις

6 ἢ αὐτοὶ ὑμῖς ἀνέρχεσθε.

7 κώμης Τήεως

8 (m. 2) ἐσημειωσάμ(ην).

3 l. πεμφθέν 4 ὑπ 5 l. παρ' ὑμῖν 6.1 l. ὑμεῖς 8 l. ἐσημειωσάμην

“ From the *decurio* to the comarchs and field guards. Hand over immediately to the soldier sent by me the fishermen(?) with you, or come up yourselves. Of the village of Teis.

Signed.”

1 (δεκαδάρ)χ(ου). There is a trace of what may be a *chi* or a stroke through a *phi* and it is probable (as the document was found near **05** to **08**), that it contained the abbreviation either for *beneficiarius* (like **05.1**) or for *decurio* (like **08.1**). We have seven summonses from a *decurio* (**08.1** n.) and three from a *beneficiarius* (**05.1**n.). I have restored this as *decurio* because of its similarity to I **64**.

2 πε[διοφύ]λαξι. Apart from a single example of *lestopiastai* (BGU XVII 2701.2), other officials to whom summonses have been addressed with comarchs have either been an *epistates eirenes* (nine times) or *demosioi* (seven times). See Bülow-Jacobsen 1986, Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, LXXIV pp. 134-13 and **5010** 6 n. πεδιοφύλακες are known from several Oxyrhynchite papyri from the early 3rd to mid-4th centuries (XLVII **3346** 16 (207-211), XXXIV **2714** 13 (256) and **2730** 7-8 (276-325), XLIV **3184** 19 (297), P. Ross Georg. V 23.7 (3rd century), PSI III 213.1 (3rd century), LXI **4128** 19 (346), XLVIII **3420** 34 (4th century)), but are not previously attested for Teis or as addressees of a summons.

5 `λη . . . ` These letters (possibly in the same hand as the signature) are much fainter than the main hand and do not make sense in the context. They may be from an earlier use of the piece of papyrus.

αλ.ις: ἀλεῖς, l. ἀλιεῖς? For the spelling see XLVI **3267** 11 (c. 37-41) and n.

6 ἢ αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνέρχεσθε. Like I **64** 5. See **04.2** n.

7 Τήεως. Teis is a village in the Thmoisepho toparchy and 8th *pagus*: see Benaissa 2009, 336-338. The position of this reference at the end of the summons is strange: see **07.3** n.

8 ἐσημωσάμ(ην). Of published summonses, only I **64** and **65**, P. Cair. Isid. 131, XII **1505**, **1506** and **1507**, LXXIV **5007**, **5010** and **5012** and P. Kellis inv. D/1/75.13.1, 13.2 and .75 have been signed: see LXI **4116** 4 n. As stated above, the editors noted that the signature in **64** was a mere scrawl; it is possible, but unlikely, that it was also ἐσημωσάμην.

010-014 Declarations of uninundated or artificially irrigated land

Introduction

There follow five declarations that land had not been inundated by the Nile flood or had been artificially irrigated. Habermann listed 69 such declarations published by 1997.⁶² Since then LXV 4488 (c. 245) and P. Harris inv. 55a (undated, Gonis 2003 (1)), both Oxyrhynchite, have appeared. In addition, I am indebted to Thomas Kruse for letting me have a copy of his as yet unpublished edition of P. Heid. Inv. G. 2083 (165-171, from Karanis). One further (not yet edited) declaration is described in Hakkert 1967 (no. 14).

These papyri are interesting for a variety of reasons. The surviving part of **010** refers to twelve separate parcels of land and **013** and **014** also refer to multiple holdings, like many of the Oxyrhynchite declarations. They confirm the pattern identified by Rowlandson of parcels of farmland in the nome becoming concentrated in the hands of non-resident landlords.⁶³ **011** and **012** together, and **013**, were comprised in *tomoi synkollesimoi* (see p. 70). Only a few letters survive of the document that was next to **013** in the *tomos*; it is not edited here. **010** is the only *abrochia* declaration known from 212. **011**, **012** and **013** are the first to be published from 225 and make a sequence with SB XX 14385 (224) and XII 1459 (226); all are addressed to the same royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, Aurelius Nemesion also called Dionysius. **014** is from 240, the same year as the two declarations in XII 1549; the flood may have been particularly poor in 239.

How the system worked

In Roman Egypt, taxes on privately-owned grain-land were normally payable in kind, assessed by reference to the area of productive land owned rather than the amount or value of crops harvested.⁶⁴ Rents on royal or public land leased from the state were similarly assessed, at higher rates. From Pharaonic times the land tax/rent system had acknowledged the need not merely to calculate the area of land owned but also to establish whether or not it was productive; both area and production, but particularly the latter, fluctuated from year to year depending upon the Nile flood, whose time of arrival, height, duration and speed all

⁶² Habermann 1997, 223-226. For earlier descriptions and summaries see Avogadro 1935 (on the *apographe* class of documents generally), Préaux 1963 and Parássoglou 1987. See also Youtie 1979, Gonis 2003 (1), Kruse 2002, 235-251. Of the declarations listed by Habermann, four relate to water-logged land (ἐφ' ὕδατος or καθ' ὕδατος) and one to land covered by sand (ἀμμόχωστος or ὕφαμμος).

⁶³ Rowlandson 1996, 128.

⁶⁴ See Wallace 1938, 6; Bonneau 1971, 21, 65.

affected its efficacy, which varied from place to place.⁶⁵ In 68 an edict of the prefect Tiberius Julius Alexander acknowledged the hardship caused to farmers who were unable to produce a crop when the Nile flood failed, but whose rent was assessed by reference to standard or average, rather than actual, years.⁶⁶ If there had been a full ἐπίσκεψις every year this measure should have been unnecessary, unless the officials underestimated the extent of the uninundated land for some purpose of their own.⁶⁷

Land which would have been inundated (βεβρεγμένη) in a “normal” year was described as ἄβροχος when the flood was insufficient to water it; this term applied only on an annual basis. Land termed ἐπηνητλημένη in the declarations was ἄβροχος land which had been artificially irrigated. Bonneau defines this as meaning water lifted by a mechanical device (usually a *shaduf*, until the *saqiya* became more widespread from the 3rd century and particularly in the 4th and 5th);⁶⁸ letting water out of canals by breaching dykes was not described in this way. Land outside the flood zone which could never be cultivated without artificial irrigation was called χέρσος.⁶⁹

Some applications for rent reduction cited in note 66 refer to rent being waived completely in the case of *abrochos* land and reduced by half in the case of artificially irrigated land κατὰ τὸ ἔθος; this custom must have predated the decree and been unrelated to it.⁷⁰ Roman period leases of both public and private land often contain a provision waiving rent if land is uninundated, and some leases of public land refer to a 50% reduction if land is artificially irrigated.⁷¹ It is generally assumed that the tax system worked in an analogous way to the

⁶⁵ See generally Déléage 1934, 83; Bonneau 1971, 21, 59, 65-76, 91, 146-153; Bonneau 1979, 59.

⁶⁶ For the edict see Chalon 1964, 222-229. No copy survives of an edict of Hadrian (117/8), which seems to have stated that land should be assessed according to its worth, pursuant to which several farmers in the Apollonopolite Heptakomias applied for a reduction in their rents (see P. Giss. 4-7, P. Lips. II 136 and 137, P. Brem. 36, P. Ryl. II 96, P. Alex. Giss 26, Sijpesteijn 1982): its ambit may have been restricted to that area. A second edict of Hadrian, in 136, permitted rents due in respect of a poor flood year to be paid by instalments over a period of years, which varied according to how badly each area was affected (SB III 6944, P. Osl. III 78, P. Heid. VII 396). See generally Bonneau 1971, 176-179; Rowlandson 1996, 76-78.

⁶⁷ Bonneau (1971, 90-92), followed by Rowlandson (1996, 76-77), doubts that the *episkepsis* was annual; Bonneau suggests that it was carried out only when deemed necessary by the authorities or in response to a request by a landholder. See Chalon 1964, 228 and Wallace 1938, 33, for possible abuse of the system by village officials.

⁶⁸ Bonneau 1979, 68 n. 46; 1993, 212.

⁶⁹ See Bonneau 1971, 76-81 and diagram 5.

⁷⁰ P. Giss. 4, 6 cols I and II, P. Brem. 36 and, probably, P. Alex. Giss. 26. P. Giss. 5 and P. Ryl. II 96 do not specify that the reduction in relation to artificially irrigated land is 50%. P. Lips. II 136 and 137, and P. Giss. 6 col III (and possibly P. Ryl. II 96 and P. Alex. Giss. 26) do not specify that it is κατὰ τὸ ἔθος.

⁷¹ For examples of leases of public land see El Ghany 1986, 295 n.1, P. Tebt II 374 (131) (no reference to 50%) and CPR I 39 (266) and CPH 119=SPP V 119 r. vii (256/7) (both having a reduction of 50% for

leasing of public lands, although the former would be imposed by legislation while the latter was contractual, and that tax was assessed at a 50% rate on artificially irrigated land and a nil rate on *abrochos* land. It is logical that a landowner who had incurred the expense of irrigation should have had a lower tax bill than one who had benefitted from the Nile flood.

Abrochia declarations are known from the Arsinoite, Hermopolite and Oxyrhynchite nomes, dating from 158 to 245, and concerning both public and private land. A change in law or procedure under Antoninus Pius (138-161) seems to have given rise to a new formal system, under which landowners who wanted to claim a tax deduction for uninundated or artificially irrigated land had to submit a declaration, pursuant to orders issued by the prefect or procurator. The change may have been connected with a very poor flood in 153 (which was followed by a tax amnesty in 154) but may also have been an attempt to simplify the system and reduce the administrative burden of the officials responsible for the ἐπίσκεψις or checking procedure, who were now only obliged to check land comprised in a filed declaration.⁷² Whether the orders were issued annually is not clear; I think the better view is that they were, on the basis of the number of declarations which have been found from successive years and because the procedure applied to excessive flooding and to sand cover as well as to insufficient flooding.⁷³ The new system “implicitly recognised the failure of the earlier ideal of more regular and systematic official adjustment of tax demands”.⁷⁴ There is no reason why both state and taxpayer should not have benefitted from a new system which left it to the taxpayer to make a claim but (presumably) assured him that when he did so, if it was accurate, his tax liability would be reduced. The state

artificially irrigated land). Rowlandson (1996, App.2) identifies private land leases from Oxyrhynchus which provide for a reduction in rent for *abrochos* land; none makes any reference to a 50% reduction for artificially irrigated land, nor does any published since then. These references are at their peak, proportionately, from c.120 to 266, after which there are none, while references to *saqiya* become more frequent; presumably when artificial irrigation was generally possible, no rent concessions were made. In the Oxyrhynchite nome, one-year leases were usually drawn up in the first four months of the Egyptian year, when the effects of the flood would have been known, rendering such a provision unnecessary. See Herrmann 1958, 95-96; Rowlandson 1996, 253.

⁷² See Bonneau 1971, 184-7.

⁷³ Grenfell and Hunt (II 237, p.179; VIII 1113), Wallace (1938, 8) and Bonneau (1971, 185) suggested that the orders were made only in years of exceptional flood. Contrary views were expressed by Déléage (1934, 115), Préaux (1963, 122-3) and Youtie and Pearl in P. Mich VI 366 Introduction pp. 9-10, noting four filed in successive years (168, 169, 170 and 171 in the Fayum). To these can be added 163 and 164, and 200, 201 and 202, in the Fayum and 203 and 204 and now also 224, 225 and 226 in the Oxyrhynchite (011, 012 and 013). Sand cover applied to sand blown from the desert as well as to sand brought by the Nile (Bonneau 1971, 68-69, with references).

⁷⁴ Rowlandson 1996, 77.

would have benefitted too, if an efficient tax rebate system encouraged people to irrigate, and so to produce something from uninundated land, and made it less likely that farmers would flee in order to escape the tax net when faced by tax bills for unproductive land.⁷⁵ Westermann's suggestion that the state levied higher taxes on unflooded land than on flooded land, as an incentive to land-owners to irrigate it, is generally dismissed.⁷⁶ That the declarations, if supported by the facts, resulted in a benefit for the declarer is clear, particularly as claims seem to have been made for larger amounts of land than were confirmed on inspection.⁷⁷ No declaration, however, makes any express claim for a reduction in tax.

The declarations do not describe the land concerned in any great detail, probably because they were checked initially by local officials who knew the area, so that the names of the *kleros*, where applicable, and farmer were sufficient.⁷⁸ Some declarations describe the rate at which the land was assessed for tax while others do not. The tax rates when specified vary considerably, with private land generally taxed at 1 or 1½ artabas of grain per aroura, while royal or public land could be taxed at considerably higher rates.⁷⁹

All published declarations for which month dates are available were made between January and July, by which time the effects of the previous year's flood were known; the river usually began to rise in June and the flood reached its peak in August and was over by October.⁸⁰ Most are dated Mecheir to Phamenoth (late January to late April). They would have been followed by an ἐξέτασις, when the contents were checked against a register maintained by the *comogrammateus*, probably the previous year's survey, and also by an ἐπίσκεψις, where the land concerned was physically checked by appropriate officials from

⁷⁵ See Bonneau 1979, 59; Habermann 1997, 222. This was a particular problem in the 2nd century, see e.g. SB XIV 11374 (168) regarding fugitives from poll tax.

⁷⁶ Westermann 1921, 174, based on his analysis of P. Brux. 1 and BGU I 84 as showing that unflooded land was generally taxed at a higher rate than flooded land. Contra Wallace (1938, 8 and 358) and Habermann (1997, 221-222), on the basis that the tax rates depended on the nature of the title to the land; if land was taxed at a high rate there was an even greater incentive to apply for a rebate.

⁷⁷ Wallace 1938, 358 n. 36. Also noted by Westermann (1921, 170) re P. Brux. 1. El Ghany's argument (1986, 296) that it is improbable that anyone over-claimed because of the risk of discovery is naive.

⁷⁸ Bonneau 1971, 184; Déléage 1934, 117.

⁷⁹ See Rowlandson 1996, 71-80 and Tables 3 and 4 for a discussion of land tax rates in the Oxyrhynchite nome generally, and Wallace 1938, 11.

⁸⁰ Habermann 1997, 259-261; no months are named in papyri published subsequently. See also Gonis 1999, 207 n. 3.

a different district.⁸¹ Some landowners may deliberately have filed late returns (three were filed in Epeiph) so that the following year's flood rendered such a check impossible.⁸²

Declarations were usually written out by and formalised in front of an official.⁸³ Up to four copies were made and kept by the appropriate officials; the declarer may also have kept a copy (as **010**). The officials' copies were sometimes stuck together to form a τόμος συγκολλησίμος or pasted roll, usually arranged in some order such as chronological, or topographical, or alphabetical; declarations are the type of document most commonly found preserved in this way.⁸⁴ There is no evidence that **010** or **014** were in a *tomos*, but **011**, **012** and **013** were; as normal, the document on the left was stuck over the left-hand margin of the one which followed it.⁸⁵ Other *abrochia* declarations known to be from *tomoi* are P. Oslo II 26a, BGU XI 2101, BGU XIII 2234, SB VIII 9866, P. Grenf. II 56, VI **970**, VIII **1113**, XII **1549** and XLII **3047**, as well as papyrus 14 in Hakkert 1967.⁸⁶

Title to/ownership of the land

The declarers of **010** and **013** make it plain that they are the owners of the land they are describing; ἦν ἔχω and τὰς ὑπαρχούσας μοι at **010.5** and **13**, ἄς ἔχω at **013.7** The equivalent parts are missing from **011**, **012** and **014**, but they probably contained similar wording. Bonneau is clear that the onus of making the declaration fell on the “*titulaire*”, the person registered as owner, not the tenant.⁸⁷ **010** and **014**, like almost half the Oxyrhynchite declarations, refer to land εἰς the names of others and it is likely that **011** and **013** did so too; in the Arsinoite many refer to land σωματιζομένη εἰς or διὰ σωματισμοῦ others.⁸⁸ Apart from **010**, the Oxyrhynchite ones do not use the term ἀναγραφομένη εἰς.⁸⁹ The meaning of these terms is not clear, but they both seem to refer to some form of

⁸¹ Avogadro 1935, 151; Wallace 1938, 9; Préaux 1963, 132; Chalon 1964, 222-229; Bonneau 1971, 185. Habermann 1997, 228-9, nn. 49 and 50, gives references of declarations noted for ἐξέτασις.

⁸² Habermann 1997, 261. See also Wallace 1938, 8-9 and 358-9.

⁸³ Harmon 1934, 157.

⁸⁴ Clarysse 2003, 355.

⁸⁵ Omar 1981, 233.

⁸⁶ On *tomoi* generally see Clarysse 2003, who identified over 230 examples, and, specifically in relation to *abrochia* declarations, Déléage 1934, 117-118; Avogadro 1935, 153; Préaux 1963, 124-127; Kruse 2002, I 249.

⁸⁷ Bonneau 1971, 186. But note two exceptions; both declarations in BGU XI 2101 are made by a tenant: possibly (unusually) he was liable for taxes under the terms of his lease.

⁸⁸ Habermann (1997, 245) noted two anomalies: in BGU I 139 the person making the claim and the person named as διὰ σωματισμοῦ were the same; in PSI III 161 the reference to σωματιζομένος was not followed by any name. I think these must have been written by a scribe used to declarations where third parties were involved and who followed the normal pattern until he realised it was not necessary.

⁸⁹ Ἀναγραφομένη εἰς is a normal term in the Oxyrhynchite to reflect registration of title, including to public land (Rowlandson 1996, 97).

registration. Possibly these named “others” were registered tenants of the land concerned, particularly in declarations made by holders of multiple parcels (like the declarers of **010**, **013** and **014**), who were probably absentee landlords who had let small lots to different farmers in the locality, but I can find no evidence of any requirement to register leases (although details may have been kept in the local *grapheion* if the leases were drawn up there); they did not have to be in writing and did not grant rights *in rem* to the tenants.⁹⁰ The βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων contained a record of ownership only.⁹¹ The name of the occupying tenant farmer would have assisted the inspecting officials to identify land comprised in a declaration, but that would not be a reason to use a term which suggested registration rather than occupation or cultivation, nor perhaps to take such care in identifying the person by parents’ and grandparents’ names. Accordingly, the named “others” must have been prior owners of the land which was still registered in their names, or tenants or other occupiers entered in some form of tax or tax-related (not land) register(s) in respect of it. Rowlandson notes that there was frequently a “disjunction between the registration of the land and its actual cultivation” and suggests that out-of-date records and deliberate use of false names were to blame.⁹² She considers that the “others” named in the declarations were either former holders of the land or “in some senses tenants”, while the new owner, who was responsible for the tax, clearly had an interest in the tax bill being reduced.⁹³ Registration of title on acquisition was not compulsory; it was only needed on an onward sale, when the notary drawing up the sale contract would check the register, and the register was often out-of-date.⁹⁴ I believe it unlikely however that the “others” were former owners of the land; it would be surprising if so many purchases leading to multiple holdings, presumably amassed over a period of time, and the subject of so many declarations, were unregistered. Most scholars considered that the terms used indicated the person(s) entered in the tax records as being liable to pay the land tax, although, in some cases at least, noting the unsatisfactory conclusion that the declarations were made, and presumably required to be made, by someone who was not going to benefit from them.⁹⁵ It makes little sense for the person responsible for paying the tax to

⁹⁰ See P. Mich. V Introduction at pp. 3-9; Herrmann 1958, 183-189.

⁹¹ See Harmon 1934, 157, 228; Wolff 1978, 222 ff, 245-7; Taubenschlag 1955, 222ff.

⁹² Rowlandson 1996, 99-100. In the case of the declarations however it is the disjunction between expressed ownership and some form of registration which is at issue.

⁹³ See Rowlandson 1996, 100 re XII **1459**.

⁹⁴ See LII **3690**, Introduction.

⁹⁵ See Grenfell and Hunt at P. Fayum I 33.18-19 n., Youtie and Pearl at P. Mich VI 367.12 n., Youtie 1981, 89-90 (on a papyrus which is not an *abrochia* declaration), Meyer at P. Hamb. I 11 Introduction, Délégé 1934, 117 (who points out that this would mark a change from the Ptolemaic treatment when the cleruch, not the

have had to rely on another person making a declaration to reduce his liability; why would that other person (owner or landlord) have bothered? Préaux, Habermann and Rowlandson all doubted that the “others” were responsible for the tax, noting Herrmann’s findings that it was generally the landlord not the tenant who was liable to pay the taxes assessed on the land.⁹⁶ XII **1460** (219-220) shows that tax records and not just property ownership records could be out of date and it is possible that the “others” were persons formerly responsible for the tax but, again, I find it unlikely that that should be the case in so many of the extant declarations. I believe that these named “others” were not previous owners, or persons previously responsible for the tax on the land, but were the tenants or other third parties who actually cultivated the land in question and whose names were shown in the tax records as actually paying the tax levied on it. These land tax records were based on reports filed by the *comogrammateus*, a village official, who was primarily concerned with the identification of the land, not with the identity of the person legally responsible for paying the tax; the local authorities wanted to ensure that all relevant grain-land was included in their returns but would not, I believe, have checked their records against the land registry to establish ownership.⁹⁷ The tenants would have been listed either because they were known from their physical occupation, and so would have been the first against whom the tax authorities would have sought to levy execution (or at least there was a risk of them doing so (see II **277** (19 BC), SB XII 10942 (4 BC), VIII **1124** (26), PSI IX 1029 (52-53), XXXIX **3489** (72/73), P. Strasb. VI 534 (161)), but also, and principally, because, probably in the majority of cases, grain from the land would have been shown as brought by them to the threshing-floor and/or deposited by them at the official granary (see XLIV **3163** (71) and **3169** (200-212)) and it would have been from those deposits that the tax would have been paid.⁹⁸ The landlord/owner made the declaration because he had a real economic interest in doing so, because under the lease and ultimately to the fiscal authorities he was liable for the tax.

farmer (“*colon*”) was liable for the tax), BGU XV 2488.3 n., P. Oslo II 26 a.II.10-11 n. Σωματίζω is clearly used in a tax context in later papyri e.g. XIX **2235** (346), L **3583** (444).

⁹⁶ Herrmann 1958 122; Préaux 1963, 122; Rowlandson 1996, 100; Habermann 1997, 245 (but querying the reference to the taxpayer made expressly in BGU I 139 and PSI III 161 (see note 88)). There were some exceptions to the rule that the owner of land was responsible for the tax (see XLIV **3168** (late 2nd century)).

⁹⁷ In Déléage’s view, the *fisc* did not care whether the right person was shown as the tax-payer (1934, 143), nor did the tax rolls contain the names of owners of private land (1934, 139ff).

⁹⁸ Leases which require such deposits include I **101**, III **640**, VIII **1125**, XXXIII **2676**, XXXVI **2795**, L **3591** (at the granary) and VI **910**, L **3592**, LXVII **4594** and LXIX **4739** (at the threshing-floor). On whether tax was deducted at the threshing floor see Wallace 1938, 370 and Adams 2007, 168-9. See also SB XVIII 14067 (mid-3rd century), where registered owner and tax payer are different, and Rowlandson 1996, 274.

The declarer of **010** distinguishes between land ἀναγγραφομένη εἰς or εἰς named individuals, as in ll. 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20, and land ἐπ'ὀνόματος (l. 12). I think that the latter is a reference to land which is still registered at the land registry in the name of a former owner, while the other more usual references are to land registered in the declarer's name but occupied by tenants who paid the tax. The accounts on the *verso* also suggest that the writer owned a large amount of land and that the named individuals were his tenants; see p.75 and **010.12 n.**

The end of the system

The latest known declarations are from 245, from the Oxyrhynchite (XLII **3046** and **3047**, LXV **4488** and possibly VI **970**).⁹⁹ From the Fayum the latest known are dated 209 (BGU XI 2101, cols I and II) but these related to water-logged land; the latest for *abrochos* are from 208 (P. Fam. Tebt. 52 and P. Tebt. II. 324). It is not clear why this should have been so. Habermann related it to the abandonment of attempts to farm on Fayum areas where water became ever more scarce, pointing out that the latest securely dated papyrus attesting the Fayum village of Patsontis is the declaration of sand-covered land from 208 (BGU I 108).¹⁰⁰ Villages at the north and west of the Fayum, like Socnopaïou Nesus and Theadelphia, were at the end of the water chain and were abandoned as the canals silted up, but the evidence shows that this did not happen as early as the first decade of the 3rd century; Socnopaïou Nesus was abandoned in the 230s but the few remaining villagers at Theadelphia were complaining about the lack of water reaching them in the early 4th century.¹⁰¹ If the edges of the Fayum were inundated less frequently one might have expected a flurry of more, not fewer, declarations shortly before it became apparent that there was no future there. The answer may be related to the non-availability of artificial irrigation; only one of the declarations from the Fayum refers to artificial irrigation, in contrast to eight from the Oxyrhynchite.¹⁰² This could support Habermann's view, on the basis that that farming was abandoned without serious attempts at artificial irrigation, but the reason for the discrepancy in dates is not entirely clear. Bonneau suggested that by the mid-third century the Roman emperors were no longer concerned with encouraging farmers to irrigate the fields artificially, and in the Fayum deliberately let the irrigation

⁹⁹ See LII 3048 for other evidence that 244 may have been a poor flood year.

¹⁰⁰ Habermann 1997, 257-9.

¹⁰¹ See Bagnall 1985, 297 and Samuel 1975, 619-621. For Theadelphia see P. Sakaon 35 (331) and P. Thead. 16-20 (all 4th century).

¹⁰² See Habermann 1997, 227 and add, for the Oxyrhynchite nome, LXV **4488** and P. Harris inv.55a.

system become clogged up, because the marginal benefits to the Roman state were not worth it, but Bagnall disputed the basis of her calculation and her conclusion.¹⁰³ Bonneau's figures do show that higher Nile floods were needed as time went on; 14 cubits was considered normal in the mid-2nd century but was not enough to avoid famine 100 years later.¹⁰⁴

These declarations ceased altogether about the time when the administrative changes under Philip the Arab were implemented (245-249) and the *comogrammateus* and the royal scribes were replaced.¹⁰⁵ Surviving leases show that artificial irrigation was becoming more common throughout the 3rd century and from Diocletian's time the tax system was simplified and *abrochos* land was taxed on the assumption that it would be irrigated.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Bonneau 1979, 64-67; Bagnall 1985, 297.

¹⁰⁴ Bonneau 1971, 191.

¹⁰⁵ Parsons 1967, Gonis 2003 (1), 172; Bonneau 1971, 191; Thomas 1975, 113-115; Borkowski/Hagedorn 1975, 780-783; Kruse 2002, II 940-954. The *comogrammateus* was replaced by the comarchs, who did not have the same responsibilities in relation to land assessments.

¹⁰⁶ See the edict of Aristius Optatus in 297 (P.Cair. Isid. I.1); Bagnall 1985, 300.

010 Declaration of uninundated and artificially irrigated land

71/54(a) (32F7)

15.1 by 17.5 cm

January to July 212

This darkish-brown papyrus contains the first 23 lines of an ἀπογραφὴ ἀβρόχου. The writing is along the fibres. The top margin is intact; the papyrus is torn at line 23 where only a few letters are legible. We cannot tell how many lines are missing. The left margin is intact but some 3-6 letters are missing from the end of each line. The hand is that of a skilled scribe, neat and fluent, with the usual abbreviations for *aroura* and *artaba*. There appear to be no orthographical errors but the scribe may have repeated some words by mistake at the start of l. 19: see 19 n.

On the back, written against the fibres in a different, larger and less regular hand is a list of names, areas of land and dates of purchase and, in the last two lines, of payments. Some of the names are the same as those in the declaration (see 9, 16-17, 20-21, 21-22 nn. below), but they appear in a different order and the descriptions are less formal. The amounts of land mentioned on the back are considerably larger than those in the declaration, and are not limited to arable land but include *oikopedas*, plots which may be built on (Husson 1983, 209-211). **010** is probably a copy of the declaration which was retained by the declarer, who used the back to make a record of his holdings and tenants and of rent paid or payable, rather than one that was filed at the royal scribe's office. For writing on the back of declarations see Préaux 1963, 125 and Habermann 1997, 233-234.

Both *recto* and *verso* testify to multiple holdings of land, and the *verso* shows that these had been accumulated piece-meal over a considerable period of time, including from the 26th, 28th and 31st years of an unnamed emperor (probably Augustus and if so 5-4 BC, 3-2 BC and 1-2 AD, but possibly Commodus when the corresponding dates are 185-6, 187-8 and 190-191), the sixth year of Tiberius (19-20), the second year of Nero (55-56) and the first year of Antoninus Pius (138).

1 Ὡρείωνι τῶ καὶ Ἀπίωνι βασιλικῶ γραμματεῖ Ὁξ(υρυγίτου)

2 παρὰ Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου Αὐρηλίου Σαραπίωνος κοσμητεύσαντος βουλ[ευτοῦ

3 τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων. κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέν[τα ἐν τῶ

4 ἐνεστῶτι κ (ἔτει) περὶ ἀπογραφῆς ἀβρόχου καὶ ἐπηντλημένης ἀπογ[ράφομαι

- 5 ἦν ἔχω ἄβροχον καὶ ἐπηντλημ(ένην) τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνεστῶτι κ (ἔτει). ἐστι.[
- 6 περὶ μὲν κώμην Μέρμερθα ἀναγραφομένης εἰς Σατ[ο]ρνεῖ[λον τὸν
- 7 κ]αὶ Ἔρωτα υἱὸν Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἔρωτος ἰδιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου)
ἐπ[η]ντλημ(ένης)
- 8 (ἀρούρης) θ καὶ εἰς Σιντοτοῖν Ἀπολλωνίου μητρὸς Τεκώσιος ἰδι[ω]τικῆς
(μοναρτάβου)
- 9 ἐπηντλημ(ένης) (ἀρούρης) θ καὶ εἰς Ἡρακλείδην Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλεί[δου
- 10 μ[η]τ(ρὸς)] Ταυσαράπιος ἰδιωτ(ικῆς) (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλημ(ένης) (ἀρούρας) ε
15 λβ καὶ εἰς Ἄρπα[
- 11 τὸν καὶ Θώνιον παστοφόρον Θοήριδος θεᾶς μεγίστης ἰδιω[τ]ικῆς
- 12 (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλ(ημένης) (ἀρούρας) β. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπ' ὀνόματος Μάρκου
Πετρω[νίου
- 13 Ἡρ[ακ]λανοῦ ὁμοίως τὰς ὑπαρχούσας μοι ἰδιωτ(ικῆς) ἐπηντλ(ημένης)
(μοναρτάβου) (ἀρούρας) [.
- 14 καὶ εἰς [Δ]ιογύσιον Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Διογένους ἰ[δ]ιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου)
ἐ[πην-
- 15 τλημ(ένης) (ἀρούρας) η' καὶ εἰς Θέωνα Θέωνος τοῦ Θέωνος μητ(ρὸς)
Δημητροῦ[τος
- 16 Μενχέως ἰδιωτικ(ῆς) (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλ(ημένης) (ἀρούρας) λβ καὶ εἰς
Ἡρακλείδην Σ[αραπί-
- 17 ωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου πρότερον Παπονθε[ῦ]τος Σαδάλου ἀβρόχ[(ου)
(ἀρουρ) .
- 18 καὶ εἰς Δίδυμον Σατόκου διὰ Διδύμου Πτολεμαίου (μοναρτάβου) ἀβρόχ(ου)
(ἀρούρης) δη[']
- 19 ἀβρόχου (ἀρούρης) d η' καὶ εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν Σαραπίωνα Ἡρακ[λείδου τοῦ Σαρα-

20 πίωνος μητ(ρός) Ταυσαράπιος (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηνητλημ(ένης) (ἀρούρας) γ δ ξδ
καὶ εἰς Πῆ[πον-

21 θεά Σαδάλου τοῦ Διδύμου ἰδιωτ(ικῆς) (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηνητλ(ημένης)
(ἀρούραν) α καὶ εἰς Σααμ.[

22 Τοτοέως τοῦ καὶ Πλουτάρχου Ἡρακλείδου μητ(ρός) Ταπονθεῦτος .[

23] [].... [] κλήρου ἰδιω[τικῆς

.

1 γρς οἰ̅ 4 κς 5 κς 5, 9, 10, 14-15, 20 ἐπηνητλημ 7 ὕιον ἰδιωτικῆς
7, 12, 13, 16, 21 ἐπηνητλ 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21 αϞ 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18,
19, 20, 21 ζ 8 ἰδι 10 ἰδιω^τ 11 ἰδιω 13 ἰδιω^τ 15 μη^τ 16 ἰδιωτι^κ 18 αβρο^χ
20 μη^τ 21 ἰδιω^τ 22 μη^τ

“To Horion, also known as Apion, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Lucius Septimius Aurelius Sarapion, former *kosmetes* and councillor of the most magnificent city of the Alexandrians. In accordance with the orders given in this 20th year regarding the registration of uninundated and artificially irrigated land, I register the uninundated and artificially irrigated land which I have in this same current 20th year. There is near the village of Mermertha

registered to Saturneilus also known as Eros, son of Tiberius Claudius Eros, artificially irrigated, $\frac{3}{4}$ of an aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and

registered to Sintotoes, daughter of Apollonius, whose mother is Tecosis, artificially irrigated, $\frac{3}{4}$ of an aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and

registered to Heraclides, son of Sarapion and grandson of Heraclides, whose mother is Tausarapis, artificially irrigated, $5 \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{32}$ arouras of private land paying 1 artaba, and

registered to Harpa....., also called Thonius, *pastophoros* of the very great goddess Thoeris, artificially irrigated, 2 ... arouras of private land paying 1 artaba, and

among the [lands] in the name of Marcus Petronius Heraclanus, similarly belonging to me, artificially irrigated, arouras of private land paying 1 artaba, and registered to [Dionysius], son of Sarapion and grandson of Diogenes, artificially irrigated, 1/8 of an aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and registered to Theon, son of Theon and grandson of Theon, whose mother is Demetrous daughter of Menches, artificially irrigated, 1/32 of an aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and registered to Heraclides, son of Sarapion and grandson of Heraclides, formerly Papontheus, son of Sadalus, uninundated, aroura(s), and registered to Didymus son of Satocus through Didymus son of Ptolemaeus, uninundated $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{8}$ arouras of land paying 1 artaba, uninundated $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{8}$ arouras, and registered to the same Sarapion son of Heraclides and grandson of Sarapion, whose mother is Tausarapis, artificially irrigated, $3\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{1}{64}$ arouras of land paying 1 artaba, and registered to Paponthes son of Sadalus and grandson of Didymus, artificially irrigated, 1 aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and registered to Saam.... son of Totoes, also called Ploutarchos, and grandson of Heraclides, whose mother is Tapontheus, in the *kleros*, private land.....”

1 Horion alias Apion is attested as royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome from January/February 211 to 7th June 213; see Whitehorne 2006, 165. The royal scribe of the nome was the sole addressee in at least 10 declarations published to date (Habermann 1997, 235; LXV 4488). Like the strategus, but unlike the *comogrammateus*, where he is an addressee his name is always given. For duties of the royal scribe generally see Biedermann 1913, *passim* and Kruse 2002, *passim*.

2 Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου Αύρηλιου Σαραπίωνος κοσμητεύσαντος βου[λευτοῦ This individual is unattested to date. The *kosmetes* was responsible for overseeing the training of the ephebes; this was a one-year position in the second rank of civic honours which qualified its holders to be elected to the *boule*, a rank held for life (see Delia 1991, 101, 109-113, 121, and Lewis 1997). Although three Roman names do not necessarily indicate Roman citizenship (Keenan 1973, 41, citing P. Mich. IV 223 (171-2)), Lucius Septimius were the first two names of Septimius Severus and it is likely that this individual was a first generation Roman citizen who owed his status to that emperor; the papyrus is too early for him to have benefitted from the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 212. He must have been a wealthy Alexandrian citizen and may have had family connections in the Oxyrhynchite nome (see Rowlandson 1996, 266-272; Biezunska-Malowitz 1975, 746-7).

3 κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέν[τα Most published declarations name the official pursuant to whose orders the declarations were made, but the identity was omitted in SB XVI 12561, P. Oslo II 26a 1 and 2 (by reference to col.1 only), P. Mich. VI 369, BGU XIII 2233 and 2234, col II, P. Oslo III 100-104, SPP XXII 34, BGU XI 2022, P. Fam. Tebt. 2.238 and P. Heid. Inv. G 2083. See Habermann 1997, 238. It is also missing from **013**. Other declarations contain no reference to the orders: see Habermann 1997, 238, and add P. Harris inv. 55a (Gonis 2003(1)) and now (probably) **011** and **012**.

4 κ (ἔτει). This is 211/212, expressed in papyri as the 20th year of Septimius Severus (d. 4 February, 211), Caracalla and Geta (d. 26 December 211), or of Caracalla and Geta, or of Caracalla alone (Bureth 1964, 98-105). Because no published *abrochos* declaration has been dated before Mecheir in any year, I have dated this papyrus 212. See Habermann, 1997, 259-161; Gonis 2003 (1), 171 n. 2.

5 ἐνεστῶτι κ (ἔτει). A similar construction is found in only one other Oxyrhynchite declaration, P.Harris inv. 55a l.4-5 (Gonis 2003 (1)), but is common in the Arsinoite declarations (see P. Grenf. II 56, P. Berl. Leihg. II 299, SB XVI 12561, 12562 and 12563, PSI III 361, SB V 7528, P. Bad. II 23, and BGU I 108; Habermann 1997, 259 n. 162). In Oxyrhynchite declarations the year in respect of which the claim is made is usually expressed as πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστὸς ἔτος (as **011.7** and **013.5-6**).

6 περὶ μὲν κώμην Μέρμερθα. Mermertha was a village in the Upper toparchy and 1st *pagus*, near the Cynopolite border (Benaissa 2009, 154-156). I have not found any reference, in any papyri mentioning this village, to any of the individuals named in **010**. μὲν indicates

that the missing part of the document contained a reference to one or more additional villages, and *περὶ* implies that the area was under the administration of Mermertha (P. Mich. Michael 7, p 61 n.4 = SB XII 11109, Gonis 2003(1), l. 6 n.).

ἀναγραφομένας εἰς The usual term in the Oxyrhynchite nome for land registered in some-one's name, although it does not appear in other *abrochia* declarations. See 8 n. and pp. 70-73.

6-7 Σατ[ο]ρνεῖ[λον τὸν κ]αὶ Ἔρωτα υἱὸν Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἔρωτος. Saturneinus and Saturneilus (both are possible) are the only names which fit here if the transcription of ρνεῖ is correct. The son has been named after his father who may have been a freedman (Eros is not uncommon as a slave name and had the son been a Roman citizen one would have expected him too to have had Roman forenames).

(μοναρτάβου). So far as we can tell (see 19 n.) all the land described in **010** is assessed at 1 artaba per aroura, the normal rate of taxation for private land in the Oxyrhynchite (Wallace 1938, 15), although 1 ½ was frequent for former vineland (Rowlandson 1996, 54 and XLII **3047** *passim*: see 11 n.). Such land paid at an actual rate of 1⅛ (Rowlandson 1987, 288 based on VII **1044**). In **010** the term is usually used with *ἰδιωτικῆς* but it appears on its own at 18 and 20, while *ἰδιωτικῆς* appears on its own at 13 and neither term is used in 17; these are probably omissions of the scribe (see Gonis 2003 (1) ll.7-8 n.), but the term *μοναρτάβου* was so frequent in the Oxyrhynchite that it gradually became a “category term” for land tenure (Rowlandson 1996, 35-36).

8 εἰς. The usual term in Oxyrhynchite *abrochia* declarations for signifying that the land is registered in the name of a third party; see 6 n. and pp. 70-73.

Σιντοτοῆν. The prefix Sin (“daughter of”) shows that this is a woman's name.

9-10 Ἡρακλείδην Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλεῖ[ιδου | μ[ητ(ρὸς)] Ταυσασάπιος. Heracleides son of Sarapion and grandson of Heracleides is named on the *verso*, but not identified by his mother. See also 16-17 n.

11 παστοφόρον Θοήριδος θεᾶς μεγίστης. This official was one of the second rank of temple officials, not a priest (L **3567** 3 n.), who carried temple items in processions, possibly a dais or platform on which statues were placed covered with an embroidered veil (Vatun 1970, 215, who suggests that the word is derived from both *πάσσω* I embroider

and πήγνυμι I make out of wood). For the temple of Thoeris at Oxyrhynchus see 01.3-4 n. On *pastophoroi* see Schönborn 1976, 6-10 and generally.

12-13 ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπ' ὀνόματος Μάρκου Πετρω[νίου] Ἡρ[ακ]λανοῦ ὁμοίως τὰς ὑπαρχούσας μοι..... (ἀρούρας). The land described is part of a parcel ἐπ' ὀνόματος (in the name of) M. Petronius Heraclanus (Ἡρκουλανοῦ is too long to be a possible reading). The declarer is distinguishing this land from the other parcels described, which also belong to him but which are εἰς other named persons. This land may be a recent acquisition, by purchase or possibly pursuant to a mortgage or in settlement of a debt, and not yet registered at the land registry in the name of the declarer. Unless the καί at the start of l. 14 is an error, the land does not appear to be tenanted (or possibly the declarer does not know the tenants' names). See pp.70-73.

16-17 This is probably a different Heracleides from the one named in l. 9. A second Heracleides son of Sarapion is named on the *verso*, close to a reference to Papontheus son of Sadalus. See 9-10 n.

18 διὰ. This indicates that Didymus son of Ptolemaeus is an intermediate landlord, while Didymus son of Satocus, a sub-tenant, is the farmer in occupation, and is a further indication that the persons whose names are qualified by εἰς are the occupying tenant-farmers.

19 ἀβρόχου (ἀρούρης) δ' ἡ' The same words and fractions appear at the end of 18. This may indicate that a different category of land (that is not private or is not rated at one artaba per aroura) is meant, although not more than six letters are missing and no other category of land is mentioned anywhere else. It is I think more likely, particularly because of the identical fractions, that the repetition was a copying error.

τὸν αὐτὸν Σαραπίωνα. This suggests that this Sarapion, son of Heracleides and grandson of Sarapion, has already been mentioned in the document. If so, he must either be the father of the Heracleides mentioned at 9, whose mother and wife were accordingly both called Tausarapis (possibly an instance of brother-sister marriage; see 02.2 n.), or of the Heracleides mentioned at 16-17, whose own father was formerly called Papontheus. Alternatively the scribe may have confused him with Heracleides son of Sarapion and grandson of Heracleides (9 n.), or written the names here in the wrong order.

20-21 Πα[πον]θέα Σαδάλου τοῦ Διδύμου This name appears twice on the *verso*.

21-22 Σααμ.[] Τοτέως τοῦ καὶ Πλουτάρχου. Other than on the *verso*, where the rest of the name is also illegible, I have not found a name beginning Σααμ. .

011 and 012 Declarations of uninundated land

83/65(a)

6 x 13.5 cm

January to July 225

These papyri were stuck together, as part of a *tomos*, in the royal scribe's office (see p. 70).

There is a trace of a letter above **011** and part of a *tau* above **012**, indicating that **012** must have been at least the 300th document in the roll. P. Osl. III 98, which has 398 at the top, is the highest document number identified by Clarysse in this context (Clarysse 2003, 352).

011, **012** and **013** are addressed to Aurelius Nemesion also called Dionysius, who is attested elsewhere (**011.2-3 n.**). The hands of **011** and **012** are similar but not identical; they were probably written by a scribe in a village office, and these copies were sent to the royal scribe's office in Oxyrhynchus. Neither refers to the orders pursuant to which it was made (see **010.3 n.**). The surviving part of **012** does not contain ἄβροχος, ἐπηντλήμενη or other vocabulary clearly relating to uninundated land: see **012.11-12 n.**

011

The top margin is intact. We have the first 16 lines of the document but up to 14 letters are missing from the beginning of each line and there is a tear after line 5 where an entire line is missing. We cannot tell how many lines are missing at the foot. The writing is across the fibres and the back is blank.

1].

2 [Αύρηλίω Νεμεσίω]νι τῷ καὶ

3 [Διονυσίω βασιλικῷ] γρ(αμματεῖ)] Ὁξ(υρυγχίτου)

4 [παρὰ 10]δώρου

5 [14].ατου

6 [10 ἀπογράφομαι]

7 [πρὸς τὸ ἐνεσ]τὸς δ (ἔτος)

8 [Μάρκου Αύρηλίου]υ Σεουήρου

9 [Ἀλεξάνδρου Καίσα]ρος τοῦ κυρίου

10 [ἦν ἔχω ἄβροχο]ν περὶ κώ-

11 [μην 11] ἐκ τοῦ Θεο-

12 [5 καὶ 6]αίου κλή(ρου)

13 [εἰς 11]ν Νεχθεν-

14 [ἰβιος 9]ς τοῦ .υ

15 [14] ἄβροχ(..) ἀπὸ

16 [14]. ἄβροχ

3 οξ̄ 7 λ 12 κλ^η 15 αβρο^χ

“To Aurelius Nemesion also called Dionysius, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from [I register] for the present 4th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord the uninundated land which I have near the village of in the allotment of Theo..... and, registered to son of Nechthenibis,uninundated land out of uninundated ...”

1 A trace of the number in the *tomos*.

2-3 Αὐρηλίω Νεμεσίω]νι τῷ καὶ Διονυσίω. Addressee of **012**, **013**, SB XX 14385 (26 Feb – 26 March 224) and XII **1459** (226), he was attested as royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome also in XVII **2125** (6.4.225) and P. Hamb. I 91 (end of 225): Whitehorne 2006, 144. See **010.1** n. for general references.

4-6 The declarer’s name, patronymic and grandfather’s name would have been stated here. He may have had a long name ending in –dorus, such as Olympiodorus, or a short name and a father called Isidorus. An alias may also have been included. του (l.5) may be the end of a name or the definite article.

7 [πρὸς τὸ ἐνεσ]τὸς δ (ἔτος). This is dated 224-225. See **010.4** and .5 n.

11-12 [10] ἐκ τοῦ Θεο[5 καὶ 6]αίου κλή(ρου) There is no trace of the village name which would have been included here, followed by the names of the original cleruchs

by which the land was still known. The missing word(s) could be **καὶ** or **τοῦ**, or **τοῦ καὶ** or **σὺν τῷ** (see **014.7-8 n.**) and the missing parts of two names if the second name is short. *Kleroi* of Theodotus, Theodorus and Theophilus are known (Pruneti 1975, 182-183). A *kleros* of **Θεοδώρου καὶ Αὐλαίου**, in the Upper toparchy near Sko, is attested in XXXVI **2726** 12-13 (119) and XVII **2137** 16-17 (226); this would fit here, but Sko is a shorter village name than one would expect. III **504** 11-12 contains **ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Θεοδότ[ου] πρ[ο]σθέματος**, a technical variant for *kleros* (Pruneti 1975, 223 n.9): this was in the Eastern toparchy, near Psobthis. A *kleros* of Theodotus was also attested in the Western toparchy (II **344**); if the *tomos* was collated by area, this may be the relevant one (**012.7-8 n.**).

13 The name, patronymic and probably grandfather's name of the tenant who farmed the land described in 15-16 was stated here. If the reading of **Νεχθεν** is correct, his father's name was Nechthenibis, but if the *chi* is not correct there are many more possibilities and the preceding *nu* may be part of that name rather than the ending of the preceding word.

15-16 The land the subject of the declaration would have been described in these and the following lines. **ἀπό** in l. 15 signifies that the land first identified was part of a larger holding. The repetition of **ἀβροχ()** suggests that the declaration concerned at least two plots of dry land, although there may have been only one the extent of which was repeated.

012

The top margin is intact and we have the first 16 lines, with slight traces only of another four. The left margin is probably intact but the first letter of some lines is hidden, where it was stuck below **011**. It is torn on the right and up to 5 letters are missing from the end of each line, with more missing from 7 and 16. The writing is across the fibres and the back is blank.

1 τ[

2 [A]ύρηλίω Νεμεσί[ωνι]

3 τ]ῷ κ(αὶ) Διονυσίω βα[σιλ(ικῷ)]

- 4 γραμ(ματεῖ) Ὀξυρυγχ[ίτου
 5 [π]αρά Αὐρηλίας [Θατ-
 6 ρ]ῆτος χρημ(ατιζούσης) μη[τ(ρὸς) Θατ-
 7 [ρ]ῆτος ἀπ[ὸ Κερκε-
 8 θύρεως δ(ιὰ) Α[πίων-
 9 ος Ἀπίωνος μ[ητ(ρὸς)
 10 Διογενίδος ἀπο .[4
 11 ἀ]πογρά(φομαι) (π)ρ(ὸς) τήν [τοῦ
 12 ἐνεστῶτ(ος) δ (ἔτους) [Μάρκου
 13 Α]ὐρηλίου Σεουή[ρου
 14 Ἀ]λεξάνδρου Καίσ[αρος
 15 τ]οῦ κυρίου πε[ρὶ κώ-
 16 μ]ην Σεν...[
 17 .
 18 .
 19.
 20 .

3 κ— 4 γραμῆ 6 χρημ^μ 8 ζ^δ 11 ἀ]πογραφῆ, ρ^λ 12 ἐ]νεστῶτ ς

“3[..]

To Aurelius Nemesion also called Dionysius, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Aurelia Thatres, officially described as daughter of Thatres, from Kerkethyris, through Apion son of Apion, whose mother is Diogenides. I register for the present 4th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord, near the village of Sen.....”

1 The *tau* above the declaration indicates that there were at least 300 documents in the *tomos*.

2-4 See **011.1n**.

5-6 I suggest that the declarer's name was Aurelia Thatres (as in PSI V 467, Oxyrhynchus, 360) and that her mother was also called Thatres. The *eta* is not clear at the start of l. 6 but the only other possibility is a *kappa* and I have not found an appropriate name with that ending.

6 χρημ(ατιζούσης). This term, used of a woman here as in e.g. IX **1200** 11 (270), XLI **2974** 4 (162), IX **542** (3rd century) and XIX **2231** 7 (241) but also used of a man in many examples, indicates that a person has no father and is officially known by reference to his or her mother. This usage has not been attested outside the Oxyrhynchite nome; in other areas ἀπάτωρ is used. See Malouta 2007, 615 to 619.

7-8 Κερκε-]θύρεως. A village in the Western toparchy (Benaissa 2009, 114-116).

8 δ(ιὰ) Aurelia makes the declaration through a man, who is not given any description such a secretary or manager (as in XLII **3047** 3-4).

10 ἀπὸ .[4? There is room only for a very short village name to be inserted here, possibly Pela, which is also in the Western toparchy.

11-12 (π)ρ(ός) τήν [τοῦ] ἐνεστῶτ(ος) δ (ἔτους). This wording is not found in *abrochia* declarations, but is usual in census declarations. Although mixed rolls are rare (Clarysse 2003, 355), documents in a *tomos* were not always of the same type; see XII **1433** and **1549**. In a census application, the reference to the year would normally be followed by, for example, κατ'οἰκίαν ἀπογραφὴν (as P. Rein. II 93, I **171** (published under II **254**), VIII **1111** (203), XXXVI **2762**), and then by a term like τήν ὑπάρχουσάν μοι or τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μοι. I think it likely that the insertion of τήν was an error by a scribe used to compiling census declarations (although neither 224 nor 225 was a census year: see XLII **3077**); see P. Corn. 17, where a similar omission occurs in a census declaration, and **010.5 n**. For the abbreviation of πρὸς as a rho with a curved stroke above it see XL **2915** 20 n.

12-15 The same year as **011**.

15 A number of Oxyrhynchite villages begin with the letters Sen. Three such villages are commonly attested in the Western toparchy (see 7-8 n.): Senekeleu, Senao and Senokomis (see Benaissa 2009). The fourth letter does not look like an *omicron* but may be an *alpha* or an *epsilon*. In XIV **1659** 3, 6, 35 the name Senekeleu was next after Kerkethyris in a list of payments, while VI **899** 7 includes the words *περὶ Σενεκελεὺ καὶ Κε*[. Senekeleu is the most likely solution, as the closest of these villages to Kerkethyris, although holdings comprised in a declaration were not necessarily near one another.

013 Declaration of uninundated land

29 4B.44/C(1-3)d

6.5 x 20 cm

January to July 225

This document has the same addressee as **011** and **012**, and was also part of a *tomos* (see p. 70), although no number is visible at the top; it is on the left of the surviving papyrus and as normal was stuck over the document on the right. It contains 30 lines, and the top and bottom margins are intact. Unfortunately, the tear on the left means that the description of the land is very patchy, but there were several plots some of which, unusually, may have been leased and some which may have been imperial estate land (17 n.).

Some 6 letters are missing from the start of lines 1 to 11, and probably lines 21 and 22, 10 or 12 from the start of lines 12 to 20 and 10 from the last five. The right margin is intact apart from the end of lines 1 and 3, where it is torn. The papyrus looks as if it was folded twice length-ways. There are a number of wormholes. It is written with the fibres and the subscription is in a different hand. Only a few traces of the document which followed it in the *tomos* have survived, next to ll. 21 to 30; it was in a different hand.

There is writing on the back of both **013** and the document which followed it, which, like P. Osl. II 26 a (see P. Osl. III 194) and BGU XI 2101 (see BGU XI 2131), must have been written in the royal scribe's office after the declarations were inserted in the *tomos*, as it is in a third hand and continues across both documents. It contains a number of references to Claudia Isidora, who is probably Claudia Isidora also called Apia, an absentee landlord who lived in Alexandria. Her estate in the Oxyrhynchite nome is known to have come into the possession of the tax authorities, possibly though not necessarily through confiscation, shortly before June 225 (XXI 2566). The notes on the back of **013**, which include references to arouras and to amounts or quantities, may be an early assessment by tax officials of the extent of the land they had taken over. On Claudia Isidora see generally Thomas 2004 and LXX 4772-4778 Introduction, p. 48.

1 [Αύρηλί]ω Νεμεσίωφι τῷ καὶ Δ[ιονυσίω βασιλ(ικῷ)]

2 [γραμ]ματεῖ Ὀξυρυγίτου

3 [παρὰ]Αύρηλίου Ἡρακλᾶτος Θώνιος μητροῦ[ς]

4 [Τσενο]νώφριος ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως.

- 5 [ἀπογρά]φομαι κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα πρὸς τὸ
- 6 [ἐνεστ]ὸς δ (ἔτος) Μ[άρ]κου Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου
- 7 [Ἀλεξάν]δρου Κα[ί]σρος τοῦ κυρίου ἃς ἔχω
- 8 [. . 6 . .] .ωσει Αὐρηλίου Πλουτίωνος
- 9 [. . 6 . . .] ος καὶ Τσενοννώφριος ἀδελφῆς
- 10 [. . 6 . .] . . ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἵππικοῦ κ[λή]ρου
- 11 [. . 6 . .] Ζωίλος Ἀχιλλέως τοῦ . . . εως
- 12 [. 11] . (μοναρτάβου) ἀβρόχ(ου) (ἀρούρας) β
- 13 [. 11] εις μὲν Πλουτίωνα
- 14 [. 11] . τος δι(ὰ) τοῦ ὑπὸ κλ()
- 15 [11] .ος καὶ μετόχων
- 16 [10 Δ]ιονυσιο() λ()
- 17 [10 ἀ]νὰ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) γ ἀβ(ρόχου) (ἀρούρας) α ς
- 18 [11 Ζ]ωιλᾶτος α . . [.] .
- 19 [11] ἀδελφῶν . [
- 20 [11] . . [
- 21 [6] . ραψατο καὶ Φμόις [] .
- 22 [6] . Ζωίλου καὶ Πτολλᾶ
- 23 [3 ἀ]νὰ (ἀρτ.) γ (ἀρουρῶν) γ'ιβ'
- 24 [(ἔτους) δ Αὐτοκ]ράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου
- 25 [Αὐρηλίου Σ]εουήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου
- 26 [Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐ]τυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
- 27 [10] ς Αὐρήλιοις

28 [Αὐρήλιος Ἡρα]κλᾶτος ἐπιδέδω[κ]α .

29 [10] . . . ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ

30 [μὴ εἰδότος] γράμματα.

6 ς 11 ζώϊλος 12 αϞ, αβροχ, ζ 17⊕ 18 ζώϊλατος 23 Ϟ, ζ

“To Aurelius Nemesion also called Dionysius, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Aurelius Heraclas, son of Thonis, whose mother was Tsenonnophris, from the city of Oxyrhynchus. I register in accordance with the orders, for the current 4th year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Caesar the lord, the land which I haveof Aurelius Ploution son of and Tsenonnophris [his] sister... from the cavalry allotment of Ptolemaeus

12 ...out of land rated at one artaba per aroura, 2 arouras of uninundated land.....

17...[land] rated at 3 1/12 artabas,

23... land rated at 3 artabas, 1/3 1/12 arouras

24 Dated the 4th year of Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus,Aurelii. I, Aurelius son of Heraclas, made the declaration. I,, wrote for him as he is illiterate.”

1-2 See **011.2-3** n.

3 Τσενο]ννώφριος The name appears here as the mother of the declarer and in 1.9 as the sister of Aurelius Ploution who may be the landlord (8 n.).

5 κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα. See **010.3** n.

5-6 πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστ]ὸς δ (ἔτος). The usual expression in the Oxyrhynchite (see **010.5** n. and **011.7**).

8 If the visible part of the first letter is the end of the stroke of a *theta*, the line may begin ἐν μισ]θώσει, which would indicate that the declarer was a tenant of Aurelius Ploution. This would be unusual (only BGU XI 2101 (1) and (2) are clearly made by a tenant), and

would suggest that the tenant was responsible for taxes (see pp.70-72). An Aurelius Ploution whose father was called Zoilus appears in XIV **1709** (224), a fragment of a sale document; he is unlikely to be the person named here as, although there are two references to a Zoilus (11 and 22), his patronymic (the missing word at the beginning of l. 9) should not end in a *sigma*.

10 ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἰππικοῦ κ[λήρου]. This is land in a *kleros* or allotment granted initially to a cavalry-man called Ptolemaeus. Cavalry allotments were larger than those of the infantry, except the royal foot-guards (LXIII **4356** 9 n.). III **506** 23-24 refers to land περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν Πέλα ἐκ τοῦ Διοκλέους καὶ Πτολεμαίου Πέρσου ἰππικοῦ κλήρου (the only reference in Pruneti 1975 to a cavalry allotment) and **01.10** mentions a *kleros* of Ptolemaeus the hipparch near Chysis. I have been unable to decipher a village name in **013**.

12 (μοναρτάβου). See **010.6-7** n.

17 ἀ]νὰ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) γ Some land in the declaration, probably *ousiake* or imperial estate land, was rated at over 3 artabas per aroura: see **014.4** n.

23 ἀνὰ] (ἀρτάβας) γ See 17 n.

24-27 The same year date as **011** and **012**.

014 Declaration of uninundated land

30.4B.36/H(6-9)c

7 x 15.1 cm

25 February to 26 March 240

This mid-brown papyrus contains the last 20 lines, and, some 4.8 centimetres below the signature clause, a 2-line endorsement of execution, of a declaration of uninundated land. The side and bottom margins are intact. The top is torn so that the first line contains traces of letters but is unreadable; it is not possible to tell how many lines are missing. The usual abbreviations for artaba and aroura are used. The writing is with the fibres; the back is blank. The first hand is that of a well-practised scribe; the subscription clause, in a different hand, is less skilled and contains what may be spelling errors. The endorsement may be in a third hand. The papyrus was folded in half vertically and there are holes along the fold line, particularly in the bottom half, which do not affect the reading.

1 .[] []

2 εἰς Πετόσειριν Παθώθου

3 καὶ ἄλ(λους) ἀνὰ καθαροῦ λόγου

4 (ἀρτάβας) β ἱβ̄μη, ἀπὸ (ἀρουρῶν) ς (ἀρούρης) δ' καὶ

5 ἀπὸ (ἀρουρῶν) αλ' (ἀρούρης) δ' μ̄η (γίνεται) οὔσιακ(ῆς)

6 ἀβρόχ(ου) (ἀρούρης) λ' μ̄η καὶ περὶ Μου-

7 χιναρυῶ ἐκ τοῦ Λεοντί-

8 σκου σὺν τῷ Ἡρακλείδου

9 εἰς Καλαμίωνα Διδύμου

10 ιδιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου) ἀβρόχ(ου)

11 (ἀρούρας) ad' vacat

12 (ἔτους) γ̄ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

13 Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Γορδιανοῦ

14 Εὐσεβοῦς [Εὐ]τυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ

15 Φαμενώθ ' vacat

16 (m. 2) Αύρηλιος Σερήνος ό και

17 Εύδαίμων επίδοκα.

18 Αύρηλιος Σερήνος ἔγρα-

19 ψα υπέρ αὐτοῦ μή ει-

20 δυτος γράμματα

21 (m.1?) ἀπεγρ(άφη) π(αρά) πραγμ(ατικῶ) Παλώ-

22 σεως.

3 αλ^λ 4 ♂, υ, υ 5 υ, υ, Γ, οὔσια^κ 6 αβρο^λ, υ 10 α♁, αβρο^λ 12 λ, 17 ι.

ἐπιδέδωκα 19 ὑπερ 19-20 ι. εἰδότης 21 ἀπεγρς, π', πραγ^μ

“...registered to Petosiris son of Pathotes and others, rated at $2 \frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{48}$ artabas at basic rate, out of 6 arouras, $\frac{1}{4}$, and out of $1 \frac{1}{2}$ arouras, $\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{48}$, making a total of uninundated imperial estate land of $\frac{25}{48}$ arouras, and near Mouchinaryo, from the *kleros* of Leontiscus and also that of Heraclides, registered to Calamion son of Didymus, of private land rated at 1 artaba, $1 \frac{1}{4}$ arouras uninundated.

In the 3rd year of Emperor Caesar Marcus Antonius Gordianus Pius Felix Augustus, Phamenoth.

I, Aurelius Serenus also called Eudaimon, made the declaration. I, Aurelius Serenus, wrote for him as he is illiterate.

Registered at the office of the *pragmaticus* of Palosis.”

2 εἰς. See 10.8 n.

3 ἀνὰ καθαροῦ λόγου. I have not found this exact expression elsewhere in papyri. It qualifies the rate of tax at which the land is assessed. In this context it is probably not a reference to the fact that the grain is supposed to be supplied pure (clean and unadulterated) (Wallace 1938, 40) but shows that the tax rate indicated is the basic rate of

tax, which does not include any surtaxes or supplements such as *προσμετρούμενα*, which were calculated on a percentage rather than on an *artaba per aroura* basis (see Wallace 1938, 12, 23, 29, 39 and 40 for a description of additional taxes on land, including special levies throughout the first half of the 3rd century, and P. Mich. VI 372 (179/180 or 211/212) Introduction, p.24, for examples of extra taxes payable on imperial estate land).

4 It is not unusual for tax rates to be expressed in tiny fractions (see Rowlandson 1996, 71-80, 291-293). The land concerned is *ousiake* (5 n.), which is normally taxed at a higher rate than private land (Wallace, 1938, 11). This rate is low for this type of land; in excess of 14 has been recorded (see Rowlandson 1987, 292; 1996, 72 and references; Wallace 1938, 11). But, as with the low rates for *basilike* noted by Rowlandson (1996, 72 and Table 3), additional amounts may have been payable here, possibly in money.

5 οὐσιακ(ῆς). This is the only reference in an Oxyrhynchite *abrochia* declaration to *ousiake ge*, land which formed part of the imperial estates (see Rowlandson 1996, 55-60; Thompson 1976, 35-56 *passim*). Such land was sub-let in the same way as private land. There were two plots in the name of Petosiris and others.

6-7 *περὶ Μουχιναρῶν*. There are two villages with this name in the Oxyrhynchite nome; one in the Lower toparchy and the other (clearly attested only once, in P. Strasb. IV 220.1) in the Thmoisepho (Benaissa 2009, 163-164). Palosis, named in l. 22, is in the Thmoisepho toparchy so it is possible that this is the Thmoisephon Mouchinaryo. For the meaning of *περὶ* in this context see 010.6 n.

7-8 *ἐκ τοῦ Λεοντίσκου σὺν τῷ Ἡρακλείδου*. A *kleros* of Leontiscus in the Oxyrhynchite nome is attested in BGU VI 1228 (258/7 BC); its location is not clear and has been suggested as being possibly in the Upper, Eastern or Western toparchies (see Uebel 1968, no. 1417, p. 335 n.; Pruneti 1975, 186-7). There are references to a *kleros* of Heraclides in the Lower, Upper and Western toparchies, but none in conjunction with that of Leontiscus, nor is any in the area of Palosis or Mouchinaryo (Pruneti 1975, 180, 224; Uebel no.1289, p. 302). The *kleros* may have been granted originally to two cleruchs jointly, Leontiscus and Heraclides, or, more likely, the reference is to land situated across two neighbouring *kleroi* (Zucker 1964, 105). By this time the reference to a *kleros* was topographical only; it did not have any significance for the nature of the title (Rowlandson 1996, 43-45).

9 Καλαμίωνα. This name is not attested in papyri; similar names are Calamos (XVI 1917 16 and SB V 8086.23) and Calamon (P. Strasb. II 139.6).

10 ιδιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου) See 010.6-7 n.

12 This declaration was made in the same year as XII 1549, which comprises two declarations relating to land at Peenno, a village in the Middle toparchy. The flood of 239 may have been exceptionally poor. There is no letter for a date after the month name, as with SB XX 14385.25, XII 1549, col ii 43 and XLII 3047 42.

16-17 Αὐρήλιος Σερῆνος ὁ καὶ Εὐδαίμων. ὁ καὶ means that Eudaimon was another given name, rather than a nickname, of the deponent. Such names were sometimes given to distinguish a son from an older family member (see Hobson 1989, 171), although a person may also have used his father's name in this way (010.6-7 n.). The person signing for him (l.18), who has the same name, may have been his father or son.

17 ἐπιδοκα for ἐπιδέδωκα. See Gignac, *Grammar* II, 242, for examples where the reduplication has been omitted from verbs in the past tense, including ἐπίδκωα for ἐπιδέδωκα, and I 275-6 for examples of ο being substituted for ω, a very frequent occurrence throughout the Roman period. Considering the handwriting and the substitution of υ for ο in l. 20, these are probably orthographical errors.

19-20 εἰδυτος for εἰδότος. See Gignac, *Grammar* I, 273 for examples of υ being substituted for ο in accented syllables, and 17 n. above.

21 ἀπεγρ(άφη) π(αρά) πραγμ(ατικῶ). No published Oxyrhynchite *abrochia* declaration bears an endorsement of registration by the recipient(s), although most are broken before the end. Similar endorsements to this are found in a number of declarations from the Fayum (Avogadro 1935, 154). A single endorsement does not mean a sole addressee; three with three recipients (P. Mich.VI 368 (170), P. Bad II 23 (190) and SB XVI 12563 (201)) are endorsed once only, at the office of the *comogrammateus*. All declarations whose addressee(s) are legible are addressed to one or more of three officials, the *basilico-grammateus*, the strategus and the *comogrammateus*, and all the published endorsements are at the office of one or more of those officials: see Habermann 1997, 228-23. None refers to a *pragmaticus*. πραγματικός is a general term for an official in the Roman period, often used in connection with tax-collection, but here, qualified as it is by the name of a village, it is another term for *comogrammateus* (see Thomas 1975, 119, citing P. Leit. 16=P.Wisc.II.86.27

(244-247) and VI **899** =W. Chr. 361 (245-249 or later) and generally on the office of *πραγματικός* Thomas 1975; Gonis, 2000 (2); CPR XXIII 17.8n.).

21-22 *Παλώσεως*. Holdings of land near Palosis may have been exceptionally fragmented (Rowlandson 1996, 129). The village was also mentioned in two other *abrochos* declarations, VII **1044** and XII **1459**. See 6-7 n. and Benaissa 2009, 210-211.

015 Letter regarding the corn dole

97/10(e)

9 x 5 cm

After 13th May, 272?

015 contains the upper part of a letter from Phileas to Nemesianus concerning the corn dole. It was not found near XL **2892-2940**, the other documents comprising the Oxyrhynchus “corn dole archive”, or the only other published papyri on this topic, P. Strasb. VII 616 and SB XII 11263 = P. Strasb. VII 53 re-ed. The use of ἐφέστιον (see 5 n.) is unusual and suggests that the papyrus relates to the extension of the dole to non-Oxyrhynchites. For information about the Oxyrhynchus corn dole see Rea’s Introduction to XL, pp.1-26, Lewis 1974, Rowland 1976, Carrié 1998 and Sharp 2007. Rea and Carrié differ as to whether Oxyrhynchites had to apply for the dole or were automatically listed by the phylarchs, as to the role of the lottery and in relation to the roll-call or *anagoria*. I find Rea’s interpretation preferable, but these differences do not extend to the method of admission of non-Oxyrhynchites.

There is a wide margin on the left of the papyrus and the top, left and right margins are complete; it is torn after l. 7, revealing traces only of one more line. Starting from ἐμοῦ in line 6 the letters are thicker and darker, suggesting that the pen was dipped in the ink again at that point. A variety of letter forms is used but the writing is fluent, suggesting a careless but practised hand. The papyrus is mid-brown, the writing is with the fibres and the back is blank.

1 Φιλέας Νεμεσιανῶ τῶ τιμειω-

2 τάτῳ (vac.) χαίρειν. (vac.)

3 προσενέγκας τοῖς ἄρχουσι τοῖς τὸ

4 σιτηρέσιον πιπιστευμένοις τὸ

5 ἐφεστιόν μου κεχροτισμένον

6 εἰς τὸ γ (ἔτος) Παχῶν ιη, ἐμοῦ δὲ λα-

7 βόντος ἀπὸ τοῦ .[.] .ιου σου[

8 τ. [

1 1. τιμιω-; 3 προσεγγ'κας 4 1. πεπιστευμένοις 5 κεχροτισμενον χρ *ex. corr.*

“Phileas to the most esteemed Nemesianus, greetings. Having produced to the magistrates entrusted with the corn dole [evidence of] my principal residence dated 18th Pachon in the third year, while I took from

1 The names Phileas and Nemesianus appear elsewhere in the corn dole archive. A Phileas is attested in XL **2925** 10 (undated), which contains no information about him but may indicate an Alexandrian connection at l.12. A Nemesianus was an identity witness in relation to a corn dole application in January/February 269 (XL **2914** 18). An Alexandrian called Aurelius Apollonius also called Nemesianus wrote XL **2916**, but if he was the addressee here one would have expected the name Apollonius rather than Nemesianus to be used. The addressee must have been well-known to the writer, who uses no title or patronymic for either Nemesianus or himself; this is clearly a private letter, although it may have been an informal appeal or complaint, about an earlier application, to a friend who was a higher authority than the magistrates to which it refers.

3-4 τοῖς ἄρχουσι τοῖς τὸ σιτηρέσιον πιπιστευμένοις. I have not seen this exact term applied elsewhere in relation to the corn dole. Its use is a further indication that the document is a private and informal letter; as well as misspelling, Phileas has not troubled to use a technical term for the office-holders. The usage of πιστεύω is analogous to τοῦ οὖν πεπιστευμένου τὰ χῶματα (XII **1469** 16, a petition of representatives of a village to the prefect's deputy, from 298) and SB VI 9050 v 12-13 (1st to 2nd century: τοῖς τὰ κυριακὰ πιστευομένοις). See also P. Turner 44.16 and P. Sakaon 44.15-16 (both 331/2) and P. Cair. Isid. 63.18-19 (after November 296). Applications for the corn dole were usually made to the γραμματεὺς σιτηρείου or (possibly in the more complex cases) to some ὑπομνηματογράφος, whose title was included in the address (see XL Introduction, 31). They would have reported to the magistrates in charge. XL **2913** was addressed to τοῖς διακρειταῖς ἄρχουσι σιτηρεσί[ου], XL **2918** to τοῖς αἰρεθεῖσι ὑπὸ τῆς κρατίστης βουλῆς δι[ι]άδοσιν ποιήσασθαι τοῦ σιτηρεσί[ου] and XL **2924** is a notice from a gymnasiarch, another named individual καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀρχόντων. It is likely that these three groups were the same. XL **2923**, a request to participate in the dole on grounds of public service, was addressed to a strategus; perhaps this was a special case or from

someone trying to pull rank. For discussion of the roles of the various officials see Rea (XL Introduction, 30-32) and Carrié 1998, 272-287.

5 ἐφέστιον. This term appears in only one published corn dole papyrus, XL **2916**, an application from an Alexandrian citizen, who had a property (ἐστία) in Oxyrhynchus, to participate in the corn dole there. Three categories of persons were entitled to participate in the draw for the corn dole: ἐπικριθέντες, ὁμόλογοι and ῥεμβοί. These were respectively metropolitans, namely Oxyrhynchite citizens who had passed their *epikerisis* and paid the reduced rate of poll tax, other residents of the town registered there who paid the full tax, and those who had carried out public service there (Lewis 1974 and XL Introduction, 2-5). Members of the first two categories were described as ἀναγραφόμενοι in a quarter of Oxyrhynchus, and, so far as is apparent from the published papyri, none of them had to provide his ἐφέστιον, or evidence of it. To the first category were added citizens of Rome and Alexandria who fulfilled some sort of residence qualification: XL Introduction, 3, **2915** 18 and **2927** 3 n. The reference to Roman citizens must be to families who held that honour before 212 (Sharp 1998, 225). Delia (1991, 25) suggests that the dole was offered to citizens of Alexandria to encourage them to perform liturgies in Oxyrhynchus but I doubt that is economically sound, particularly if those who had performed liturgies only had the right to participate in it for a year or so (Lewis 1974, 160). Those Alexandrian citizens who made claims on grounds of public service (XL **2901**, **2915**) probably did not fulfil the residence requirements.

2916 refers to a decision of the Oxyrhynchus *boule* that citizens of Alexandria could also μεταλαβεῖν τῆς τοῦ σίτου δωρεᾶς and the writer sent τοῦ ἐφεστί[ου] τὸ ἀντίγραφο[ν] to substantiate his claim (9-10). The word ἐφέστιον also appears in **2916** 5 but the word(s) immediately following it have not been deciphered; Rea noted that perhaps the next word was αἰτή[σά]μενος, meaning that the writer had petitioned for permission to have an official residence in Oxyrhynchus, but that something meaning just ἔχων would be easiest (5 n.). ἐφέστιον appears in only 13 published papyri; see P. Jena II 7.3 n. for a list of references. The census edict of C. Vibius Maximus (Chr. Wilck. 202: 104) required persons from the *chora* who were living at Alexandria to ἐπα[νελ]θεῖν εἰς τὰ ἔαυ[τῶν] ἐ]φέστια (ll.23-24), in order to make their declarations in the usual way, and to labour in the fields there. This suggests that the census declarations had to be completed where the ἐφέστιον was. One of the persons named in P. Oslo III 111.235 (235), a list of free men and freedmen in two quarters of Oxyrhynchus, lived in a house in the quarter being

recorded but had his ἐφέστιον in another; all others in what appear to be similar circumstances used the term ἀναγραφόμενος, and it is not clear whether the terms had the same meaning or a deliberate distinction was being drawn. XVII 2106 (early 4th century), a copy of a prefect's letter requiring gold to be sent from Oxyrhynchus, excluded ξένοι from the obligation unless they had established some sort of residence there (18-20: τὸ ἐφέστ[ιον] αὐτόθι κατεστήσαντο), had not already performed public service and were wealthy. In four drafts of the same petition, P. Ammon I 10 and 11, II 39 and 42 (348), the petitioner suggests that someone with his ἐφέστιον in the city or the Thebaid should be asked to stand as a guarantor; this could mean legal residence or property ownership. In SB XII 11104 (149) a person is described as having neither πόρον nor ἐφέστιον in the nome; this could be contrasting actual property with registration, or income-producing property with a residence. In SB VIII 9907 (388) ἐφέστιον ἔχων seems to mean no more or less than ἀπό but may indicate that the person was not originally from that place, as in IX 1206 (335), where the father of a child given for adoption is described as τὸ ἐφέστιον ἔχων in Oxyrhynchus, contrasting with his wife and child who are described as ἀπό the same city. In SB XVI 12290 (133?) a person who was entitled to marry an Antinoite woman and who had his ἐφέστιον in Antinoopolis (translated by Sijpesteijn as “domicile”) claimed the Antinoite exemption from being obliged to perform liturgies elsewhere; here it must mean something different from “origin”. P. Flor. I 103 (344-345?) is too damaged to be helpful.

The meaning of ἐφέστιον has given rise to some debate. Hombert and Préaux noted (1952, 71) that census returns showed that a person might live in one place, file his return in another and be registered or ἀναγραφόμενος in a third. Relying particularly on the authorities cited above, they considered that in P. Oslo III 111 ἐφέστιον had the same legal meaning as ἀναγραφόμενος, and that in the early 4th century at least it meant “le lieu d'une résidence stable où l'on est astreint à des prestations fiscales”; a person was liable to pay taxes where he had his ἐφέστιον (1952, 67). Braunert denied that the term necessarily had this legal meaning, suggesting it meant a secondary residence (Braunert 1964, 25 n. 39). I think that ἐφέστιον means “principal residence” so that, while most people would have been registered and resident in the same place, someone who originated and was ἀναγραφόμενος in, say, Alexandria could have an ἐφέστιον in Oxyrhynchus and that the term, which had a precise legal meaning, was only used when the distinction was being drawn, hence its relative rarity. ἐφέστιον ἔχων does not mean the same as

ἀναγραφόμενος, which appears in the majority of corn dole applications and which would surely have been used in **2916** and in **015** had it been the correct term.

ἀναγραφόμενος was only appropriate for metropolites of the place concerned (see Hombert and Préaux 1952, 104).

Rea translated τοῦ ἐφεστί[ου] τὸ ἀντίγραφο[ν] in **2916** 9-10 as “a copy [of the certificate?] of residence”. I think that this extension of the meaning of actual or legal residence described above applies in **015** also, and that the use of the term in this papyrus means that, like **2916**, it concerns a citizen of Alexandria, or a Roman citizen (there are no published applications from Roman citizens: LV Introduction, 3), who is not ἀναγραφόμενος in a district of Oxyrhynchus. We do not know what (if any) other proof or documentation had to be submitted in order for a Roman or Alexandrian citizen to be able to claim dole at Oxyrhynchus, the implication of **2916** clearly being that not all non-Oxyrhynchites who had houses or even principal residences there could participate in the dole.

5-6 κεχρονισμένον εἰς. This means “dated”: see Preisigke, WB s. v. 2, “datieren (ein Schreiben)”. In some judicial contexts it means “adjourned” (as XXII **2340**, from 192). Here, as it qualifies ἐφέστιον, it seems to mean the date on the evidence of residence, although the writer may have intended to refer to the date of its submission and be complaining about, or explaining, a late or delayed certification or submission: see 6 n.

6 τὸ γ (ἔτος) Παχῶν ιη We have evidence of the Oxyrhynchus corn dole from 265/6 (XL **2903** 10 n.) to June 272 (**2902**). This papyrus refers to 18th Pachon (13th May) in the third year of an unnamed emperor. It is too late to come from the reign of Claudius II (who probably died shortly before 28 August 270 in his second year but whose death was not known in Egypt until later) so I think it means the third year of Aurelian (271-272). See XL Introduction, 15-25 for a discussion of chronology.

At XL Introduction Rea notes that published applications from people who were successful in the lot for the corn dole were submitted in Thoth, Phaophi, Tubi and Mecheir and suggests that the main lottery was in Thoth, the first month of the year, while the other applications were supplementary. Pachon is later still. The author of this papyrus may be stressing that his evidence of residence, or his submission of it, was late.

7 τοῦ . [.] ἰου σου [The letter before the break may be a *theta*; if so, the reading τοῦ θ[ε]ίου σου is possible.

016 List of assistants of *praepositi pagorum*

104/34(a)

8 x 23 cm

338-340?

Introduction

016 contains a list of assistants of Oxyrhynchite *praepositi pagorum*, dating from the 4th century, possibly around 338-340.¹⁰⁷ It is the first complete list of its type from the Oxyrhynchite nome to be published; that nome was divided into 10 *pagi*, numbered from south to north, all of which are listed here.¹⁰⁸ Possible attestations of persons named in it are cited in the line notes below.

Pagi replaced the earlier division of the Oxyrhynchite nome into toparchies in 307-8. *Praepositi pagorum* are known to have held office until at least 365 (C. Theod. 12.6.8, which concerns obligations of persons who nominate *praepositi*);¹⁰⁹ the latest certain date for a *praepositus* listed in P. Louvre II 120 is 362 (P. Harr. II 219) and there is a later attestation for Eulogius (365) in XLVIII **3393**. The office was a liturgy undertaken by members of the bouletic class: *praepositi* are described sometimes as *bouletai* and at other times as *politeuomenoi*, possibly the term for those eligible to be *bouletai*, rather than those who actually were.¹¹⁰ Bowman estimated that there may have been 100 actual *bouletai* in Oxyrhynchus at any one time, out of an eligible class of some 300;¹¹¹ not all *bouletai* performed liturgies, nor is the converse true. The *boule* of each metropolis appointed *praepositi* to the *pagi* in its surrounding territory, usually for one year although sometimes longer: Aurelius Heras alias Dionysius (no.9 below) is attested as *praepositus* of the 8th *pagus* for at least two years between January 316 and April 318 (XII **1425**, XVII **2113**, **2114**, **2124**, XIX **2232**, LXIII **4358**).¹¹² It may have been difficult to find 10 different persons of the appropriate status to take these offices each year, and so perhaps it was not abnormal for some to hold office for longer periods or more than once. The *praepositi* were responsible for the administration of the villages in their respective *pagi*: their duties included determining who would fulfil village liturgies in response to nominations received and

¹⁰⁷ See pp. 109-110.

¹⁰⁸ Benaïssa 2009, 391-393.

¹⁰⁹ Cited by Lewis 1997, 42.

¹¹⁰ See Gonis 2008 with references to prior literature.

¹¹¹ Bowman 1971, 22-31.

¹¹² See Pruneti 1994.

overseeing the apportionment and collection of taxes and army supplies (as in X **1253**, see below). Their assistants were called βρηθοί, the usual word for assistants to a liturgist.¹¹³

Two lists of *praepositi* have been published to date. P. Louvre II 120 (2nd quarter of the 4th century, possibly around 340) contains a list of *praepositi pagorum* from the Hermopolite nome, prepared in connection with a *merismos*, or tax assessment. P. Strasb. IX 818 (also Hermopolite, from the 1st half of the 4th century) contains part of a list of *pagi* by number, with the names of the *praepositi* in different hands, as if each had signed for an allocation of something. **016** does not contain any indication of amounts or any prepositions to suggest that an activity such as tax collection is being carried out. It was probably drawn up in the offices of the *boule* by its clerk, for internal record purposes; the apparent lack of a prescript (although it is not certain that no lines are missing at the top, the lay-out makes a prescript unlikely) and the absence of formal titles make it unlikely that it was for sending to a higher authority. The assistants seem to have been privately appointed by the *praepositi* on an *ad hoc* basis, rather than being longer-serving members of a local government bureaucracy.¹¹⁴

The list is consistent from lines 1 to 14, with the *pagus* number and the name and office of the *praepositus* on one line and the name and office of his assistant on the next. In 15 and 17 the term *praepositus* is not written (possibly for reasons of space in 17, but more likely because the scribe thought it unnecessary) and must be assumed, but 16 and 18 are consistent with the preceding even-numbered lines. There are four lines, 19 to 22, about the 10th *pagus*. Line 19 appears to follow the normal format, with the *pagus* number and the name of the *praepositus* (omitting the name of the office), but 20 and 21 give two additional names, followed by the usual abbreviation for *praepositus*. See 19-21 n. Normally a *pagus* would have had a single *praepositus*.

Oxyrhynchite *praepositi pagorum*

In the introduction to P. Louvre II 120 (at pp. 110-113) Jördens sets out a list of *praepositi pagorum*, which includes 14 definitely and one other possibly known from the Oxyrhynchite nome.¹¹⁵ None of those has the same name as any in this papyrus. The πραιπόσιτοι πατριμωνιαλίων of VI **900** and P. Col. X 286 (also Oxyrhynchite) and probably P. Ryl.

¹¹³ On *praepositi* see generally Oertel 1917, 301-2, 369; Lallemand 1964, 131-134; Lewis 1997, 42; Mitthof 2001, 146-147.

¹¹⁴ See XLVIII **3384-3429** Introduction in relation to Papnuthis and Dorotheus and Lewis 1997, 105.

¹¹⁵ To the list in P. Louvre II 120 can be added further references to two Hermopolite *praepositi*: for Aur. Asclepiades (no.6) at *Tyche* 19 (2004), 123, and for Aur. Diocles (no. 14) in P. Sijp. 22.

IV 658 (of unknown provenance; see BL XI 191) are correctly omitted (P. Louvre II 120, p.110 n.1), as are a number of individuals described as ἀπὸ πραιποσίτων, signifying a former holder of that military rank (PSI I 90 (364), LXIII **4374** (365), SB IV 7445 (382), LXVIII **4677** (408) and XVI **1973** (420)), and PSI I 90 (although it is possible that *praepositi pagorum* could be meant: LXIII **4374** 14 n.). Two Oxyrhynchite *praepositi* called Horion and Eulogius were omitted from the P. Louvre II 120 list and Diogenes may be a third omission:

Horion. Horion was the author of four documents in the archive of Papnuthis and Dorotheus: XLVIII **3391** (16th January 360), **3392** (14th June 360: a tax receipt signed on his behalf by Dorotheus, where he is described as *praepositus*), **3405** and **3412**, and is assumed to be the *praepositus* of an unidentified *pagus*.¹¹⁶ His activities certainly correspond with those of a *praepositus pagi*: issuing tax receipts and orders to produce provisions for superiors, and having the power to send a soldier.

Eulogius. There are references in XLVIII **3400** 30 and **3425** 7 (both assumed to be from 359-365 and from the archive of Papnuthis and Dorotheus) and in SB V 7756 to a *praepositus* called Eulogius. **3400** is written by Papnuthis to his γεοῦχος or landlord, assumed to be a *praepositus* because of the reference to “the other *praepositus*” at l. 23. He must be called Eulogius, as **3400** 25-26 reads ποιήσον δὲ τὸν δεσπότη(ν) μου γεοῦχω(ν) Εὐλόγιων γράψαι. On the back (l. 30), in the same hand, is a reference to Eulogius the *praepositus* of our district. There seem accordingly to be two *praepositi* called Eulogius referred to in **3400**, which relates to attempted collection of corn at Berky, which was near Chysis (see **03.1** n.) in the extreme south of the nome, on the Hermopolite border.¹¹⁷ The Eulogius in **3425** is described as being πραιπόσιτος κώμης Τερύθειας; the editor explains this as meaning that Eulogius is the *praepositus* of the 4th *pagus*, in which Terythis is situated. (It is possible, but unlikely, that a military rank was meant in both these cases.) Eulogius *politeuomenos* in XLVIII **3393** 6 (8 June 365), which relates to tax-collection from the village of Terythis, may be the same person as in **3425**: the editor of **3393** points out that, if *praepositus* is meant, *politeuomenos* is an oddly imprecise description in such a case, but that does not rule out the possibility that this Eulogius held office as *praepositus* at

¹¹⁶ See XLVIII **3384-3429** Introduction and **3405** Introduction.

¹¹⁷ Benaissa maintained that Berky was in the Hermopolite nome prior to the 5th century, but it may have switched twice between the nomes in the 4th century. While I accept (as Benaissa) that **3400** does not expressly mention the Oxyrhynchite nome, I think it more likely that at the date of **3400**, and probably even earlier, it was in the Oxyrhynchite. See Drew-Bear 1979, 80-81; Gonis 2003 (2), 177; Mitthof 2003, 208-9; Benaissa 2009, 41; LXXIV **5010** 6 n.

around that time.¹¹⁸ SB V 7756 (27 September 359 and possibly part of the same archive) is a tax receipt signed on behalf of Eulogius *praepositus* by his son (possibly the son Sarapion mentioned at **3393** 20). It refers to an *epoikion* called Tancheo, which was probably in the northern part of the nome, in the Lower toparchy, and so could not have been in the 4th *pagus*, which was further south and comprised villages in the Eastern and Western toparchies.¹¹⁹ Tancheo might however have been in the 8th *pagus*, which did include some villages in the Lower toparchy,¹²⁰ and so the Eulogius in SB V 7756 might have been *praepositus* of that *pagus*, which is the one attributed to Eulogius in **016**.15-16. I have not found any examples of *praepositi* holding office in different *pagi* at different times (although Flavius Olympiodorus (no. 40 in Jördens' list) held office in two *pagi* simultaneously) and there are six years between SB V 7756 and **3393**, so I think it unlikely that only one Eulogius is mentioned in all four papyri **3393**, **3400**, **3425** and SB V 7756, although that is possible. More likely, there were three *praepositi* called Eulogius: one in SB V 7756 (359), one in **3393**, **3400** and **3425**, for whom Papnuthis and Dorotheus worked, and another, for whom they did not work, in **3400**. Any of these might conceivably be the Eulogius in **016** but the analysis of dates below makes me think that probably none of them was. Eulogius was a fairly common name. See 15-16 n. for a discussion of 4th century *bouleutai* called Eulogius.

Diogenes. Each of Papnuthis and Dorotheus was described as βονηθός to Horion (XLVIII **3391**, **3392** and **3412**: separately, but the proximity of dates of **3391** (Papnuthis: 6th January (?) 360) and **3392** (Dorotheus: 14th June 360) suggests this might have been a joint appointment) and to Eulogius (XLVIII **3393** (jointly) and **3400** (Papnuthis alone)). They were also jointly βονηθοί to a third “master”, Diogenes (XLVIII **3415**, **3416**), who had a third assistant also, called Eudaimon (**3415**). The editor noted that the “tone and subject-matter” of these papyri (tax collections) suggested that Diogenes was also a *praepositus pagi*.¹²¹ There is no reference to a place or *pagus* in **3415** or **3416** but on the basis of the dates of some other documents in the archive and a presumed 5th indiction year, the editor suggested 376 as the most likely date (**3415** Introduction). If this is correct this would be a very late reference to a *praepositus pagi*, but 361, also a 5th indiction year, is equally possible, which would mean that Papnuthis and Dorotheus worked for Horion in 360, Diogenes in 361 and for Eulogius at some time afterwards, possibly (on the basis of **3393**) 365.

¹¹⁸ See XLVIII **3393** Introduction and Gonis 2008.

¹¹⁹ Benaissa 2009 314, 392.

¹²⁰ Benaissa 2009, 393.

¹²¹ XLVIII **3384-3429**, Introduction, at 75-76 and **3416** Introduction.

Assuming a one-year term of office being the norm for a *praepositus*, I would suggest that Horion, Eulogius and Diogenes were all *praepositi* of the same pagus and that Papnuthis and Dorotheus were employed by each of them in succession. See generally XLVIII **3384-3429** Introduction.

For ease of reference, I set out below an expanded list of Oxyrhynchite *praepositi pagorum*. Those from **016** are listed separately at the end.

No.	Name.	Pagus	Date	Attestations
1	Αὐρ. Ἀχιλλεύς	3	361	XLIX 3479 and BL IX 203
2	Αὐρ. Δίδυμος Διδύμου	8	309	LV 3788
3	Διογένης*	?	61?	XLVIII 3415 and 3416
4	Εὐλόγιος*	?	359	SB V 7756
5	Εὐλόγιος*	4?	c.365	XLVIII 3393 , 3400 and 3425
6	Εὐλόγιος*	?	c.365	XLVIII 3400
7	Αὐρ. Εὐτρύγιος	10	361	LXVII 4598 and 4599
8	Κλ. Ἡράκλειος ὁ καὶ Πλούταρχος	1	311	XXXIII 2668 =SB VIII 9875
9	Αὐρ. Ἡρᾶς ὁ καὶ Διονύσιος	8	316-318	XII 1425 =Sel. Pap. II 345, XVII 2113 , 2114 =Sel. Pap. II 427 and 2124 =Sel. Pap. II 344, and BL VIII 254, XIX 2232 and Palme 1989, 246, n. 259, LXIII 4358 . See Pruneti 1994.
10	Αὐρ. Θέων (with no. 13)	5	347	IX 1190
11	Αὐρ. Θεωνῖνος	2	327	SB XVI 12543=PSI IV 309, with BL IX 286
12	Αὐρ. Ἰσίδωρος	5	336	PSI X 1106 and 1107
13	Φλ. Π[(with no. 10)	5	347	IX 1190
14	Αὐρ. Πλουτίων	3	329	LI 3621
15	Πτολεμῖνος	8	362	P. Harr. II 219 and <i>CSBE</i> ² 57
16	Αὐρ. Σαραπάμων Εὐλογίου	1	346	LXI 4128
17	Αὐρ. Σαραπίων	?	313	LIV 3741 r. <i>descr.</i>
18	Φιλόξενος	5	323-4?	P. Harr. II 213
19	Αὐρ. Χω[**	5 and 6?	319	PSI Congr. XVII 28
20	Ἵωρίων*	?	360	XLVIII 3391 , 3392 , 3405 and 3412

From **016**:

Name	Pagus
Ἀντίοχος	4
Ἀφθόνιος	10
Ἀπίων	7
Γερόντιος	9
Εὐδαίμων	2
Εὐλόγιος*	8
Θεόδωρος	6
Θεόδωρος	10
Κορνήλιος?	8
Παιάνιος	3
Πτολεμαῖος?	10
Παῦλος	5

Notes: *See pp.105-107.

**May not be from Oxyrhynchus.

Names

I set out below the result of a search of the DDBDP in June 2011 showing the number of attestations of the names in this papyrus.

Name	Occurrences	Occurrences 300-400 in Oxyrhynchus
Ἀντίοχος	c.150	4
Ἀφθόνιος	29	10
Ἀπίων	>700	28
Γαιανός	44	5
Γερόντιος	>200	37 (at least 12 are 1 person)
Ἑρμείας	>100	23
Εὐδαίμων	> 700	>60
Εὐλόγιος	>200	>50
Θεόδωρος	>1,000	>50
Θεωνῖνος	28	5
Ἰσίδωρος	>1,000	41
Κορνήλιος	>200	16
Παιάνιος	9	6
Πτολεμαῖος	>3,000	43
Παῦλος	>700	49
Σαρμάτης	149	28
Ἵριων	>1,000	96

Date

016 is undated. It is unlikely that it was written in any of the years for which we already have dated records of other Oxyrhynchite *praepositi*, namely 309, 311, 313, 316-318, 323/324, 327, 329, 336, 346, 347, 359, 360, 361 or 362 (not including the uncertain dates for Eulogius).

X **1253** 19 contains a reference to an assistant in the 5th *pagus* called Gaianus. This is a fairly rare name (see above) and I think that he is likely to be the same individual as is named in l. 10 as holding that position, making **1253** the most certain attestation we have of a person named in **016**. **1253** is undated but assumed to be 4th century. Although it is likely that both **1253** and **016** were written around the same time, they may not be from the same year, as the other assistant named in that papyrus, Isidorus of the 7th *pagus*, does not correspond with any in **016** (see 2 n.), but as we do not know an assistant's term of office, or the number of assistants per *pagus*, we cannot be certain of that. **1253** contains an official report addressed to the prefect of Egypt, with particulars of some military requisitions made in the Oxyrhynchite nome. The prefect's name is lost but the papyrus must date from a time when Oxyrhynchus was not a separate province with its own *praeses* but was part of the province of Egypt.¹²² There are four such periods in the 4th century when that was the case, namely before 314/5, between 324 and 341, between 368 and 371 (when Fl. Eutolmius Tatianus was prefect: see VIII **1101**, XVII **2110** (where the prefect of Egypt was choosing liturgists in Oxyrhynchus), LXIII **4376** and **4377**) and from c.374 to 381. In 381 Egypt became a diocese and its prefect was an *augustalis* who would not have been addressed as ἐπάρχος Αἰγύπτου.¹²³ The prefect was addressed at **1253** 2 as τῷ λαμπροτ[άτω] ἐπάρχῳ Αἰγύπτου. λαμπρότατος, equivalent to *clarissimus*, was only used before 364 in respect of one prefect of Egypt, Flavius Philagrius, who held the office twice, 334-336 and 338-340.¹²⁴ If this is correct (and I have not found any contrary examples from the 4th century), **1253** must have been written during one of those periods or after 364. Assuming that **016** was written around the same time as **1253**, and ruling out 336, as noted above, possible dates for this papyrus are around 334-335, 338-340, 368-371 and 374-381. **1253** 22 also mentions a strategus and the latest attestation of a strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome is from 369 (LXIII **4380**), while as noted above the latest firm attestation of a *praepositus*

¹²² Lallemand 1950, 389-392; 1964, 49.

¹²³ See in relation to the provinces Lallemand 1950, 389-395 and 1964, 49-59; Bagnall 1993 (1), 63-64; Palme 1998 (1) 123-133.

¹²⁴ Lallemand 1964, 61.

pagi is from 362 (on the bases set out above, Eulogius would extend this to 365). I would rule out, accordingly, 368-371 and 374-381.

Eulogius is the only name of a *praepositus* in **016** which is attested elsewhere as belonging to an Oxyrhynchite *praepositus*. As set out above, one Eulogius was a *praepositus* in 359 and probably another two persons called Eulogius held the office in 365. If either/any of these is the Eulogius in **016** (l. 15), that would suggest a date around 359-365, which, on the above analysis, is unlikely. There are attestations elsewhere of a number of other members of the bouletic class who may be listed here as *praepositi*, including a Eulogius who was *logistes* in 341 and *riparius* in 346 and 350 and one who was an ex-gymnasiarch and *bouletes* in 370 (see 15-16 n.). Paeanius (5 n.) may have been the Flavius Paeanius alias Macrobius who was *logistes* in 336 and (or, if they were not the same person, or) the Flavius Paeanius who was *strategus* in 351. Gerontius (17 n.) may be the 352 *riparius* and/or the ex-exactor and *bouletes* from 370. Aphthonius may have been the councillor from 338 (20 n). It is not possible on the basis of this to establish the date of **016** with certainty, although the relative rarity of the names Paeanius and Aphthonius (see above) leads me to suggest that a date around 338 to 340 is the most likely.

Description

016 contains 22 lines. The left margin is intact except for the beginning of l.1, although the first letter of l. 22 is missing. The right margin is intact apart from the end of l.1. There are traces of the *alpha* at the beginning of l. 1, the first line of the list, but there may have been an introductory part which is missing. Lines 21 and 22 have been written by a different hand; the letters are thinner and slightly smaller (although this might be accounted for by being squeezed in at the end of the papyrus). It is not possible to tell whether there are any missing lines.

The papyrus has been folded vertically, probably twice. There is a tear along the outer fold, from l.18 onwards, but no letters are lost completely. The writing is with the fibres and similar to that of P. Louvre II 120. The back is blank.

1 α πάγ(ου)[

2 Ἰσίδωρος βοηθός

3 β πάγ(ου) Εὐδαίμονος πραι(ποσίτου)

- 4 Ἑρμείας βοηθός
- 5 γ πάγ(ου) Παιανίου πραι(ποσίτου)
- 6 Ὠρίων βοηθός
- 7 δ πάγ(ου) Ἀντιόχου πραι(ποσίτου)
- 8 Εὐλόγιος βοηθός
- 9 ε πάγ(ου) Παύλου πραι(ποσίτου)
- 10 Γαιανός βοηθός
- 11 ς πάγ(ου) Θεοδώρου πραι(ποσίτου)
- 12 Ἰσιδωρος βοηθός
- 13 ζ πάγ(ου) Ἀπίωνος πραι(ποσίτου)
- 14 Θεωνῖνος βοηθός
- 15 η πάγ(ου) Εὐλογίου
- 16 Κορηλίου Σαλμάτις βοηθ(ός)
- 17 θ πάγ(ου) Γεροντίου
- 18 Γερόντιος βοηθός
- 19 ι πάγ(ου) Θεοδώρου
- 20 . Ἀφθόνιος ἀδελφός
- 21 (m. 2) Πτολεμαίου πραι(ποσίτ.)
- 22 Π]τολεμαῖος βοηθ[ός .]εναφεῦ.[

2 Ἰσιδωρος 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 παγ^ε 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 21 πραις 10 γαῖανος
 12 Ἰσιδωρος 16 Ι. Σαρμάτης 19 παγ^ε 20 Ι. Ἀφθονίου ἀδελφοῦ

“Of the 1st pagus, [of *praepositus*], Isidorus assistant
 of the 2nd pagus, of Eudaimon *praepositus*, Hermias assistant
 of the 3rd pagus, of Paeanius *praepositus*, Horion assistant
 of the 4th pagus, of Antiochus *praepositus*, Eulogius assistant
 of the 5th pagus, of Paulus *praepositus*, Gaianus assistant

of the 6th pagus, of Theodorus *praepositus*, Isidorus assistant
of the 7th pagus, of Apion *praepositus*, Theoninus assistant
of the 8th pagus, of Eulogius [son] of Cornelius, Sarmates assistant
of the 9th pagus, of Gerontius, Gerontius assistant
of the 10th pagus, of Theodorus [and] Aphthonius, brother, [son][s] of Ptolemaeus,
praepositi, Ptolemaeus assistant

2 Ἰσίδωρος βοηθός. See Gignac, *Grammar* I 206-7 for examples of this use of the *diairesis*. X **1253**, which mentions Gaianus (10 n.), also mentions (l. 16) an Isidorus who is assistant to the *praepositus* of the 7th pagus, but it is unlikely that he is the person named here or in l.12. Assistants are more likely to have stayed in the same pagus, working for successive *praepositi*. Isidorus is a very common name.

3 Εὐδαίμονος. We know of at least three individuals named Eudaemon who might have been *praepositi*. Aurelius Eudaemon alias Helladius was described as an ex-gymnasiarch, councillor and *bibliophylax* in 307 (or 309?), (M. Chr. 196) and was strategus from 319 to 323 (LXII **4341**, LX **4076**, XLIV **3194**: see Whitehorne 2006, 111); he may have been too early to be the Eudaemon in this papyrus. The Eudaemon (πραίποσι with no abbreviation sign, like XIX **2232**) who was the recipient of a number of pounds of silver in XXXI **2571** (27.7.338), may have been a *praepositus pagi* but I think it more likely that he was a military officer dealing with requisitions. A Flavius Eudaemon (possibly an ex-*logistes*: Keenan 1974, 294) was described as *officialis* in 362/3 (LXVII **4607**) but this is a term for a salaried official and one would not expect a *praepositus* to have held such a position. Eudaemon is a common name.

5 Παιανίου. Paeanius is not a common name. There are a number of attestations of probably two individuals called Flavius Paeanius (corrected from Paranius in X **1265** and XXII **2344**: see XXXVIII p. xiv) which may be relevant. Flavius Paeanius alias Macrobius was *logistes* in 336 (X **1265**, **1303**): see LIV App. 1, pp 227-228 and LX **4089** Introduction. Flavius Paeanius was strategus in 351 to 352 (XXII **2344** (redated to c.351-2, see LX **4089**, Introduction), LX **4089**, **4091**). They may be one person (LV **3820** 3 n.), although Whitehorne (2006, 112) doubts that that is the case; the alias is used only to describe the *logistes*, not the strategus. There is a Paeanius in XVII **2115** (undated) and a Paeanius

referred to as “my lord brother Paeanius” in LV **3820** 3 (possibly dated to 340 and which at l.6 mentions a Eulogius in the same terms). A Gerontius son of Paeanius is mentioned in LXVII **4611** (see 17 n.).

6 Ὠρίων βοηθός. XLVIII **3428** (4th century), a list of sums of money, probably taxes, received on various accounts, and possibly part of the archive of Papnuthis and Dorotheus, contains a reference to a Horion, who is an assistant of someone called Theodoulus. Of the places named in that papyrus Leukiou, which is mentioned twice, is known to have been in the 3rd *pagus* (Benaïssa 2009, 138).

9 Παύλου. A Paulus was a *χωματεπείκτης* in 336 and so of bouletic class (P. Laur. IV 167 and see **017**), a Paulus was *logistes* in 381 (PSI X 1108) and (possibly the same as the *logistes*) a Paulus was *politeuomenos* in the late 4th/early 5th century (P. Wash. Univ. II 83). The first may be the man in this papyrus but it is a common name. The words *καὶ Εὐλόγιος καὶ Παῦλος* have been added in the margin of a tax account (XIV **1660**, dated only to the 4th century); it is perhaps fanciful to suggest that this may be a reference to two of the *praepositi* mentioned here. IX **1190** (347) shows two *praepositi* of the 5th *pagus*: Paulus may be the Flavius P[.....] (no. 13 above), who operated jointly with Aur. Theon (no. 10) in 347.

10 Γαιανός. X **1253** 19 refers to a Gaianus who is assistant to the *praepositus* of the 5th *pagus*, and who is probably the same Gaianus as is mentioned here; Gaianus is a rare name. See p. 108.

11 Θεοδώρου. Theodorus is a very common name.

12 Ἰσίδωρος βοηθός. See 2 n.

13 Ἀπίωνος. There may have been a strategus called Apion in 357 (I **66**: see Whitehorne 2006, 112).

14 Θεωνῆνος βοηθός. See 2 n. for comments on X **1253** in relation to the 7th *pagus* and pp. 106-107 for evidence of *praepositi* with more than one assistant.

15-16 Εὐλογίου Κορνηλίου. Eulogius son of Cornelius is unattested. None of the other *praepositi* named here is given a patronymic. The writer may have wanted to distinguish this Eulogius from another of the same name; alternatively, this might be a reference to two *praepositi*: Eulogius and Cornelius. That there is no *καὶ* between the names does not rule out this interpretation.

The following are known to have been *bouleutai* or to have performed bouletic liturgies in 4th century Oxyrhynchus:

- (1) Flavius Eulogius, deputy *strategus* in early January 316 (XVII **2113**).
- (2) Eulogius, *paredros* in 325 (LIV **3757** 4 and **3758** 79).
- (3) Flavius Eulogius, *logistes* in 341 (LIV **3774**) and *riparius* in 346 (VI **897**) and 350 (XIX **2233**, P. Harr. II 218); there are also undated references in XIX **2229** and **2235**. His career is summarised in LIV App. 1, pp. 228-229.
- (4) Eulogius *praepositus* (possibly of the 8th *pagus*) in 359 (SB 7756): see pp. 105-6.
- (5) Eulogius *praepositus* of the 4th *pagus* (XLVIII **3400** and **3425** (359-365?)): see pp. 105-6.
- (6) Eulogius *praepositus* (unknown *pagus*), also in **3400** (c.365?) see pp. 105-6.
- (7) Eulogius *politeuomenos* in 365 (XLVIII **3393**): see pp.105-6.
- (8) Eulogius son of Ptolemaeus, ex-gymnasiarch and *bouleutes* in 370 (XVII **2110.34**).
- (9) Eulogius βουλευτής in SB XX 14589.15 (of unknown provenance and dated to the first half of the 4th century).

Whether (1), (2) and (3) are the same person is not entirely clear, but the editor of LIV (at pp. 228-229) thought this implausible. He found less implausible the suggestion that Eulogius (3) may be the same person as Eulogius (7): see LIV App. 1, pp 228-229. I have suggested above (p. 106) that Eulogius (5) and (7) are the same person. Eulogius (5) was *praepositus* of the 4th *pagus*, not the 8th as is described here, and as stated above we have no attestations of a person holding office as *praepositus* of different *pagi*. If I am right about the date for **016** (see pp. 109-110), Eulogius (3) is the most likely candidate. See also **017.3-4 n.**

16 Σαλμάτις. The *rho* and *eta* in Σαρμάτις have been replaced by *lamda* and *iota* respectively; for examples of these frequent interchanges see Gignac *Grammar* I, 102-107 and 235-237. Neither of such shifts occurs elsewhere in **016**.

17 Γερωντίου. There are many attestations of an Aurelius and of a Valerius Ammonianus alias Gerontius, dating from 313-320, but such a person would not have been named by his alias in a list like this. LXVII **4611** ii (363), an undertaking to deliver wheat, refers to a delivery from a Gerontius son of Paeanius. It was suggested there (at 6 n.) that this might be the son of the former *curator civitatis* or *logistes* Flavius Paeanius (see 5 n.). A wealthy Gerontius is known from LXVII **4628** (4th century) and XVII **2110** 10 (370) has a Gerontius who is an ex-exactor and a *bouleutes*. Unlike membership of the gymnasial class, being a *bouleutes* was not hereditary, but the wealth necessary to be eligible for the role may

have been inherited, and it would not be surprising to see families perpetuating the role. See Bowman 1971, 28-31. The fact that the *praepositus* and his assistant have the same name is surely a coincidence.

19-21 Θεοδώρου . Ἀφθόνιος ἀδελφός Πτολεμαίου πραι(ποσιτ.).[I cannot make sense of this part of the list unless Ἀφθόνιος ἀδελφός in 20 should be in the genitive case, indicating that there are either two *praepositi* of the 10th *pagus*, Theodorus and Aphthonius his brother, sons of Ptolemaeus, or Theodorus and Aphthonius the brother of Ptolemaeus, or three, Theodorus, Aphthonius and Ptolemaeus, but I think that if that had been the case the scribe would probably have used the nominative for Ptolemaeus too. The first explanation is the most likely. It is not clear what the letter or symbol at the start of line 20 represents. This is the only instance in the list where a person is described as brother. It is unusual to have more than a single *praepositus* for a *pagus* but two are attested for the Oxyrhynchite nome (IX **1190** (347), where two brothers were *praepositi* of the 5th *pagus*) and for the Hermopolite (P. Louvre II 120 (no. 40), Tyche 19 (2004), 123), and note Eulogius and Cornelius (15-16 n.). These may be forerunners of the shared pagarchies common in the 6th century, which as described by Gasco ultimately became a charge on the large estates rather than on individuals (Gasco 1972=2008, 43-50, *passim*); possibly in these two examples the office had become in effect a charge on the brothers' undivided patrimony. Alternatively, they may have been joint appointees, like the irrigation supervisors in **017**. This may be the same Theodorus as in l. 11 (6th *pagus*) and that it is because he had responsibilities for two *pagi* that there was a joint appointment in the 10th *pagus*, although I would have expected the *pagi* to be contiguous in such a case, as with Fl. Olympiodorus also called Asyncritus (P. Flor. I 34 with BL IX 83, P. Oslo III 113 and P. Lond. III 1249 with BL I 290) and possibly Aurelius Cho[...] (PSI Congr. XVII 28).

20 Ἀφθόνιος. An Aphthonius held office as *nyctostrategus*, a bouletic liturgy, in LI **3620** (326) (see Lewis 1997, 38 on the office). XLVIII **3386** (338) mentions a Flavius Aphthonius, who was a (current or former) gymnasiarch and a councillor. A loan in 322 (LXI **4125**) and two orders to make payments in c. 337 (I **92** and P. Princ. II 80) may be from the same person, a wealthy individual whose father, Stratonicus, was a magistrate and councillor of Oxyrhynchus. As noted above, Aphthonius is not a common name.

22 Πτολεμαῖος βοηθ[ός .]εναφευ.[It is not clear what this line means. In the rest of the list the name of the assistant precedes the title; on that basis, Ptolemaeus would be the

assistant. What follows is not clear. The name Oenapheus is attested in P. Bodl. I 74 (100-300) but the letter following *upsilon* does not look like a *sigma* and there would be no logic in having another name.

017 Agreement regarding irrigation administration

44 5B.60/C(3-4)a

17.5 x 25.5 (max) cm

10 April 358

Introduction

017 contains an agreement between three χωματαπεϊκται, allocating responsibility between themselves for maintenance of the public dykes in the Oxyrhynchite nome. It is of particular interest because of the information it gives about the nature of the appointment and the area of responsibility of such officers. Two of the parties are known from other published papyri. Apollonius son of Apollonius is named in LXI 4129 and 4130 (11 May 358), two copies of a document addressed to him by comarchs, nominating men to serve as ἐκβολεῖς (χωμάτων) or directors of work on the dykes in their village. The inventory numbers of those papyri, 44 5B.63/79 (a) and (b), suggest that they may have been found not far from this one. Achilles son of Posi is probably the *riparius* of that name who appears in XVII 2110 (370) as a member of the *boule* in 370. Eulogius son of Ammonianus may also be known from other documents: see 3-4 n.

Irrigation supervision

Dyke maintenance works were carried out when the waters were at their lowest. The liturgy of supervising work on Trajan's canal, the subject of P. Cair. Isid. 81 (9 April 297), was to take place between Pharmouthi and Pauni, April to June. Completed *penthemeros*- and *naubion*-certificates from the canal-fed Fayum are mostly dated from Pauni to Mesore (June to August)¹²⁵ but in areas directly subject to the flood work would have begun earlier and most of the routine maintenance work would have been completed between Phamenoth and Mesore, March and August (XLIX 3475 8-10 n.). The dykes were inspected, and a surveyor (a δημόσιος γεωμέτρης) would determine the amount of earth needed to repair them, calculated in ναύβια (each *naubion* was nine cubic cubits). Each village was allocated a certain number of *naubia* as its responsibility.¹²⁶ The work was of crucial importance as the following year's harvest depended on irrigation from the Nile flood, and so it received attention at a high level, as is illustrated by XII 1409 (278), where *strategi* and *decemprimi* are urged by the *dioecetes* to ensure that responsible people are selected to oversee the dyke works, so that the dykes are properly built up to withstand the floods and the canals are properly cleared out to receive and distribute the water; it was not acceptable that people

¹²⁵ Sijpesteijn 1964 (2), 10 and 20. The Fayum was the source of all the certificates in this article.

¹²⁶ See Sijpesteijn 1964 (2), 19.

should make payments in order to avoid doing the physical labour required.¹²⁷ Those responsible for ensuring that the work was done in the villages had to file reports with the *strategus* of the nome (as LXII **4341** (319): see Introduction for other references), stating the amount of earth shifted. Tasks such as the opening of channels (see 15-16 n.) would have been carried out later in the year, and there would have been a need for surveillance and emergency repairs during the flood.¹²⁸ It is not known whether work on Trajan's canal was done annually or only occasionally "under stimulus of special conditions" (P. Cair. Isid. 81 (297), p. 314) but in all "normal" cases, checks must have been carried out and work done annually.

The *χωματεπέικτης* is mentioned in papyri from 298 (XII **1469** 20, where the title was also given as ὁ τῆ ἐπίξει τῶν χωμάτων ἐπικείμενος (1.7) and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν χωμάτων (1.9)) to the 6th/7th century (VII **1053**). He replaced the *χωματεπιμελητής* mentioned in earlier papyri (for example XLIX **3508** 4 (70)) without any significant change in function. He operated at a high level; P. Beatty Panop. 2 ix 222-226 (300) shows the *epitropos* of the Lower Thebaid being in direct communication with the *χωματεπέικτης* in regard to his function. The role included overseeing the appointment of subordinate officials at village level (**4129** and **4130** (both 358), P. Lond. III 1246-8 (pp. 224-226) (345)), allocating the work that needed to be done between appropriate villages (**1469** (298)), going into the villages to supervise the work (PSI V 460 (3rd/4th century)) and being part of a team appointed to investigate allegations of improper use of the water network (as in P. Thead. 20 (4th century) and P. Sakaon 33 = P. Ryl. IV 653 (321)).¹²⁹

Oertel, Lallemand and Sijpesteijn all suggested that *χωματεπέικται* were a two-man commission, like their fore-runners in office: Oertel believed that their area of responsibility was part of a nome, Lallemand and Sijpesteijn that, as in P. Lond. III 1246-1248 (pp. 222-226) (345), each of two *χωματεπέικται* would assume responsibility for part of the nome (a *meris*, upper or lower) although sometimes both would officiate in the whole nome.¹³⁰ Sijpesteijn relied also on XII **1546**, pointing out that because of its late 3rd century date, the addressees' title (abbreviated after *χωματ*) was more likely to be *χωματεπέικται* than *χωματεπιμεληταί*, and stating that this too showed that they

¹²⁷ See also SB XIV 11349 (3rd century), P. Beatty Panop. 2 ix 222ff. (300) and P. Berl. Cohen 13 (150).

¹²⁸ Bagnall 1993 (1), 23; Sijpesteijn 1964 (2), 12.

¹²⁹ See generally Sijpesteijn 1964 (1), 13, 17-19; Lallemand 1964, 133, 167; Bonneau 1993, 161-5.

¹³⁰ Oertel 1917, 193; Lallemand 1964, 167; Sijpesteijn 1964 (1), 15.

officiated over a *meris*.¹³¹ (I think that that papyrus and P. Lond. III 1246-1248 pp. 222-226) suggest rather that two were appointed to each part of the nome and therefore at that time there was a four-man commission.) Bonneau, also relying on **1546** but without opining on the numbers involved, considered that the Oxyrhynchite nome was divided into two *merides*, north and south, and that the area of responsibility of the *χωματαπεϊκται* was a *meris*.¹³²

The papyri published so far do not present a coherent picture. Often, as in **1469** (298), the area of responsibility is not specified. XLIX **3475** 2-4 (220) mentions *χωματοε(πιμελητῶν) λιβ(ός) τ[ο](παρχίας) νοτινης μερ[ι]δος*, translated as the southern section of the Western toparchy but which could be a reference to the western toparchy in the southern part of the nome, and so evidence of a sub-division of responsibility into northern and southern parts. **1546** (late 3rd century) was sent by a named person *καὶ τοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ χωμα(τεπιμελητοῦ) [or χωματαπεϊκτου; see above] τ[ῆ]ς νοτινης μερίδος* (ll.1-3), suggesting two officials were responsible for southern parts of the nome and, presumably, two others for the northern parts, as *meris* cannot here be used in the sense of part of a toparchy (see 14 n.). That papyrus refers to villages in at least two and possibly three toparchies: Seryphis in the Western, Teis in the Thmoisepho and Phoboou in the Eastern. It is strange that the Thmoisepho is included in the southern part of the nome. The three addressees of P. Laur. IV 167 (336) are described (l.4) as *ἐπεϊκταις δημοσίων χωμάτων νομοῦ Ὀξυρυγχίτου*. LXI **4129** and **4130** are addressed to a single individual, Aurelius Apollonius son of Apollonius, who also appears in this papyrus, as *ἐπίκτη δημοσίων χωμάτων νομοῦ Ὀξυρυγχίτου* (**4129** 5-7); that suggests a nome-wide responsibility, or at least a nome-wide appointment, and possibly a sole appointment.

Papyri from other nomes are also inconclusive. P. Beatty Panop. 2 ix. 222-226 (300) refers to *τοῖς κατὰ νομὸν χωματαπεϊκταις* (the nome is in the Thebaid) but we do not know how many there were. P. Lond. III 1247 and by analogy 1246 and 1248 (pp. 224-226: 345) are addressed to two *χωματαπεϊκται (sic) νοτινῶν μερ[ῶν νομοῦ] Ἐρμουπολίτου*, suggesting that there may have been four for the whole nome, but each nome need not have ordered its affairs in an identical way.

017 shows three Oxyrhynchus councillors allocating responsibility between themselves by reference to three toparchies. Since 307/8 the nome had been divided into 10 *pagi* and the

¹³¹ Sijpesteijn 1964 (1), 17 n. 3, but referring to *χωματαπιμεληταί* in relation to P. Lond. III 1246-8 in error.

¹³² Bonneau 1993, 162, n. 277.

fact that the councillors do not mention three former toparchies (the Thmoisepho, Eastern and Western) suggests that they are not using the term in its former technical sense. LXI **4129** and **4130** (3-4 n.), addressed to Apollonius, relate to Mouchinaxap, which was in the 3rd *pagus* and Western toparchy,¹³³ but in this papyrus he is accepting responsibility for an area described as the upper toparchy and there is no space into which one could fit words allocating the Western also to him, or to any of them. Apollonius was not sole appointee with overall responsibility for the entire nome; the agreement is among equals all of whom have been allotted the duty (6 n.) and there is no sense that Apollonius was appointing the others to help him. I think that the three councillors were appointed with joint and several responsibility for the entire nome (5-6); they drew lots between them (9) to decide how to split the tasks but as far as the other officials and inhabitants of the nome were concerned each would have remained responsible for the whole. On that basis **4129** and **4130** could equally well have been addressed to any of them, or, like P. Laur. IV 167 (336), to all three, although Apollonius may have been the most senior member of the three, as he is first named in **017** (assuming the order was not just alphabetical). As each remained responsible for the whole it was important to each of them that the others should fulfil their duties properly, hence the use of the imperial oath (17-19). Each must also have had a clear understanding of the area allocated to him. I would suggest that the upper and lower toparchies referred to in **017** followed the “old” boundaries, while the middle toparchy encompassed the old Middle, Eastern, Western and Thmoisepho. **017** therefore shows a college of three with nome-wide responsibility, like P. Laur. IV 167 (336). It does not follow, however that that was always the case. The area of responsibility may have fluctuated from year to year depending on who could be found to accept it: there is evidence of difficulty in finding people to undertake liturgies from the mid-3rd century and later.¹³⁴ These three councillors may have been exceptionally wealthy and been required to undertake a number of liturgies (3-4 n.).

Oertel considered that the role of *χωματεπέικτης* was a liturgy.¹³⁵ Bonneau disagreed (although acknowledging that the *χωματεπιμελητής* was a liturgical official: XLIX **3508**), noting that Lewis had omitted this office from the 1982 edition of his work on compulsory officials: “On a cru qu’il était liturge, mais aucun texte ne faisant connaître une telle

¹³³ See Benaissa 2009, 162-3.

¹³⁴ See XXXVIII **2854**, X **1252**, Bowman 1971, 106-7, 111-113, Sijpesteijn 1992, 245.

¹³⁵ Oertel 1917, 193.

situation et des arguments s’y opposant même, on peut assurer qu’il était fonctionnaire.”¹³⁶ In his original BASP work on compulsory public services, Lewis had shown **χωματεπέικτης** as a separate category, last evidenced in 346 (P. Lond. III 1248), whose area of responsibility was the nome, but without stating the term of the office. He had followed this by a cross-reference to the entry on **ἐπέικτης** and to XII **1469**. In the 1982 edition he had, as Bonneau wrote, omitted a separate reference to **χωματεπεικτής** (although still noting under **ἐπέικτης** that the word existed), but had cited only Bonneau as authority for the suggestion that it now appeared that it was not a liturgy. In the 1997 edition Lewis had moved closer to his original position and while **χωματεπιμελητής** was entered as a separate category, responsible for a toparchy or canal and with a three-year term, **ἐπέικτης δημοσίων χωμάτων** was included as a type of **ἐπέικτης** (who, based on **4129** and **4130**, also had nome-wide responsibility) and the reference to Bonneau’s view was omitted.¹³⁷

A number of individuals named as **χωματεπεϊκται** in published papyri are known to be members of the bouletic class: Flavius Olympiodorus also called Asyncritius who was also a *praepositus pagi* (P. Flor. I 34 (342), P. Oslo II 113 (346) and P. Lond. III 1247 and 1248 (pp. 224-226: 345)), Aurelius Diogenes also called Eulogius, a former magistrate (LXV **4492** 2 (311-312)), the two men who hold office also as *riparii*, a bouletic liturgy, in SB XVI 12384 and 12385, and Apollonius in LXI **4129** and **4130** who also appears in **017**. Claudius Heraclius, one of the three named in P. Laur. IV 167 (336), may be the strategus in 342 (I **87** ii.3, LXII **4344** 3) and/or possibly *proedros* in 361 (LXVII **4602**).¹³⁸ These examples suggest that the position of **χωματεπέικτης** was a liturgical one in the 4th century, like its predecessor the **χωματεπιμελητής**, and this papyrus **017** establishes that beyond doubt, for three reasons. First, if the reading of l.6 is correct, the duty was allotted, and **κληρώω** (6 n.) is used for bouletic appointments. Secondly, other vocabulary used is also that of a liturgical appointment: **ἀποπληρῶσαι** (8) (as P. Cair. Isid. 82 (318)), **φρόντισμα** (8) (as in P. Lond. V 1648 and 1649 (373)), **μερίς** (14 n.) used in the sense of a part allotted or allocated to an official (Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. **μερίς** (h), citing P. Flor. III 304.5 and I **126** 4 (both 6th century)). Thirdly, this agreement is between members of the bouletic class who also undertook other high liturgical offices (3-4 n.). They would not

¹³⁶ Bonneau 1993, 161 and n. 272.

¹³⁷ Lewis 1997, 24 and 50.

¹³⁸ Whitehorne 1997, 113.

have operated as mere functionaries,¹³⁹ nor would mere functionaries have been entitled, unlike bouletic liturgists, to enter into an agreement like this one, sharing out their responsibilities.¹⁴⁰ There is no other evidence that this appointment was made by the *boule*, as would be usual with the appointment to liturgies of the bouletic class, but that is the most likely explanation. P. Beatty Panop. 2 ix 222-226 (300) implies that *χωματαπεϊκται* were subject to direct instruction by the *epitropos* but that the strategus also had a role in their supervision. In P. Louvre II 121 (351-361), the *χωματαπεϊκτης* was subordinated to the *strategus-exactor* (see 18n.). These *χωματαπεϊκται*, although their appointment was nome-wide, would have been selected and appointed by the metropolitane *boule* and would have reported to and been supervised by a higher official such as the *exactor*.¹⁴¹

There is no indication in **017** of the duration of the office. The date suggests that it did not run from 1 Thoth, the usual start date for liturgies, but that like other irrigation functions it began later in the year, when the repair and maintenance work was due to be done.¹⁴² It would thus probably have covered one entire flood season. A *χωματαπεμελητης* held office for a 3-year term in 116 (P. Giessen 58 and 59) but normally a bouletic liturgy would be for a single year (and in the 3rd century sometimes for part only of a year).¹⁴³

Description

017 contains 23 lines of text and slight traces of one more. There are spelling errors in lines 3 and 10 and an omission from line 2 but the hand is flowing and practised; the agreement may have been written in haste by an experienced scribe. Both side margins are intact as is the top margin, apart from holes in two places. Three or four lines at least are missing at the bottom, containing an agreement by each party to comply with the agreed terms and a signature by or on behalf of each. Because of a hole approximately 16 letters are missing (apart from slight traces) from the beginning of lines 6 and 7 and some 26 letters are missing from the beginning of lines 19 to 23. The papyrus is pale with thin handwriting, in a script typical of the mid-4th century. A second hand is discernible in the last 2 letters, probably a subscription clause. It is written along the fibres. The back is blank.

¹³⁹ As Bonneau 1993, 161.

¹⁴⁰ Lewis 1997, 105.

¹⁴¹ See Bowman 1971, 107 and Lewis 1997, 75 and 83.

¹⁴² Bonneau 1993, 159. P. Cair. Isid. 81 (see p.117) is dated 9th April.

¹⁴³ Lewis 1997, 76.

1 μετὰ τὴν ὑπα[τείαν τῶ]ν δεσπ[ο]τῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου Αὐγούστου
2 τ[ὸ] θ καὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος <τὸ> β Φαρμουῦθι ιε.
3 Αὐρήλιοι Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ Ἀχιλλέως Πόσιτος καὶ Εὐ-
4 λόγι· οἱ Ἀμμωνιανοῦ οἱ τρεῖς βουλ(ευταί) τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)
Ὀξυγυχι-
5 τῶν πόλεως ἀλλήλοις χαίρειν. ἐπιδὴ ἡμῖς οἱ τρεῖς
6 ἐκλήρω[θημεν ε]ἰς χωματεπι[κ]τίαν δημοσίων χωμά-
7 των τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους λδ ςγς καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ
8 ἀμέμπτως τὸ φρόντισμα ἀποπληρῶσαι ὁμολογοῦμεν
9 ἀκολουθῶν τῶ γενομένῳ κλήρω τὴν διαίρεσιν ε.
10 .. [. . 9? . . .] . ε . . ι . . σθαι καὶ κικληρῶσθαι οὕτως·
11 τὸν μὲν Ἀπολλώνιον τὴν ἄνω τοπαρχίαν τὸν δὲ
12 Ἀχιλλ[έα . . 9? . .] κικληρῶσθαι τὴν κάτω τοπαρ-
13 χίαν τὸν δὲ Εὐλόγιον τὴν μέσην τοπαρχίαν
14 ἐπὶ τῶ δὲ τὸν κληρωθέντα ἐκάστη μερίδι τὴν ἀναβολὴν
15 καὶ διόρθωσιν τῶν ὑποστελλόντων χωμάτων καὶ δια-
16 κόπων ποιήσασθαι ἀμέμπτως πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὀχλῆσθαι
17 τὸ ὀπότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀποτέρου κ[αὶ ἐπ]ὶ τούτοις ὄμνυμεν
18 τὸν σεβάσιμον θε[εῖον ὄρκον τῶν] δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν
19 [Κωνσταντίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Ἰου]λιανοῦ τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου
20 [Καίσαρος 17? . . .] . ἡ ὁμολογία ἣτις κυρί[α
21 10? καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες ὡ]μολογήσαμεν. Αὐρήλι[ο]ι
22 28? . . .] ὁμωμέχαμεν

23	30?] . ὡς πρόκειται
24	30?]χ.[. . .] . . .

.....

1 ὑπα[3 Ἰ. Ἀχιλλεύς 4 Ἰ. τρεῖς, βουλ', λαμ, λαμ 5 Ἰ. ἐπειδὴ, ἡμεῖς, τρεῖς 6 Ἰ. χωματεπεικτῶν 10 Ἰ. κεκληρῶσθαι 16 Ἰ. ὀχλεῖσθαι

“(The year) after the consulship of our masters Constantius Augustus for the 9th time and Julian the most noble Caesar for the 2nd time, Pharmouthi 15th. Aurelii Apollonius son of Apollonius and Achilles son of Posi and Eulogius son of Ammonianus, all three councillors of the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings to one another. Whereas we three have been allotted the duty of superintendency of the public dykes [of the said] nome for the current year 34/3 and with a view to fulfilling our tasks blamelessly we agree, in accordance with the lot which has taken place, [to make] the division [into three parts/ between us] and so there has been allotted to Apollonius the upper toparchy, to Achilles..... there has been allotted the lower toparchy and to Eulogios the middle toparchy. With a view to the person allotted to each *meris* making the building up and repair of the dykes for which he has been allocated responsibility and the channels blamelessly, so that what one does will not be adversely affected by what any other does, we swear to these things the august divine oath by our masters Constantius Augustus and Julian the most noble Caesar.....”

1-2 Dating by reference to consulships was normal in Egypt from 293 onwards: see *CSBE*² 3-5, where it is suggested that this was connected with Diocletian’s creation of the tetrarchy and with his desire to bring Egypt more into line with the way the rest of the Empire operated. These formulae were used consistently and may have been published annually within Egypt soon after the changes took effect: see *CLRE* 23, 66. Other references to the year 358 dated in this way are in LXI **4129** and **4130** (and see *CSBE*², 186-187).

2 Φαρμουῦθι ιε. This date, April 10th, is consistent with other evidence that dyke maintenance works took place when the Nile was at its lowest, in preparation for the next flood. I would have expected to see τὸ before the β after Καίσαρος as, for example, in I **66**, but the space seems to be too small and the scribe probably omitted it inadvertently.

3-4 Aurelius Apollonius son of Apollonius, gymnasiarch, councillor and superintendent of the public dykes of the Oxyrhynchite nome, is the addressee of LXI **4129** and **4130** (11 May 358, a month after the date of this agreement). Achilles son of Posi, a *riparius* and member of the *boule*, is known from XVII **2110** 2 (370). This is the third example of a person who held office as both *riparius* and dyke superintendent: two officials are addressed as ῥιπαρίοις ἦτοι χωματεπίκταις of the Hermopolite nome in two copies of a nomination to liturgies (SB XVI 12384 and 12385 (362)), one of whom (named Neilos) also appears in a declaration under oath relating to the maintenance of dykes (P. Louvre II 121.13 (351-361)). (See Sijpesteijn 1992, 244-250 on the use of ἦτοι in this context.) The editor of P. Lond. V 1648 (373) suggests (p. 4) that *riparii* may have had some sort of jurisdiction over dyke works and that the name of the office (from Latin *ripa* = river bank) recalls this earlier function. He also suggested that χωματεπίκται were subordinate to *riparii*, but this is not supported by the sharing of roles in SB XVI 12384 and 12385. The *riparii* were the senior police officials of the nome and it would have been usual for eirenarchs, who led the village police authorities, to report to them.

Eulogius is a common name and I have not found any other reference to a Eulogius the son of Ammonianus. A list of 4th century councillors named Eulogius is set out at **016.15-16** n. Any of those named at (3) to (9) could be the same person as in this papyrus. The most likely candidate is Eulogius (3), who held office as *logistes* in 341 (LIV **3774**) and *riparius* in 346 and 350 (VI **897**, XIX **2233** and P. Harris II 218), both because of the dates and because he too was a *riparius*. He was also the most likely to be the person named at **016.15**. If he is the Eulogius in both **016** and **017**, then Cornelius (**016.16**) cannot be his patronymic and must be the name of another *praepositus* in the 8th pagus. See also **016.1** and pp. 105-106.

5 ἀλλήλοις χαίρειν. ἐπιδῆ. The identical construction and spelling appears in P. Strasb. VII 672 (289-290), P. Cair. Isid. 81.6 (297) and P. Oxy. Hels 44 (322-324).

6 ἐκλήρω[θημεν εἰς] χωματεπι[κ]τίαν. κληρώ is attested in the context of appointments to bouleutic liturgies from 100 (P. Iand. 27) to 392 (P. Herm. 19), although αἰρέομαι (as in XIV **1627** (342), described by Lewis as “the verb *par excellence* for the action of the *boule* in appointing to liturgies and magistracies”), is more common: see Lewis 1997, 57-63 and 87. I have not found the noun χωματεπικτία (or -επικτία) attested elsewhere, nor a similar construction for other liturgical functions of an ἐπικτητής.

7 τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ. Although there is no earlier reference to the nome, it is not uncommon to find such a term after a reference to the city of the Oxyrhynchites (as in XIV **1662** (246)).

τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους λδ ζγς. This is a reference to the 34th year of Constantius II, who was proclaimed Caesar by his father, Constantine I, on 8th November 324 and raised to Augustus after his father's death in 337, and the 3rd year of Julian, who became Caesar with Constantius as Augustus on 6th November, 355. This type of dating, which is peculiar to the Oxyrhynchite nome and also appears in LXI **4129** and **4130**, continued to be used until at least 668/669 (T. Varie 8.7). These Oxyrhynchite era years ran from 1 Thoth. See XIV **1632**, Introduction and 9 n. and *CSBE*² 55-62.

9 τῷ γενομένῳ κλήρῳ. This is either a reference to the lot by which they were selected, or to a lot cast privately by the three councillors to determine who was responsible for which area of the nome; see 10 n.

9-10 ε. . . [. . . 9?] . ε. . ι . . θαι. The missing words probably mean either “into three parts” or “between ourselves”. ποιῆσθαι (or πεποιῆσθαι or ποιήσασθαι?) is used with διαίρεσιν in e.g. P. Lips. I 26 (beginning of 4th century) and XLIV **3126** (328)) but cannot be read here.

10 καικληρῶσθαι A misspelling of κεκληρῶσθαι, which appears correctly in 12, and indicates that the three councillors decided by lot which of them would be responsible for which parts of the nome.

12 The missing word after Ἀχιλλέα may be Πρόσιτος, but if so he is the only one of the three to be graced with a patronymic in this part of the agreement. Alternatively there may be an adverb but nothing plausible suggests itself.

14 ἐκάστη μερίδι. Here μερίς is used in the sense of the area in which an official has to perform his functions; see pp. 118-120. In the Oxyrhynchite nome the term is used in a number of other ways also: as a subdivision of a toparchy (II **287** (23), P. Köln III 137 (88) and possibly XLIX **3475** (220)), as part of a toparchy named after an individual (XVII **2129** (205-6?)), as the northern or southern part of the nome (XII **1546** (3rd century)). It can also mean a part (of property) and be used in the same way as μέρος. See Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v. μερίς.

15-16 διακόπων. A διάκοπος is a deliberate opening in or channel through a dyke, made at high water and in the same place every year to enable water to flow into a side closed channel or an irrigation basin. XLIX **3475** (16 March 220) shows the amount of earth required to fill in such a cutting. The dykes would presumably be weak at these points and require additional support. See P. Lond. III 1246-8 (pp. 222-226) and Bonneau 1993, 81-84 and n. 669 for references to appearances of the word, to which should be added P. Berl. Cohen 13.

17 τὸ ὀπότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀποτέρου. Elsewhere ὀπότερος always means one or the other of two.

17-20 I have restored these lines on the basis of the formula of the Imperial oath common in the Oxyrhynchite nome, as in e.g. XLIII **3122** (322), XXII **2347** (362), XLVI **3309** (373). The use of the oath shows the seriousness of the obligations involved and the importance to each that the others fulfilled the duties allocated to them. It may also indicate that they would have had to swear the oath on taking office: at XXXVI **2764** Introduction it was suggested that this was required, but contra Seidl, 1935, 73. It would be more usual to see ὁμολογοῦμεν ὀμνύντες than ὀμνύομεν, although both are used. See generally P. Louvre II 121, Introduction and CSBE², App. G. The oath would normally be followed by a reiteration of the undertaking, the commitment to the performance of which was being made under oath, or words such as εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι and then ἢ ἔνοχοι εἶημεν τῷ θεῷ ὄρκῳ, but I cannot make this out here. For the use of the oath in private contractual relationships see Seidl 1935, 114-128.

018-020 Three circus programmes

Introduction

Each of the following papyri contains a list of items which were part of a programme of entertainment, probably presented in the hippodrome in Oxyrhynchus. Only three such programmes have been published to date: XXXIV 2707, P. Bingen 128 and P. Harrauer 56. 2707 is from Oxyrhynchus; the provenance of the others is unknown. P. Bingen 128 has been dated to the late 5th or 6th century; 2707 and P. Harrauer 56 to the 6th. The three described here are probably all late 5th or 6th century.¹⁴⁴

Some of the words used are not otherwise attested in papyri: γυ]μνικό[ς in 018 (unattested in this context), ἀβλατον (whose meaning I have been unable to establish) in 019 and γυροπασι[and ἠθολόγοι in 020. The evidence for the usage and meaning of these and some of the other terms used in the circus papyri, such as βοκάλιοι (2707 5, 7, 018.9, 020.2) and καλοπαῖκται (2707 5, 7, P. Bingen 128.5, P. Harrauer 56.4), comes from a variety of sources over a considerable time-span, suggesting that some types of entertainment did not change significantly over long periods of time. Even today circuses include tight-rope walkers, stilt-walkers and gymnasts or tumblers, and Reich shows consistency in mime/pantomime performances over two millennia.¹⁴⁵

018-020 are not specifically related to any of the other papyri considered here, although a connection between the Apion family and the hippodrome, which that family was already known to support through payments of wine, is indicated by 030.

Background

The entertainments listed in these programmes have their origins in both the gladiatorial and wild beast shows of imperial Rome and the Panhellenic festivals of classical and Hellenistic Greece. Gladiatorial contests, which had become less popular over time, were finally prohibited by edict of Theodosius II in 438. The custom of throwing people to the animals (*condemnatio ad bestias*) was prohibited by Anastasius at the end of the 5th century and although wild beast hunts (*venationes*) and shows continued (the dogs and gazelle hunt in 2707 was the successor of earlier contests with more exotic participants), these were

¹⁴⁴ In relation to such entertainment see generally Cameron 1973, 227-232 and 255-257; Cameron 1976, 193-229 and 316-317; Gascoü 1976 (1)=2008, 51-71; Roueché 1993, 1-79; Bagnall 1993 (1), 92-105; Potter 2010; Liebeschuetz 2001, 202-218.

¹⁴⁵ Reich 1903, *passim*.

becoming rarer. A combination of pressure from the Christian church and, more significantly, increasing costs and, in the case of *venationes*, difficulty in obtaining wild animals probably brought about the changes.¹⁴⁶ By the 6th century chariot-racing was the main competitive “sport” for mass entertainment. Chariot-racing is attested in Oxyrhynchus from the foundation of the Capitoline Games there in 273/4 (BGU IV 1074.16, XLIII **3135**), but that was Greek-style racing at festivals: the earliest evidence of a more permanent and professional operation is from the first half of the 4th century (O. Ashm. Shelton 83-190). By the time of **018-020**, possibly because of increasing costs, races were interspersed with other entertainments such as mimes, acrobats and singers, continuing the tradition of musical displays and contests which took place alongside the track and field events in the ancient Panhellenic festivals and their later equivalents. By this time too the gymnasium had ceased to play a major part in the education of the upper classes and athletics had also become a spectator sport, with professional athletes forming part of the bill at events in the hippodromes and theatres of provincial cities as well as in the great population centres of Constantinople and Alexandria.¹⁴⁷ Even the mimes and other “artists” may have been competing rather than just performing: see below and **018.5 n.**

From as early as the 4th century BC mimes, actors and other travelling theatrical entertainers had organised themselves in, and been represented by, synods or guilds, such as the *τεχνῖται Διονύσου*.¹⁴⁸ These were attested in Egypt as early as 270-246 BC (OGIS 51 =SB V 8855). By the 2nd century AD there is evidence that these local guilds, which were more like trade unions than employing organisations, had become members of world-wide (*οἰκουμενικά*) associations (see XXVII **2476** 1 n.). Similar guilds and associations of athletes are known from the 2nd century and in the 3rd century we can see evidence of cooperation, and possibly a merger, between the two “professional associations”.¹⁴⁹ We have no evidence that these guilds continued beyond the 3rd century (for artists) or the 4th (for athletes), and the paucity of artists’ work contracts after the Roman period (only one of 25 currently known is from the Byzantine era: see LXXIV **5013-5016** Introduction) may point to a change in the way in which the “profession” was organised.

¹⁴⁶ See Ville 1960, 311-332, Liebeschuetz 1959, Cameron 1976, 214-217.

¹⁴⁷ See Forbes 1955, 249; Cameron 1976, 216-217; Bagnall 1993 (1), 104-105; Roueché 1993, 76-79.

¹⁴⁸ For the date see Ghiron-Bistagne 1976, 2,163, 299 citing Moretti, *I.G.U.R.* 223-230 (Stefanis *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΟΙ ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΙ* (Heraklion 1988) 304, 332, 363, 1227, 1413, 1723).

¹⁴⁹ XXVII **2476** and **2477** (288/9) with Rea 1983, and OGIS 713, a 3rd century inscription from Alexandria, which refers to a theatrical and athletic synod: ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς θυμελικῆς καὶ ξυστικῆς συνόδου, cited by Roueché (1993, 55).

Roman chariot-races were organised in or by Factions (see e.g. Pliny *Ep.* ix.6); originally four in number (Reds, Whites, Greens and Blues), the Blues (βένετοι or καλλαίνοι) and the Greens (πράσινοι) became the most prominent.¹⁵⁰ We tend to use the word “faction” to mean fans or partisans but *factio* meant the performers and the professional corporations which employed them; Factions, in contrast to Colours (the word I will use to indicate the different “teams”), are not attested in later sources and may have ceased to exist when breeding horses for racing became a liturgy.¹⁵¹ The Colours were first attested in Egypt in Alexandria in 315 (P. Cair. Isid. 57.26 and 58.13-14) and in Hermopolis in 320-325 (CPR VI 63, which mentions καλλαίνων)¹⁵² but we have no evidence of them in Oxyrhynchus until 552 (I 145). A 6th century papyrus from Antinoe shows charioteers in the four Colours, as do, inter alia, 2nd century mosaics from the Via Cassia in Rome.¹⁵³ The Colours seem to have spread from racing to the theatre; they are first attested in the theatre in Constantinople in 490 and graffiti in Aphrodisias (which had no hippodrome) show that mimes could belong to a Colour.¹⁵⁴ Graffiti from the theatre at Alexandria also mention the Colours:¹⁵⁵ these relate principally to charioteers and do not provide any evidence for theatre entertainers being in Colours, although they show that areas of the theatre were reserved for their supporters.¹⁵⁶ See also 018.5 n.

It is generally acknowledged that by the 6th century not merely chariot-racing but artists and athletes too were organised by a single organisation with two sub-divisions, the Blues and the Greens.¹⁵⁷ It is not known precisely when and how this formal amalgamation took place but it was probably at some point in the 5th century: Liebeschuetz suggests that it was during the reign of Theodosius II (408-450).¹⁵⁸ Cameron thought that the change evidenced a state take-over of the provision of entertainment, Roueché that it was the natural

¹⁵⁰ Possibly Greens and Reds were always paired together, and Blues with Whites, so that the Greens and Blues became referred to as “the major factions” (Potter 2010, 320). Roueché (1993, 47) suggested that possibly four Colours were maintained in the major urban centres while in less prosperous areas there were only two, but all four are depicted in the Antinoe papyrus (see Turner 1973).

¹⁵¹ Cameron 1976, 13-15, 202, 211; Gascou 1976 (1), 199 esp. n. 3=2008, 61-62 n. 46. See also on *factionarius* Gascou 1976 (1), 191-2, n. 2=2008, 55-56, n. 24.

¹⁵² See Gascou 1983, 226-228.

¹⁵³ Turner 1973, Weeber 1994, 44-45.

¹⁵⁴ Cameron 1976, 194 citing Malalas p.386, Roueché 1993, 1.iii (I Aph 2007 8.104) and pp. 19-23.

¹⁵⁵ Cameron 1976, 316; Borkowski 1981, 75-96.

¹⁵⁶ As possibly also seat graffiti from Aphrodisias such as I Aph. 8.54, 8.55, 8.57, 8.61, 8.64 from the theatre and 10.3 and 10.4 from the stadium.

¹⁵⁷ The evidence for this is summarised by Cameron (1976, 194-196, 214-221) and Roueché (1993, 54-60). See also Gascou 1976 (1), 199-200=2008, 61-62. Zuckerman (2000, 78) suggests that each Colour had its own resources, see p. 132 below.

¹⁵⁸ Liebeschuetz 2001, 207.

continuation, albeit with imperial support, of the process instigated by the performers themselves by which the various guilds of artists and athletes had become part of one world-wide organisation.¹⁵⁹ The extent of imperial involvement in any such process is not clear but there were clearly practical advantages of such a grouping. As Cameron and Roueché both note, it would have been easier for the person(s) charged with organising such spectacles to have to deal with only one organisation in order to be sure of a variety of performers including, for competitive events, at least one representing each Colour.¹⁶⁰

Regardless of whether there was any formal organisational grouping, there were probably joint “performances” involving racing, athletes and artists in Egypt as early as 320-325: CPR VI 41, 47, 50 and 63 show payments to a *xystarch* (president of the athletes’ association), a flute-player and a boxer, as well as to a cellar-master of the Blues.¹⁶¹ Gascou describes all these as “personnels du cirque d’Hermopolis”.¹⁶² Those papyri are the earliest to suggest a grouping of all these types of entertainers at the circus in a permanent way. Much later, **2707** and **019** show racing and entertainers together on one programme. There was clearly a permanent base of horses and charioteers in Oxyrhynchus in and around the 6th century (XXVII **2480** 10, 28, 82, 83, 90, 97, 98, 99, 101, 107, 108, 118 and PSI VIII 953.42, 77, 91 show the Apion estate issuing wine to it, SB III 6018 is a column from Phocas’ time (602 -610) inscribed τόπος διαφέρων τοῖς Βενέτοις, **030** shows the Blues’ horses kept near the Apions’ stable), and entertainers (like the mimes and men on stilts in **2480** 43) may have had to remain in the town where they were based.¹⁶³ One wonders whether in a town like Oxyrhynchus there would have been sufficient variety of entertainers to keep the people amused; perhaps the horses and riders remained in the same stables or racing yards but the other artists continued to travel around.

The entertainments were provided free for the crowds, but it is not entirely clear how they were funded at the time of these papyri; probably there was not a single source of finance. The traditional festivals were supported at least in part by foundations, but the value of this funding would have been eroded by inflation and probably was no longer significant. XVII **2110** (370) and, possibly, P. Cair. Isid. 57 and 58 (315) show that the maintenance of the horses and charioteers was a liturgy in the 4th century. This continued into the 5th but

¹⁵⁹ Cameron 1976, 218-222, Roueché 1993, 46, 57.

¹⁶⁰ Cameron 1976, 221; Roueché 1993, 46-49.

¹⁶¹ See Gascou 1983, 227; Bagnall 1993 (1), 105 and n. 389.

¹⁶² Gascou 1983, 226.

¹⁶³ Roueché 1993, 10-11 and references at 10.82.

ceased before the 6th century.¹⁶⁴ The emperor paid for entertainments in Constantinople and to achieve the same political purpose the imperial role should have been performed by the governors, or others perceived to represent him, in the provinces. Gasco points to what he calls the increasing “*fiscalisation*” of the spectacles, claiming that they were publicly funded like any other municipal public service and citing as evidence *inter alia* papyri showing payments in wine to horses, mimes and stilt-walkers by the Apion household, such as **2480** (565/6?) and PSI VIII 953 (567-8); these were however all relatively small amounts.¹⁶⁵ In support of his assertion that those responsible at municipal or provincial level were totally indifferent to which Colour was being paid, Gasco relies on the four relevant Apion papyri, one of which, I **145** (552), mentions the Greens while the other three refer to the Blues.¹⁶⁶ He cites P. Lond. III 1028, which lists collections from a number of streets in Hermopolis, one part of which is under the heading (καὶ) τοῦ Πρασίνου μέρ(ους), as evidence that the whole population contributed to one team or the other, with the allocation to Blues or Greens having being made by the collector after the collection, rather than the people on a particular street making payment for a particular Colour; his argument is based partly on the number of priests who contributed. But that papyrus is an official account of payments made by the guilds of Hermopolis; the “Green Part” is an official designation of a district of the city, which survives into the Islamic period, and has nothing to do with the circus.¹⁶⁷ If racing was funded by collections from all the inhabitants of the towns, a geographical split would make it unlikely that each side would receive an equal amount, so Gasco is right that any such funding would not have been determined by area,¹⁶⁸ but there is no evidence that everyone in the city contributed to a Colour. Zuckerman interprets P. Lond. III 1028 as recording money actually collected for the account of the Greens; this is also unfounded, but I think he is correct that some funds for the circus came from private sources, unrelated to the tax system.¹⁶⁹ On his analysis, the Colours had their own funds managed by their *aurarii* or treasurers; these would have been used *inter alia* to pay transfer fees and the bonuses which the crowds demanded.¹⁷⁰ Such

¹⁶⁴ Gasco 1976 (1), 192-193 and n. 3 =2008, 56-57, n. 27. See also LXXVII **5120** Introduction.

¹⁶⁵ Gasco 1976 (1), 192-193=2008, 56-57.

¹⁶⁶ Gasco 1976 (1), 195=2008, 58-59. See also **030.2** n.

¹⁶⁷ See Mithof at CPR XXIII 33 3-4 n., who shows that when a reference is to the circus, μέρος is followed by the genitive plural of the relevant Colour, while when a district is meant the Colour word is singular and precedes μέρος.

¹⁶⁸ Gasco 1976 (1), 196-199=2008, 59-62.

¹⁶⁹ As Roueché (1993, 46).

¹⁷⁰ Zuckerman 2000, 73-78. Cameron (1976, 248-9) considered the *aurarii* were members of professional cliques who manipulated the crowd.

items need not have been privately funded, however, if each Colour had a manager who was responsible for its part of the funding, and Zuckerman follows Gascou on the main issue, that the circus was a unified institution with a global budget; he suggests that most of the *aurarii* would have been members of municipal colleges.¹⁷¹ Herakleopolis had areas which supported a particular Colour (SB XX 14682.1, where the reference is to a *laura* or quarter).¹⁷² It is possible that the stables were maintained by wealthy land-owners but that the public purse (which may indeed have been funded by them) paid for putting on the spectacles themselves, while fans also contributed so that their favourite charioteers might benefit.¹⁷³ As with similar payments to other public services, the extent to which wealthy estate-owners were required to make them is not clear. The Apion payments of wine may have been in part for private performances, or been voluntary donations; wealthy locals may not have been averse to displaying their wealth and gaining popularity by sponsoring events or performances, always assuming that did not meet with imperial disapproval, and imperial acclamations may have averted imperial displeasure: see **018.2** n.

It is not clear either whether all the events at these spectacles were competitive, ἀγῶνες, (as Liebeschuetz) or if some were mere displays or side-shows, ἐπιδείξεις (as Potter).¹⁷⁴ Musicians, pantomimes and, later, mimes took part in competitions at festivals (**018.5** n.) and if all the artists belonged to Colours there must have been a competitive element but one need only think of the reaction of the audience at any Italian opera house to a non-Italian singer to realise that “sides” could be taken even in a pure entertainment context.

The six circus papyri

All three published papyri commence with an invocation to good fortune and some form of display or shout of victory, as does **018**. In P. Harrauer 56.3 a procession takes place before the first event. The proper place for this procession of horses was before the first race (Const. Porph. *de cer.* II 153, cited by Morelli at p. 203), but there were no races in P. Harrauer 56. Both **2707** and P. Bingen 128 show the procession after the first race. **018** is too damaged to be able to say whether a procession was listed but it may have been, at line 3, 4 or 6. **019** and **020** are too incomplete for us to know whether they included these items.

¹⁷¹ Zuckerman 2000, 78; Gascou 1976 (1), 196-198=2008, 59-61.

¹⁷² See for other references to such terms CPR XXIII 33 3-4 n. at p. 209.

¹⁷³ On funding see also Cameron 1976, 218-221, Roueché 1993, 7-10, 46.

¹⁷⁴ Liebeschuetz 2001, 203; Potter 2010, 299-300.

The number of races held on a single day varied widely from time to time and from place to place.¹⁷⁵ **2707**, the only programme we have which is complete, listed a number of entertainments which took place in the intervals between six chariot races; apart from between races 1 and 2, when as well as the procession there was some form of act on stilts (see P. Harrauer 56.4 n.), there was a single item of entertainment between each race. P. Bingen 128, an incomplete list, showed three races (see P. Harrauer 56.8 n. on the meaning of ἄθλον in this connection and on the substitution of ἄθλον for βάιον in P. Bingen 128.3), with the procession and two other items between races 1 and 2 and a single item of entertainment between subsequent races. P. Harrauer 56, so far as it can be read, lists only entertainments and no races. Morelli suggested that this may have been the first part of the programme, with chariot races to follow, or that there were no chariot races and only other entertainments; he noted however that the opening elements (the invocation to good fortune, the display of victories (see **018.2** n.) and the procession) were typical elements of *ludi circenses*.¹⁷⁶

No races can be read with certainty in **018** below, which is the most complete in length of the three but very damaged; there are clearly none in lines 7-9. Nor are any included in the four extant lines of **020**. **019** lists one race, at line 2. Together with P. Harrauer 56, papyri **018** and **020** suggest that there were what we would today call “circus” entertainments, without chariot racing, even in a location like Oxyrhynchus which had a hippodrome. It must have been cheaper to put on such a show rather than a full programme including racing. Alternatively **018** and **020** may be later than **019** and from a time when Oxyrhynchus no longer had racing stables.¹⁷⁷

The papyri do not show the venue for the events. At Oxyrhynchus there was a hippodrome (probably just outside the city to the north of the ancient site) and a theatre (in the south-west quarter).¹⁷⁸ Shows without chariot-racing may have used the theatre; in Aphrodisias, where there was no hippodrome, there is evidence in the theatre for a range of entertainers, including mimes and a tight-rope walker.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ Cameron 1973, 251-257.

¹⁷⁶ Morelli on P. Harrauer 56, at p. 203, citing Gasco 1976 (1), 190, n. 4 =2008, 54-55, n. 21.

¹⁷⁷ Chariot-racing continued until at least the 9th century (Zuckerman 2000, 93) but may have been in decline from the 6th and 7th: Potter 2010, 327. See also Cameron 1973, 256-257. The Blues may have had a “club-house” at Oxyrhynchus in the time of Phocas (Cameron 1976, 148).

¹⁷⁸ See Padró 2006, 100 and fig. 71 and 2007, 136-137.

¹⁷⁹ Roueché 1993, 1.1. iii (I Aph 2007 1.104), 8 b ii on pp 36-37 and plate II.

The items listed are in the nominative in **018** and **020** and the accusative in **019**. There is no significance in this; the other circus papyri are inconsistent. There is also no consistency between the papyri in the use of the singular or plural. In **2707** 11, the plural was used in relation to mimes, and at P. Bingen 128.6 n. the editor suggested that the singular term might indicate the spectacle rather than the artist. Mimes are usually referred to in the plural but there are papyri where payments are made to single artists, like III **519** 3 (2nd century) and VII **1050** 25 (2nd-3rd century).¹⁸⁰ We have no programmes which contain both singular and plural of exactly the same type of performer, but **020** has a singular mime and plural *ethologoi*, a type of mime artist (**020.4** n.), and **018** also has a mixture of singular and plural. I agree with Morelli (P. Harrauer 56, at p. 203) that the singular noun indicates a solo artist. It is possible, in the case of mimes, that the plural in **2707** 11 may indicate a competition.

The use of these documents has been discussed by editors of the papyri already published. **018** is subscribed, like **2707**, which Rea suggests (**2707** Introduction) may have been a copy of a public notice which had to be seen and approved by a second person, possibly passed from one municipal official to another. We cannot tell if any of the others had a subscription; all may have. Morelli notes that the writing and lay-out of P. Harrauer 56 was in the style used in official notices but thinks it unlikely that it was hung in public and suggests that such programmes would have been handed round before the performance, perhaps as invitations; the signature on **2707** may have been greetings from the sender (P. Harrauer 56, Introduction, p. 204). The three published papyri are all in a similar style of writing: large letters, wide spaces between the lines, described by Rea at **2707** Introduction as “in the “chancery” style, with tiny *alphas* and *hypsilons* placed close to the top level of the other letters”. Of these three papyri, **018** is the closest to that, but all have large letters with wide spaces between the lines and, so far as one can see, wide margins which suggest that they may have been created to be handed round or pinned up; whatever the general level of literacy, there would have been enough people able to read to justify this. Alternatively they may have been used by the master of ceremonies or impresario in charge of ensuring that the various acts came on at their appointed times. All the hands are different.

¹⁸⁰ Other references are at P. Harrauer 56, p. 203.

018 Circus programme

A 6 B.5/57(a)

30 x 12.5 cm

6th century

Description

018 is very damaged, with a number of large holes. The upper and right margins are intact, as is the left margin except for a hole from lines 5 to 7, and a separate fragment (shown in that position in an earlier transcript by Rea and confirmed by the line of the fibres) completes the bottom margin. Wide margins were left at both sides and wide gaps between the lines; it does not look like a document for private use. The *alpha* and *upsilon* are higher and smaller than the other letters (particularly in l. 1), the *nu* is curved (l. 7) and the *iota* has a small loop on top (ll. 5, 7, 9). The writing is with the fibres. The back contains an account which is probably a list of vegetables, written later.

1 ἀ[γα]θῆ τύχη

2 νί[κη]

3 . . [

4 .[] . [

5 μῖμος

6] . [

7 γυ]μνικό[ς

8 μῖμος

9 βουκάλιοι

10 .[

11 (m.2) δι]ετυ[χει

“For good fortune.

Victory.

.....

.....

Mime

.....

Gymnast

Mime

Vocalists?

.....

(2nd hand) Farewell.”

1 ἀ[γα]θῆ τύχη. The circus programmes are the only Byzantine era papyri in which this invocation appears (P. Harrauer 56.1 n.). The latest dated example of its use in another context is from 359, BGU I 316.2(=Chr. Mitt. 271), an agreement for sale of a slave. See LXIII 4359 2 n. for comment on its use in contracts on papyrus. In 2707 1 and P. Harrauer 56.1, the words are preceded by a christogram. We cannot tell if a cross or christogram appeared at the start of 018 or of P. Bingen 128, but on the basis of the other two papyri it is likely that it did. I have not found any other examples of this juxtaposition, and I would have expected the usage of the cross to have superseded the call to good fortune. The use of ἀγαθῆ τύχη at the start of a programme was customary in pre-Christian times, when Tyche was thought to be a goddess representing the fortune of the city, possibly because the activities were dangerous or involved betting, and the tradition continued without thought being given as to whether it was still appropriate, whether or not in conjunction with a cross. Or were the punters just hedging their bets?

2 νί[κη] I think it more likely that this is νίκη (as it clearly is in P. Harrauer 56.2) than νῖκα (as 2707 2 and P. Bingen 128.2: see P. Harrauer 56.2 n.), as had there been a fifth letter traces of it would have been visible. The plural might have indicated a victory figure for each reigning emperor (SHA *Severi* 22.3) carried in or before the *pompa circensis*: see 2707 2 n. Ovid (*Amores* III 2.45) shows a figure of Victory leading the procession at the races, followed by statues or representations of other gods, but that was some 500 years earlier,

and the circus papyri were produced in Christian times and show the victory as a separate item, not part of the procession, which might have been a parade of the horses and other participants (Const. Porph. *de Cer.* II 153). But the ceremony could have continued as a traditional start to the entertainment without its ancient meaning of Victory as the goddess of the circus (see *RE* VIII A.2 2528-2529) and a single figure symbolising victory may have been carried. The Hippodrome in Constantinople was the principal venue for imperial victory celebrations in the 5th and 6th centuries. If, when the emperor was present, there was always “some non-specific reiteration of victory ideology” (McCormick 1986, 95), it would not be surprising if this was mirrored in some way at events which took place in front of his representatives in the provinces. See Roueché 1993, 145-147 on imperial statues at celebrations and McCormick 1986, 59-68 and 92 to 99 on imperial victory celebrations. *νίκη* could also be an exhortation, as in Roueché 1993, pp. 31-32, 4 and 5. The other possibility is *νικᾶ*, which appears frequently in the theatre and other graffiti from Alexandria and Aphrodisias (Borkowski 1981, Roueché 1993 *passim*) and is usually taken to be indicative, an acclamation of victory (P. Bingen 128.2 n. and Cameron 1973, 248-250), but could also be subjunctive, expressing a wish for victory. Examples are *νικᾶ ἢ τύχη τῆς πόλεως* (Roueché 1984, 183= I Aph 2007 8.106) and *νικᾶ ἢ τύχη τῶν Ῥωμαίων* (*de Cer.* 425). Acclamations for the emperor were customary at games and the theatre when he was in attendance, and it is possible that they took place regularly at the start of all entertainments. On acclamations see generally Roueché 1983. Rea suggested that the victory might have something to do with the previous day’s racing (2707 2 n.). This is possible, assuming none of the programmes relates to the first day of a session, although there is 4th century evidence of racing at Oxyrhynchus over five or six consecutive days (O. Ashm. Shelton, p. 74).

5 μ]ῖμ[ος] This can mean the play or sketch to be performed but was also a general word for a comic actor, often one who imitated or parodied his subjects. Mime(s) are the common element in all the circus papyri known: 2707 11, P. Bingen 128.6, 10, P. Harrauer 56.5, and 019.1, 3 (and 5?) and 020.1 below. Here I have restored the singular because this form can be read in l. 8. Mimes could “belong” to a Colour: I Aph 2007 8.104 (1.iii: in Roueché 1993, 17). See also XXVII 2480 43, where wine is distributed by the Apion household to mimes of τῶν β ἐργαστηρίων: this may be a reference to the two Colours (see *inter alia* 2480 10 showing wine being supplied to the horses of the Blue Faction); Gascou thinks it is not (1976 (1), 195 n.2=2008, 58 n. 34), although without giving a

reason). It is not clear whether the *καλοπαῖκται* mentioned in the same line belonged to the same group. Might *β* be short for *βενέτων*?

We cannot tell whether the mime was competing or just performing. Mimes took part in competitions at earlier festivals, although not as early or in as high-level contests as pantomimes, which were regarded as superior (see Robert 1929, 433-438=*OMS* I, 221-226 and 1936, 244-248=*OMS* I, 680-684, and Roueché 1993, 24). That even the later appearances were competitive is suggested by references to *διασκεύη ἄμαχα* (unbeatable equipment) and exhortations to victory at Aphrodisias: see Roueché 1993, 19-25 1.1.iii and 1.3.ii, 1.4 ii, 1.5.i (I Aph 2007 8.16, 8.17, 8.18 and 8.104). Mimes are referred to in a number of papyri from the 1st century onwards: BGU XIV 2428.29 (1st century BC, in a festival context); LXXIV 5013 3 n. (possibly: 2nd century, context unclear); III 519 32 (2nd century), VII 1050 25 (2nd/3rd century) and P. Harris I 97.9 (4th century) showing that they took part at games; P. Ryl. IV 641.17 (first half of 4th century) entertaining a visiting strategus; P. Wash. Univ. II 95.1 (4th/5th century); Stud. Pal. XX 85 (4th century), again in the context of a festival; XXVII 2480 43 (565/6, see above). A *biologos*, a special type of mime, is mentioned in VII 1025 7-8 (late 2nd century) in a context of village entertainment. Apart from 2480 and CPR VII 45.24, 27 (6th century, where the meaning is unclear), the only references in later papyri are in the circus programmes. At LXXIV 5013 3 n. the editor mentions a reference in SB IV 7336 but I have been unable to confirm this, although it contains references to a number of entertainers. See Robert 1936, 242=*OMS* I 678, Perpillou-Thomas 1995, 230 and references, Cameron 1973, 230-232, 1976 224ff. and, for mimes generally, Reich 1903.

7 γυ]μνικό[ς]. The adjective *γυμνικός* is frequently found in contrast to *μουσικός* in relation to contests, but this is the first papyrological attestation of the term used to mean an acrobatic or gymnastic performer in a spectacle, as in *SEG* 30.1231, an inscription from Lyons (1st half of 3rd century) commemorating Gorgonius, a foundling raised as a *gymnicus* who died aged ten. Sacco (1980) cites five Latin inscriptions in the same vein (*CIL* VI 10158, 10159, 1060 and 14400, and X 2132) and SHA Vopiscus. *Car.* XIX 2 and XIX3, showing *gymnici* appearing in spectacles in Rome along with, inter alia, pantomimes, musicians and what we would call circus entertainers. These suggest that the term may have been applied principally to young performers. This is an example of a transliterated Latin word used in a circus context (like *μίσσοσ* and *βοκάλιοι* in 2707). See *Thes. Ling. Lat. s. v.*

gymnicus. Zuckerman (2000, 76) notes that the use of Latin words more or less “grécisés” was typical of the vocabulary of the circus in the East.

8 μῖμος. See 5 n.

9 βουκάλιοι. This word, spelt βοκάλιοι, appeared as an adjective qualifying καλοπαῖκται (men on stilts: see P. Harrauer 56.4 n.) in **2707** 5 and 7, where Rea translated it as “singing”, from Latin *vocalis*, citing Soph. *Lex.* s.v. This refers to Const. Porph. *de Cer.* 20.14 and 742.10, where it means people who sing or shout (in the latter case in Latin; they are called τοῖς ῥωμαῖίζουσι βουκάλοις at p. 744) and *Chron. Pas.* 159 (τοὺς δε ᾠδοὺς τοὺς λεγομένους βοκαλίους). Here and in **020.2** it is a noun. I have not found the word used elsewhere in papyri.

11 δι]εγτύ[χει The remaining letters are written in a different hand on the small fragment which fits at the bottom of the papyrus. The reconstruction follows **2707** 14. See p. 135 for possible implications of the use of this word, which normally appears at the end of letters.

019 Circus programme

84/90(g)

14x12.5 (max) cm

5th to 6th century

Only four lines, and slight traces of a fifth, have survived. We cannot tell how much is missing. The right margin is intact and, like **018**, the letters are large and a wide margin is left on both sides, as if for a public notice. The *mu* and *nu* are curved, the *nu* ends with a flourish at the end of each line and there are ligatures between *mu* and *iota*, and *mu* and *omicron*. The *alpha* is open but, other than its second appearance in l. 4, not noticeably smaller than the other letters. The back is blank.

1 μ[ι]μον

2 ἄθλον

3 μῖμον

4 αβλατον

5 ἄθλο]ν

“Mime

Race

Mime

??????

Race”

1 μ[ι]μον. See **018.5** n.

2 ἄθλον. This word is attested in three other papyri: P. Bingen 128.3, 7, 9 (see P. Harrauer 56.8 n.), where it has the same meaning as here, SB X 10493.7 (228), where it clearly meant prize, and P. Lond VI 1927.36 (mid-4th century), where the meaning is not entirely clear but it was translated as contest. Its meaning changed over time, developing from the prize to

the contest which was fought for it and then, specifically or in specific contexts, a chariot contest or race (see P. Harrauer 56.8 n. citing Const. Porph. *de Cer.* I 758). Philo (*de div. verb. sig. s.v.*) distinguishes ἄθλον meaning contest from ἔπαθλον meaning prize.

3 μῖμον. See 018.5 n.

4 ἀβλατον. I do not know what this word means. I have not found anything in Greek or Latin that looks similar, other than *ablatus* from *aufero*. If that is the correct derivation, there are I think three possible (I hesitate to use the word in this context; none is satisfactory) meanings: carried away (possibly a stock mime or pageant), interval, and prize giving (see Lewis and Short *s.v aufero*, A “to take or bear off, carry off”, B “cease from” or “desist from”, and C “carry off (as the fruit or result of one’s labour)” respectively). While one might have expected another race in this position in the list, it is clear that the word is not ἄθλον. The second letter may possibly be a *kap* but that does not help the interpretation; I can find no examples of ἀκλατον either. Nor is ἀύλατον attested.

5 ἄθλο]ν. Restored following line 2. The word could equally well be μῖμο]ν but 2707 and P. Bingen 128 show a maximum of two events between races and (subject to l. 4 not meaning some form of race) another mime at this point would seem unlikely.

020 Circus programme

105/67(a)

20 x 9.25 cm max

6th century

Only four lines of **020** have survived; we cannot tell how much is missing. The left margin is complete, with a wide band of papyrus left blank on both sides. The writing is the same size as in **019**. The *alpha* and *omicron* are smaller and higher above the line than the other letters. There are no ligatures and the letters are less curved than in **018** and **019**. The back is blank.

1 μῖμος

2 βοκάλιοι

3 γυροπασι[

4 ἠθολόγοι

“Mime.

Vocalists.

Dancer with hoop?

Mimics”

1 μῖμος. See **018.5** n.

2 βοκάλιοι. See **018.9** n.

3 γυροπασι[I have found not found this word anywhere else but the *sigma* and *iota* are not in doubt. γῦρος means a ring or circle (LSJ). The word may be γυροπασία, which by analogy with ἵππασία, an exercise for horses in a ring (for example in Xen. *De Eq.*), might mean an act involving going round (from πατέω) the hippodrome with or on a hoop. XXVII **2470**, a 3rd century painting of what looks like a circus act, shows a hoop on the right, through which the person whose legs are seen on the left may be about to jump,

avoiding the bear below. This may be the type of performer mentioned here, although the word γυροπασί[makes one expect the hoop to be the focal point of the act and from the angle of the legs in 2470 it looks as if some form of trapeze may have been used, in which case I would have expected the act to be identified by the bear or the trapeze. Whether the artist(s) spun a hoop or flew through it or juggled with it can only be a matter of conjecture, although I assume (but only because a different word is used) that the performance was different from that of a τροχοπαίκτης, someone who juggles with hoops or does some sort of acrobatic act with them (see Robert 1929, 433-430=*OMS* I 221-226). γυρόω means to coil oneself up, so it is possible that the performer here was a contortionist, and the term is also used in connection with wrestling to signify twisted or contorted limbs (Philostr. *de Gym.* 11, 35).

4 ἠθολόγοι. Another word not found elsewhere in papyrological sources. Defined in Photius, Hesychius and the Suda only as θεατριστής, this is a specific type of mime who mimics or impersonates, equated to a *biologos* by Reich (1903 I 83, in the context of mimes who imitated Christian figures, and II 642) and Robert (1936, 242=*OMS* I 678). See Ath. *Deipn.* I 20 a, a reference to Noemon the mimic, Diod. Sic. XX 63.2.5, where a person is described as making people laugh as if he was an ἠθολόγος or a θαυματοποιός (a mimic or a conjuror/ stuntman) and Plut. *Questiones Conviviales* 673.b2, καὶ μίμοις καὶ ἠθολόγοις, in relation to entertainments at drinking parties.

021-032 Documents relating to estates

There follow editions of 12 papyri from the 6th and early 7th centuries, which fall into a number of separate but over-lapping groups. Eight (**021**, **022**, **023**, **026**, **027**, **028**, **029** and **030**) belong to the dossier of the Apion family and illustrate different aspects of life on their estate; **025** and **031** may also have Apion connections. **021** and **022** are employment contracts for a door-keeper at the Apion family mansion and a rent-collector. **023**, an instruction to a *pronoetes* to waive collection of rents, informs the debate on the relationship between the great land-owners and the farmers on their estates. **024**, also probably from a large estate, is the first published receipt for payment of rent categorised as *ekphorion* pursuant to an *apaitesimon*. **026**, **027** and **028** evidence payments of wheat to three monasteries, Abba Andrew and the previously unattested Abba Petros and Abba Castor; **027** contains some unusual indemnity provisions. **029** and **030** show the monastery of Abba Castor supplying ropes to the Apion estate, supplies known to have been furnished to it by the monasteries of Abba Andrew and Abba Hierax. **027**, the Abba Petros receipt, mentions Flavia Gabriela, who was attested in XXXVI 2780, and establishes a connection between her and the Apion family. **025**, a receipt for a payment for wine, can also be related to her. This enables the compilation of a small dossier relating to her, comprising XXXVI 2780, SB XXVI 16795 (=P. Herm 80), **025**, **027** and possibly XVI 2020. The last five papyri, **028** to **032**, can be considered to constitute a separate dossier relating to the monastery of Abba Castor.

The large estates of the Apions and other 6th century landowners in the Oxyrhynchite nome

The Apion family are attested as major aristocratic landowners in the Oxyrhynchite nome and elsewhere from the mid-5th century to the first quarter of the 7th.¹⁸¹ Some 300 papyri relating to that family or their interests have been published.¹⁸² Jones estimated the Oxyrhynchite and Cynopolite estates together at 112,000 *arouras*, some two fifths of the total area of those nomes, based on figures for tax contributions in XVI 1909 and I 127, but it is unlikely that the tax contributions derived only from their own estates (see pp. 155-157).¹⁸³ Hickey estimated that in the Oxyrhynchite and the Cynopolite combined they

¹⁸¹ Their family tree is set out in Ruffini 2008, 255; for additional details see Mazza 2001, App. 1.

¹⁸² Mazza 2001, 20-45 and Sarris 2006, 25-26, esp. 26, n. 81, to which add LXX 4780-4802, LXXII 4923-4930 and LXXVII 5123.

¹⁸³ Jones, LRE II 780.

owned some 25,000 arouras, up to 22,000 of which may have been arable land.¹⁸⁴ Whatever the exact size of their estates, the Apions are acknowledged to have been the largest landholders in the nome. Their Oxyrhynchite estate was not one single piece of land but comprised a number of separate parcels in different parts of the nome and a complex hierarchy of officials was employed to run it.¹⁸⁵ The rural estate was divided into districts; Mazza identified ten of these *pronoesiae* or *prostasiae*, each administered for income and expenditure purposes by a *pronoetes* or “steward”, but there may have been more.¹⁸⁶ Apionic *pronoetai* are mentioned in **023**, **026**, **027** and **028**. A number of annual accounts of these stewards have been published, including two for the *prostasia* which included Apelle (**023.2** n.) among its ἐποικία: XVI **1911**, from 556/557 (now partly restated in SB XXIV 16324), and LV **3804**, which is almost complete, from 565/566.¹⁸⁷ These accounts show payments in produce and (the majority) in cash made by farmers in the *epoikia* and disbursements, also in cash or kind, and concessions or reductions made by the *pronoetes*. The meaning of *epoikion* changed over time. In the 4th century it seems to have evolved from an enclosed and gated complex of farm buildings and accommodation to a sort of *villa rustica*, which might have incorporated former villages as well as farmlands, vineyards and orchards (SB VIII 9907 (388)).¹⁸⁸ By the 6th century (but possibly in some instances as early as the 4th) it meant an estate-owned settlement, as in LXX **4781** (525); LXIII **4398** (553) suggests that more than one estate could be interested in the same *epoikion*, see LXX **4787** 9-10 n. Hickey calls them farmsteads or hamlets,¹⁸⁹ but these terms are not synonymous; the accounts show that a number of persons, and so presumably families, lived in each, while a farmstead suggests single family occupation.¹⁹⁰ We would I think best translate it as hamlet, a less loaded term than “labour settlement”.¹⁹¹ An *epoikion* did not have any administrative autonomy.¹⁹² Some *prostasiae* (see I **136**) comprised or included villages, κῶμαι; these were self-administering, but the *pronoetes* made collections from them too, probably rents on property leased from the estate, and taxes. Villages were not described as belonging to or being owned by an estate but as being παγαρχούμεναι or administered by an estate-

¹⁸⁴ Hickey 2008 (1), 98. See also Sarris 2006, 83-86 and Ruffini 2008, 99-101.

¹⁸⁵ See Sarris 2006, 78-79 for a suggestion as to its mode of operation.

¹⁸⁶ Mazza 2001, App. 6, XVI **2032** and Hickey 2001, 69.

¹⁸⁷ See Mazza, 2001, App. 8 and Sarris 2006, 29 n. 2 for references for accounts.

¹⁸⁸ Lewuillon-Blume 1977, *passim*, relying *inter alia* on P. Thead 17 = P. Turner 44 (331-2).

¹⁸⁹ Hickey 2007, 295.

¹⁹⁰ Possibly as many as 200-300 persons may have lived in an *epoikion*: Banaji 2007, 11-12, Sarris 2006, 115-116.

¹⁹¹ Following Benaissa 2009, 7 n. 4.

¹⁹² Mazza 2001, 79.

owner (as for example LXX **4787** 9-10 n. and see below pp. 155-158).¹⁹³ A different official, called an οἰνοχειριστής, was responsible for the estate's wine production and supply and the Apions employed their own *zygostates*: LV **3805** 30. Their estate encompassed a full range of farming activities: arable farming, viticulture, orchards, vegetable plots and date-palms, as well as the related oil and wine presses and other mechanical equipment. Some of their land, referred to as αὐτουργία, may have been directly farmed by the Apions, although part of this too (probably only a small part) may have been let out to inhabitants of the *epoikia*.¹⁹⁴ In Oxyrhynchus itself, a role equivalent to that of the *pronoetes* was fulfilled by the rent-collector or ἐνοικολόγος, as shown in LVIII **3958** and **022**.

We know of a number of other Oxyrhynchite estate owners in the same period, although they are less well documented than the Apions. XVI **2020** and **2040** list tax payments and contributions to a public bath made by a number of property owners, and XVI **2039** lists major landowners who were responsible for the provision of *riparii*. As well as the θεῖος οἶκος or *domus divina* (the private estates belonging to the emperor), the church and monasteries, other landowners attested in papyri include the families of Flavius Alexander, Timagenes (see **027**), Ioannes and Theon, and a number of women: Flavia Kyria (**032**), Flavia Euphemia and Flavia Anastasia. The evidence suggests that they managed their estates in the same way and used same types of documentation as the Apions.¹⁹⁵ The *pronoetes* employed by the imperial estates in VIII **1134** (421) and in PSI III 196 and 197 (6th or 7th century) carried out the same tasks as those assigned to his Apionic counterpart in 583 (I **136**). The church owned *epoikia* and had *enapographoi georgoi* (SB XVIII 14006, a guarantee of service) and employed a *pronoetes* (XVI **1950**). Euphemia employed a *pronoetes* (P. Mich. XV 733 (548)) and an *enoikologos* and a *dioecetes* (VII **1038** (568)), and Flavia Gabrielia employed a *zygostates* and an *oinocheiristes* (**025**). Documents relating to Flavia Anastasia, who employed two *dioecetai* at the same time, suggesting she had a large estate (LXIX **4756-4758** Introduction), include guarantees of service concerning farmers on her estate, like those relating to the church and the Apions (see p. 150 below): LXIX **4756**

¹⁹³ Hickey 2008 (1), 89 n. 11. On κῶμαι see Banaji 2007, 146-148, 173-4.

¹⁹⁴ The concessions or rebates in LV **3804** 204-212 may be explained as allocations in relation to such land which had fallen into disuse: Mazza 2001, 134. See Mazza 2001, 129-134 and 2008, 152 for references to the *autourgia*.

¹⁹⁵ As Benaissa 2007, 76 n. 5.

(590), **4757** and **4758** (both late 6th century) and XLIV **3204** (588), which has the only reference to a village being *παγαρχουμένη* by someone other than an Apion.¹⁹⁶

The legal relationship between landowners and farmers

Much has been written on the nature of the legal relationship between the major landowners and those who lived on their estates and worked their land, the nature of the payments collected from those farmers and from others, and the principal source of their income. Hardy considered them to be feudal landlords, whose serfs were bound to the soil, and who were responsible for collecting the taxes of their *coloni* and accounting for them under a system of *autopragia*, although he admitted that the terms on which the tenants held their land and paid rent were rather obscure.¹⁹⁷ The feudal view has fallen out of favour. The residents of the *epoikia* were clearly not serfs: they had the right to produce and sell cash crops for their own account (XLIX **3512**, LXI **4132**, LXXVII **5123**) (they could not have obtained the gold needed to make the payments shown in the accounts by any other means) and so to create contractual relationships and to own and lease property (LXVII **4615**). They even gave guarantees that others of the same status would not leave their place of residence, and had possessions which they pledged in support (LXX **4794** (580): see below p.150).¹⁹⁸

A number of Apion accounts show payments, frequently by a collective of *georgoi* and *ampelourgoi* (vineyard workers, although possibly not specialist vine-dressers),¹⁹⁹ for *ἀπότακτον χωρίων*.²⁰⁰ *Apotakton* means fixed or predetermined, and here is assumed to mean a fixed rent.²⁰¹ Gascou interpreted these as payments for land held on emphyteutic lease (a type of lease found in relation to church or state property) and considered that this was the normal form of tenure of the *georgoi*.²⁰² No Oxyrhynchite emphyteutic leases of privately-owned land have been published. There is a single reference to emphyteusis in the Apion archive: see LV **3805** 12 n., where it is described as “a system of perpetual heritable leases”; as the editor stated, not much is known about such leases between private

¹⁹⁶ See generally on other large estate-owners Hardy 1931, 39-49 and Ruffini 2008, 43-93.

¹⁹⁷ Hardy 1931, 50-55, 90.

¹⁹⁸ See also Gascou 1985, 21=2008, 142-3, Fikhman 1991, 16-17.

¹⁹⁹ Mayerson 2003.

²⁰⁰ For a list of occurrences of this term see Hickey 2001, Table 2.1.

²⁰¹ Banaji 2007, 95.

²⁰² Gascou 1985, 7-9=2008, 128-131. For emphyteutic leases see Jones LRE I 417-420 and Simon 1982.

persons.²⁰³ Had emphyteusis been the common mode of land-holding it is highly unlikely that there would be only one reference, although, as Gascou wrote, the rent (*phoros*, *ekphorion* or *apotakton*) had (at least apparently) the characteristics of emphyteutic rents: fixed amounts payable in perpetuity (as evidenced by similar payments nine years apart in XVI 1911 and LV 3804), usually in cash, and not varying according to the harvest (some vine-land may have been treated differently). There is no clear evidence in support of Gascou's view, and I think that it can be discounted.²⁰⁴ Mazza and Hickey believed that the term ἀπότακτον χωρίων was used in relation to vine-land, and this is certainly possible;²⁰⁵ Rea at 3804 34 n. noted that vineyards must be included, if not exclusively meant, although in the Apion “archive” the term was not used only in conjunction with *ampelourgoi*. In any event these payments clearly did not cover all or even most of the land to which the *georgoi* had access, as not all *epoikia* paid them. In the *prostasia* which included Apelle, for example, payments of ἀπότακτον χωρίων were received from *georgoi* and *ampelourgoi* at Apelle, Paciac and Luciu (3804 34, 47, 101), but not from the other four *epoikia*. The *pronoetes'* accounts record some payments as φόρος (rent), usually for items like a dovecote or olive press, and some as *apotakton chorion*, but most sums collected from the *georgoi* were not specifically described; the *ekphorion* in 024 may be such a payment. Gascou termed these “rent-taxes” and suggested that the *georgoi* also supplied liturgical agricultural labour.²⁰⁶ In his view, although the estates did not have the right of *autopragia*, the landowner/farmer relationship was a fiscally-driven quasi-public law relationship imposed by imperial policy. For the peasants, whom he assumed to be *enapographoi* (see below), the *pronoetes* was the tax-collector and the estate owner was equivalent to the state.²⁰⁷

Sarris considered that the *coloni* were a class of wage-labourers rather than tenant-farmers, who were granted residence on “estate labour settlements” (*epoikia*) and rental access to its associated allotments in return for labour on the *autourgia*; this was a wage in land. He saw the estate as bi-partite, comprising only *autourgia* and *epoikia*, and believed that the *autourgia* (a “shadowy phenomenon” (Rea at 3804 196 n.)), which he calls “the in-hand”, accounted

²⁰³ See 027, Introduction for the suggestion that this may have concerned imperial land managed by the Apions.

²⁰⁴ As Banaji 2007, 94-95, Hickey 2001, 5, 53, 77, Sarris 2006, 155-6; even Mazza admits it only as a possibility (Mazza 2001, 109).

²⁰⁵ Mazza 2001, 80, 112; Hickey 2001, 53-59, 77.

²⁰⁶ Gascou 1985, 12-15=2008, 133-137.

²⁰⁷ Gascou 1985, 13-23=2008, 134-145. He relied in part on the use of “tax language” in I 136, a *pronoetes'* work contract, but this could equally be standard wording following the practice of the imperial estates, where such distinctions would have been irrelevant. See also Gascou 2004, 99-100=2008, 447-448.

for the main part of the produce which was sold as surplus to generate income for the Apion estate.²⁰⁸ If that is correct it would have required a sizeable workforce. Apart from the lack of evidence of any other source of such labour, there are only two strands of evidence which might suggest that the inhabitants of the *epoikia* had to work on the *autourgia*. First, P. Wash Univ. II 102 contains a list of ἐργάται, or workers, who have come from a number of named *epoikia* to work on the γεουχική αὐτουργία; as Mazza remarks, it is not clear whether they were forced to work there or had volunteered for the work to increase their income.²⁰⁹ Secondly, guarantees of service, sometimes called deeds of surety and known as *enguai*, of ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί (such as I 135 (579) and XLIV 3204 (588)) make it clear that farmers, the subject of such arrangements, and their families had to remain in their place of residence and in some cases, such as PSI I 61 and XXVII 2478, it is also clear that they had to sow or perform other agricultural services. That this relates to the *autourgia* of the Apions is nowhere explicit; even in 2478, references to the landlord's possessions and orchard are probably to land leased,²¹⁰ nor is a reference to the landlord's vintage, for example, necessarily conclusive that a reference to the *autourgia* is meant: in XVI 1859 (6th/7th century), the γεουχικήν ῥύσιν could be from land in an *epoikion*, as in XVI 1896 (577).²¹¹ The extent to which such work was required can only be surmised.²¹² Interestingly, such guarantees do not cover only residents of *epoikia* but also villagers, who can also be *enapographoi* (LXX 4787 14-15 n.). I do not think that there is sufficient evidence to support the contention that the right to live and work on the estate was granted to the *georgoi* in return for their labour on the *autourgia*, or that the *autourgia* was a substantial part of the estate.²¹³

In Banaji's view, most of the workforce were wage labourers or "service tenants", providing labour to the estate for wages and housed in *epoikia* which belonged to the estate but over which, or some of the lands related to which, they may have had usufruct rights; he noted however that labour could be obtained in a number of different ways, including employment contracts, leases of works, various types of loans and advances of money and

²⁰⁸ Sarris 2004, 65-66; 2006, 33-34, 53-55, 59, 86-88. He saw the *exotikoi topoí* as part of the *autourgia*; see 023.3 n. for a discussion of this.

²⁰⁹ Mazza 2008, 152-3.

²¹⁰ φόρον in l. 19 is translated as taxes but more likely means rent.

²¹¹ Benaissa 2012. I am grateful to Amin Benaissa for a sight of this as yet unpublished article.

²¹² See Sarris 2006, 62, nn. 47, 48 for a list of these guarantees relating to the Apions, from which deduct LXVI 4536, which is a different type of document, and add LXVIII 4703 and LXX 4787, 4790, 4791, 4794 and 4802.

²¹³ See Benaissa 2012, n. 24 for references to documents which attest *enapographoi georgoi* paying rent (categorised as *phoros* or *ekphorion*).

sharecropping. Banaji placed more emphasis than Sarris on cash wages although acknowledged that there was a “complex and flexible integration of tenancy and wage labour”.²¹⁴ We have as yet no published records of an agricultural labour force on the estates either comprised of slaves or remunerated in cash. Banaji suggests that the agreements which record payments of advances or loans (προχρεία) may be evidence of cash remuneration,²¹⁵ but these are more likely to be “conditional advances or loans “to be consumed by the work itself” rather than straightforward wages in the economic sense”.²¹⁶ The estate accounts do show some payments to παιδάρια, who may have been slave or free, for performing various minor duties, and to specialist craftsmen, but none to the great mass of peasant-farmers.

We have only four leases which form or may form part of the Apion “archive”: LXIII **4390** (469), P. Flor. III 325 (489), LXVII **4615** (505) and XVI **1968** (= SB XXVI 16722, late 6th century).²¹⁷ All relate to arable land and so far as is apparent prescribe rent payable in kind. The *georgoi* occupying the *epoikia* and paying cash to the *pronoetes* must have had tenure in some other way, for which we have as yet no documentation. Sarris cites **4615** as an example of the type of lease they would have been granted but as a one-year term it cannot be representative of the normal permanent relationship; the shortness of the term may have been part of the reason why there was such a lease.²¹⁸ There was nothing to prevent a *georgos* who could afford it from renting some extra land, in the same way that groups of farm workers and vine-dressers leased vine-land and paid *apotakton chorion*. It is possible that the leases were kept in a different place from the accounts and other documents which form the “archive”, so that we have no traces of them,²¹⁹ or that they were long-term or emphyteutic leases which did not require renewal and so were infrequently produced.²²⁰ The guarantees of service of *georgoi* attest the requirement for some farmers to remain on the land, but do not give them any property rights. Sarris suggests that there would have been three contracts in relation to each farmer: a contract of employment, a guarantee and a lease (presumably renewed annually but not necessarily in writing) like **4615**.²²¹ I find it difficult to believe that even such a bureaucratic system as Byzantine Egypt would have

²¹⁴ Banaji 2007, 99, 182, 185, 198-200.

²¹⁵ Banaji 2007, 183.

²¹⁶ Benaissa 2012 esp. n. 27, following Mazza and Hickey.

²¹⁷ Gonis 2000 (5), 94-95.

²¹⁸ Sarris 2006, 65.

²¹⁹ As Rowlandson 1994, 499.

²²⁰ Mazza 2001, 107, relying in part on XVI **1868**, and 109.

²²¹ Sarris 2006, 65-66.

required quite so many contractual arrangements, even if unwritten, for each farm worker; we have no published examples of employment contracts of this type, the guarantees were probably given in exceptional cases where the farmers had absconded or otherwise caused difficulties, and leases such as **4615** would, I think, have been extraneous or additional to the main *geonchos/georgos* relationship.

Whether all the farmers in the *epoikia* had the status of *enapographos* is not clear. Gascou, Banaji and Sarris all assume that most if not all did so, and that may have been the case in the Oxyrhynchite nome, which was with a couple of exceptions the only area of Egypt where the term was used.²²² This status may have been more of a two-way process than is sometimes envisaged: the *georgos* obtained protection from the tax authorities and from rent increases while the wealthy landowner increased his work-force (and possibly his land-holding if the *georgos* had owned land).²²³ As noted above, the term applied to villagers as well as residents of *epoikia* (LXIX **4757** 1 n., LXX **4787**) and such persons could hold leases (LXVII **4615**) and buy and sell produce (LXXVII **5123**). Perhaps in the Oxyrhynchite nome the term did not have the strict legal meaning of *colonus adscripticius*, but a full analysis of the issue is beyond the scope of this thesis.

I think that the *georgoi*, whether or not *enapographoi*, had the right to live in the *epoikia* and to work land in and around it, from which they were entitled to retain any profits after paying what they owed to the estate, by virtue of a personal contractual relationship with the estate-owner, but that this did not give them a property interest in the same way as a lease. These terms of occupation, and the relationship between the γεοῦχος and his γεωργοί, were customary, documented only by the *apaitesimon*, a schedule showing what was due from each farmer.²²⁴ I **136** makes it clear that the *apaitesimon* was to be used by the *pronoetes* when collecting payments and the relative scarcity of lease documents and the logistical issues involved make it extremely unlikely that separate leases would have been drawn up in each case.²²⁵ The farmers would have had an inalienable right to occupy provided that they remained in the settlement, farmed the land and paid their dues. Whether individuals were allocated specific portions, or a global allocation was made to each *epoikion*, is not clear, but the range of payments by different individuals in LV **3804** points to the former. Benaissa

²²² Gascou 1985, 20=2008, 141-2; Banaji 2007, 99; Sarris 2006, 62-64, 128. Hickey disagrees: 2001, 100-106.

²²³ Gascou 2004, 99-100=2008, 447; Sarris 2006, 150-156, 183-187. See in the context of the Apion estates Gascou 1985, 20-22, 27=2008, 141-144, 149-150; Mazza 2001, 122-124, Sarris 2006, 60-66 and generally the works referred to at Ruffini 2008, 43 n.6 and Benaissa 2012, n.2.

²²⁴ See **024.6-7** n.

²²⁵ Rowlandson 1994, 498-499.

notes that some farmers sold wine to the Apion estate and suggests that this was surplus after they had paid over part of the vintage as rent in kind.²²⁶ The extent to which the *georgoi* had to bear the market risk themselves is not clear but **023** shows that concessions were made at times, at least by the Apions. Some *georgoi* may also have been required to provide some labour on the *autourgia*.

The scarcity of surviving leases makes it likely that the terms of leases of village-dwellers were also unwritten, the entry on the *apaitesimon* (the term appears also in leases (as LV **3803** (411) and SB XXVI 16722=XVI **1968** re-ed. (late 6th century), where the amount due under it is termed φόρος) being all that was needed to confirm a legal relationship the terms of which had become customary.²²⁷

The sources of the Apions' wealth.

Scholars from Hardy on have all agreed on the importance of monetary wealth to the Apions. The main area of contention is whether the major part of their income derived from the sale of produce from that part of the estate worked for them by wage-labourers (as Banaji and Sarris), or from rent payments under leases (as Hickey).

As stated above, Sarris believed that the *autourgia* accounted for the main part of the produce which was sold as surplus to generate income for the Apion estate.²²⁸ I **127** (late 6th century) shows their Oxyrhynchite estate paying over 87,000 artabas of wheat in taxes in 572: the Cynopolite total was over 52,000. These amounted together to some two fifths of the total amounts from the two nomes, based on the total of 350,000 artabas specified in XVI **1909** (dated to 582-602 by Gascou (1985 11, 133=2008 46, 169, nn. 49, 265)). The *pronoetes'* accounts XVI **1911** and LV **3804** (from the same *prostasia* but nine years apart) show no wheat surplus left at the end, only a net income in gold. Few of the other surviving accounts contain totals although XVIII **2195** shows surpluses of some wheat, as well as money. It is therefore possible that a large part of the wheat produced was grown on the *autourgia* part of the estate.²²⁹ However Sarris' view of the extent of the *autourgia* and the obligation of the *georgoi* to work on it is not supported by the evidence and the tax figures probably included taxes collected from others as well as taxes payable by the estate itself (see below, pp. 155-158) and, as we do not know the breakdown of the figures or the

²²⁶ Benaissa in LXXVII **5123**, Introduction and 2012.

²²⁷ See Rowlandson 1994, 499, Gonis 2000 (5), 95, 98.

²²⁸ Sarris 2004, 65; 2006, 33-34, 49.

²²⁹ As Sarris, 2006, 34.

extent to which the obligation may have been satisfied in gold, the amount of wheat grown by the estate cannot be estimated with any degree of certainty.²³⁰

3804 shows net cash income in 565/566 of c.480 *solidi* from the *prostasia* which included Apelle; some 507 *solidi* were surplus from the same area in 556/7 (**1911**). XVI **2196** v shows total receipts of the Oxyrhynchite *pronoetai* of 18,512 *solidi* in c.586 and XVI **1918** v shows an equivalent figure of just over 20,010 *solidi*, and payments made from them of 6,917 *solidi*, in 540/1, leaving some 13,000 surplus;²³¹ even if the disbursements were some form of taxes, as Gascou and Hickey suggest,²³² or deductible for tax, other taxes would also have been payable in gold to the imperial authorities. XVI **1909** puts the gold tax figure for the Oxyrhynchite and Cynopolite nomes combined at 24,500 *solidi*, of which the Apions' share, as described above, may have been two-fifths. The receipts referred to above are only from their estates in the Oxyrhynchite nome, and even there they had other sources of income too: wine, produce from the *autourgia*, urban rents and possibly rents from villagers. The extant accounts of the *pronoetai* make no reference to receipts of wine, all of which seem to have been handled by the *oinocheiristes*,²³³ or to receipts emanating from the *autourgia*, although they do record expenditure and concessions which relate to it (see **3804** 202-212). Hickey, writing principally on vine-land, considered that no wheat was grown beyond that needed for the estate's own use and its taxes and that its sales of wine were far too small to generate the income attested.²³⁴ He suggested that vineyards directly exploited and those let out to inhabitants of the *epoikia* in return for *apotakton chorion* (the latter amounting to about 55% of the total vineyard area and generating only about 900 *solidi* per annum) comprised only a small percentage of the total estate area, possibly as little as 600 arouras, so that at least 90% of the estate's after-tax income was derived from rents, probably of flax-or vine-land but also of arable land.²³⁵ This would suggest a large leasing operation. Possibly those *prostasiae* which comprised villages rather than *epoikia* were the source of more of the estate income than the surviving *pronoetes'* accounts show; their duties in I **136** included collection from villages, but villages feature much less frequently than *epoikia* in their accounts and may have been the subject of separate records. I think that Hickey is right when he suggests that the bulk of the Apions' income came from rents; the main "value" of the

²³⁰ See below and Hickey 2008 (1), 90-91.

²³¹ Sarris 2006, 83.

²³² Gascou 1972 (2), 245;-248 Hickey 2007, 302; Banaji 2007, 138. See also **028.3** n.

²³³ See Hickey 2001, 57, 68.

²³⁴ Hickey 2001, 69-70, 191, 201 n. 265.

²³⁵ Hickey 2001, 200-201; 2007, 301-302.

farmers in the *epoikia* and the villages would have been in the amounts of rent they had to pay through the *pronoetes*. **023** and **024** show the collection mechanism of rental income in operation.

Landowners as tax-collectors

Hardy considered that the Apions and other land-owners collected tax from their own *georgoi* and from others and had the right of *autopragia*, namely the right to pay those amounts and their own taxes directly to the central authorities.²³⁶ It is now generally accepted that this was not *autopragia* in the sense that applied for example in Aphrodito.²³⁷ The estate-owners collected taxes; what is not clear is how this right or obligation had devolved on them. Gascou's main thesis in his 1985 article has become known as "fiscal participation" or "fiscal shares", namely that the Apion family and other significant proprietors of land formed a "college" and divided the fiscal and liturgical responsibilities for the nome between them, so were responsible not just for their own contribution but also for others, including non-tenants and non-employees.²³⁸ The relationship between collector and payer was evidenced *inter alia* by tax transference requests written to the houses of Theon and Timagenes (L **3583** (444), P. Warren 3 (504?), XVI **1887** (538), SB XXIV 15955 (540 or 541) and I **126** (572) (see **027**), although these may have been specific to those houses or to the types of duty which had fallen originally to be performed by them, as I have found no similar documents relating to the Apions. This fiscal shares theory was accepted by Hickey and Mazza.²³⁹ Banaji believed it was a better explanation than *autopragia*, but that the power of the great estates over rural taxation was a private power, which they exercised through the pagarchy, and which the imperial powers sought to restrict and control. He maintained that "there seems to be no obvious distinction between the institution of the pagarchy and the granting of autopract status to the most powerful landholders, and that the institution itself is in fact likely to have emerged as the logical outcome of a situation where *autopragia* was threatening to undermine the fiscal efficiency of the state".²⁴⁰ Sarris also believed in Gascou's fiscal shares model but that it was instigated by the land-owners themselves and not by the state.²⁴¹ The main difference between Gascou on the one hand and Banaji and Sarris on the other on the tax-collection

²³⁶ Hardy 1931, 50-55.

²³⁷ See Ruffini 2008, 148, nn. 10-12 for references.

²³⁸ Gascou 1985, 4-52 esp. 48-52=2008, 125-175 esp. 48-175.

²³⁹ Hickey 2001, 42; 2008 *passim*; Mazza 2001, 105.

²⁴⁰ Banaji 2007, 140.

²⁴¹ Sarris 2006, 175-176.

issue revolves around whether the state or the estates were the driver of the process by which the estates became responsible for rural tax collection not merely from their own estates but elsewhere, whether in effect they had it imposed on them or carved it up between them. I am more convinced by the latter argument. Mazza noted that all known named pagarchs were land-owners, and that the tasks attached to the office were carried out by their employees.²⁴² Whether all the land-owners who collected taxes were actually pagarchs, each with responsibility for a specified part of the nome, or they just exercised fiscal authority, is not clear, but the division of responsibility for the actual collection must have been on a geographic basis. Gascou was not certain whether this “*sorte de pagarchie permanente*” derived from personal responsibilities of the *geouchos* or was the result of a *munus patrimonii*.²⁴³ The description of a village as *παγαρχουμένη* (see LXX 4787 9-10 n.) may not be conclusive as to the technical legal status. Fikhman hypothesised that papyri which describe a village in this way might only have been so expressed in order to underline the dependence of the villages on the “grand propriétaire foncier”, whose power was interpreted as a public power represented in the nome by the pagarch.²⁴⁴

We know that Apion *pronoetai* collected certain specific taxes from farmers in the *epoikia* in their *prostasiae*: there are references to *συντέλεια κεφαλῆς* in, for example, LV 3804. The *συντέλεια κεφαλῆς* receipts from Paciac, Trigyu and Luciu were aggregated with payments of *phoros* (3804 46, 60, 93) while the amounts due from Trigyu were waived or refunded in full (3804 158), showing that such amounts were not kept or accounted for separately, but that the estate would have paid over a global amount to the imperial authorities. The last two named *epoikia*, Tarusebt and Cotyleciu, do not pay any of this tax. It is not clear how it was calculated but it was probably *per capita*; Johnson and West described it as a contribution by the community to make up the deficit of some member who had not paid his tax.²⁴⁵

Johnson and West considered that, apart from specific items such as described above, the residents of each *prostasia* paid one amount to the *pronoetes*, which included taxes.²⁴⁶ The difference between this and Gascou’s term “rent-taxes” may be semantic only: I doubt that the farmers in the *epoikion* were liable for any land tax (they had no interest in land) but if

²⁴² Mazza 1995, 193.

²⁴³ Gascou 1985, 67 n. 376=2008, 190 n. 376.

²⁴⁴ Fikhman 1977, 193-4. For a summary of earlier views see Banaji 2007, 89-100 and on landholders and the pagarchy see Gascou 1972 (1)=2008, 43-50 and Mazza 1994, 191-196.

²⁴⁵ Johnson and West 1949, 262.

²⁴⁶ Johnson and West 1949, 62.

they were it must have been included in their “rent” (see LXX **4787** 9-10 n.). In none of the published sets of *pronoetes*’ accounts does anyone pay any amount identified as *demosia* or *embole*, and while payments out or concessions on account of *demosia* or *embole* are made in XVIII **2195** 130, 187 and XIX **2243A** 82, the meaning of this is not clear: see **2243A** 82 n. It is hard to be precise, as a place of habitation may be referred to in one place as a village and in another as an *epoikion* or *ketema* (which in this context have the same meaning), possibly because of a change in status, possible from a lack of precision on the part of the author, but, based on the references in Benaïssa 2009 as to how places are characterised, the only papyri which suggest that farmers in the *epoikia*, as opposed to those in the villages, had to pay these taxes are I **142** (534), XVI **1841**, **1908**, **2000** and **2002** (579) and LXII **4350** (576) and **4351**. **142** is a receipt for a payment by the *pronoetes* of the *epoikion* of Leontos of an amount of taxes in money, but this may have been a reference to the nature of the funds in the hands of the payee. **1841** is a letter from one official to another asking him to get the people of Nigru to pay the *embole*; Nigru was described as a village in the 4th century but as an *epoikion* in the late fifth (XVI **2036**).²⁴⁷ Its status is not conclusive and as the letter was not sent to the farmers themselves it was probably an exhortation to collect the wheat they were due to pay as rent and which the estate owner was going to use to pay his *embole*. **1908** lists arrears of *embole* from eight places: five are known to be villages, two are not otherwise attested and only one, Leonidou, is otherwise described as a *ketema* or *epoikion*. **2000** is described as a receipt for *embole* but it is the application of the amounts paid by four possible *epoikia* that is characterised in this way rather than their payment itself. In **2002**, a record of payment of *demosia*, *embole* and δωρεά, the reading of *demosia* (l. 3) received from the *ketema* of Pathalec (which is not otherwise attested) is uncertain and again, I think, it is the application of the other amounts that is described rather than the character of the receipts. In **4350** a number of *enapographoi georgoi* from the so-called *epoikion* of Sasu Cato undertake to collect the *demosia* from that settlement, but the fact that the place had a scribe or *grammateus* (l.7) and a *meizon* (XVI **2033**) suggests that it was a village. **4351**, which is probably a similar document to **4350** but the first part of which is missing, refers (at 4-5) to τὰ δημόσια τοῦ ἡμῶν κτήματος, and has several references to *embole*; the note on the back shows that the *ketema* is Pacerce, a locality attributed to more than one toparchy and in some cases referred to as a village.²⁴⁸ None of the tax transference

²⁴⁷ See Benaïssa 2009, 184.

²⁴⁸ Benaïssa 2009, 204-207.

documents referred to above (p. 155) is from a resident of or refers to property in an *epoikion* or *ketema*.

The position in villages may have been different. P. Iand. III 38 (6th/7th century) is a receipt for a payment of *demosia* and *embole* from the *meizon* of the village of Leukiu. Leases, where written, may have prescribed which party was due to pay the tax on the land. Tantalisingly, P. Flor. III 325 breaks off just where it is going to specify who pays the taxes, ending τῶν τῆς γῆς δημοσίων. In XVI 1968 (=SB XXVI 16722) and LXIII 4390 the tenant agrees to pay the *naubion* (a not unusual requirement) but no other taxes are mentioned. LXVII 4615 is too fragmentary to cast any light on the issue. In the Roman period leases commonly provided that taxes were the responsibility of the lessor (see 02.10 n.). Herrmann noted that Byzantine period leases were silent on the point, except for two in “conservative Oxyrhynchus” (VI 913 (442) and PSI I 77 (551/565), in both of which the landlord was responsible for taxes) and suggested that this was because the landlords were then able to levy taxes directly on their tenants rather than because the term had become customary.²⁴⁹

Other public responsibilities

Papyri show estate owners making payments to or supporting a range of entities and activities, including the circus, churches and monasteries (026 to 028), and soldiers (as for example, PSI VIII 953. 33, 41), as well as providing *riparii* (XVI 2039) and the postal service (I 138). They may also have fulfilled the role formerly played by magistrates in settling disputes.²⁵⁰ The extent to which these payments and functions were voluntary, customary (the wealthy doing what was expected of them), a remnant of the old liturgical system, or payments of tax or treated as such and so deducted from the amount of tax that would otherwise have been payable by them, is not clear. Gascou considered that the estates were semi-public and that the payments to the circus, the postal service and the troops were a *munus* or liturgy and so in effect quasi-fiscal.²⁵¹ He did not extend this thesis to the church. I discuss the nature of payments to the circus at pp. 131-133 and payments to monasteries at pp. 206-211.

²⁴⁹ Herrmann 1958, 122-125.

²⁵⁰ Gascou 2004=Gascou 2008, 441-451.

²⁵¹ Gascou 1976 (1)=Gascou 2008, 51-71 *passim*, 1976 (2) =2008, 73-83 and 1985, 58=2008, 180-181.

Conclusion

As Banaji and Hickey point out, there was not a simple system of very poor and very rich; there were also smaller landowners, “private” tenants living in villages, and some wealth differentiation in the *epoikia*, where some individuals make much larger payments than others: in LV **3804**, payments recorded from inhabitants of Apelle alone range from one to more than 15 *solidi*.²⁵² Unfortunately we do not know the proportion which the gold which the farmers paid over bore to the total income they were able to derive from the lands which they farmed. Probably only the wealthier ones took additional leases like LXVII **4615** or gave guarantees of service for others. The distinction between inhabitants of villages and of *epoikia*, apart from some rights to self-administration in the case of the latter, seems to have been mainly theoretical; both could be *enapographoi* (although the term is much rarer in the case of villager dwellers) and both had to make payments (whether of rent or taxes or both) to the estate owners through the *pronoetai*.

²⁵² Banaji 2007, 192; Hickey 2007, 298.

021 and 022 Two employment contracts

Introduction

The contracts of employment set out below form part of the Apion “archive” and bring to nine the number of work contracts known from that estate: the others are I **134**, **136** and **138**, LI **3641**, LVIII **3942** (probably), **3952** (much restored following I **136**) and **3958**. Of these, **134**, **3641** and **3942** are not true contracts of employment, as the payments made are calculated by reference to items supplied or delivered. XIX **2239**, an overseer’s contract of 598, which is addressed to Flavius Ioannes and is not from the Apion estate, uses similar terminology to **021** and **022**, and VIII **1134** (421), a discharge with receipt of a *pronoetes* of the *domus divina*, implies that he was engaged under a contract similar to **136** and **3952**,²⁵³ suggesting that the form was in general use. On work contracts from the Byzantine period generally, see Jördens in P. Heid V, 130-184, who included contracts of employment, contracts for services, and some contracts for production or delivery of goods, and add (from Oxyrhynchus) LVIII **3933**, **3942**, **3952** and **3958** (and possibly **3943-6**), LXXII **4910**, LXXIII **4967**, LXXVII **5121** and (possibly) P. Ct. YBR inv. 325 in Benaissa 2007.

²⁵³ As Benaissa 2007, 76-77.

021 Contract of a door-keeper

54 1B.25(B)/D(3)a

16.7 x 30 cm.

17 February 569

This is a contract whereby a door-keeper or porter is employed to work in the Apion family mansion, the *proastion* (19 n.), for one year. Unusually, the contract does not contain any information as to his duties, probably because he holds the office already (9 n.), although in LVIII **3958**, where a rent-collector appears to be already employed, the duties are specified. There is a third party guarantor. Guarantors are also found in I **136** and LVIII **3952** and in **022** but in **021**, unlike in those examples, the guarantor's obligations are not set out in any detail (26 n.) either. Possibly both doorkeeper and guarantor had fulfilled these functions for many years. Although the contract provides for the doorkeeper to forfeit his wages if he leaves before the year is up (24-26), it does not provide for the converse if he is dismissed before his time, as in for example P. Heid. V 345 (early 6th century) and 350 (612) (the latter describes someone taking over the duties of a messenger, who may have been engaged in a semi-public capacity, but the principle is the same), I **140** (550) and LI **3641** (544).

This is the first published employment contract for a door-keeper, although there are several attestations of such a function (9 n.). Unlike the *pronoetes* (**136**, **3952**), who paid a premium for his office which must have carried with it an opportunity of profit, or the *enoikologos* (**3958**), who seems to have had to account for a fixed sum collected and then been able to keep any surplus, the door-keeper is remunerated by a wage in cash and in kind (21-22 n.); probably he was not expected to get many tips from visitors.

The bottom of the papyrus is torn; possibly as many as 7 or 8 lines are missing. The top margin is intact. The left margin is frayed at lines 5-6 but is otherwise intact until l. 25, and the right margin is intact until l. 28. The left-hand third of the papyrus is damaged and there is some evidence of a fold-line, while the remaining two thirds are undamaged. The writing is along the fibres. The principal hand is regular and evenly spaced. There is a one-line endorsement on the back, written downwards along the fibres, probably incomplete and not read. The papyrus may have been turned clockwise after the *recto* was written, then rolled up upwards, and then flattened for the endorsement to be added.

2 + βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότη μεγίστου

3 εὐεργέτου Φλ(αοίου) Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος
ἔτους δ΄

4 ὑπατίας τῆς αὐτῶν γ[α]ληνοτήτος τὸ β// Μεχεῖρ κγ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) β//

5 Φλ(αοίω) Ἀπίωι τῶ πανευφήμω καὶ ὑπερφουεστάτῳ ἀπὸ ὑπ(άτων)
ὀρδ(ιναρίων) (καὶ) πατρικ(ίω)

6 γεουχ[οῦν]τι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλει δι(ὰ) Μηναῖ

7 οἰκέτου τοῦ καὶ ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προσπορίζοντος τῶ ἰδίῳ δεσπότη

8 τῶ αὐτῶ πανευφήμω ἀνδρὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ ἐνοχίην, Μηναῖς

9 θυρουρὸς τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου, υἱὸς τοῦ θαυμ(ασιωτάτου) Σερήνου μετ' ἐγγυητοῦ

10 τοῦ καὶ ἀναδεχομένου αὐτὸν ἐν τούτῳ τῶ συναλλάγματι

11 ἐμοῦ Ἰωάννου, νομικαρίου καὶ ῥιπαρίου, υἱοῦ τοῦ μακαρίου

12 Φιλοξένου, ἀμφοτέροι ὀρμώμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως

13 ἐξῆς ὑπογράφ[ο]ντες ἰδίᾳ χειρί, χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ ἐγὼ

14 ὁ πρῶτότυπος Μηναῖς) ἐκουσία γνώμη καὶ αὐθαιρέτω

15 προαιρέσει συντεθεῖσθαι με πρὸς τὸν ἐνδοξον οἶκον τῆς

16 ὑμῶν ὑπερφουείας ἦτοι διὰ τῶν αὐτῇ προσήκοντων ἐπὶ ἓνα

17 ἐνιαυτόν, λογιζ[ό]μενον ἀπὸ εἰκάδος τρίτης τοῦ παρόντος

18 μηνὸς Μεχεῖρ τῆς παρουσίας δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος), ἐπὶ τῶ με τὴν

19 χώραν τοῦ θυρουροῦ τοῦ προαστίου αὐτῆς ἀποπληρῶσαι ἀόκνως

20 καὶ ἀκαταγνώστως δεχόμενος λόγου μισθοῦ παντὸς τοῦ ἐνὸς

21 ἐνιαυτοῦ χρυσοῦ νομίσματα δύο καὶ σίτου καγκέλλω ἀρτάβας δώδεκα

22 καὶ οἴνου γεουχικὰ κνίδια εἴκοσι πέντε καὶ μὴ δύνασθαί με

23 πρὸ τέλους τοῦ ἐν[ός] ἐνιαυτοῦ ὑπαναχωρῆσαι ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης

24 χρείας δι[ί]χα ὑπερθέσεως καὶ πόνου τινός. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ποιήσω

25 πρὸ τ[έ]λ[ου]ς τοῦ αὐ[τοῦ] ἐνὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ ὁμολογῶ ζημιοῦσθαι

26 [τοὺς ἐμοῦ]ς μισθοὺς ἢ καγῶ ὁ τούτου ἐγγυητής. κύρ(ιον) τὸ

27 [συνάλλαγμα ἀπλ(οῦν) γραφ(έν) καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθέντες) ὠμολο(γήσαμεν).(vac.)

28 (m. 2) [Μηνᾶς υἱ]ὸς τοῦ θαυμασ(ιωτάτου) Σερ[ήν]ου ὁ προγ[εγρα]μμένος

29 πεποίη[μ]αι τοῦτο τ[ὸ συν]άλ[λαγμα].[

30 []..[

[

2 ευσεβεστατ 3 φλς 4 ὑπατίας 5 φλς ὑπς ορθ πατρικ 6 ποχ 7 ἴδιω 9 θαυμςυ 12 οξυρ
ποχε 16 ὑμων ὑπερφύειας 18 ινδ 24 ὑπερθεσεως 26 κυρ 27 απχ γραφ επερ ωμολο 28
θαυμασς

“

?

+In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Justinus, the eternal Augustus and Emperor, year 4, in the consulship of his serenity for the 2nd time, Mecheir 23, indiction 2.

To Flavius Apion, the all-renowned and most extraordinary former *consul ordinarius* and *patricius*, landowner here also in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, through Menas, *oiketes*, who also puts the formal question and supplies for his own master, the same all-renowned man, the conduct of and responsibility for (the transaction), Menas, door-keeper of the glorious household, son of the most admirable Serenus, with as guarantor who accepts responsibility for him in this agreement me Ioannes, *nomicarius* and *riparius*, son of the late Philoxenus, both originating from the city of the Oxyrhynchites and subscribing below by our own hand, greetings. I Menas, the principal party, acknowledge that, by willing resolve and voluntary choice, I have come to an agreement with the glorious household of your extraordinariness, through its people, for one year, reckoning from the 23rd of the present month of Mecheir in the current 2nd indiction on condition that I fill the

place of door-keeper of its *proastion* without hesitation or condemnation, receiving as a wage for the whole one year period 2 gold *solidi* and 12 artabas of wheat by *cancellus* measure and 25 estate *cnidia* of wine, and that I am not allowed to withdraw from such service before the end of such one-year period, without delay or trouble. If I do this before the end of such period of one year I agree to forfeit my wages or I also, his guarantor. This contract, written in a single copy, is binding and in answer to the formal question we gave our consent.

(2nd hand). I, [Menas], son of the most admirable Serenus, the above-written, have made this agreement.....

1 ¶ This looks like a single letter, possibly a *pi*, with a horizontal stroke through it about two-thirds of the way up. It is reminiscent of the abbreviation at the top of many letters from the 5th to 7th centuries and at the top of **023** (see **023.1** n.), although not exactly the same. I have found no other examples in a contract of this sort, including those in letter form. If the sign is a *pi* it is different from the form used elsewhere in the document but that is often so in such cases (including **023**). Frequently interpreted in letters as an abbreviation for **παρά** (as for example XVI **1831** 1 n., LVI **3867** 1 n. and LIX **4007** 1 n.), it was more recently suggested by Daris that it might be an abbreviation for **π(λεῖστα) χ(αίρειν)** and most recently by Messeri and Pintaudi that the abbreviated word might be **παράκειται**, meaning “to be attached or appended” of documents (LSJ) citing BGU III 889.15, and Preisigke *Wörterbuch s.v. παράκειμαι*, 3. See Daris 1998 and Messeri and Pintaudi 2005. This last interpretation has the attraction of being able to be applied to a wide range of documents, including an agreement such as **021**, and makes more sense at the top of a letter or, particularly, at the top of a document such as this than does **παρά** when it is not followed by the name of the sender in the genitive. If it is correct, however, there must always have been another document to which the one under consideration was attached or appended (which would presumably have contained any missing information as to sender and recipient of a letter that was not on the back) and I doubt that that would always have been the case. Shelton suggested that the double cross, in the form of two downward strokes with crossing lines near the top, was the origin of the *pi* at the top of a document where the usual interpretation **π(αρά)** appeared meaningless; many Byzantine documents are headed by some sort of Christian symbol, whether a single or double cross or christogram, or the letters **χμγ**, or the initial letters of Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. The sign here

does not look like any of these, although if it were derived from a double cross, that would explain why it is not a form of *pi* used elsewhere in the document. See Shelton 1977, P. Köln III 165.1 n. and P. Hamb. III 228.1 n. If the letter is not *pi*, it might be *beta* or *kappa*, but I can think of no reason for either of those letters to be there: the contract is expressed to be executed in one copy only so it is not an indication that this was the second copy and it is unlikely to be a reference to its place in a collection of documents, as the hand looks the same as the principal hand, suggesting that the sign was not added later by a filing clerk. Probably therefore it is the abbreviation that is found on letters like **023**; possibly the scribe followed the usual format from habit.

2-4 This is an example of a type of dating used under Justinus II (566-578), where although the reckoning is by regnal year and consular era, the consular era has remained “fixed” at 2, rather than being adjusted for actual years. See *CSBE*² 209-210; the date in this papyrus is an instance of their type 4. **021** is the same year date as I **134**, a stone-mason’s contract, also from the Apion “archive”, but they are in different hands.

5 Φλ(αουίω) Ἀπίωνι τῷ πανευφήμῳ καὶ ὑπερφουεστάτῳ ἀπὸ ὑπ(άτων) ὀρδ(ιναρίων) (καὶ) πατρικ(ίω) The document is addressed to Flavius Apion II, who had been consul in 539. See in relation to him LXX **4788** Introduction, Mazza 2001, 60-64 and App. 10, Banaji 2007, 252-253, and for documents dated by reference to his year of office *CLRE* 613 and *CSBE*² 206.

6 γερονχ[οῦν]τι καὶ ἐνταῦθα. This implies that Fl. Apion possessed land outside Oxyrhynchus too; an absentee landlord, he would have spent most of his time in Constantinople (Mazza 2001, 72 n. 96).

6-8 Μηνᾶ οἰκέτ[ου τοῦ καὶ] ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προσπορίζοντος τῷ ἰδίῳ δεσπότη τῷ αὐτῷ πανευφήμῳ ἀνδρὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ ἐνοχίην. This phrase and the reference to Menas *oiketēs* (household retainer, not necessarily slave: see **0.6.3n.**) is attested in Apionic contracts from 523 to 620 (LVIII **3935** 7 n.). Although it is possible, as Hardy suggests, that the estate always had a retainer with this name and this function, perhaps because it was a hereditary position, it is much more likely that it became formulaic, as Mazza suggests, citing as authority XXIV **2420** 4-7 where it was used even though an *antigeouchos* or *vice-dominus* was present (Hardy 1931, 84; Mazza 2001, 136-137). The absence of the formula from an Apionic document has been taken to indicate that a different branch of the family was involved: see Gascou 1985, 70=2008, 194, n. 390, regarding pseudo-

Strategius. LXIII **4390**, a lease dated 469, shows Flavia Isis, daughter of Strategius I, contracting through a servant called Areobindus in similar terms.

9 θυρουρῶς. Menas is described as door-keeper, showing that he already held the office and that this was an appointment for a further term. Door-keepers were employed in large estates, churches and public buildings and for town gates. As one would expect, their duties in the Apion estate included taking delivery of letters (XXXIV **2719**) and goods: although not all such receipts specify this, the old axles for which replacements were supplied in I **137** 24, XVI **1988** 31 and LXX **4788** 21 were handed to the doorkeeper and another (XXXVI **2779** 23) was delivered εἰς τὴν μεγάλην γεουχικὴν οἰκίαν (presumably also to the door-keeper). Door-keepers also played a security role: see XXIV **2419** 8, in which a witness statement in a case involving theft describes one (a woman) closing the door, and P. Flor. III 295.10 (6th century Arsinoite), where a door-keeper is stated to have been beaten to death by intruders. The Apions employed a door-keeper for their box at the race-course (PSI VIII 953.62); this appointment was probably in addition to the one created here. The equivalent position in a church has been described as the lowest rung on the hierarchical ladder (P. Iand. VIII 154.15 n. (c.600)). See on door-keepers generally P. Eirene I 12 and, on their role in churches, Wipszycka 1993, 208-210.

τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου. A reference to the *domus gloriosa* or Apion household (Mazza 2001, 83.)

11 νομικαρίου καὶ ῥιπαρίου. According to Rea at LVIII **3942** 9-10 n., citing LV **3788** 2 n. (309) where he followed Skeat at P. Panop. Beatty 1.252 n. (298), *nomiciarius* derives from νομός or nome, not νόμος or law. Rea suggested that the function might have something to do with public transport of goods, a common thread between XVI **2024** 10-11 (late 6th century) which attested two individuals who were *nomiciarii* and *pactarii* of the postal service, and those papyri. The role probably changed with time: in LIX **3985** (473) one of the tasks of a *nomiciarius* nominated by a village council was to pay their share of taxes (presumably out of money paid to him). LXXV **5068** (5th/6th century) is a receipt for salary from a deputy to the *nomiciarius* who appointed him, which suggests that the original liturgical aspect of the role may have continued in some respects (see Introduction) although, following **3985**, the post would by the late 5th century have been salaried. One of the *nomiciarii* and *pactarii* attested in **2024** 10 was called Ioannes, but it is a common name.

A *riparius* was originally a senior police official responsible for law and order in the nome (see **017.3-4** n.); the role was a liturgy. By the time of **021** *riparii* were appointed by the major landowners for senior police work (LVIII **3942** 7-8 n., XVI **2039**). On Gascou's analysis they still functioned as state officials (Gascou 1985, 26, 43, 45-46, 47 n. 269, 56 n. 321=2008, 148, 166-169, 170 n. 269, 179 n. 321). **2039** (562-563), which covers a period of 65 years, shows that the task of supplying *riparii* was shared between a number of large estates in the Oxyrhynchite nome, with the Apion estate being responsible for more years than any of the others. (Azzarello interprets **2039** as providing evidence for the rise to fortune of the Apions c. 459/460: see Azzarello 2006, 209-212.) Although in the 5th and early 6th century Flavius Strategius had held the office himself (LXVII **4614** Introduction and 1 n. (late 5th century)), it seems that the custom changed in the 6th century and the estate fulfilled the role by nominating one or more of its employees, as such officials sometimes held a salaried post of which we are aware. LVIII **3942** 7-8, a potter's work contract of 606, was addressed to Sergius, a *chartularius* or secretary and *riparius*, and **3949** 7, a fragment of a contract from 610, records an Enoch who was a *riparius*, *logistes* and (perhaps surprisingly) an assistant of the bath; on this analysis the latter function was probably a private one (see **3949** 7-8 n. and Mazza 2001, 82-83). We do not know whether the Ioannes in this contract was also an Apion employee but I think it likely. I have not found any other reference to a *riparius* called Ioannes.

A *nomiarius* was guarantor of the *pronoetes* appointed under I **136**, a schoolmaster (*grammatodidaskalos*) was guarantor in LVIII **3952** and in **022** the guarantor is a *dioecetes*. One can understand senior officials being involved as guarantors for stewards and rent-collectors, who were in positions of responsibility which included handling large amounts of money, but the amount to be repaid here should the doorkeeper default is not large (see 26 n.). Possibly the *riparius* is guarantor for the doorkeeper because there was a security aspect involved and it relates to his police functions; maybe the doorkeeper was a former police assistant.

16-17 ἐπὶ ἓνα ἐνιαυτόν Contracts for a one-year period are common: see Jördens 1984, 64, n. 3. The other Apionic employment contracts whose terms are known (I **136** and **138**, LVIII **3952** and **3958**, and **022**) are all for one year.

19 τοῦ προαστίου αὐτῆς. Originally meaning a suburb, when used in the singular in the context of the Apion household it means their mansion or principal residence at Oxyrhynchus, sometimes coupled with the term ἔξω τῆς πύλης (as in XVI **1925** v. (7th

century), P. Wisc. II 66.2 (584) and PSI III 193.2 (566) and see **029**), which meant the wider area owned by the family surrounding the residence and included orchards, vineyards and fields (XVI **1913**, c.555). This abode lay outside the city walls, next to the hippodrome, to which it was connected by a wooden staircase which may have led to the Apions' private box (LVIII **3941** 19 n. on **1925** 42). **1925** (a list of objects removed from the *proastion*) shows that it had a *triclinium* with painted walls and a bath house. **1925** 10 includes a reference to a large door (πτύχια τ[ῆς μεγ]άλ(ης) θύρας) and this may be where the door-keeper was positioned. Hardy had suggested that the term προάστιον meant not merely the residence but also the administrative hub of the Apion estate, but Husson rejected that, considering that such a dispersed land holding would not have had such a centre (Hardy 1931, 83; Husson 1967, 196). The fact that some farmers requiring new axes brought the old ones to the doorkeeper of the mansion itself (9 n.) may be an indication of the value of the wood involved. See generally Husson 1967, Mazza 2001, 84-87.

21-22 νομίσματα δύο καὶ σίτου καγκέλλω ἀρτάβας δώδεκα καὶ οἴνου γεουχικὰ κνίδια εἴκοσι πέντε. See **026.2** n. for an explanation of the *cancellus artaba*. The capacity of a *cnidium* was probably variable but a large one may have held eight *sextarii* and a small one seven (LI **3628** 15 n. and LVIII **3960**, Introduction at p. 119); Hickey suggests that the usual capacity of vessels on the Apion estate was eight *sextarii* and that a *diploun* and a *cnidium* may have been the same (Hickey 2001 68 n. 175, 292). Other examples of remuneration paid in a combination of money, grain and wine are *solidi*, wheat, barley and wine for an *epikeimenos* or overseer in XIX **2239** (598), and *solidi*, wheat, barley, wine and oil for a *familiaris* in P. Strasb. I 40 (569). The door-keeper's total wage was worth approximately 4 *solidi* on the basis of 18-24 *knidia* of wine and 12 artabas of wheat each being worth one *solidus*. It is difficult to assess precisely where in the hierarchy of wage-earners the doorkeeper stood; the terms of contracts published before 1990 are summarised by Jördens in P. Heid. V (pp. 130-147) but the wages are missing from many, some are for what we would call piece-work and in some of those where the wages are known the contracting party has to pay assistants or provide animals (as, for example, I **138** and SPP XX 217), so it is impossible to know the actual rate of pay. The herald's contract in LXIII **4967** is incomplete; we know only that he is to receive the same remuneration as his co-worker. The door-keeper's rate of pay places him slightly higher than the *familiaris* in P. Strasb. I 40 (569: total value 3.2-3.5 *solidi*) and higher than the stable-boy in SPP XX 219 (604: less than 2 *solidi*), the camel-driver in XVI **1911** 156 and LV **3804** 238 (557 and 566: 2.66 *solidi*) and the goldsmith's assistant in LVIII **3933** (3 *solidi*) but below the skilled

purple worker (P. Herm 30: 551/552: about 5 *solidi* a year) and not surprisingly well below the overseer in **2239**. He earns about the same as the *tabularius* of the express post in P. Goth. 9 (564). Several papyri show door-keepers in receipt of grain or wine, more likely as part of their wages or, in the case of religious institutions, donations for their own use, than as receiving deliveries for their masters (CPR X 16.4, P. Bad. IV 95.69, 174, P. Herm. 84.12, I **141** 3-4, PSI VIII 957.3, XVI **2049** 8, P. Mich. XIII 674.9, P. Iand. VIII 154.15). See Banaji 2007, Table 11, 235-237, for occupational wage levels and the values taken above for wheat and wine, also Hickey 2001, Table 3.4 for wine prices.

24 δ[ι]χᾶ ὑπερθέσεως καὶ πόνου τινός. These words are usual where one party is undertaking obligations of personal service, but their position here is strange: I would have expected them to follow a positive undertaking (as at LVIII **3952** 39) rather than a negative one as here. It is not clear whether the words had any legal significance or were just standard or stylistic additions (Jördens at P. Heid. V p.164).

25-26 ζημιούσθαι [τούς ἐμού]ς μισθούς ἢ κάγω ὁ τούτου ἐγγυητής. These are the only words in the contract which describe the obligations of the guarantor, which suggests that he is only required to repay any wages due should the doorkeeper abscond during the year of the contract. In both I **136** 34-39 and LVIII **3952** 40-44 the guarantor is expressed to stand behind the performance by the steward of his obligations under the contract but the guarantee clause is in the same position there as here and I think that in all cases the employer would have looked to the guarantor for financial recompense alone. Although guarantors of *enapographoi georgoi* generally undertook to procure that the farmer would not leave and to fetch him back if he did, it is likely that in those cases also the guarantor would have had to pay in case of default rather than perform manual labour in his place (e.g. LXX **4794** (580)). P. Eirene II 12 (492) (=SB VI 9152 and SB XVIII 13953 re-ed.), where the guarantor is covenanting to do the work himself, is exceptional. Whether our doorkeeper would have been required to refund the payments in kind as well as the cash is not specified but all are described as being paid λόγῳ μισθοῦ so if they had been consumed their cash value may have been added to the amount to be paid.

31 The endorsement probably continued with the description of Menas and possibly of the guarantor, as in ll. 9 and 11-12: see for example I **136** v. and **140** v. and LVIII **3958** v.

022 Contract of a rent-collector

54 1B.26(E)/B (5)a +53 1B.26(D)/A (2)a

26 February 596

54 1B.26(E)/B(5)a: 4 fragments 20.7 x 8, 21.5 x 8.2, 22 x 8.1, 21.8 x 8 cm.

54 1B.26(D)/A(2)a: 6 fragments 22.2 x 8.1, 22.1 x 8, 21.9 x 7.7, 21 x 7.4, 21 x 7.1, 20.9 x 3.5 cm.

This papyrus, 10 fragments of which have been assembled, contains a service contract for an *enoikologos* or rent-collector called Menas, a deacon, son of Victor, a priest, whose obligations are guaranteed by a *dioecetes* called Flavius Justus. I have not found any attestation of these individuals except possibly (but unlikely) the guarantor (43 n.). The references to the ἔνδοξος οἶκος (16, 18 and 20) show that this related to the Apion estate: see 021.9 n. One rent-collector's contract has been published to date, LVIII 3958 (614); in that instance there was no guarantor. The rent-collector fulfilled in relation to property in the city of Oxyrhynchus the role which the *pronoetes* played in the countryside: see 9 n. and 023.5 n. Sarris' suggested hierarchy of the Apion household places the *enoikologos* at a higher level than the *pronoetes*, but probably only because his would have been a single appointment, while more officials were needed to deal with the rural estate.²⁵⁴ The tasks described in 3958 were to collect rents from urban properties, to distribute oil and small denominations of cash, to hand over a fixed sum (125 *solidi*) at the year-end and to make good any shortfall in the accounts. Unfortunately, the surviving parts of 022 do not give us new information about the tasks performed by the rent-collector, but he may in addition have supervised construction work on properties in his area of responsibility (22 n. and 23 n.). The provisions relating to the ἀγγαρευταί (23 n.) and to the Novella of Justinian (33-36 n.) are interesting.

The fragments contain a total of (or of traces of) 50 lines. Some 9 lines are missing from the top (see 1 n.) but we have most of the subscription clause at the foot of the document. The left margin is intact in places, with only a couple of letters missing in others. There were probably about 50 to 55 letters per line, and a varying number of letters are missing from the end of each line, and an unknown number of lines may also be missing between lines 7 and 8, 20 and 21 and 27 and 28. The writing is with the fibres and the back is blank.

²⁵⁴ Sarris 2006, 78-79.

- 1 τοῦ] τῆς μακαρίας μνήμ[ης 2].[2] ι. [. 15? ἐξῆς ὑπογράφοντες
- 2 ἰδίοις γράμμασιν, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Ὁξ[υ]ρ[υ]γχ(ιτῶν) πόλεως, χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ
- 3 ἐγὼ ὁ πρωτότυπος Μηνᾶς διάκονος ἐκο[υσία γνώμη καὶ αὐθαιρέτω
- 4 πρ]οαιρέσει συντεθεῖ[σ]θαί με πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶ[ν] ὑπερφυεῖαν διὰ τῶν αὐτῆ
διαφερόντων
- 5 ἐπ]ὶ ἕνα ἐνιαυτόν, λογιζόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς σήμε[ρον] καὶ προγεγραμμένης ἡμέρας
ἦτις
- 6 ἐστὶ]ν Φαμενώθ νεομη[ν]ία τ[ῆ]ς παρ[ού]σης [τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος
- 7 ἔτους] σοβ[ε]ρ[α]ν ἐπὶ τ[ῶ] ἐμὲ τὴν χώραν τοῦ ἐνοικολόγου παρὰ ὑμῖν
ἀποπληρῶσαι]
- 8 τῶν διαφερόντων αὐτῆ οἴκω[ν] καὶ ἀποστάσεων καὶ ἄλλων προσήκοντων καὶ
- 9 ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ ἐνοικο[λόγων] 20? τῶν
- 10 α]ὐτῆς πραγμάτων κατὰ ταύτην τὴν πόλι[ν] καὶ 25?
- 11 καταβαλεῖν κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν πρὸ ἐμο[ῦ] ἐνοικολόγων 16?
- 12 ἀμέμπτως καὶ ἀκαταγνώστως ταδε [. 28?
- 13 παρὰ τῆς ὑμῶν ὑπε[ρφυ]ε[ί]ας 34?
- 14 . . οἰκιῶν παντ[ῶ]ν 40?
- 15] ἐλαίου τοῦ ἀναλωματος τ.[3] αστελλ[. 21?
- 16] αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου ὁμολογῶ καθὼς [. 21?
- 17] ποιήσασθαι καὶ διαστεῖλαι ἀκολούθως παλ[. 10? τοῖς πρὸς ἐμὲ
- 18] πιττακίοις ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου κ[αὶ ἀμέμπτως] κατὰ μίμησιν
- 19 τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γενομένου ἐνοικολόγου δίχα τ[ῆ]ν ὑπερθέσεως 8?

- 20 τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου τῆ[ς] ὑμ[ῶν] ὑπερφυείας 20?
-
- 21 .. 5? . .]. [. 45?
- 22 τοῦ ἐνοικολόγου εἴτε οἰκοδόμ[ων] λ[. 26?
- 23 φ[ιλ]οκαλείας εἴτε ἀγγαρευτῶν ἀνθρώ[πων] .. 22?
- 24 πρὸς τῷ καὶ δέξασθαί με λόγῳ μισθοῦ ἦτοι [ὄψωνίου παντὸς τοῦ ἐνὸς
- 25 ἐνιαυτοῦ κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐνο[ικολόγου]. δώσω δὲ τοὺς λόγους
- 26 πάσης τῆς ἐμῆς ὑποδοχῆς τοῦ τε λήμμα[τος καὶ ἀναλώματος] .. 7? ..
- 27 λογους καὶ κατὰ τὴν [σ]υνήθει[αν] 30?
-
- 28 [.. 6..] . [. 48?
- 29 δίχα ὑπερθέσεώς τινος. προσο[μολογῶ] δὲ καὶ ἐγὼ Φλ(άουιος) Ἰουῆτος
- 30 ἐγγυητῆς ἐγγυᾶσθαι καὶ ἀναδέχεσθαι τὸν προγεγραμμένον Μηνᾶν
- 31 διάκονα καὶ ἐνοικολόγον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ συν[αλλάγματι καὶ εἰ λοιπαδάριος
- 32 φανείη ἐμὲ οἴκοθεν καὶ ἐξ ἰδίων μου δοῦνα[ι καὶ πληροῦν ἐπὶ τὴν ὑμῶν
- 33 ὑπερφυ(είαν) δίχα ὑπερθέσεώς τινος ἀποτα[ττόμενος τῇ νεαρᾷ
- 34 διατάξει τῇ βουλομένη κατὰ π[. 27?
- 35 [. 16?] .. [. 32?
- 36 κατὰ δευτέραν τάξιν ἀλλ' ἐμ[1] . [. 25? τὰ τῆς
- 37 αὐτοῦ ὑποδοχῆς ὑποθέμενοι ἀμφότεροι [εἰς τὸ δίκαιον τούτου τοῦ
συναλλάγματος
- 38 πάντα ἡμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπάρ[ξ]ο[ντα] ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἐνεχύρου
- 39 λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ. κύριον τὸ συν[άλλαγμα] ?δισσὸν? γραφ(έν),

- 40 καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες ὠμολογήσαμεν.+ (m. 2) [Μηνᾶς σὺν θεῶ διακονος υἱὸς
 41 Οὐ]ίκτηρος πρε(σβύτερου), ὁ προγεγ[ραμμένος, πεποίημα τοῦτο τὸ
 συναλλάγμα τοῦ
 42 ἐνοικολόγου καὶ στοιχεῖ μοι πάντα [τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς πρόκειται καὶ ὑπογράφας
 χειρὶ
 43 ἐμοὶ ἀπέλυσα.+ (m. 3) + Φλ(άουιος) Ἰοῦστος σὺν θεῶ διοικ(ητής) υἱ[ὸς
 44 ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐγγυῶμαι καὶ ἀναδέχομαι τὸν προγεγραμ(μένον) [Μηνᾶ
 45 διάκον(ον) καὶ ἐνοικολόγον πάντα διδοῦντα πληρο[ῦντα τὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ
 ὑποδοχῆς, καὶ
 46 εἰ λοιπαδάριος φανείη περὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ε . . . [οἴκοθεν καὶ ἐξ ἰδίων μου
 47 διδόναι καὶ πληρῶσε τῆ[ν ὑμῶν ὑπερφυσίαν 19?
 48 ἀπέλυσα (vac.)
 49 (m. 4) †δι' ἐμοῦ Παπνουθίου συμβολα[ιογράφου ἐτελειώθη]
 50 + di em(u) Παρηϋτιου et[eliioth

2 ἴδιοις 4 ὑμων 9 ὑπο 13 ὑμων ὑπε[19 γενομεν 18 πιτ'τακιοις 20 ὑμ[23 l. φιλοκαλίας
 26 ὑποδοχης 29 ὑπερθεσεως 30 εγ'γυητης 32 ἰδίων 33 ὑπερφύ 37 ὑποδοχης ὑποθεμενοι
 38 ὑπαρ[ξ]ο[39 ὑποθηκης 41 πρε- 43 ἐμῆ φλς θεω διοικ 47 l. πληρωσαι 48 l. ἀπέλυσα

1, son of] of blessed memory, both subscribing below in their own
 writing, from the same city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings. I Menas, deacon, the principal
 party, by willing resolve and voluntary choice, acknowledge that I have come to an
 agreement with your excellency [through your people] for one year, calculated from today,
 the above-written first day of Phamenoth in the present [14th indiction], in the year 272
 241, to fulfil the position of rent-collector of the houses [and storerooms and other
 properties belonging to you] and simply put, [to carry out] all those things that are
 done by rent collectors in respect of the city and to pay in the same way as
 the rent-collector who preceded me without blame or condemnation in
 accordance with your excellency's

16 of the glorious house, I agree to do and pay in accordance with account books (or vouchers?) for the same glorious house [and without blame in the same way as] the rent-collector who preceded me without [delay] of the glorious house of your excellence

22 of the rent-collector, whether care of the builders or of the conscripted workmen , in order that I may receive on account of wages or [salary for the entire] one-year period the same as the rent-collector before me. [I will give the accounts] of all my stewardship, the accounts of the income [and expenditure] and in accordance with custom

29 in full without delay. And I too, [Flavius Justus], guarantor, agree to guarantee and be responsible [for the above written Menas], deacon and rent-collector, in this agreement and if there should be a [deficit] I am to deliver it from my household and my private resources and to pay your excellence [in full] without delay, [waiving the [new] edict in the second rank

37 the affairs of his stewardship, both of us pledging [to the right of this contract] all our possessions now and in future [in particular and in general], by way of pledge and by right of mortgage. This agreement, written in [two] copies, is binding, and in answer to the formal question, we gave our consent.

“2nd hand). [I, Menas, with God deacon, son of] Victor, priest, the above-written, [have made this agreement] of [being a] rent-collector and all that is in it is satisfactory to me, [as aforesaid. I subscribed with my own hand] and delivered the contract. (3rd hand.) I, Flavius Justus, with God *dioecetes*, son of , the above-written, guarantee and accept responsibility for the aforementioned Menas, deacon and rent-collector, giving everything in full in support [of his stewardship,] and if a deficit should appear concerning his to give and pay your excellence in full [from my household and out of my personal possessions.] I have delivered it.

(4th hand) [Completed] through me, Papnuthius, notary

(Latin) [Completed] through me, Papnuthius.”

1 By analogy with PSI I 60 (a receipt of irrigation equipment dated 8 October 595), I **136** (583, a *pronoetes*’ employment contract which also had a guarantor) and LVIII **3958**, some nine lines are probably missing from the top of the document. These would have contained

an invocation of Christ (*invocatio*) (see P. Heid. V 350.1 n.), a dating formula (*intitulatio*), the address to Flavius Apion III, who was the head of the Apion family at the time, the Menas *oiketes* formula (see 021.6-8 n.), the name and description of Menas the main contracting party, and the name and first part of the description of the guarantor. I have restored these lines as set out below, taking the invocation of Christ and the dating formula from PSI I 60, the Menas *oiketes* formula from 3958 and the actual date and description of the parties from 136 and the surviving parts of this document. I have used Mauricius Novus Tiberius for the emperor rather than Tiberius Mauricius, as the former is slightly more common, but the latter is possible also. See for the invocation and dating formula Rea at LVIII 3933-3962 Introduction, 51-54 and *CSBE*² 51-52 and 260-265.

- i [† ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπ(ότου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος
- ii ἡμῶν, βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότης μεγίστου
- iii εὐεργέτου Φλαουίου Μαυρικίου Νέου Τιβερίου τοῦ Αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ
- iv Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους ιδ, ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης ἔτους
- v ιγ Φαμενώθ α ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ιδ Φλαουίω Ἀπίωνι τῷ πανευφήμῳ καὶ ὑπερφουεστάτῳ
- vi ἀπὸ ὑπάτων γεουχοῦντι καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Ὁξυρυγχ(ιτών) πόλει, διὰ Μηνᾶ οἰκέτου
- vii τοῦ ἐπερωτῶντος καὶ προσπορίζοντος τῷ ἰδίῳ δεσπότη τῷ αὐτῷ πανευφήμῳ ἀνδρὶ τὴν
- viii ἀγωγὴν καὶ ἐνοχὴν, ἐγὼ Μηνᾶς διάκονος, υἱὸς Οὐίκτωρος πρεσβύτερου,
- ix μετ' ἐγγυητοῦ τοῦ καὶ ἀναδεχομένου αὐτὸν ἐμοῦ Φλαουίου Ἰούστου διοικητοῦ υἱοῦ]

“[In the name of the lord and master Jesus Christ, our god and saviour. In the reign of our most godly and pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Mauricius Novus Tiberius, the eternal Augustus and Emperor, year 14, and in the consulship of our same most pious master, year 13, Phamenoth 1, indiction 14. To Flavius Apion, the most renowned and most extraordinary consular, landowner here also in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites,

through Menas, *oiketes*, putting the formal question and supplying for his own master, the same most renowned man, the conduct of and responsibility for (the transaction), I Menas, deacon, son of Victor, priest, with my guarantor, who takes responsibility for me, Flavius Justus *diocetes*, son of.....]

3 Μηναῖς διάκονος. Menas is described only as a deacon, not *enoikologos*, which implies that he is not already in office; Joseph, the person being appointed rent-collector in LVIII 3958, was described at 3958 11-12 as a psalmist of the church but also as a rent-collector of the glorious household, and in 021.9 Menas, who as stated there must already hold the office, is described simply as door-keeper. Schmelz notes that office-bearers in churches or monasteries which belonged to an estate were sometimes involved in its administration (Schmelz 2002, 242, with references) and it is notable how many individuals who fulfilled these steward-type offices were connected with the church. As well as Menas in 022 and Joseph in 3958, Serenus and Phoibammon, the *pronoetai* appointed under I 136 and LVIII 3952, were a deacon and a priest respectively. PSI I 81 (Oxyrhynchite, 6th century) attests another deacon, called Apollus, who was rent-collector of the Apion household. Other relevant sources are SB XX 14294.1, 7 (538-9) (= P. Cair. Masp. II 67135 re-ed.) and P. Cair. Masp II 67134.2 (547-548), both from Aphrodito, which attest a priest who is a *pronoetes*, and P. Cair. Masp. III 67325 viii r. 22 (6th century, also from Aphrodito), which attests a priest who is a *diocetes*. The sub-deacon in P. Ross. Georg. V 46 no. 3 (8th century), who gives a receipt for rent paid for his master's property, and the deacon who concluded the rental agreement in BGU I.2 305 (556) were probably also rent-collectors or stewards. The *enoikologoi* in SB XXII 15273.2 (5th/6th century, provenance unknown) and P. Wisc. II 66.1 (584, from Oxyrhynchus) were both described as *enlabestatos*, an epithet usually reserved for persons connected with the church (see 027.2 n.). Cometes, a deacon and *enoikologos*, is attested by SPP VIII 743.2 (8th century). Clergy may have been appointed to these roles because they were trust-worthy, or literate (although not all could write: see Schmelz 2002, 47, 71-72), or well-known in their local communities. In a number of papyri, such as P. Strasb. I 15 and SPP VIII 881, 929, 1069 and 1070, receipts for rent paid to clergy are probably for rent of church property; SB XX 14282.63 refers to a rent-collector of a church mill. In relation to deacons generally, see Schmelz 2002, 37, 52-58, 70-72, and, for roles they played outside the churches and monasteries, 241-254.

5 ἐπὶ ἔνα ἐνιαυτόν. One year was the usual term for an appointment of this sort: see 021.16-17 n.

6-7 Φαμενώθ νεομη[ν]ία τ[ῆ]ς παρ[ού]σης [τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης ἰνδικτίονος | ἔτους] σοβ̄ σμᾱ. The Oxyrhynchite era year 272 241 equates to 595/6. This was a leap year, when the year started on 30 rather than 29 August, and so this 1 Phamenoth is 26, not 25 February (*CSBE*² 158, 162) in regnal year 14, consular year 13 and indiction year 14 of Mauricius' reign (LVIII, pp 53-54). Other papyri from the same era year are PSI I 60 and XXVII **2478** (with BL V 82). Contracts could start on any day of the month but they were often expressed to start on the first, like I **140**, particularly if the employee had already started work: see Jördens in P. Heid. V, p. 154-155. LVIII **3958** was expressed to start, not on a fixed calendar date like this papyrus, but by reference to the beginning of the year's rental period (possibly 1 Thoth: see **02.3** n.). The two *pronoetes*' contracts, I **136** and LVIII **3952**, were also calculated from a point in the annual collection cycle. XIX **2239** started on the 1st of a month, like this papyrus.

8 Restored following LVIII **3958** 20.

9 ἐνοικο[λόγων] The rent-collector's title is derived from ἐνοίκιον, meaning rent from a dwelling or other non-agricultural or urban property. It can also be spelt ἐνοικιολόγος. References to such employees have been found from the Roman period (as in XIX **2240** 49, an account of a large estate from 211) but most occur in the Byzantine era: see LVI **3870** 7 n. and CPR XIV 45 Introduction and add, for the 5th century and later, LVIII **3958**, SB XX 14282.63, 14657.14 and 15183.1 and XXII 15273.2, and SPP III 105.4 and VIII 743.2. A rent-collector did not just collect rents (as attested for example in SB XXII 15273). Some acted as landlord's agent in contracts (as in VII **1038**, a house lease) and were responsible for making or organising payments, such as to messengers in XVI **1904** and SB XX 15183. SB X 10560 shows an *enoikologos* paying out rents which he had received to an *epimeletes* on account of a bonus (*beortikon*), and the rent-collector appointed under **3958** distributed cash (and, I believe, oil: see 15 n.) and had to account for them, presumably in the same way as the *pronoetes*' accounts in, for example, LV **3804** show disbursements being made and the net amount being handed over to the estate treasury. XVI **2008** (580) is a receipt for wages paid by an *enoikologos* to himself, which he would presumably have used when drawing up his year-end accounts. See Wipszycka 1968, 344-351.

15 ἐλαίου τοῦ ἀναλωματος. It is not clear what this line means, even if ἀναλωματος is corrected to ἀναλώματος. Oil is mentioned also in LVIII **3958** 27-28, where the *enoikologos* seems to agree to account for oil which he has delivered. At **3958** 27 n. the editor

suggests, on the basis of a reference to “the prevailing custom” in l. 28, that it is more likely that this is a payment in kind to the estate as a premium for the office than a distribution to customers, but notes that the position is unclear. Oil was received by an *enoikologos* (ὑπὲρ) μισθ(οῦ) in SPP VIII 929, but in this papyrus the wages are described in ll. 24-25, so it is unlikely that the oil in this papyrus is being paid to the rent-collector. I think it more probable in both **3958** and **022** that he is making payments to workers (possibly to *aggarentai* (see 23 n. below)) rather than deliveries to customers, which would probably have been the duty of an official who was responsible for its collection and storage. VII **1043** (578) is a receipt for 3 *sextarii* of oil paid λόγω ἀναλωμά(των) by an Apion *enoikologos* to three *symmachoi*. Oil frequently formed part of wages; see Morelli 1996 *passim*.

τ. [3?]αστελλ This suggests τῶ[ῦ δι]αστελλ[ομένου], but it is not clear what that would mean.

18 πιττακίοις. The precise meaning of this term, which must have been some means by which payments were recorded, either income or expenditure or both, is not clear. It may originally have meant a “writing tablet” or “material on which writing appears”, and then, by transfer, what was written on it (Day and Keyes in P. Col. V (*Tax documents from Theadelphia*) p. 144: in that papyrus the landholders and properties in a register were grouped by *pittakia*, and *pittakion* had come to mean the group). At XVI **2028** 16, XXVII **2480** 34 n. and PSI VIII 955.10, it means instalments, because the payments were recorded, in each of such cases, on two *pittakia*. Sarris suggested *pittakia* were like cheques or credit notes, by means of which wages were paid (Sarris 2006, 56). Here, they may have been receipts issued to the payers of rent and counter-signed by them (LVIII **3958** 25-26 n., where it is noted that the word seems to mean the same as ἐντάγιον), or the equivalent of modern “rent-books”, with a separate one for each payer (see LXX **4800** 9-10 n.).

[κατὰ μίμησιν. Restored following l.11 and I **136** 31-32 (see also LXXIII **4967** 7.)

20 τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου This is a reference to the Apion estate: see **021.9**.

22 οικοδόμ[ων. Architects or builders on the Apion estate are known from XVI **1834** 4, **1910** 5 and **1912** 122, XIX **2243A** 79 and LV **3804** 151, 215. φ[ιλ]οκαλίας in the next line suggests that the rent-collector had some sort of supervisory role or was responsible for paying them, like the *pronoetes* in **3804**. See Mazza 2001, 151-152.

23 ἀγγαρευτῶν ἀνθρώπων These workmen are attested in only four published papyri from Oxyrhynchus: P. Hamb. III 216 (at 586 the earliest dated reference), PSI III 200 (592: as restated in P. Hamb. III 216), LVIII 3958 and P. Iand. II 24 (6th/7th century). All except the last of these may relate to the Apion estate and specifically to areas associated with or near the Apion villa at Oxyrhynchus: see 3958 28 n. Unfortunately both 3958 and this papyrus are too incomplete to identify the precise relationship between the Apion estate and these workers. Most references to *aggareutai* are from the Arab period and from Aphrodito. See generally 3958 28 n. and P. Hamb. III 216 Introduction at 97-98 and, for a list of references, 100-103, to which add P. Clackson 49, SB X 10454, CPR XXII 45 and 53 and 3958. The term *aggareutai* indicates that the workers were conscripts, who would have been requisitioned from particular localities from time to time and put to work there or elsewhere, but who would have been paid for their labour, and papyri show them being requisitioned for a variety of public services (P. Lond. IV 1401) and works such as brick-making (P. Hamb. III 216), irrigation (SB X 10458.3) and building mosques, palaces and ships (as in P. Lond. IV 1376.1, 1401.3, 1433.418, 1435.15): see P. Lond IV Introduction at p. xxxii. Johnson and West suggested that this was a manual liturgy (1949, 332). The *aggareutai* in 022 may have been engaged in public work in Oxyrhynchus for which the Apion estate was responsible, possibly near the Apion villa, and been supervised or paid by the rent-collector, or possibly were doing work for the Apions themselves. This is another example of the quasi-public nature of the Apion estate.

24-25 λόγῳ μισθοῦ ἦτοι [ὀψωνίου παντὸς τοῦ ἐνὸς] ἐνιαυτοῦ κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐνοικολόγου. Restored following 021.20 and LXXIII 4967 6-7. The rent-collector is to be paid the same wage as his predecessor, but we do not know how much. In LVIII 3958, the rent-collector had to pay λόγῳ πάκτου an amount of 125 *solidi* (see 3958 22 n.) and also to make distributions of small denominations of cash given to him for the purpose, but may have been entitled, in lieu of a wage (none is specified), to retain the rest of the sums which he collected. In I 136 and LVIII 3952 the *pronoetes* paid for his office and although he received a wage he may also have been entitled to retain some profit from his activities (see 023.5 n.).

33-36 ἀποταττόμενος τῇ νεαρά] διατάξει τῇ βουλομένη κτλ. Similar, although not identical, waivers appear in the two published Apionic employment contracts which have guarantors: I 136 37-38, ἀποταττόμενος τῷ προνομίῳ τῶν ἐγγυητῶν, διαφερόντως δὲ τῇ νεαρά διατάξει τῇ περὶ ἐγγυητῶν καὶ ἀντιφωνητῶν ἐκφωνηθείση, and LVIII

3952 44-45, ἀποταπτόμενος τῆ νεαρᾷ διατάξει [...ca.35....] κατὰ πρώτην τάξιν. These are references to one of the Novellae or new decrees of Justinian, which were published after the Digest, the Code and the Institutes, between 535 and 564. The 4th Novella (535), headed περὶ τοῦ τοὺς δανειστὰς πρότερον χωρεῖν κατὰ τῶν πρωτοτύπων χρεωστῶν, καὶ ἐν δευτέρα τάξει, ἀπόρων τούτων εὐρεθέντων, κατὰ τῶν μανδατῶρων ἢ τῶν ἀντιφωνητῶν ἢ ἐγγυητῶν, protected guarantors by providing that a creditor should not in the first place (κατὰ πρώτην τάξιν) claim against a mandator, guarantor or bondsman (κατὰ τοῦ μανδάτωρος ἢ τοῦ ἐγγυησαμένου ἢ ἀντιφωνήσαντος χωρεῖτω) but should first sue the debtor and could only proceed against the guarantor if he did not recover in full. If the debtor was abroad, the creditor could proceed against the guarantor first but the judge would grant a period of time to enable the debtor to be joined. If a debtor's property was held by a third party the required order of suit was debtor, guarantor and then, κατὰ τρίτην τάξιν, the third party. Line 33 may end with a reference to the principal party, or with a reference to the first rank, as in **3952** 45. In either event this must be a waiver of the right to require the debtor to be sued first; the reference to the second rank may be merely clarificatory, or be a waiver either of the right of subrogation until the whole amount owing has been paid or of the right to require some other surety (unknown to us) to be sued before a claim could be made against this guarantor. The 99th Novella, which relates to joint and several liability, and to which reference is made at **136** 37-38 n., may also be relevant but it seems more likely that the 4th is intended. Beaucamp points out that, although this law was designed to protect guarantors, wealthy landowners like the Apions could apparently ensure that parties contracting with them had to agree to give up that protection (Beaucamp 2001, 282-283). The Novella does not itself specify that it can be renounced but Novella 136, which gives certain rights to bankers to avoid its provisions in certain circumstances, states a general principle that any person has a right to renounce any privileges which the law grants to him. See Amelotti and Luzzatto 1972, 64.

43 ἀπέλυσσα. This word, repeated in a different hand and spelling at l. 4, the equivalent of the Latin *absolvi*, means that the document has been delivered. At LVIII **3952** 53 n. it is noted that although in the West the notary was generally responsible for handing copies of the contract to the parties, in papyri, as was usual in the East, the party who made the acknowledgments delivered a copy to the other, and it was he who wrote ἀπέλυσσα at the end of his subscription.

Φλ(άουιος) Ἰοῦστος σὺν θεῶ διοικ(ητής) A Flavius Iustus, *dioecetes*, is known from LXIX 4754 6-7 (572), but the date and the fact that the individual in that papyrus was attached to the *patrikia* Maria in a different household makes it unlikely that he was the person in this document. A *dioecetes* was an official in the hierarchy of administration of an estate, senior to a *pronoetes* or an *enoikologos*. A large concern like the Apion estate would have employed more than one, each with responsibility for a number of districts. Many carried the honorary title of *comes* and so were designated *spectabilis*. See Mazza 2001, 137-8. Fl. Iustus may be guaranteeing the performance of an underling in his area of responsibility; perhaps he had suggested him for the post.

48 ἀπέλησα. See 43 n. This declaration, spelt as here, by a guarantor appears also in LVIII 3952 57, and may not be as unusual as is suggested there at 57 n.

49 δι' ἐμοῦ Παπνουθίου συμβολα[ιογράφου ἐτελειώθη]. A notary called Papnouthius is known from a number of Oxyrhynchus papyri, including from the Apion archive I 136 (583) and 138 (610/11), the only documents where, as here, his subscription appears first in Greek and then in Latin (Diethart and Worp 1986, 84-85, nos.16.2.4 and 16.2.12). There are more examples where his subscription is only in Latin. See Diethart and Worp 1986, 83-86 and add LXVI 4535 and LXX 4794, 4798 and 4799. I think from the script that the notary in 138 is probably the signatory of this document also.

023 Letter to a *pronoetes*

68 6B.25/F(4-5)a

29.5 x 5 cm

6th century

Introduction

This papyrus, part of the “archive” of the Apion estate, contains a polite instruction to a *pronoetes* (5 n.) not to demand payments that would otherwise have been due from certain γεωργοί and others from Apelle. Although a number of papyri show that concessions were granted to farmers, this is the first where a *pronoetes* is being instructed to grant such relief, and it casts further light on the meaning of ἐξωτικοί (see 3 n.).

The papyrus is undated but in 6th century style. It was written at a time in the year before, and probably shortly before, the first instalment due from the farmers was payable and when the sowing of the grain should have been taking place. This would have been after the Nile flood had receded, and so between late September and November. It is likely that this papyrus was written towards the end of that period (see 3 n. and 5 n.).

I have summarised above (pp. 148-153) various theories in relation to rent or tax payments and the status of the farmers. While **023** refers to a payment to be made by *georgoi*, it does not specify in what capacity or for what that payment is being made. This is not surprising: both sender and recipient of the document would have known to what they were referring. As far as the farmers were concerned and for the Apions too if, as I believe to be correct, they had to pay a certain “global” amount of tax and did not pass on specific amounts collected from specific individuals, all that mattered was the total amount to be collected from each.

023 contains an instruction, albeit one expressed as a polite request; it must have come from some-one superior to the *pronoetes*. As such it provides an answer to Hardy, who noted that the *pronoetes* had authority to make reductions in the amount demanded but that there was no way of determining whether this was on his own responsibility or subject to approval;²⁵⁵ this papyrus suggests that he acted on orders from above. No reason for the concession is given but if, as I think probable, it was because of a problem affecting the whole Apelle area, the *pronoetes* would have been aware of it, and may even have raised the question of a rebate with his superiors.

²⁵⁵ Hardy 1931, 91.

Accounts of *pronoetai* list many concessions or deductions; XIV **1911** (557) and LV **3804** (566) list gross receipts, followed by a longer section describing rebates or reductions. Many of the latter amounts may never have been collected, rather than being collected and then returned, and the concession directed in **023** would probably have been accounted for in the same way. The only concessions recorded in such accounts in relation to Apelle are a personal concession to one Isak κατὰ τὸ ἔθος and reductions (albeit small) for land which has been encumbered by sand or possibly a lake which has been filled with sand (ψαμμόχλωστος) (**1911** 88, 89 and **3804** 160, 161). The concession in **023** is to be given to the *georgoi* generally and not to named individuals. We know that as well as wheat production there was vine-land at Apelle and that there was an oil factory there (**3804** 264), which suggests that there may have been oil crops too. The concession is only for the second instalment, and is granted to the *georgoi* alone, not to the *ampelourgoi*, which coupled with the reference to sowing suggests that the problem relates only to the sowing of the new wheat crop. The first instalment would be paid out of proceeds of the previous year's crops. I suggest below (3 n.) that the *exotikoi* were farmers resident outside the *prostasia* who were cultivating areas within it, and that the "others" who may not have sown were *georgoi* from other settlements within the *prostasia*. Possibly the problem giving rise to this concession was sand encroachment, or a poor flood which was good enough to supply other parts of the *prostasia* but not Apelle, which was probably on the edge of the land capable of agricultural use (2 n.), or the land around it. The sender of **023** assumes that the *georgoi* from Apelle were adversely affected. He seems to be querying whether the same applied to the *exotikoi* and others, suggesting possibly that only those who farmed lands outside the boundary to one side of the *epoikion* might have had problems; alternatively he may not have known whether in fact there were any such persons. The concession was probably granted for practical rather than philanthropic reasons; the estate owner would not have wanted his work-force to flee to another owner (as XVI **2055**).²⁵⁶

Description

All the margins are intact. Holes in the centre show that the papyrus was folded vertically, down the middle; there is a trace of one letter in the hole in l. 2, which may be the ν of τρίτον or may be part of another word such as καὶ. I think the latter is more likely. There

²⁵⁶ See Sarris 2006, 43.

are marks on the *verso* below the address which may relate to some sort of sealing process. The writing is against the fibres.

1 π(.....)

2 † εὐὰν οἱ γεωργοὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀπελλῆ παρέχουσιν πεντήκοντα ὀλοκότ'τινα εἰς τὴν πρῶτην καταβολὴν

3 μὴ θελήσης λαβεῖν παρ'αὐτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸ τρίτ[ον]. [] εὐὰν δὲ εἰσὶν ἐξωτικοὶ ἢ ἄλλοι μὴ σπεύραντες

4 μήπω μὴ θελήσης αὐτοὺς τέως ἀπαιτῆσαι. ἔ[ρ(ρωσο)

On back, along the fibres:

5 ἐπίδ(ος) τῷ θαυμασ(ιωτάτῳ) Μηνᾶ προν(οητῆ) π(αρά) τοῦ βοηθοῦ

4 ε// 5 επιξ̄ προνς π̄

“+ If the farm-workers from Apelle provide 50 *solidi* for the first instalment, you need not take from them other than the third. If there are persons from outside the area or others who are not sowing, you need not collect from them until then either. Farewell.”

[On back] “Give to the most admirable Menas, steward, from the assistant.”

1 π(..) This looks like the two vertical strokes of the letter *pi* with a long diagonal stroke through it, which curves down at the right-hand end, but with no horizontal stroke on top. Letters from the 5th to 7th centuries frequently contain an abbreviation like this, on its own above the first full line of the text. With two exceptions (P. Flor III 303 and PSI IV 284) the letters in which it appears do not have any prescript and most identify sender and recipient on the reverse, as here. It has traditionally been interpreted as an abbreviation for *παρά*, which it clearly means in P. Flor. III 303 where the same letter form and abbreviation sign appear in the body of the text, but a number of alternative meanings have been suggested: see 021.1 n. for a summary of views. I am not convinced that any of those explanations (a christogram, *παρά*, *π(λεῖστα) χ(αίρειν)* or *παράκειται*) is correct. All the letters, even the private ones, relate to business matters or similar items requiring attention and I wonder whether, at least where it appears in letters, like this one, it might be an abbreviation for some form of *παρακαλέω*. The stroke interferes with the writing on the next line, as in LIX 4007 1.

2 γεωργοί. The basic meaning is “farmers”. It has been translated as “labourers” (e.g. by Grenfell and Hunt in XVI 1911, approved by Banaji (2007, 99)³, and “tenant-farmers” (Rea on LV 3804). These may have been *enapographoi georgoi* (see pp. 150, 152). *Georgoi* are distinguished from *ampelourgoi*, vineyard workers, in e.g. 3804 34. Hickey (2001, 90-91) suggested that they worked primarily as irrigators, but I think it more likely that they were general agricultural workers, working the land around the settlement that was allocated to them as well as the estate owner’s *autourgia* if required, including performing unskilled tasks in the vineyards. See pp. 152-153.

τῶν ἀπὸ In this context this means the people from Apelle who are liable to make payments: see P. Mert. II 96.1, SB XX 15167.1.

Ἀπελλῆ Sometimes described as *epoikion*, sometimes as *ktema*, and sometimes spelt with a single *lambda*, this settlement is attested from the late 5th to the early 7th century, mostly in documents relating to the Apion estate. It formed part of the same *prostasia* as Paciac, Cissonos, Trigyu, Luciu, Tarusebt and Cotyleeiu (XVI 1911 and LV 3804 (where its contributions are listed in the first two columns)) and may have been next to Cissonos, with which it shared an ἐργοδιώκτης or work overseer (3804 155). References to a payment to a church at Iseu Panga (3804 144-148), a much-attested village in the first *pagus* and Upper toparchy near the western desert (Benaissa 2009, 98-101), to sand-encroached land (1911 89 and 3804 161) and to quarrymen from Trigyu (1911 166-7) suggest that it was in the far south of the nome, near the desert and the rising ground to the west. Vine-growing land and an oil-press are attested at 3804 34 and 264, but there must have been arable land too, to supply the wheat paid to the *pronoetes*. (Sarris (2006, 31) supposes that no wheat was supplied by Apelle and no wheat is mentioned in col. ii of 3804, but col. i, most of which is missing, also lists contributions from Apelle and must have included wheat, as the total wheat paid in amounts to just over 1,312 artabas, whilst the amounts shown in cols. iii to vi only amount to some 945 artabas. If this is correct, Apelle contributed some 367 artabas, making it one of the larger contributors in its area.) The settlement also paid one *solidus* συντέλεια κεφαλῆς in 566 (3804), but it is not possible to calculate the number of inhabitants or size of the settlement from this. See generally Mazza 2001, 87-88 and App. 6 and Benaissa 2009, 29-30.

πεντήκοντα ὀλοκότ'τινα εἰς τὴν πρώτην καταβολήν It is implicit that this amount is before taking account of any amount paid by the *exotikoi* or others who are not sowing (3 n.). XVI 1911 (557) and LV 3804 (566) are nine years apart but show consistent amounts

being paid in both years from the *prostasia* which included Apelle. The total number of *solidi* from Apelle in respect of a full year, derived from **3804**, was in the region of 202: 102 in col. i (see 1-14 n.) and 100 from col. ii (ignoring fractions). **1911** and **3804** also show certain specific payments being made from Apelle. Assuming (and it can only be an assumption, as there is no way of dating this papyrus accurately) the same list of exactions, ignoring fractions, and deducting the 43½ *solidi* paid for ἀπότακτον χωρίων (fixed rent probably of vineyards: see pp. 148-149) the one *solidus* tax and half *solidus* for rent of a dove-cote, we are left with some 157 *solidi* payable for the full year. 50 *solidi* represents roughly one-third of this. The writer of **023** is dealing in round numbers and specifies a global amount due from the *epoikion*, whereas the amounts paid in are recorded by the *pronoetes* by reference to individual payers. I think that the payments referred to here are not φόρος (which is not used in **1911** and **3804** for arable land) or ἀπότακτον χωρίων or for any other specific items: those amounts are too small for the first instalment to have amounted to 50 *solidi*. This must be a rebate of the second instalment of the rent payable by the general body of farmers on the estate. καταβολή (2 n.) and ἀπαιτήσαι (4 n.) can be used in a tax context but are not necessarily so used (see **024.6-7** n. for the use of *apaitesimon* in this context and below on καταβολή) and as far as the farmer was concerned if he had to pay any land tax (which I doubt) the total payable would have represented both.

όλοκότ'τινα. A word often used in place of *nomismata* at this time and attested in papyri from the end of the 3rd to the 9th century.

καταβολή, payment or instalment, is used in relation to loan repayments (e.g. XVI **1892** 18, 26) and tax payments or arrears (XVI **1908** 26 and **1843** 7), as well as generally: in XVI **1868** (6th/7th century) a *pronoetes* is sent out to collect an instalment. **023** suggests that three instalments were the norm, which would be consistent with the tax regime (Hardy 1931, 56, Johnson and West 1949, 287-288, XVI **1843** 7 n., LI **3637** Introduction, LXIII **4386** 3 n.). It would be logical that collections of rent (which would have been used to fund the tax payable) would be made from the farmers before the estate's tax payments were due to the imperial authorities, but the dates when the instalments fell due to be paid are not clear. Although in the Oxyrhynchite nome the indiction year began for chronological purposes on 1 Thoth (29 August), for fiscal purposes it began, as elsewhere, on 6 Pachon (1 May). Tax was expressed to be payable in an indiction year by reference to the harvest of that year, namely the harvest which was concluding at the start of it, and initially in accordance with an estimate or *praedelegatio* published by 1 May (*CSBE*² 27). PSI I 80 (a 6th century tax

register from Oxyrhynchus) refers to both first and second instalments being paid in Pharmouthi (March/April), and to second instalments also being paid in Pachon (April/May), presumably all in relation to the same indiction year and at or shortly before the end of that year: in that papyrus the indiction year is not specified in relation to instalments where the month of payment is given, but all payments noted without the month of payment relate to the same, 10th, indiction year (possibly an indication that the payments noted by month were late). A number of other papyri give some indication of when instalments of tax were due. I **143** (535) is a receipt for a 3rd instalment on 26 Hathur (22 November) and I **144** (580) shows three payments, in Tubi, Phamenoth and Mesore. SB XX 15167 mentions a first instalment (presumably of tax) paid in Choiak (as well as non-tax related payments). PSI VIII 953.68, 78-79 shows that bucellarii had arrived in Alexandria with the second instalment of the income of the first indiction on 24 Pachon in that same indiction year. LI **3637** (19 October 623) and XVI **1843** (6 November 623) show payments in gold from Oxyrhynchus in respect of the first instalment for the 12th indiction being made on those dates (in Phaophi and Hathur) and LV **3797** (26 April – 25 May 624) shows the third instalment for the same indiction year being made in Pachon; these are from the Persian period but the Sassanids took over the Byzantine system (Sänger 2008, 198). The dates on which payments had to be made by the *pronoetes* to the estate are not clear either. LV **3804** 275-279 shows a *pronoetes* paying amounts to the estate treasurer in three instalments in Tubi (December/January), Pharmouthi (March/April) and Mesore (July/August), but there were four instalments in XVI **1911** 212-215, which has an additional one in Phaophi (September/October), and XVI **1914** 9-13 shows similar payments by a *pronoetes* in Choiak (November/December) as well as Pharmouthi, Phaophi and Tubi. The *pronoetes* would have made the collections from the *prostasia* before he had to make payments to the estate treasurer, but we cannot tell how long before, nor do we know whether the timing was determined by the amount collected and retained by him or whether there were fixed dates for the payments. **1911** and **3804** both show the *pronoetes* making his first payment in Tubi, January. The first instalment from the *georgoi* must have been due before that, and this papyrus suggests that it was due in the autumn, around the same time as the sowing, namely October/November, although the previous year's grain harvest would have been gathered in months before.

3 μὴ θελήσης This auxiliary function of θέλω is not uncommon in letters; it “appears to form a polite request but the semantic value of θέλω is hard to pin down” (Lee 2010, 21,

who considers it is not the same as “please” or “be so kind as to”). For examples of its use see Lee 2010, 32-33.

τὸ τρίτ[ον] This is not strictly a reference to the third instalment, which would have been τὴν τρίτην, but I think εἰ μὴ shows that the intention was to waive the second instalment, and not merely to defer its collection. Instalments need not necessarily have been equal, but possibly in this case they were.

ἔξωτικοί The most frequent use of ἔξωτικός, in the Apionic context, is qualifying τόποι or γῆ, in conjunction with the names of *epoikia* or villages in the description of an area for which a *pronoetes* has responsibility. It appears in prescripts and adscripsts to accounts and in *pronoetes*' work contracts: I **136**, VI **999**, XVI **2019** and **2038**, XVIII **2196** and **2204**, XIX **2243A**, LVIII **3952**. The *pronoetes*' accounts do not contain receipts directly referable to *exotikoi topoi* in such terms but do show concessions; see XVI **2038** 20-21. Possibly such receipts were dealt with separately, but more likely they were included in the general payments made. They may be indicated where a different place of origin is specified for a payer, as in XVIII **2195** 5, 15, 29, 66, 67, which shows a number of payments by individuals from named villages who were not from the *ketema* in the heading of the relevant section of the accounts.

When related to land, *exotikos* is usually translated as “outlying” but the precise meaning has been the subject of some debate. Banaji's assumption that it means *epoikia* is clearly wrong, as identified by Benaissa (Banaji 2007, 173-4; Benaissa 2007, 85 n. 21). The *exotikoi topoi* were treated differently from the rest of the land in both **136** 24-27 and **3952** 26-30, the two contracts of engagement of a *pronoetes* on the Apion estate, where the *pronoetes* agreed to be responsible for arrears in relation to the *epoikia*, but had a collection function εἰς πλῆρες in relation to the *exotika*. Sarris, relying on these papyri, considered that they must be different types of landholding and that, because in his view the rural estate comprised only *autourgia* and *epoikia* and *exotikoi topoi* were not the latter, they had to be the former, namely the *autourgia* of the estate (Sarris 2006, 53-55). I find it difficult to see how the term could have this meaning; apart from being an over-simplification of the landholding structure, it would be a very odd word to use to mean *autourgia*. Sarris' view was refuted by Mazza in her review of Sarris 2006 and by Benaissa, who showed that *epoikia* and *exotikoi topoi* were treated identically in P. Ct.YBR inv. 325, part of a *pronoetes*' contract of employment of unknown provenance (Mazza 2008, 153; Benaissa 2007, 85-86).

Exotikos must mean that the land itself, or the people who farmed it, or both, were from “outside”. The *pronoetes*’ contracts make it clear (see I 136 15-16) that their collection duties were defined in relation to an area of land and not the residence of the *georgoi*, who might accordingly be making payments to more than one *pronoetes* if they farmed land in more than one area. If collections were of produce then it would be logical for the *pronoetes* in the area cultivated to make the collection. Mazza defined *exotikoi topoi* as “simply scattered outlying plots, located in proximity to, but outside of, *epoikia* or villages” within a *prostasia* (Mazza 2008, 153); on that basis, the lands would have been so defined even if farmed by people from the *epoikion* near whose area they lay, but would those farmers have been described as “*exotikoi*”? Benaissa similarly suggested that *exotikoi topoi* were “a supernumerary type of landholding appended to an overseer’s *προστασία*” (Benaissa 2007, 84). In 023 the word describes people, not fields, and they are contrasted with *georgoi* from Apelle on the one hand and “others” who are not sowing on the other. This might correspond with the three types of farmer described in the *pronoetes*’ contracts (as at I 136 18-19) as *κτηματικοί*, *κωμητικοί* and *ἐξωτικοί*, namely farming (or possibly from) the *epoikia* (here this must be the meaning of *ketema*: see Benaissa 2009, 7), from the villages and *exotikoi*. In that instance *exotikoi* clearly means farmers who are not from *epoikia* or villages in the *prostasia* but who are farming land within it, not necessarily (I would suggest) outlying land, although it would make sense if land leased to outsiders was usually outlying land. Preisigke (*Wörterbuch*) defines *exotikoi*, in relation to people, as “die in auswärts (in anderen Dörfern) belegenen Besitzungen (des byzantischen Grossgrundbesitzers) ansässigen hörigen Bauern”. (See also P. Lond IV 1421.150 n. and 1459.23 n., Morelli 2000, 221 and possibly also SB XXVI 16453, but the reference there could equally be to payments). Mazza also suggested an alternative interpretation, namely that *exotikoi* farmers might be farmers who rented plots in a *ketema* which was listed under one *prostasia*, but who came from places “external to the district”, i.e. from outside the *prostasia* where those plots were situated (Mazza 2008, 153). This papyrus could support Mazza’s interpretation; on the basis that the *exotikoi* were from outside the *prostasia* the “others not sowing” would be people who were resident not in Apelle but elsewhere in the *prostasia*: see below. The *exotikoi topoi* would not necessarily have been (although possibly they usually were) outlying scattered lands whose value was small in the overall scheme of things, or leased and cultivated only sporadically, as on that interpretation it is the origin of the farmer which determines whether or not lands are *exotikoi*, not their own location. It would I think be confusing if the adjective always meant “outlying” when applied to land and “from another *prostasia*”

when applied to people, but that is of course possible (and no doubt the position would have been clearer to those operating the system than it is to us today). I think that the primary definition must be by reference to the location of the land, and that, although it was physically outlying, it ceased to be treated or defined as such when it was farmed by residents of the nearby *epoikia* or villages, who would never have been treated as *exotikoi* in relation to it. The *exotikoi* in this case were therefore farmers from outside the *prostasia*, who were farming outlying land.

Views differ as to the import of the different treatment of *epoikia* and *exotikoi topoi* in the *pronoetes*' contracts in **136** 24-27 and **3952** 26-30. Benaissa's explanation, that because the *exotikoi* were "relatively small, scattered land-holdings, the central management of the estate probably did not foresee problems in the full exaction of their revenues and expected the overseer to be able to make up automatically for any shortfalls" (Benaissa 2007, 85) is in my view illogical. I would expect it to be easier to collect from the main areas than scattered outlying ones. I think that the more onerous obligation lay in relation to the *epoikia* because of the express obligation to make good amounts unpaid, but Sarris holds the opposite view because of the use of εἰς πλήρες in relation to the *exotikoi topoi* (Sarris 2006, 53). In practice there may be little difference.

ἢ ἄλλοι μὴ σπείραντες The *prostasia* comprised a number of *epoikia*, as noted above (1 n.). As the farmers from Apelle and the *exotikoi* have already been mentioned, I think that this is a reference to a third category of farmers, namely those resident in other *epoikia* or villages in the *prostasia*, who are unable to sow their fields, presumably because of the same problem.

4 ἀπαιτῆσαι The term used for a *pronoetes* collecting a payment in XVI **1868**. ἀπαιτήσιμον was the word used for schedule of exactions (often called "rent-roll" but it may not have been limited to "pure" rent payments) which the *pronoetes* was instructed to follow (I **136**); see **024.6-7** n. Both words have a tax connotation from the Roman period (see Gasco 1985, 18=2008, 140) but the usage had become more general in Byzantine times.

ἐ[ρ(ρωσο). This reading is very unclear.

5 ἐπίδ(ος) Although ἀπόδος continued to be used in this context, ἐπίδος became more common in the 5th and early 6th centuries: see XVI **1831.14** n.

θαυμ(ασιωτάτω) This honorific is frequently used of lower-grade officials, including *oinocheiristai* and *zygostatai* as well as *pronoetai*. See LVI **3869** 14 n., de Groot 2002, 29. It is used of a *pronoetes* in *inter alia* XVI **1838**, **1894**, **2000** and **2006**. See Azzarello and Gonis 2009, 212.

Μηνᾶ Menas is a common name. A Menas who was *pronoetes* of Cotyleeiu, which is in the same *prostasia* as Apelle, is known from XVI **1916** iii 32 (6th century, undated). A *pronoetes* with the same name, addressed as being of Netnëu, is the addressee of unpublished papyrus 68 6B.25/F(3)a, which from its inventory number was found in the same season as and near **023**. It is dated 12 Epeiph in the 6th indiction, but no year is given. 6th indiction years in the 6th century are 512-3, 527-8, 542-3, 557-8, 572-3 and 587-8 (*CSBE*² 147-153). Netnëu was close to Iseu Panga and Cissonos (PSI III 165)(see 2 n.) and shared a taskmaster (ἐργοδιώκτης) with Cotyleeiu, which like Apelle was in the far south of the nome (XVI **1911** 83, LV **3804** 155), although in both **1911** and **3804** they had a different *pronoetes*. Netnëu must accordingly have been not far from Apelle. If the same Menas is in XVI **1916** and/or 68 6B.25/F(3)a and **023**, this would suggest that the boundaries of the *prostasiae* were not constant, as one would expect if the estate was expanding. (I make a similar comment on **026**.1n. regarding Polemonos.) For Netnëu see Mazza 2001, 90 and 183 and Benaissa 2009, 180-181 and references.

προνοητῆ. The *pronoetes* was an estate steward, whose duties comprised collecting payments in cash and in kind and making disbursements on behalf of the estate owners. He had responsibility over a specified area, a *pronoesia* or *prostasia*. Examples of one-year contracts of such officials are found at I **136** (583) and LVIII **3952** (610), and annual accounts submitted by them for various years between the mid-fifth to early 6th centuries are found at VI **999**, XVI **1911-1914**, **2019**, XVIII **2195**, **2204**, XIX **2243 A** and **B**, PSI VIII 954 and LV **3804**. See Sarris 2006, 29 n. 2, Mazza 2001, App. 8. The annual salary of Theodorus, the *pronoetes* in **3804** 154 (566), was only 4 artabas of wheat and two *solidi* minus 5 carats, so it is assumed that he was expected to make some profit out of his activities. Found in the hierarchy below the *dioecetes*, he had to deliver the grain which he collected to the state grain carriers and the cash to the estate treasurer. The Apion *pronoetai* seem to have had no responsibility for wine, which is not mentioned in any of their accounts (Hickey 2001, 57). See generally Hardy 1931, 88-93, Mazza 2001, 83, 138-144, Sarris 2006, 51-53.

π(αρά) τοῦ βοηθοῦ βοηθός is a general term for a secretary or assistant. The fact that this letter contains an instruction suggests that it came from an assistant to someone superior to the *pronoetes* in the estate hierarchy, not from his own office. It would not have been sent by an official in Apelle; the tone is not sufficiently humble, it does not only concern Apelle and, unlike a village, an Apion *epoikion* would be unlikely to have its own administrative function (but note that *epoikia* are expressed to have a *grammateus* in PSI V 474 and LXII 4350 and see p. 157 where I express doubts that the latter concerned an *epoikion*). At I 136 17, the newly appointed *pronoetes* was to follow the list of exactions (ἀπαιτήσιμον) supplied to him by the relevant *chartularii* of the “glorious household” of the Apion family. The sender of this papyrus is probably an assistant to a *chartularius* or possibly an assistant to the *dioecetes*: see Sarris 2006, 78 and 79 for a suggested organisation chart. Papyrus 68 6B.25/F(3)a, mentioned above, was sent to the *pronoetes* παρά τῶν γραμματέων. They were probably at the same level in the hierarchy of the estate management as the βοηθός in this papyrus.

024 Receipt for rent

1 1B.122/D(h)

7.5 x 12.25 cm

19 August 507

Introduction

This is a receipt for an individual payment described as ἐκφόριον paid pursuant to an ἀπαιτήσιμον; no other receipts of this nature for *ekphorion* have been published. The payment was from an inhabitant of the *epoikion* of Akindynou, named Joseph. The papyrus was found close to another, 1 1B.122/D(d), which is not edited here; it has not been completely deciphered but the part which I have been able to read is as follows: ἔσχοῦ παρὰ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Πρωῦ-ισις γεωρ(γῶν) ἐποικ(ίου) Ἀκινδύ[νο]υ ὑπ[ὲ]ρ τ[ῆ]ς [...θ] ἰνδίκ(τίονος).[] .[] νομισμάτια δύο. I refer to it as **024A**. The inventory numbers show that the two papyri were found in the same season and close to one another, and both mention the settlement of Akindynou and a farmer called Joseph, so I think it is reasonable to suppose that the same Joseph is mentioned in both. The payers in **024A** are described as *georgoi*, and I think that the payment was made under the customary arrangements whereby farmers were allowed to occupy and farm estate land (see pp. 152-3), although the terminology is not conclusive on this issue. The leaseholder in LXVII **4615** (505) was an *enapographos georgos* resident in Monimou, variously described as *topoi* or *epoikion* or *ktema* but not village (Benaissa 2009, 159-160), and the leases in LV **3803** (411) and XVI **1968**=SB XXVI 16722 (late 6th century) both describe the rent as payable pursuant to an *apaitesimon* (see 6-7 n.). The payment in **024** may accordingly have been made under a lease (written or unwritten). Gascou termed payments such as this, if not made pursuant to leases, “rent-tax” (see p. 149), but I can see no reason to suppose that the payment was anything other than rent (and paid in cash, as **024A** is a receipt of a payment of 2 *solidi* from Joseph and another farmer), albeit rent which the landlord would have used to fund any tax payable on the land. There must have been hundreds if not thousands of payments by farmers on the Apionic and other large estates each year (see e.g. XVI **1911** and LV **3804**, both of which concern only one Apionic *prostasia*), and if it had been the norm to issue such receipts one might have expected more to have appeared, even though they would have been issued to the farmers and so dispersed, rather than kept in a central archive. There may have been special reasons why these two were issued. Joseph may have been an important member of the community (although he is not given any title in either papyrus) and so afforded special treatment, or he may have asked for proof of payment because of some dispute in which

he was involved. The amount paid is not specified, nor is the property in respect of which it was paid, and it is not possible to tell what, if any, connection there was between the payments in the two papyri. It is also not possible to tell to which estate the documents relate (see 2 n.).

Description

This mid-brown papyrus contains twelve lines of text and traces of a thirteenth. The top and side margins are mainly intact, apart from lines 12 and 13, where some six letters are missing on the left and also, in 13, on the right. It is not clear whether any lines are missing from the bottom. There are a number of holes particularly between lines 4 and 5. The writing, with the fibres, is fairly large and untidy but fluent, and there are several mistakes, noted below, where the spelling is phonetic.

1 † παράσχεν ἰωσήφ

2 ἀπὸ ἐπικ(ίου) Ἀκινδύνου

3 ὑπὲρ ἐκφορίον πεν-

4 τεκαϊδεκάτης ἰνδικ(τίονος)

5 τὰ ἐροῦντά ση πλήρης

6 ἀκολούθως ἀπετη-

7 σίμου κατὰ τὸ τέ-

8 τартон μέρος τῶν

9 ἐ]κφορίων ὥλων

10 L ρπγ ρνβ Μεσορῆ

11 κς ιε ἰνδικ(τίονος) λο . . ι() λοιπ(ᾶ?)

12]ησι γί(ν.) λοιπ(ᾶ?)

13] .οι..[

1 I. παρέσχεν 2 επικς I. έποικ(ίου) 3 I. έκφορίων or έκφορίου?? 4 ινδικς 5 I. αίρουντά σοι
6 I. άπαιτήσιμον 9 I. όλων 11 ινδικς λοιπ 12 γλ λοιπ

“† Joseph from the *epoikion* of Akindynou paid, on account of rent for the 15th indiction, in full, the amount demanded by you in accordance with the *apaitesimon* in respect of one-quarter of the total rents. Year 183/152 Mesore 26, 15th indiction.....”

1 Ἰωσήφ. This is a common name but the closeness of the inventory numbers, the fact that Akindynou is mentioned in both papyri and the rarity of receipts from this period make it probable that the same person is named in **024A**.

2 έπικ(ίου) Άκινδύνου. For the meaning of *epoikion* see p. 146. Akindynou is mentioned in only one published papyrus, XLVIII **3407** 8 (4th century, part of the archive of Papnuthis and Dorotheus), a letter sent by or on behalf of (we do not have a signature clause) an unnamed woman described as τῆς γεούχου, who is addressing a *pronoetes* (**023.5** n.) and a *phrontistes* or foreman. Akindynou is referred to as τὸ ἡμέτερον έποίκιον, so when that papyrus was written the settlement was part of a large estate. We do not know where it was situated. See Benaissa 2009, 19.

3 ὑπέρ έκφορίον. Whether έκφόριον means rent or some other form of dues, or even taxes, has been the subject of some discussion. I have found only four published instances of its use in the Oxyrhynchite nome after 400: VIII **1134** 6 (421), SB XVIII 13949.12 (541), XXVII **2478** 27 (595) and XVI **1917** 127 (616-617). **1134** is a receipt, from a senior official of the *domus divina*, acknowledging to a *pronoetes* that he has received the *ekphoria*, in both cash and kind, which the *pronoetes* has collected from his district in accordance with the *apaitesimon* which the official had given him. As the imperial estate was concerned, there would be no distinction between rent and taxes; Banaji notes the “ambiguous nature” of such payments (2007, 96). At **1134** 7-10 n., the editor remarks on the similarity of the wording to I **136**, the Apionic *pronoetes* contract, see 6-7 n. below, but in **136** no word for rent or taxes was used. SB XVIII 13949 is a deed of surety for what was probably a renegade *georgos*, under which the guarantor ensures inter alia the payment of π[α]ντοῖα έκφόρια τῆς ὑπ’ αὐτὸν γεουχικῆς μ[ηχανῆς]; in this context it is clear that it means rent. **2478**, another deed of surety, contains a pledge on the part of the guarantor to ensure that the έκφόρια τοῦ αὐτοῦ γεουχικοῦ πωμαρίου are paid in full; here too it must mean rent (as did φόρος in the same papyrus: Banaji 2007, 97). **1917** is an account of receipts

from an estate, both in money and corn; the individual entries do not usually specify the nature of the payments but the few that do are described as φόρος or ἐνοίκιον, while the title on the reverse indicates that it is an ἑξαγμὸς ἐκφορίων for the year; here ἐκφορίων seems to be a general term incorporating all the types of revenue collected, but I can see no reason to suppose that any of the payments listed there were anything other than rent or some equivalent property-related payment. The term appears more frequently in leases or receipts of this period from outside Oxyrhynchus (for example BGU XII 2183-2185, Herakleopolis) and is contrasted with δημόσια, taxes, in SB XVIII 13969.45 (Apollonopolis, 7th century), P. Cair. Masp. I 67002.13, 15 (Aphrodito, 567) and P. Hamb. I 23.31 (Antinoopolis, 567). Gascou noted the range of vocabulary for revenues, including ἐνοίκιον, which meant rent from leases of buildings, but considered that ἐκφόριον and φόρος were more general terms, both of which meant, in the case of the large estates, rent-tax paid under emphyteutic leases (Gascou 1985, 7-9, 13-14=2008, 128-131, 134-136). There is no evidence for the leases being emphyteutic (see pp. 148-149). Banaji, relying on 2478, considered that ἐκφόριον just meant rent, and noted that Preisigke cited no example of *ekphorion* in the sense of “taxes” (Banaji 2007, 97 n. 52). Whilst some forms of tax were clearly payable by farmers who were based in *epoikia* (see p. 156), I have found no example where it has been described as *ekphorion*. Herrmann noted that whereas in Ptolemaic and Roman times ἐκφόριον meant a rent payment in kind and φόρος a rent payment in money, in Byzantine times ἐκφόριον rarely appeared and φόρος incorporated both (Herrmann 1958, 99-100). This papyrus suggests that, although it appears only rarely in documents from Oxyrhynchus, ἐκφόριον may have been the word commonly used to describe the general mass of payments by the *georgoi*, in cash or in kind.

6-7 ἀπετησίμου. The earlier ἀπαιτήσιμον κατ’ ἄνδρα had a tax connotation, and Gascou suggests that the use of the term *apaitesimon* by the Apions and the *domus divina* indicates a continuity with the “roll” used for collecting taxes and dues on public land, and so points to the nature of the relationship between the estate owners and their farmer being related to public finances (see Gascou 1985, 18-19=2008, 140-141). But it is equally possible that the estate-owners adopted for use in their own collections the terminology used by the state and in the imperial estates, and that the *apaitesimon*, like our term “roll”, takes its meaning from the context in which it is used. LV 3803 9 (411), a lease from a substantial landowner, describes the rent as being ἀκολούθως προτέροις ἀπαιτησίμοις: this was an unusual example because it was a perpetual lease (the editor suggests (2 n.) that it may have been treated like state land because it was subject to the *navicularis functio*, but

there is no evidence for this). XVI **1915** (c.560), a draft account of imperial land on the verso of an Apionic document and so possibly relating to land administered by that family, lists collections made in accordance with the ἀπαιτήσιμον and the same word was used for the list pursuant to which the *pronoetes* in I **136** was to collect the amounts due from his *prostasia*. VIII **1134** shows a steward of the imperial household carrying out a similar function with wording similar to that of **136**; the editor notes (7-10 n.) that the Apions may have modelled their estate management on the imperial estates (see 3 n. above) and there is no reason to suppose that all large estates of the period would not have adopted similar systems. SB XXVI 16722.6=XVI **1968** 6 (6th century), part of a lease of arable land, contains an undertaking that rent (φόρος) will be paid in accordance with the landlord's ἀπαιτήσιμον. The relative scarcity of individual leases suggests that the *apaitesimon* was the only document of record for land-holding by the inhabitants of the *epoikia* (see pp. 152-153).

7-8 τὸ τέταρτον μέρος. There is no description of any property. Property was frequently divided into fractional shares and it is possible that Joseph was liable for only one-quarter of the total amount that was due because he had only a quarter share in the property concerned (as for example XVI **1901** (6th century)). I think it more likely that this was an instalment of the total due from him: XVI **2037** (late 6th century, from the Apion archive) lists a number of payments by instalment, including payments of 25 and 50 per cent.

10 Ἐ ρπγ ρνβ I have found no other published papyrus from this era year (= 506/7).

11 λο . . ι () λοιπ(ά?) It is not clear what precedes λοιπ in this line.

12 The amount remaining due from Joseph was probably specified and repeated here; as noted above, the amount paid by him is not specified. There is a similar usage in accounts.

025 Receipt from a *zygostates* to a wine steward

Ref: 15. 1B.201/E(h)

Size: 25 x 6.5 cm.

After 29 August 552

Introduction

025 is a receipt issued by a *zygostates* or “weigh-master” called Ioannes for payment made by him for wine purchased by an *oinocheiristes* or wine steward, also called Ioannes. It does not state the name of the employer of either party, and it is possible that the *zygostates* was acting on his own account, but it is more likely that he was engaged as cashier on behalf of a large estate. Although this is not entirely clear, I think that both individuals were employed by the same large estate and that the *zygostates* was making payment for wine delivered to his colleague. A *zygostates* Ioannes is known from two other papyri from Oxyrhynchus, XXXVI **2780** 22, whose inventory number, 15 1B.201/E(b), suggests that it was found at the same time as, and near, this papyrus, and SB XXVI 16795.1 (=P. Herm. 80 republished; see Gonis 2009 for its completion). **2780** attested Ioannes to be in the employment of Flavia Gabriela, a *patrikia* with estates in Oxyrhynchus who is mentioned in **027**; a summary of what is known about her, including an apparent connection with the Apion family, is set out at **027**, Introduction. If, as I suggest, the same Ioannes appears in **025**, it shows that Gabriela’s estate was sufficiently large and wealthy to merit the employment of a wine steward and a *zygostates*.

Date

The document was created in a first indiction year; the year and month are missing at the start of l. 4. Both **2780** and SB XXVI 16795 are dated: **2780** on 22 Epeiph in the 27th year of Justinian and 12th post-consular year of Basilius, in a first indiction (see BL VIII, p.262), namely 16 July 553, and SB XXVI 16795 in Choiak in the year 230/199 in the second indiction, namely between 27 November and 26 December 553. **025**, like **2780**, is a clear example of the Oxyrhynchite indiction year being calculated, as usual, from 1 Thoth (29 August), as the wine for which payment was acknowledged was described as supplied in Pharmouthi, Pachon (the first month of the indiction year for tax purposes) and Pauni in the 15th indiction. Assuming that the same Ioannes the *zygostates* is named in all three papyri, this receipt is probably dated after 29 August in 552.

The sale of wine

We have many examples of contracts where wine has been paid for in advance for delivery at the vintage, usually in Mesore;²⁵⁷ in such cases the wine would have been kept in fermentation vats for another three or four months, and actually delivered later, usually in Choiak, Tubi, Mecheir or Phamenoth.²⁵⁸ The timing here is unusual; possibly the estate ran out of wine mid-year, and had topped up its stock, but had not been required to pay for the wine until later. That even the Apion estate, although a major producer, was not always self-sufficient in wine is known from LVIII **3960** 13-15 and PSI VIII 953, 12-14, 72-74.²⁵⁹ Mazza suggests that such purchases may have been made in years of poor production or the Apions may have sold good wine and bought in wine of a lower standard for internal use or for tax payments.²⁶⁰ The lateness of the purchase in **025** may indicate that an unforeseen event had given rise to the demand, or that whoever was in charge of the stores had not been doing his job properly or that there was a problem with the cellars, or a deliberate policy of buying late in the season. The receipt does not show to whom payment was made or who sold the wine. The usual measure on the Apion estate was the 8-*sextarii* jar,²⁶¹ which would suggest that the Apions were not the sellers (2 n.). The price was 4 *solidi* less 17 carats for 136 5-*sextarii* jars of wine, 680 *sextarii*. In P. Col. VIII 245 (undated) and LXI **4132** (619) the price was 1 *solidus* for 100 5-*sextarii* jars. Typical “prices” or valuations in the Oxyrhynchite nome in the 6th and 7th centuries were 1 *solidus* for 400-500 *sextarii*, but quantities *per solidus* ranged between 220 and 658 *sextarii*.²⁶² **3960** 13-15 (621) shows the Apions’ steward buying in wine at 144 and 192 *sextarii* per *solidus*, assuming 8 *sextarii* to the *cnidium*.²⁶³ The price paid in **025**, 1 *solidus* less 4 ¼ carats for 170 *sextarii*, is among the highest, probably because at that stage in the year it was a seller’s market (although it is of course possible that this was a particularly good vintage); prices tended to be lower when wine was bought in advance of the vintage and to increase as the year went on.²⁶⁴ It is not possible to discern any pattern in the prices which must have fluctuated for a number of reasons, including quality and availability.

²⁵⁷ See, for example, LXI **4132** (619) and the references in that introduction.

²⁵⁸ See Kruit 1992 (1), 272.

²⁵⁹ See Hickey 2001, 134-5 and Table 3.4, who suggests (at pp.67, 126) various reasons, including increased military presence in the area or major family occasions, why purchases might have been necessary at certain times.

²⁶⁰ Mazza 2001, 146.

²⁶¹ Hickey 2001, 291.

²⁶² Jördens, P. Heid. V 359 Introduction; Hickey 2001, 134-5; Kruit 1992 (2), 182-184; LXXVII **5123** 12-13 n.

²⁶³ As Rea (LVIII **3960** Introduction. p.119) and Hickey (2001, 135).

²⁶⁴ See LI **3628-3636** Introduction and **3628** 15 n. and Kruit 1992 (2), 184.

A number of papyri evidence sales on credit, such as CPR V 14 (475); these are sometimes styled an “acknowledgement of debt”, as XVI **1973** (420), or a “promissory note”, as VIII **1131** (6th century). Jördens noted that wine was the most common product in such documents and that the period of credit was usually only a couple of months.²⁶⁵ Possibly the sale for which payment is being made in **025** was documented in that way, as the amount left outstanding, while large, would not have been exceptionally so.²⁶⁶ There is no reference to any preceding documentation, unlike in VIII **1133** (396), although in that case those details may have been included only because the original document had been lost; **1133** indicates that normally the original acknowledgement of debt or note would have been returned to the buyer when payment was made, in which event no reference to it would have been necessary.²⁶⁷

Description

025 contains four lines of text. The top, bottom and right margins are complete, but up to 12 letters are missing at the start of each line. The writing is in black ink, in a practised and formal hand, against the fibres. The document has been folded once, vertically, down the middle.

1 ἐδόθη δι(ὰ) τοῦ θαυμασιωτ(άτου) Ἰωάννου ζυγ(οστάτου) (vac.) ὑπὲρ τιμ(ῆς) οἴ(νου) ἀγορασθέντος καὶ δοθέντος Ἰωάννου οἰνοχειρ(ιστῆ)

2 ἐπὶ μη]ν[ῶν] Φαρμουῦθι καὶ Παχῶν καὶ Παῦνι ἰνδικτ(ίονος) πεντεκαϊδεκάτης ὑπὲρ οἴ(νου) (πεντα)ξ(εστιαίων) ρλς τῶν

310.....]δ χρ(υσοῦ) νομισμάτια τέσσαρα ἰδιωτικῶ ζυγ(ῶ) παρὰ κεράτια δέκα ἑπτὰ γί(νεται) νο(μισμάτια) δ παρὰ κ(εράτια) ἰζ ἰδ(ιωτικῶ)

4 (ἔτους) σκθ ρρη ἰ]νδικτ(ίονος) πρ[ώ]της. (m. 2) γί(νεται) χρ(υσοῦ) νο(μισμάτια) τέσσαρα παρὰ κερ(άτια) δέκα ἑπτὰ ἰδ(ιωτικῶ)

²⁶⁵ Jördens 1993, 272-3.

²⁶⁶ Jördens 1993, 268.

²⁶⁷ For a general discussion about sales on credit see Jördens 1993. On wine sales see generally Jördens in P. Heid. V 296-341, esp. 332-341, and for bibliography Hodeček and Miththof 2005, 77-78 and LXXVII **5123**.

Back, along the fibres:

5 (m. 3) † ΠΙΤΤΑΚ(ΙΟΥ) ΤΟΥ ΟΪΝ(ΟΥ) (vac.) ἐπὶ μην(ός) Χοιακ [

1 ἰ. θαυμασιωτῆς Ἰωαννου ζυγῆς τιμῆς οἴνου αγορασθῆς δοθῆς Ἰωαννου ἰ. Ἰωάννη οἰνοχειρῆ 2
ἰνδικτῆς οἴνου ἐξῆς 3 χρῶ ζυγῆς γὰρ νοδὲ ἰζῆ 4 ἰνδικτῆς γὰρ χρῶ νο κερῆ 5 πιττάκ- οἴνου μην

“There was given through the most admirable Ioannes, *zygostates*, on account of the price of wine bought and delivered to Ioannes wine steward [in the months of] Pharmouthi and Pachon and Pauni in the fifteenth indiction, for 136 five-*sextarii* jars of the, in gold four *solidi* less seventeen carats by the private standard. Total 4 *solidi* less 17 carats by the private (standard). [Year 229/198], first indiction. (2nd hand). Total in gold, 4 *solidi* less 17 carats by the private (standard).”

Back: “† Record of wine in the month of Choiak [”

1 ἐδόθη δι(ὰ) τοῦ. Restored following SB XXVI 16795 and a typical beginning for Oxyrhynchite receipts in this period, as, for example, I **145-148, 150-153** (Gonis 2000, 182).

θαυμασιωτ(άτου). An honorific typically used of lower-grade officials, including *oinocheiristai* and *pronoetai* as well as *zygostatai* (XXXVI **2780** 22, SB XII 10810.1 and BGU III 837.17). See **023.5** n.

Ἰωάννη ζυγ(οστάτου). Attested in XXXVI **2780** 22 and SB XXVI 16795.1 (both 553). The public office of *zygostates* was formally created by Julian in 363 (C. Th. XII 7.2) and lasted into the 8th century (P. Bal. II 287.4-6 (725)), but *zygostatai* were attested even before that (LXVII **4606** 11 n., from 361): see Carlà 2009, 197. The public appointment was to protect the gold currency; each city was to have one such official whose duties were to receive, weigh and check *solidi* which were being bought or sold to make sure that no one was clipping them, before reissuing them. They did not check the purity of the metal. They are thought to have been remunerated by the fees (ῥοπή) charged for weighing the currency (conventionally ½ carat per *solidus* in Oxyrhynchus; see Rea on LV **3805** 7-8 n.) but we have no evidence of them actually keeping this for themselves. Large towns must have needed a number of these officials; Cynopolis had more than one (XVI **2028** 5, 7, 10). Clearly with a public role is the Alexandrian Petros in LXIII **4395** 27(c.499-500). Sometimes they also acted as bankers (P. Michael. 35) and invested money for others

(LXIII **4397** 101, 109, 148 (545)); on Carlà's reasoning, this was not because their job had evolved to include banking but because bankers were often created *zygostatai* (Carlà 2009, 200). *Zygostatai* making payments to the Apion household attested in XVI **1897** 5, 7, 10, **2028** 7, **2032** 69, XIX **2243A** 8, 43, 45 and SB XII 11163.3 may have been acting in an independent banking capacity but, although the office of δημόσιος ζυγοστάτης is still attested until 609 (BGU III 837.18-19), by the 6th century some at least were acting on behalf of, and probably employed by, major landowners. At **3805** 30 a *zygostates* is recorded as paying a premium to the Apions for the right to hold office (like the *pronoetes* in I **136**) and Serenus in P. Ct YBR inv. 4357 is probably also acting privately on their behalf: see Hickey 2004. **2780** 22 shows a *zygostates* named Ioannes, whom I believe to be the one in this papyrus also, in the employment of Flavia Gabrielia, a wealthy estate owner; he is described as ζυγοστάτου αὐτῆς (l. 22) and although Gascoü considered that this did not show definitively that he was in her private employment (Gascoü 1985, 56 n.318=2008, 179 n. 318), Fikhman's contrary view is to be preferred (Fikhman 1997, 165 n. 21). See **027**, Introduction, on Flavia Gabrielia. In **025** Ioannes is issuing a receipt in what appears to be a private matter. In **2780** the *zygostates* was performing a quasi-public function, paying a public worker, but both were probably employed by Gabrielia. As Gonis points out (2000, 182), the extent to which one views the *zygostates* as working for the state or as privately employed depends on one's assessment of the role and status of the great estates in the 6th century. See generally on *zygostatai* Rea on **4395** 26-7, Gonis 2000, 182, de Groote 2002, who sets out a list of attestations, and Carlà 2009, 196-205.

ἀγορασθέντος) καὶ δοθέντος). This wine has been not merely purchased but delivered; there was no need for it to be retained in the vats as was normal for wine bought before the vintage (as Kruit 1992 (2), 272)).

Ἰωάννου οἰνοχειρ(ιστῆ). The genitive ending of Ἰωάννου does not make sense, unless it should have been preceded by διά, παρά or ὑπό, showing that he was the person who supplied the wine. There are instances of such a construction following ἀγορασθέντος or ἀγορασθείσης, for example BGU I 14.6 (255), P. Lond. IV 1433.30 (707), I **153** 1 (618) and XVI **2010** 1(618) but where the combination of ἀγορασθέντος καὶ δοθέντος appears, it is followed either by εἰς plus the accusative, as in XVI **1912** 152, XVI **2010** 1, XLII **3054** 9 (265) and **1921** 4, or by the dative, as in P. Cair. Masp I 67062.8-9 and LV **3804** 218. The name here should be in the dative, signifying that this Ioannes was the recipient of the wine.

Ioannes was a common name. We know of only one wine steward called Ioannes who was definitely from the Oxyrhynchite nome (see LVIII **3690** 3, dated 621). He is too late to be the person in **025**. SB XX 14073, of unknown provenance and dated to the 6th or 7th century, has a Ioannes *oinocheiristes* who works for an unidentified woman: this is one of 4 Byzantine papyri in the Cairo museum edited by Sijpesteijn (1988) (2), the first of which (SB XX 14072.1), from the Fayum, attests a *zygostates* called Ioannes and another of which, SB XX 14074, attests an οἰνοπαραλήμπτης also called Ioannes. I doubt that this is the person here. Accounts of the Apion *oinocheiristai* (XXVII **2480** (565/6), **3960** and PSI VIII 953 (567-8) show that they were responsible for most, if not all, of the wine received and paid out by the Apion household, including paying wine out to *bucellarii*, churches etc. Only a large estate would have required such an employee. For a list of references to *oinocheiristai* see Hickey, 2001, Table 3.3, to which can be added Biktôr (LXVII **4621** (5th/6th century) possibly the same as the Ouiktôr in SB XVI 12608.1 but not, according to the editor, the Biktôr in XIX **2243** 37, and additional references to Phoibammon (I) in LXVIII **4699** (23 January, 504) and to Phoibammon (II) in SB XXII 15368 (27 October, 590). On *oinocheiristai* see Mazza 2001, 146-7 and Hickey 2001, 56 n. 127, 66, 126- 135 (both in relation to the Apions but of general interest).

2. ἐπὶ μηνῶν. Restored following a much earlier text, LXIII **4357** (317), a memorandum concerning municipal accounts which uses these words when referring to amounts expended in the months of Hathur and Choiak the previous year. Alternatively, the line could start ἐπὶ μηνός, following the 5th century LI **3628-3633**, lists of commodity prices, where those words are followed by a number of months, in the context of prices prevailing in each of those months. It is unlikely that the name of another month was missing; the preceding month, Phamenoth, followed by καί, would be too long.

ἰνδικτ(ίονος) πεντεκαίδεκάτης. As stated above (p. 198) this shows the months of Pharmouthi, Pachon and Pauni included in the same, fifteenth, indiction year. For tax purposes Pachon and Pauni would have been in the following, first, indiction year.

(πεντα)ξεστιαίων. The ξέστης, the Roman *sextarius*, was the predominant measure for liquids used in Egypt from the end of the 5th/beginning of the 6th century; it was about half a litre. It was also a measure for dry goods such as grain, equivalent to one-sixth of a *modius*. When applied to liquids it could be used on its own or in conjunction with a word for jars, such as σηκώματα. 5-*sextarii* jars are known from a number of 6th and 7th century papyri, mainly from Oxyrhynchus but also from the Arsinoite, Antaiopolite and Herakleopolite

nomes. The *sextarius* did not always have the same capacity: see Hickey 2001, App. D. qv, citing Lang 1976, 56-57, who suggests that it amounted to 0.546 l. in the first and second centuries but was normally one-third more, 0.728 l., after that. On measures see Kruit and Worp 1999, 98, 111-127.

3 νομισμάτια τέσσαρα ἰδιωτικῶ ζυγ(ῶ) παρὰ κεράτια δέκα ἑπτὰ. In the 6th century the *nomisma*, or *solidus*, weighed 4 grams of gold and comprised 24 carats. There were three different standards commonly in use in Oxyrhynchus for describing payments: private, public and Alexandrian. West and Johnson described the uses of such standards in public, particularly fiscal, contexts, as relating to the right to deduct fees or charges at particular rates, such as a fee of 2 carats per *solidus* when converting from private to public, but considered that they were only book-keeping terms when used in private contexts, and that whatever the standard used, there were 24 full carats in the gold *solidus*. In cases such as the present, where a payment was expressed as being less a specified number of carats, the carats in their view “were deducted by the payer for some definite purpose” (West and Johnson 1944, 140-156, esp.154-155). That view was disputed. Maresch considered that the 24-carat 4 gram *solidus* had become an abstract by the 6th century and that the “real value” of 4 grams of gold was 20 carats in the private standard and 18 carats by the public standard (Maresch 1994, 39, 2-33). His view seems to have been followed by Mazza (2001, App. 5, 175-176) but this seems unnecessarily complicated. Banaji (1998) noted that Johnson and West’s “fiscal deduction” did not explain why the amount deducted was not the same in all districts. He argued for a “metrological” explanation of the “minus carats” system; it did not imply a loss or deduction of value, but the weight of the pound varied from district to district. He suggested that “the aristocracy probably introduced the heavier pound into the Oxyrhynchite, which led to the standard being called private since no other district used a pound weight of this type” (*op. cit.*, 190). On that basis (as he himself noted) there would have been no need ever to state the number of missing carats; the reference to the private standard would have sufficed. He suggested that the Alexandrian pound was lighter and his theory would explain why the average number of minus carats in the Hermopolite nome was six (an even heavier pound weight). He also suggests a 1/2 carat *per solidus* deduction for dealers when exchanging *folles* for gold and a bankers’ commission of 1 1/2 carats *per solidus*. See Banaji 1998, 183-192, 195, 201. In **025**, the deductions are 4 1/4. Banaji’s theory does not explain why the deductions in the Oxyrhynchite are not always a constant number (see the table at Maresch 1994, App. I) nor why it was the norm to specify the number of minus carats. There are at least two examples where no carats are

expressed to be deducted in relation to payments for wine, LXI **4132** 17-18 and P. Col. VIII 245, and LXXII **4930** refers to *solidi* of 18 carats on the Alexandrian scale; see 13-16 n. Contrary to Banaji (whom he did not cite) Zuckerman, who was considering only the Aphrodito tax register, suggested that compensation for loss of weight of the coins was the origin of the deductions; this was averaged out as each coin was not individually weighed, so there was a “marge budgétaire” for the village, but where it looked as if the deductions were excessive part would have been handed back to the payer as change (“le *boethos* rend la monnaie”: Zuckerman 2004, 67, 87 and *passim*). Carlà, whose views are the most recently published, dismissed the views of Maresch, Banaji and Zuckerman and agreed with West and Johnson, but without limiting the deductions to taxes (Carla 2009, 367-378). As Rea had noted at LV **3805** 7-8 n., it is still not clear what the terms meant.

4 (ἔτους) σκθ ρρη . . . ἰνδικτίονος πρ[ώ]της. The year, month and date are missing. The year has been restored based on the reasoning on p. 198. Payment must have been received on or after 1 Thoth, the start of the new indiction year. If the missing month is Choiak, as in the endorsement on the back, the period of credit extended was at least five months, one of the longest known (Jördens 1993, 273).

5 πιπτάκιον. See **022.18** n.

ἐπὶ μην(ὸς) Χοίακ [This probably incomplete endorsement shows when the payment was made, or (less likely) the date of the accounting entry: see 4 n.

026 to 032 Documents relating to monasteries

Connection with the Apion family

Five of these seven papyri relating to monasteries form part of the Apion dossier, and a sixth, **031**, may also do so. The monastery of Abba Andrew (**026**) is known to be connected with the Apion estate. The ἔνδοξος οἶκος or *domus gloriosa* of the Apions is mentioned in **027.10**, which shows that the Apions had a connection with the monastery of Abba Petros also. **028** records receipt by the monastery of Abba Castor of 50 artabas of wheat from the *pronoetes* of Phakra, a village which is known to have been on the Apion estate, and a *pronoetes* of Phakra is a known Apionic official (**028.1 n.**). In addition, the inventory numbers of **028** and **029** show that they are from the same folder, 53 1B.26 (F), as LVIII **3943, 3952, 3953, 3956, LXVI 4537** and LXX **4781, 4793, 4794, 4798, 4799** and **4800**, all of which are part of the dossier of the Apion family. **029** is clearly an Apion document; it mentions "Ἐξω τῆς Πύλης, the Apion mansion and grounds "Outside the Gate" known from nine other published papyri, and the *saqiya* τόπ(ου) Ἡλίου[υ, which appears also in SB XVIII 14061. The references to the riding stable and to the Blues in **030** suggest an Apion connection with it (**030.2 n.**) and if the reading of Psaei is correct in **031**, then it too is Apion-related (**031.3 n.**). The inclusion of the monastery of Abba Castor as one of the payers listed in the final and later papyrus, **032**, links it with **028** to **031**, but there is nothing to connect that papyrus with the Apion family.

Payments of wheat to monasteries

There is considerable papyrological evidence of payments of wheat to monasteries and churches.²⁶⁸ Amounts paid by a single estate in the same year could differ widely: LXVII **4620** shows payments of 20 artabas to the monastery of Leucadius (ll. 20-21), 30 to the Μέγα Ὄρος (ll. 17-18),²⁶⁹ 50 to the monastery of Ama Juliana (ll. 24-26: the same as to Abba Castor in **028**) and 100 to a foundation of Apa Hierax (ll. 22-23), but only 6 to the monastery of Ama Maria (ll. 27-29). The amounts in **026** and **027** (500 and 319 artabas respectively) are fairly large. Wipszycka notes that gifts to monasteries are sometimes much larger than those to local churches,²⁷⁰ but Apionic accounts which show gifts to monasteries of wine and grain often show small amounts, and of sour wine: 2½ artabas of

²⁶⁸ Schmelz 2002, 208-212.

²⁶⁹ See LXVII **4620** 18 n., Cadell and Rémondon 1967, regarding ὄρος denoting a monastery, and Hickey 1998, 164 on PSI VIII 953.6.

²⁷⁰ Wipszycka 1972, 85.

wheat to the monastery of St. Appheus at XVI **1912** 117, 20 artabas to the monks of Pruchthis and the monks of Berku at XVI **1913** 58, sour wine at PSI VIII 953.9 and XXVII **2480** 31, 46, 119, 120. Other amounts are significantly larger, particularly those paid by the Apions to the monastery of Abba Andrew: XVI **1911** 147-152 (557) and LV **3804** 184-6 (566) both show payments of over 1,000 artabas to it, seemingly on a regular basis. **1913** 8 notes a gift of 400 artabas of wheat to the monastery of Abba Apollo and an unpublished papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, 68.6B.25/F(3)a, for a sight of which I am grateful to Nikolaos Gonis, contains an instruction to a *promoetes* to pay amounts of 200 and 300 artabas to the Μέγα Ὄρος.²⁷¹ The largest gift in **4620**, 416 artabas, was expressed to be εἰς τὴν ἀγί(αν) προσφορ(άν) of the grandmother (ll. 2-4). προσφορά can mean the mass, or the offering made to a church or monastery for the mass, or, by extension, any pious gift.²⁷² XVI **1906** 2, 9 and 18 shows 1,780 artabas paid as or for προσφοραί in Alexandria. Large amounts given to monks at the monastery of the Metanoia at Canopus are now clearly established to be payments of *embole* delivered to them for onward transmission by boat, possibly to feed the poor in Alexandria, possibly destined for Constantinople, and not gifts or contributions to the monastery itself, so are not relevant to this discussion.²⁷³

Some wheat may have been supplied, not for subsistence or sustenance of the monks, but for them to bake into loaves at the order of the estate which provided it, for estate workers or others. LXXII **4926-4929** and, as amended, XVI **1952** (all 564) contain four orders and one receipt for bread baked by the monastery of Musaeus, possibly to feed farm-workers at harvest-time.²⁷⁴ Rémondon, followed by Gascoü, suggested that **1952**, an order from the Apion household to the archimandrite to supply 600 loaves to the people of the village of Tarouthinou, showed that it was in effect totally subordinate to the estate, under its trusteeship and expected to produce bread for distribution by it, but these papyri do not show that the estate supported the monastery, which paid “taxes” itself (XVI **2020** 38) and could have had a commercial relationship with the estate.²⁷⁵ Rémondon had taken a similar approach in relation to the Metanoia, considering that the provision of boats for transporting the *embole* was a compulsory service performed by it, but Fournet and Gascoü

²⁷¹ Schmelz lists references to gifts by the Apions to religious establishments (Schmelz 2002, 208 n. 36).

²⁷² Wipszycka 1972, 65.

²⁷³ See e.g. P. Cair. Masp. III 67286, which shows payments of 5,759 artabas of wheat, in 2 successive years, by the village of Aphrodito, Fournet and Gascoü 2002 and Schmelz 2002, 215-216.

²⁷⁴ See Benaïssa’s introduction to **4926-4929** in LXXII pp. 172-174.

²⁷⁵ Rémondon 1972, 274; Gascoü 1991, 1644.

explained it as a remunerated private enterprise.²⁷⁶ If monks were often supplied with wheat in order to bake bread for others, then the extra 12 artabas for the “day of the great man” shown as supplied to the monastery of Abba Andrew in XVI **1911** 149 and LV **3804** 185 might relate to an extra amount of bread required by the estate for a local celebration day. That some monasteries had the ability to mill flour and bake bread is clear: XVI **1890** (508) concerns a monastery which included a large milling-bakery (it had three ovens and two mills), and if a monastery was isolated one would have expected the monks to have the means to mill and bake for themselves at least. Gasco, in his analysis of the economic activities of monasteries, considered that these were tasks performed for the monks rather than “trades” which produced goods for exchange, but that was before the publication of **4926-4929**.²⁷⁷ 10 artabas of wheat would make some 400 double loaves, which would be sufficient for one person for one year at a daily ration of between one double and three single loaves.²⁷⁸ **4926** to **4929** show three loaves a day as a ration or payment and a total of 1,677 loaves produced between 26 Pachon and 2 Pauni (seven days), enough for some 80 workers. We cannot tell whether the wheat paid in **026** to **028** was to bake bread for others or was for the monks themselves. It is perhaps easier to believe that only the small amounts were gifts, so that the monastery of Abba Andrew, for example, may have become, as Rémondon suggested, a “centre de production” or “atelier, travaillant pour une puissante famille”, although not, I would suggest, in a dependent capacity.²⁷⁹

If the larger payments were not made for bread-making for the estate owner, the issue arises as to whether they were genuine gifts, or made pursuant to a liturgical obligation, or in effect a payment of, or on account of, taxes. Sometimes a gift is described as *λόγῳ εὐσεβείας*, on account of piety, as XXVII **2480** 5, 31, 44, 46, 120, LVIII **3960** 23 and LXIII **4397** 93, 117, 176, but the omission of this does not necessarily mean that a gift was not intended. Hardy, who considered that the payments in P. Cair. III 67286 to the Metanoia were taxes paid to that monastery probably by imperial decree, suggested that issues of grain and money to monasteries and churches by the large estates were “in lieu of ecclesiastical dues” and “a charge on the land rather than a donation by the landowners”, although some were to pay for masses for deceased members of the family, but he admitted that the direct relation of landowners to ecclesiastical bodies was not clear, and, as

²⁷⁶ Rémondon 1971, 777; Fournet and Gasco 2002, 30-31.

²⁷⁷ Gasco 1991, 1640.

²⁷⁸ Sarris 2006, 11 n. 9; Rathbone 1991, 308.

²⁷⁹ Rémondon 1972, 274.

stated above, that interpretation of P. Cair. III 67286 is no longer tenable.²⁸⁰ Wipszycka, followed by Schmelz, believed that the monasteries in the country were owned by the owners of the estates on whose lands they were situated, although acknowledged that there was no proof of this, and that the payments of wheat etc. were genuine gifts, not just for the celebration of masses but for upkeep too, and were given out of piety or for prestige, and regulated by custom and the good-will of the proprietors. They were not necessarily given every year (XVI **1913** 8). A number of sources, although no papyri, evidence state support for churches and monasteries, including the Novellae of Justinian, the acts of the Council of Chalcedon and certain Greek and Arab historians, but there is no evidence for a separate ecclesiastical tax levied to pay for the church at this time. Accordingly, even XVI **1906** (undated, 6th or 7th century) which shows 1,780 artabas of wheat paid (ὑπὲρ) τῶν προσφορ(ῶν) Ἀλεξανδρεί(ας) (ll. 2, 9, 18) attests private offerings from the Apion estate for churches in Alexandria rather than some kind of ecclesiastical tax.²⁸¹ Gascou, who describes the circus, the baths and the post as public services, payments to which by the Apions and other large estate owners were in effect in his view made on behalf of the state as a sort of taxation, does not suggest that the payments to churches and monasteries should be categorised in this way.²⁸² Justinian's 67th Novella required persons who wanted to found a church or monastery to satisfy the bishop that they would provide sufficient funds for its maintenance and clergy, suggesting that there was no *munus* or legal requirement that anyone else should, or that the state would, do so, but there is no papyrological evidence for this obligation. The church was one of the major tax-payers in Oxyrhynchus (XVI **2020** 16 and **2040** 7) and **2020** 38 shows the monastery of Musaeus paying 42 artabas of barley. The monastery of Abba Castor made what are presumably tax payments in **032**. But not all monasteries were wealthy. PSI XIV 1425 (end of 5th century) shows the monks of an unnamed monastery begging the Apion estate for help in return for prayers, and the monastery in which the milling-bakery referred to above was situated may have been sold because the monks could not afford to keep it (XVI **1890** as interpreted by Rémondon).²⁸³ Justinian's 7th Novella prohibited sales of church land but permitted it to be let out for profit; this again suggests that churches were not maintained by the state or at its direction. But the line between what owners of large estates had to pay by way of taxes and

²⁸⁰ Hardy 1931, 140, 143-144.

²⁸¹ Wipszycka 1972, 83-86, 90-94; Schmelz 2002, 208-215.

²⁸² Gascou 1976=2008, 51-71, 1985=2008, 125-213 *passim*: perhaps surprisingly, he does not cite the supply of wheat to stablemen at Takona, known to be a postal service staging post in XVI **1906**, in support of his theory in relation to the postal service.

²⁸³ Rémondon 1972, 272.

what they felt obliged to pay, whether for prestige or by local custom, to religious bodies on their estates may have been a fine one, and it is possible (as suggested to me by Nikolaos Gonis) that the payers may have been entitled to some sort of tax deduction for payments of this type, in which case receipts may have been used as evidence of payment not just internally but for the taxing authorities. This would run counter to the generally accepted view that churches and monasteries were not maintained by or at the cost of the state, and I would question why such payments would be characterised as “by custom” or “out of piety” (see **028.2-3** n.), if they were so deductible, although such expressions may themselves have been merely customary. A tax connection would seem to be suggested by the reference to the *embole* in three receipts, LVIII **3936** 20, PSI I 89.3 and **028** (see **028.3** n.), all of which, perhaps surprisingly if in a tax context, are for fairly small amounts: 11 artabas in **3936**, 25 in PSI I 89 and 50 in **028**. In **3936** 19-21 (598) the payment is expressed to be ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας προσφορ(ᾶς) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμβολῆς δευτέρας ἐπινεμήσεως, in PSI I 89 3 (605) the receipt was made in Mesore in the 8th indiction (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολῆ(ς) ἐνάτης and in **028** it is made ἐπὶ τῆς δ' ἰνδ(ικτίονος) while the receipt is dated in Epeiph in the 3rd indiction (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) τετάρτης. Although those are the only references to the *embole* in such receipts, most payments are recorded by reference to a particular indiction year, a period by reference to which taxes are paid. Some are described as ἀπὸ a particular harvest, showing the indiction year in which the crops that were used for it were harvested. Others are stated to be ὑπὲρ or ἐπὶ a particular harvest or indiction, designating the year in or in respect of which the payment is made, possibly indicating an annual payment, alternatively (or also) showing the tax-year in which a deduction was to be claimed. I have checked the wording in the papyri listed by Schmelz as attesting payments by the Apion family to churches and monasteries.²⁸⁴ Such payments as are included in the *pronoetes'* accounts at XVI **1911** 70ff, XVIII **2195** 83-88, **2196** 9-10, XIX **2243A** 74-78 and LV **3804** 143ff are listed under the heading ἐπὶ τῆς .. ἰνδ(ικτίονος), like all other payments in those accounts. At XVI **1913** 8, a payment to the coenobitic monastery of Abba Apollo was made from (ἀπὸ) the 1st indiction but during or in respect of (ἐπὶ) the 3rd. The gifts in XVI **1898** 21-23 and **1993** 25-26 (both 587) are both expressed as τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν τῆς σὺν θεῶ ἕκτης ἐπινεμήσεως', while that in LXI **4131** 23-25 (600) is τὴν ἐξ ἔθους προσφορὰν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς παρούσης τετάρτης ἰνδ(ικτίωνος). In **026.2-3** the payment is ἀπὸ γενήμ(ατος) δωδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος) and the receipt is dated in the 11th indiction ὑπὲρ δωδεκάτης; in **027.6-7** it is ὑπὲρ καρπῶν τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας

²⁸⁴ Schmelz 2002, 208 n. 36.

ἰνδ(ικτίονος). All such payments may not have been treated alike, with some being tax-deductable and others not, but I think that unlikely. Unfortunately we have no published documents which indicate whether such a deduction was claimed. I think that patronage and/or local custom probably “obliged” families such as the Apions to support their local churches and monasteries, in the same way, I believe, that they may have supported the circus (see pp.132-133), and that the references in the *pronoetes*’ accounts and in receipts to a particular harvest or indiction were for internal accounting purposes and, where payments were for whatever reason made annually, in respect of which year they had been made. On that basis, the term *embole* in the three receipts described above was, I would suggest, merely another way of referring to the harvest or indiction year.²⁸⁵

Production of ropes

Rope-making appears to have been a common trade of monastic communities; see **029** to **031**, with references to the monasteries of Abba Andrew and Abba Hierax at **029** Introduction.²⁸⁶ Ropes and mats may have been supplied to the estate owners without payment, as an entitlement, or in return for payments of money or wheat, but we have no evidence for this. XVI **1921** 14 (621), accounts probably of an Apion *pronoetes*, shows payment made for ropes for camels, but does not give the name of the payee. The receipts and orders do not show any evidence of payment but that would have been separately documented. There is also no evidence of any single monastery supplying more than one estate, but that again may be a consequence of the incidence of finds. **029** to **032** show that the monastery of Abba Castor supplied ropes and also paid taxes but do not indicate whether it was economically dependent on, or a tied production unit in, the Apion estate.

²⁸⁵ See generally on gifts to churches and monasteries Wipszycka 1972, 78-86 and Schmelz 2002, 208-212.

²⁸⁶ See also Barison 1938, 75-77 and Sijpesteijn 1987(1).

026 Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Andrew

15 1B.201/E(g)

29 x 11 (max) cm

[4 -13] July 548

This papyrus records a payment of 500 artabas of wheat made by the heirs of a *pronoetes* or steward (see **023.5** n.) of Polemonos to the monastery of Abba Andrew. The monastery is known from a number of other papyri, including the Apionic *pronoetes*' accounts in XVI **1911** 147, 150, 153 and LV **3804** 184, 186, 254, both of which show payments of wheat to it; it is likely that it was near Apelle and the other *epoikia* in that *prostasia* (1 n.). To date Polemonos has been attested in a number of Apionic documents (see 1 n.) and it is reasonable to conclude that this document also relates to the Apion estate (although see 1 n. for Ruffini's suggestion that the monastery may have been a tenant of Flavius Serenus) and shows that Apionic *prostasiae* were not constant over time (see 1 n.). Its inventory number also supports an Apion connection, indicating that it was found at the same time as, and near, LXIII **4396** (18 February 542) (15 1B.201/E(c)), which contains a fragment addressed to Fl. Strategius II and is clearly an Apionic document. At **027**, Introduction, I suggest that two other papyri with inventory numbers close to this one, **025** and XXXVI **2780**, were also part of the Apion "archive".

A Kyriakos was *pronoetes* of Polemonos in 540/41 (XVI **2032** 40); if he is the same person as in this papyrus it is evidence that, although the published examples of their contracts (I **136** (583) and LVIII **3952** (610)) were for single year terms, Apionic *pronoetai* may have held office for a number of such terms, like equivalent officials on the imperial estate (VIII **1134** (421)). XVI **1916** lists receipts from *pronoetai* in respect of a four year period, at least one of whom (Pamouthius of Adaiou: see ll. 4, 19, 30) paid over amounts in respect of three years, and others of whom were responsible for at least two years. **026** is interesting because it shows the heirs of the *pronoetes* carrying out what must have been duties assigned to him (1 n.).

The papyrus is mid-brown with a horizontal kollesis joining the bottom third, on which nothing is written. The writing is in a thin, practised hand, against the fibres. There are a few holes near the centre which may suggest that the papyrus was folded once, vertically in the centre, but this is not certain. The back is blank.

1 † ἐδόθη(ησαν) δι(ὰ) τῶν κληρ(ονόμων) Κυριακοῦ προ(νοητοῦ) Πολέμωνος
(vac.) εἰς τὸ κοινόβιον τοῦ ἀγ(ίου) Ἀββᾶ Ἀνδρέου

2 ἀπὸ γενήμ(ατος) δωδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος) σίτου καγκέλ(λω) ἀρτάβας
πεντακοσίας γί(νονται) σίτου κ(αγκέλλω) ἀρ(τάβαι) φ μό(ναι)

3 (ἔτους) σκδ ρϚγ Ἐπειφ ι. ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἑνδεκάτης ὑπὲρ δωδεκάτης.

1 εδοθς δι κληρ προ 2 γενημς ινδ καγκελ γλ κ αρ μο// 3† ινδ

“†There were given through the heirs of Kyriakos, *pronoetes* of Polemonos, to the cenobitic monastery of Saint Abba Andrew from the produce of the 12th indiction five hundred *cancellus* artabas of wheat. Total 500 *cancellus* artabas of wheat only. Year 224/193, Epeiph [10], in the 11th indiction on account of the 12th.”

1 δι(ὰ) τῶν κληρ(ονόμων) Papyri often record payments such as tax being made by heirs of a named individual, indicating that his estate had not been divided between them but remained jointly held (as, for example, XVI **1912** 74, 75, 91). Having checked the DDBDP in December 2011 in relation to προνοητής, οἰνοχειριστής, μάγειρος, φροντιστής, χαρτουλάριος, ἐνοικολόγος and διοικητής in conjunction with heirs, I have found no reference to heirs making a payment which would otherwise have been made by an Apionic office-holder by virtue of his office, such as this appears to be, since Kyriakos is described by his title and the amount of wheat seems too large to have been a private gift or bequest. There are a number of possible explanations. The heirs might have guaranteed Kyriakos' performance of his duties (both I **136** and LVIII **3952** include a third party guarantee of performance of the *pronoetes'* obligations), but I think in that event they would more likely have been described as guarantors and heirs, or just guarantors. Possibly they had made a specific agreement with the estate owner that they would carry out the year's duties, and in return would be able to keep the rewards from it. In **136** 40, both steward and guarantor pledged τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπάρξοντα ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς in support of their undertakings; perhaps this effectively required the heirs to perform the contract if the deceased's estate (and possibly other family property too) was to be free of the pledge. The heirs are acting at what would normally, if **136** represents the norm, be the beginning of a *pronoetes'* term of office; in that contract dated 29 Pachon (24 May) 583, the period of office ran for one year, from and including receipt of arrears of money payments

due in summer 583 (which were arrears of the first indiction), but principally in respect of the crops and payments of the coming (in chronological terms: see 2 n.) second indiction, namely those just harvested or about to be harvested. The month and day of execution are missing from **3952** but it covered a similar period. None of the published *pronoetes*' accounts (see **023.5** n. for a list) identifies receipt of arrears, although XVI **1916** 2, 3 (undated, 6th century) shows payment received in respect of two years earlier. It would make sense, from a *pronoetes*' perspective, to be responsible for one complete indiction year of crops and related payments, particularly as the contracts provide for a personal guarantee in respect of them, but no doubt it was easier for the estate owner if the office-holder took over completely from his predecessor and had to collect any arrears from the preceding period as well. The issue would have been less significant if a *pronoetes* tended to hold office for several years. In this papyrus the payment is made out of the newly harvested crops of the 12th indiction. We do not know when Kyriakos died; it may have been shortly before this document was written and soon after he had received the crops from the recent harvest, all or part of which he may have retained to defray disbursements such as this, but the date suggests that the heirs are not just finishing off the “tail end” of Kyriakos' duties but may have taken over the obligations (and rights?) for the whole year. If Kyriakos had held office for a number of years, as suggested above, it may be that the holding of the office had become in effect a family entitlement and they had inherited his position.

Κυριακοῦ προ(νοητοῦ) Πολέμωνος. A Kyriakos *pronoetes* of Polemonos appears in XVI **2032** 40 (540/541), a list of payments by Apionic *pronoetai*; he is probably not the same Kyriakos who appears later in that list (46-48) as *pronoetes* of Netnëu, as where there are two payments from the same *pronoetes* the second is described as “παρὰ τῷ αὐτῷ”. If he is the same person as in **026** he may have held office for a number of years. For the role of the *pronoetes* see p.146 and **023.5** n. Polemonos is attested in five published papyri, all of which are Apionic: **2032** 40 (540/541), XIX **2243A** 77, 80 (590), XVIII **2206** 9 and **2207** 15 (6th century) and XVI **2031** 15 (6th/7th century). See Mazza 2001, 94 n.105 and 184, Benaissa 2009, 244-5. To date we have had no evidence of its location. **025** suggests that Polemonos was near the monastery of Abba Andrew; if so, it would also have been near the Apionic *prostasia* which included Apelle (see **023.2** n.), whose *pronoetes* also made payments to that monastery. This would place the monastery in the south of the nome, possibly near the desert. In both XVI **1911** 71ff and LV **3804** 144ff the first listed items of expenditure were payments to churches in the *epoikia* in the *prostasia*, including the church in Trigyu, which appears in the same position in the list in **2243A** 76, which relates to a different *prostasia*

which includes Polemonos. Mazza notes that this may be a different Trigyu but that it was possible that the boundaries of the *prostasiae* were not constant (2001, 94, n.104). We have examples of at least two *prostasiae* which remained constant: one in **1911** (covering 556/557) and **3804** (covering 565/566), the other in I **136** (583) and XVI **2196** (after 587), but those span relatively short periods of time. I think it highly unlikely that the boundaries would have remained the same for over a century; the estate must have expanded considerably over the years (Sarris 2006, 81-86, although, as Hickey points out (2008, 98-99) the tax figures alone are not evidence of this, as not all the tax may derive from land which it owned) and the areas of administration would presumably have been adjusted to reflect this to ensure that no district became unmanageably large. This papyrus might accordingly be further evidence that the boundaries of the *prostasiae* were not constant, if between 548 and 556/7 (the year covered by **1911**) Polemonos ceased to be part of the *prostasia* whose *pronoetes* was responsible for payments to Abba Andrew. See **023.5** n. for a similar suggestion about Netnëu.

τὸ κοινόβιον τοῦ ἁγ(ίου) Ἀββᾶ Ἀνδρέου. The Oxyrhynchite monastery of Abba Andrew is mentioned in a number of receipts: I **146** (555), **147** (556) and **148** (556), XVI **2015** (555) and SB XVIII 14061, 14062 and 14063 (all 556). These papyri were found in the first year of excavation at Oxyrhynchus, their Cairo inventory numbers, 10074-10079 and 10150, are close and their dates are close; they were probably found together and comprise an archive relating to the monastery. The monastery is also mentioned in two sets of *pronoetes*' accounts, XVI **1911** 147, 150, 153 (557) and LV **3804** 184, 186, 254 (566). It is described as a *μοναστήριον* in **146**, **1911**, **3804** and SB XVIII 14061-3 and once as a *κοινόβιον*, in **148**. "Monastery" was used originally to denote the cells of monks or hermits who did not necessarily live together in common, but in the present context the terms are interchangeable (both are used of the monastery of Abba Hierax, for example, in LXIII **4397** (545)), although *μοναστήριον* is much more common. See on the meaning of *koinobion* Barison 1938, 30-31, 42-43 and P. Bingen 122 and on the monastery of Abba Andrew Barison 1938, 75-77 and Sijpesteijn 1987 (1).

Monasteries usually took the name of their founder, or a member of the Holy Family, or a saint, or were identified by their location (Barison 1938, 33-34). Papaconstantinou's analysis shows that ἅγιος, before a person's name, always connotes someone no longer living who is a saint (although not necessarily in today's technical sense); when used to describe a church or monastery, as opposed to the person after whom it is named, it just means

“holy”. She found ἅγιος in conjunction with ἀββᾶ, as in this papyrus, 21 times (Papaconstantinou 2001, 240-241). The indeclinable term *abba* (sometimes translated as abbot) is used in connection with monks or former monks (Derda and Wipszycka 1994, 32, 34, 44). ἅγιος was not used in relation to this monastery in the accounts in **1911** and **3804**, or in any of the published references to it except **147**, while it was used with the *martyrion* or shrine of St Serenus (**1911** 92, **3804** 164) and in the similar accounts in XVI **1912** 117 referring to the monastery of St. Appheus. There are however at least three other examples where the use of ἅγιος to describe the monastery of a saintly monk has not been consistent; that of Abba Apollo in P. Bal. II 203 and 204, of Abba Antinus in P. Bingen 122 and 123, and of Abba Enoch in P. Cair. Masp. II 67234.4 and 67242.6. ἅγιος may have been used in error here and in I **147**. According to Papaconstantinou, saints described as ἅγιος ἀββᾶ are often more prestigious than those called ἅγιος ἄπα, as ἀββᾶ is a weightier title than ἄπα (*op.cit.* 244-5, following Derda and Wipszycka’s (1994, 44) analysis of the use of the term in relation to living persons). Apart from St. Andrew the apostle, she identifies only one other St Andrew in Egypt, who came from Lydda, and who may have given his name to a church in Arsinoe (SPP III 299: see *op.cit.* 49-50). O’Leary noted a third St. Andrew, an ascete who moved from the monastery of Anba Samuel to the Monastery of the Cross in the Thebaid (O’Leary 1937, 75). Neither mentions the Oxyrhynchite Abba Andrew. I do not see any reason to identify this monastery with any of these saints; Andrew must have been a saintly monk who had been the “abbot” of this monastery at some previous time.

Ruffini suggests that Flavius Serenus, a member of another wealthy Oxyrhynchite land-owning family, that of Eulogius, may have been the landlord of the monastery of Abba Andrew, if the stable-hand (also called Serenus) who delivered hay and chaff to it in I **146** (555) was the same Serenus who was appointed by Flavius Serenus to manage the stable of the *cursus velox* in I **140** (550) (Ruffini 2008, 67-69). Serenus is described in **146** 1-2 as the stableman of the βαδιστικὸν στάβλον, a term not used in **140** and which I believe relates to the Apion stable (**030.2** n.), and as noted above (1 n.), the monastery was probably on an outlying part of the Apion estate; the large payments of wheat to it by the Apions shown in **1911** 147-154 and **3804** 184-187 must indicate a connection. Most of the expenses in such accounts relate to land in or around the *prostasia* concerned and it is likely that the monastery was near that *prostasia* and also near Polemonos.

The monks kept animals (horses or mules) for which the landlord supplied hay and chaff (146) and they supplied ropes and mats (147 and 148, XVI 2015, SB XVIII 14061-14063), which they had presumably woven themselves, to the Apions and possibly to other estate owners too, as well as for public amenities. 029-031 attest this activity at the monastery of Abba Castor also.

2 ἀπὸ γενήμ(ατος) δωδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος). This may have read ἀπὸ γενήμ(ατος), as for example XVI 1911 (557), or ἀπὸ γενημ(άτων), as XVI 1913. The former is more common in Oxyrhynchus in this period. For tax purposes the indiction year began on 6 Pachon or 1 May, when the harvest would have been under way or possibly even finished in some areas, and the crops were counted as those of that new indiction year, which is when the taxes on them would have been collected. See 3 n. and *CSBE*² 7, 28, 32. The reference to the indiction year may support the view that the disbursements and allowances by estate-owners such as the Apions were actually a form of tax payments (see pp. 206-211) but the expression would have been the customary way of describing the crops and I doubt that one can read more into it.

σίτου καγκέλ(λω) ἀρτάβας πεντακοσίας. An artaba of grain was about 38 litres and weighed a little more than 30 kilos: Mazza 2001, 176. A *cancellus* artaba seems to have included a surcharge of 15%, although the accounting for such quantities is not entirely clear: see Rea on LV 3804 141-2 n. and Mazza 2001, 176. On the basis of 10 artabas a year per person (see p. 208), this payment to the monastery of Abba Andrew would have kept 50 monks for a year, while the amounts in 1911 147, 150, 153 and 3804 184, 186 would have supported more than twice that number. In 556/7 (1911 147-151) 1,000 artabas were paid to the monastery κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, according to custom, by written order of the consul, 12 more on the “day of the great man”, possibly the birthday of the head of the Apion family, possibly an anniversary of the abbot or archimandrite (3804 185 n.), and another 100 artabas on the specific orders of Strategius. In 565/6 (3804 184), the 1,000 artabas were described merely as κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, according to custom, and the 12 for the special day and the extra 100 were also given. We do not know whether the monastery received grain from a number of *prostasiae* each year or whether the payments were made in instalments or all at the same time; it is possible that only 500 artabas were given to it in 548 and that the amount was increased subsequently as numbers grew.

3 Ἐπειφ ι. ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἑνδεκάτης ὑπὲρ δωδεκάτης. It is not clear whether a letter follows the *iota*. The document was written between 10 and 19 Epeiph (4 and 13 July) of

the 11th indiction, the Oxyrhynchite indiction year which, like the Oxyrhynchite era year, began on 1 Thoth (29 August). The produce referred to in **026** has already been delivered and must have been harvested shortly before delivery, probably between April and early June of the same calendar year. This month of Epeiph was in the 11th indiction by Oxyrhynchite chronological reckoning but the 12th for tax collection purposes. See 2 n. and *CSBE*² 30, 32.

027 Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Petros

54 1B.25(B)/A(3)a

24.8 x 20 cm

553?

027 contains the lower part of a receipt for 319 artabas of wheat paid by a *pronoetes* to the cenobite monastery of Abba Petros. It is interesting because of the references to the *patrikia* Gabrielaia (see below) and to κτημάτων πατριμουναλίων (see below and 9 n.), the first attestation of the monastery of Abba Petros (16 n.) and the terms of the receipt, which incorporate a pledge of possessions not merely of the signatory but of the monastery also (13-14 n.). The *pronoetes* Anoup may be known from other papyri but Anoup is a common name (8 n.).

Flavia Gabrielaia

The *patrikia* Gabrielaia (l.5) is connected in some way with this payment of wheat, but her precise role is not clear (see 1 n. below). In particular it is not clear whether the receipt was addressed to her.

Flavia Gabrielaia is attested in XXXVI **2780** (15 July 553), a receipt for the salary of a *hydroparochos* of the public bath in Oxyrhynchus, where she is addressed as a *patrikia*. This was the only definite reference to her, but the editor suggested (**2780** 6 n.) that she may have been the (late) mother of Patrikia mentioned in XVI **2020** 41 (580s), a list of taxpayers and amounts of tax contributed by each of them. The amount paid by Patrikia is one of the lowest in the list, but that is not conclusive as to her wealth.

When **2780** (inventory no. 15 1B. 201/E (b)) was published, there was nothing to connect it or Gabrielaia with the Apion family. We now know of two other papyri with Apion connections whose inventory numbers (15 1B. 201/E(c) and /E(g) respectively) show that they were found around the same time as, and close to, **2780**: LXIII **4396** (18 February 542), a fragment addressed to Fl. Strategius II (and probably the latest attestation of him alive: see below) which is clearly an Apionic document, and **026** (July 548), which mentions the *epoikion* of Polemonos, which is only attested in Apionic contexts, and the monastery of Abba Andrew, already known to have received large amounts of wheat from the Apions (XVI **1911** 147, 150, 154, LV **3804** 184, 186, 254). The coincidence of finds suggested that there might be some connection between the Apions and **2780**. The inventory number of **027**, 54 1B.25(B)/A(3)a, indicates that it was found at the same time as, and near, a number of papyri which are clearly from the Apion estate: 54 1B.25(B)/A(1)a (LXI **4131**), /A(1)b (

LXVII 4616), and /B (LXX 4782, 4783, 4785, 4788, 4790, 4795 and 4797, and the reference to the ἔνδοξος οἶκος (10 n.) proves that it in some way relates to the Apions. I think that either Flavia Gabrielia was a member of the Apion family, or her estate, with its records, was acquired by the Apion estate at some time after her death and before 571 (SB XII 11079; see below in relation to the house of Timagenes). Another find at the same time and place as 2780, 025 (inventory number 15 1B.201/E(h)), refers to the same *zygostates* as 2780. There is accordingly a Gabrielia sub-dossier, within the Apion papyri, comprising 2780, SB XXVI 16795 (=P. Herm 80: see 025 Introduction), 025, 027 and (possibly) XVI 2020. Apart from the incidence of finds, there is nothing to connect Gabrielia with 4396 or with 026.

In 2780, Gabrielia is addressed as τῆ ἔνδοξοτάτῃ καὶ ὑπερφ(υεστάτῃ) πατρικίᾳ, λαχούσῃ τὴν λογιστείαν καὶ προεδρίαν καὶ πατερίαν ταύτης τῆς λαμπρᾶς Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως ὑπὲρ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μνήμης Τιμαγένους. This formula is almost identical to the one used in relation to Phoebammon and Samuel, grandsons of Timagenes (see below), in SB XX 14964 5-6 (517) and also in relation to Apion II in SB XII 11079 7-10 (571, nearly 20 years after 2780), and the three titles do not appear together in any other context. The payment for which the receipt in 2780 was issued was made in an official capacity to a worker in the public baths, not to a personal or private employee. Gascou, followed by Beaucamp, considered that these public services of the offices of *logistes/curator civitatis*, president of the *boule* and father of the city were imposed on the estates or *oikoi*, rather than on individuals, from the mid-5th to the end of the 6th century, and that for ease of record-keeping the “books” referred to the old estate names.²⁸⁷ Fikhman describes them as *munera patrimonii sui generis* and Beaucamp as in effect *munera patrimonialia*.²⁸⁸ Sijpesteijn suggested that the use of λαγχάνω in 2780, SB XII 11079 and SB XX 14964 might indicate that the offices were originally acquired by lot,²⁸⁹ according to Fikhman, this would have been more like a “rubber-stamping” by the council rather than a voting exercise.²⁹⁰ Sijpesteijn also suggested that the titles of πατέρες τῆς πόλεως when held by wealthy women such as Flavia Gabrielia (and Flavia Theophania) may have been honorific titles bestowed on them by the community to encourage them to be generous, but the first two titles held by Gabrielia suggest real functions even if the third

²⁸⁷ Gascou 1985, 41-44=2008, 163-167; Beaucamp 1992, II, 8-10. Rowlandson (1998, no. 150) described these as “all the public offices”.

²⁸⁸ Fikhman 1997, 164-168; Beaucamp 1992 II 10.

²⁸⁹ Sijpesteijn 1987 (2), 173.

²⁹⁰ Fikhman 1997, 164-168.

may have been honorary, and I think that it must be correct that the offices fell on the estates rather than the individuals.²⁹¹ Timagenes may have been elected personally to these offices originally, or on Gascoü's thesis noted above his estate may have been elected. It makes sense that the obligations fell on the owners for the time being of the estate whose owner was initially charged with them, since it would have been the extent of the land-holding that caused the original appointment to be made; the original estate names may have been retained for ease of book-keeping, as Gascoü suggested, but also, I believe, because they identified the physical entity whose owner from time to time had to fulfil the roles originally allocated. Many of the documents which refer to the estate of Timagenes are applications to change entries in the tax register. A number of documents attest the house of Theon similarly performing tax-related or other public functions, for example XVI **2039** (possibly 562-3) (where its obligation to provide *riparii* has been shared between a number of other estates, including the Apions, suggesting the original estate was no longer able to fulfil the functions), applications for taxation remission in SB XXIV 15955 (540-541) and I **126** (572), both of which describe Theon as dead, and XVI **2016** 1, 5, 8, 13,14 which shows the houses of Theon, Timagenes and Eudaemon being involved in payments of corn presumably for taxes.

Timagenes, who may have been the *riparius* mentioned in SB XXII 15471.1,²⁹² is known to have been alive in 432 (PSI Congr. XVII 29.2, where he is described as λαμπροτάτος). All other references to him are to his estate (or to him) after his death, which had occurred by 444: L **3583** 3 (444), LXVIII **4696** 5 (484), P. Warren 3.2-3 (c.500), SB XX 14964.3 (517), XVI **1887** 2 (538), **2780** 10-11 (553), LV **3805** 12 (566 or later), SB XII 11079 9-10 (571), I **149** 2 (572), **2016** 5, 13, 14 (undated). It is probable that he had a son, Ioannes, who was a *politeuomenos* and *comes sacri consistorii* (**4696** 4 (484); see also **3805** 12), and grandsons (sons of Ioannes) called Phoebammon and Samuel (LXVIII **4697** 3-4 (489): see **4697** Introduction and 3-4 n. and SB XX 14964.4). Assuming that is correct, Ioannes would have been dead by 489 (**4697** 3-4). The latest reference to Phoebammon and Samuel is in 524 (XVI **1946** 1).²⁹³ At some time after that date, the estate subject to the relative duties must have passed into the hands of Gabriela; following Gascoü, I think that she would not have been allotted or allocated the offices in her personal capacity and so must have inherited or otherwise acquired the estate which was charged with their fulfilment. It

²⁹¹ Sijpesteijn 1987 (2), 173; see on offices generally references at **2780** 7 n. and Sijpesteijn 1987 (2).

²⁹² Undated: see Bingen's post-script at *CE* 70 (1995), 192.

²⁹³ Phoebammon, the more senior and always first named of the two (**4697** 3 n.), may also be mentioned in LXIII **4393**, a late-5th century petition to a πατήρ πόλεως. See also Sijpesteijn 1988 (1), 123-124.

is possible that she was a great-granddaughter or great-great-granddaughter of Timagenes, or married to a great-grandson or great-great-grandson. By 571 (SB XII 11079) the duties and, I believe, the estate of Timagenes had been acquired by Apion II, so it would seem that Gabrielia was dead by then or had sold the estate or lost control of it in some other way. The only later dated reference to the estate, I **149 2** (572), a receipt for taxes, does not name any individual in relation to it.²⁹⁴ Azzarello, relying on XVI **2039**, suggests that the Apions' rise may have begun by their acquisition of the wealth of the house of Theon through *bona vacantia* in or soon after 459/460: we do not know the fate of the house of Timagenes.²⁹⁵

In both **2780 6-7** and **027** Gabrielia is described as *patricia*. *Patricius* was an honour awarded from the time of Constantine I to very high-ranking officials.²⁹⁶ Only three *patriciae* are known from 6th century Middle Egypt: Gabrielia, Maria (see below) and Sophia (SPP VIII 1090-1097 and P. Erl. 67: none of these refers to the Oxyrhynchite). While it seems to be accepted that a woman would not have been granted such a rank in her own right, it is not entirely clear whether she might have taken the honorific from her father rather than her husband, although the evidence points to the latter: Flavia Christodote, for example, daughter of the *patricius* Ioannes, is described as an *illustris* (PSI I 76.2), while her sister Maria (see below) was a *patricia*. Members of the imperial family were called *patricia* before marriage, but that may have been a royal prerogative.²⁹⁷ There are very few *patricii* known to have had Oxyrhynchite connections. Most are from the Apion family: Apion I (died between 524 and 532), Strategius II (died c.542), Apion II (died c. 579), Apion III and Strategius Paneuphemus (see LXIX **4754 4 n.**). It is now accepted that Apion I was married to Flavia Isis, the daughter of Strategius I.²⁹⁸ Strategius II, who is attested from 489 to 542, became *patricius* at some time between 525 (LXX **4781**) and 530 (LXX **4784**). He probably died in the first half of 542, but his wife (who survived him) was called Leontia: from 9 October 543 the Oxyrhynchite Apionic documentation is addressed to Fl. Apion (Apion II), who was son of Strategius and Leontia.²⁹⁹ The first firmly dated attestation of Apion II being called *patricius* is from 15 October 566 (LXX **4788 5**), and the latest papyrus not to use that title in relation to him is LXX **4787 5** (12 March 564). The identity of his wife is

²⁹⁴ For the house of Timagenes see Hardy 1931, 47-49, Gasco 1985, 42-46=2008, 164-169, Fikhman 1997, Banaji 2007, 136-137, Ruffini 2008, 53-64.

²⁹⁵ Azzarello 2006, 211-212 and *passim*.

²⁹⁶ Heil 1966, 50-67, esp. 64.

²⁹⁷ See Beaucamp 1990, I 271-273, 1992, II 13, 130-139 and LXIX **4754 4 n.**

²⁹⁸ See LXVII **4614 2 n.**, LXIII **4390 2-3** and Gonis 2004, 176-177. See also Azzarello 2007, *passim*.

²⁹⁹ See LXIII **4397** Introduction p.148 and Mazza 2001, 59.

not known but as he probably obtained the title between March 564 and October 566, Flavia Gabrielia, addressed as *patricia* in 553, cannot have obtained her title as his wife. A Strategius described as *patricius* in XVI **1911** 151 (556/557) was deceased by 565/566 (LV **3804** 186-7), but on Palme's interpretation that was Strategius II, who had been dead since c.542, and the wording in **1911** 151 followed the stereotyped format used while he was alive.³⁰⁰ If Palme were wrong, the Strategius in **1911** 151 and **3804** 186-187 could have been the husband of Gabrielia, but he would not have been head of the family, and so it is perhaps unlikely that he would have been *patricius*; there is documentation showing Apion II, who is distinguishable from the other members of his family with the same name by reason of having held office as *consul ordinarius* in 539, as head of the estate as early as 543 (XVI **1985** 2). Although there is what appears to be a strange gap in the published Oxyrhynchite documentation, with no references to Apion II securely dated between 552 (P. Lond. III 776) and 564 (LXX **4787**), that is probably due to the incidence of finds, as unless there was another Apion who was *consul ordinarius*, Apion II must have been head of the estate from 543 (XVI **1985**) to at least 577 (XVI **1896**). The family tree after Apion II is not entirely clear.³⁰¹ There seem to have been at least two later persons called Strategius, one of whom, Strategius Paneuphemus, was *patricius*, as was Apion III, but the identity of their wives is known and they are too late to have been married to Gabrielia. It is unlikely, therefore, that Gabrielia obtained her title of *patricia* through marriage to a head of the Apion family.

LXIX **4754** 4 (572) refers to a Flavia Maria, one of the only two other *patriciae* known from 6th century Middle Egypt and the daughter of the late *patricius* Ioannes, who may possibly be the same former *patricius* who was father to Christodote and Cometes (PSI I 76.2 (572 or 573): see **4754** 4 n. and 4-5 n.). Cometes had by the 560s become the formal head of an *oikos* inherited, presumably, from the *patricius* Ioannes, as evidenced by payments made by his household in XVI **2040** 8 (560s) and **2020** 24 (580s).³⁰² The family to which Christodote and Cometes belonged was very wealthy; in PSI I 76 (a petition), Christodote claims that her brother Cometes owes her 61 pounds of gold, a huge amount. She also claims that she was being harassed by creditors and that real property left to her in Arcadia was about to be handed to them. Might Gabrielia have been the wife of this Ioannes and Christodote's and Cometes' mother? If she was, pressure from creditors might explain why her estate had

³⁰⁰ Palme 1998 (2), 296 n.18.

³⁰¹ See Palme 1998 (2), 322, Mazza 2001, 64-72, Sarris 2006, 20-23.

³⁰² Banaji 2007, 149.

fallen into the hands of the Apions by 571 (SB XII 11079). Against this are **2020** and **2040**, which suggest that Cometes' estate had not changed hands between the 560s and the 580s, although his sister might have inherited a different part of the original estate, nor would this explain the connection with the house of Timagenes, unless the Ioannes who was the father of Flavia Maria was grandson of the Ioannes who was Timagenes' son.

The only other *patricii* known from this date and period in Egypt are another Ioannes, *dux* of the Thebaid in the 560s (see LXIX **4754** 4 n. with references to PLRE IIIA), but we have nothing to connect him with Oxyrhynchus, and Athanasius from the Thebaid (P. Cair. Masp. I 670002 – 67005, 67008, II 67151, 67166 and P. Lond. V 1674), who visited Oxyrhynchus in some style in 563 (XVI **1920**). But there must have been other *patricii* who had connections with Oxyrhynchus and Gabrielia could have been a daughter of the Apion family who obtained her title (and estate) by marriage to an as yet unattested *patricius*.

Patrimonial land

P. Iand. III 51.7 (Oxyrhynchus, 6th century), part of an undated account of income and expenditure known, because of the incidence of place-names, to relate to the Apion estate, includes in a list of expenditure by reference to named *ketemata* the term πατριμουναλ(..). It appears between Skytaltidos (which was in the Lower toparchy and 8th pagus in the north of the nome) and Megales Paroriou (which may have been near Oxyrhynchus itself).³⁰³ Benaissa considered that Πατριμουναλ(..) was the name of a place.³⁰⁴ This is possible, but if so it is strange that it is the only name in that papyrus which is abbreviated, while longer names are not. **027**, as well as the earlier references described below, suggests that it describes a particular type of property.³⁰⁵ Lewis and Short translate *patrimonium* as “an estate inherited from a father”, and it would be nice to think that the reference here was to land inherited by Flavia Gabrielia from her father, but I think that these must be some sort of imperial possessions. The terms πατριμουναλ.., also spelled πατριμωναλ.., and the related πατριμουνη.. (also πατριμων.., πατριμων.., πατρεμουν...) appear in a number of papyri, mostly in the context of taxation. After a single early reference, P. Amst. I 28.4 (3 BC, Oxyrhynchus), an imperial oath where it means imperial possessions, there are 17 in the 4th century, including references in four Hermopolite papyri to *sitologoi patrimonii* (P. Cair. Preis 18.12, P. Charite 14.2, P. Vind Sijp. 2.12, 15 and CPR VII 17.4) and in two

³⁰³ Mazza 2001, 183 and 185; Benaissa 2009, 215-216, 296.

³⁰⁴ Benaissa 2009, 219.

³⁰⁵ The abbreviated word in P. Iand. III 51.7 may be the dative πατριμουναλίοις, qualifying ἀγροῖς in l.1.

Oxyrhynchite papyri to *praepositi patrimonii* (P. Col. X 286.7 and VI 900 5), where the term clearly means imperial property, either land or revenues from land or other assets.³⁰⁶ At P. Charite Introduction, p. 13, the editor suggested that in that papyrus *patrimonalia* were taxes raised on land that belonged to the imperial estate that Charite had rented under the condition that she paid the taxes on it. In the 6th century there are four papyrological attestations: SB XX 14669 (the 524 cadaster from Aphrodito), P. Petra I 4 and 5, where it clearly means some sort of land, and P. Iand. III 51.7. There are possibly six references to *patrimonium* in 7th century papyri: P. Ant. III 203.11 (the *sacrum patrimonium*), CPR IX 75.3 and SPP XX 147 (a place in the Hermopolite nome), CPR IX 45.v.3-4 and P. Sorb. II 69.89B3 (both tax lists) and possibly SB XX 14700, a list of payments by instalment, the last three of which may reflect payments made by the administrators of such property to the *fiscus* for rent or similar sums received or crops produced.

Gascou, commenting on SB XX 14669.298, 299 (=P. Freer 1 and 2), considered that in Egypt the “terres “patrimoniales”” were equivalent to the οὐσιακὴ γῆ, and part of the old *patrimonium principis*, which by the 6th century had been appropriated to private title. In his view these had nothing to do with the *sacrum patrimonium*, that part of the *res privata* (Crown property) which following reforms under Anastasius in 498 still belonged to the Crown but whose revenues had been ceded to the public treasury to compensate it for revenue lost due to cancellation of the χρυσάργυρον or *collatio lustralis*;³⁰⁷ it was administered, separately from the emperor’s private estates and from other imperial property, by the *comes sacri patrimonii*. The θεῖος οἶκος or *domus divina* was the private property of the emperor, which was his to dispose of and which was organised and administered and liable to pay taxes in the same way as the other great estates.³⁰⁸ There were probably therefore three types of imperial property: the *domus divina*, the *sacrum patrimonium* and the rest of the *res privata*, namely Crown property whose revenues remained at the disposal of the emperor.³⁰⁹ Whether land described after 498 as patrimonial, including the land in this papyrus, was or was not part of the *sacrum patrimonium* is not clear.

³⁰⁶ Other 4th century references are in P. Charite 15.4-5, 16, 38, P. Flor. III 320.4, P. Harrauer 39.1, 8 and 45.2, 4-5, P. Ryl. IV 658.6-7, P. Strasb. V 315.12, 14, 325.5, 337.4-5, SB XIV 12214, P. Ant. I 32.3 and SB XX 14586.6, 9-10, where it is described as “land or tax on a specific category of land (Sijpesteijn and Worp, 1990, 511).

³⁰⁷ Gascou 1987, 115=2008, 260; VI 900 5 n.; Jones LRE I 237, 425-427.

³⁰⁸ See for example P. Harr. 1 88 and II 239, XVI 1892 and 2020, LXXII 4906, SB XXIV 16312, Kaplan 1976, 16, followed by Tacoma 1998, 126.

³⁰⁹ As Kaplan 1976, 11-16. Delmaire considered that the *sacrum patrimonium* was still part of the *res privata* (Delmaire 1989, 674-709).

We do not know how much patrimonial land there was in the Oxyrhynchite nome and it is possible that this papyrus concerns the same land as P. Iand. III 51. We do not know where that land was situated, as the properties listed in P. Iand. III 5 are neither close together nor listed by geographical proximity to one another, and although Mazza suggests that that document may have been part of a *pronoetes*' set of annual accounts, she places Skytalitidos, Aspida, Evangeliou, Terythis and Pangouleciou, all of which are mentioned in it, in different *prostasiae*, and some of the places were in different toparchies.³¹⁰ Seven of the 21 places named in P. Iand. III 51 are shown in XVI 2032 (540-541) as having their own *pronoetai* and I think that it was more likely a summary, like 2032, than a set of individual *pronoetes*' accounts. If the term as used in P. Iand. III 51 related to land at a particular place, this may have been at Skytalitidos or Megales Paroriou, but the term itself may have been sufficient to show to what the expenditure related, particularly if there was only one parcel of that type in that area, so that there would have been no need to specify a place-name.

Some imperial lands may have been administered by the Apions. XVI 1915, dated to soon after 555-556, relates to land near the village of Pempo described as property τοῦ θειοτ[άτ]ου οἴκ(ου) and also mentions Megalou Choriou and Meskanounios, two villages listed next to one another and after the word πατριμουναλ(..) in P. Iand. III 51, although not directly following it. 1915 is on the back of a schedule of dues of the Apion estate and the editors suggest that the land may have been recently acquired from the Apion family by the imperial estates or, more probably, was administered by that family on behalf of the imperial house, to which a report such as 1915 was provided from time to time. Such functions may have been performed in relation to the *res privata* and the *patrimonium* as well as the estates of the *domus divina*, and their administration may have been another *munus* which fell to be performed by a major landowner.

Gabrielia's connection to the patrimonial settlements in 027, which may have been leased by the Apions from the Crown or administered by them on its behalf, is not clear. LV 3805 12 (566) records a payment by the heirs of Ioannes, son of Timagenes, of 83 *solidi* ὑπὲρ ἐμφυτείας. This is the only reference in the published Apion archive to land held under an emphyteutic or permanent heritable lease, a type of tenure common for imperial or church lands but not much used in private dealings, and the sum of money paid is much larger than the other amounts of rent paid in the same account.³¹¹ Rea, at 3805 12 n., suggested

³¹⁰ Mazza 2001, 29 n. 142, 179 to 187.

³¹¹ For emphyteutic leases see pp. 148-149 and Jones LRE I 417-420, Simon 1982.

that the Apions might be the head tenants who had sub-let the property. The reference to Timagenes suggests that this may be the same land as in **027**, in which case Gabrielia might have been a sub-tenant who had undertaken duties that in effect ran with the land, or been a tenant of lands owned by the Crown and administered by the Apions on its behalf, but in the absence of more evidence this can only be conjecture.

Date

027 is undated but deals with a payment of wheat on account of the harvest of the “present second indiction” (6-7 n.), a reference to a tax indiction year (see **026.3** n.). Like **026**, it was probably executed shortly after that harvest and during, but near the end of, the Oxyrhynchite indiction year. The only securely dated document to mention Gabrielia, **2780**, is a receipt for a payment on account of the *logisteia* of the second indiction, which ran from 553 to 554, and is dated Epeiph 22 (16 July) 553, in the first (Oxyrhynchite) indiction year (BL VIII 262). If **027** is addressed to Flavia Gabrielia it is likely that it was executed about the same time as **2780**. The closest alternative dates are 538 and 568. In the unlikely event that Gabrielia was dead when **027** was written (see 5 n.), then 568 or an even later date would be possible.

The form of the receipt

We have many Byzantine period receipts; short form documents like **026** and **028** and longer more formal notarised documents which may record more unusual transactions. **027** is one of the latter type; it is most similar to three other Apionic receipts, XVI **1898** and **1993** (both 587: for **1993** see LXX, pp. 144-146) and LXI **4131** (600), two of which (**1898** and **4131**) are for charitable donations to hospitals, while the third (**1993**) relates to a church. What distinguishes the present papyrus from all these others is the pledge of property, not merely of the signatory but of the monastery itself (13-14). Such a pledge is normal where obligations remain to be fulfilled by the person giving the pledge, as in the return of an advance of seed (I **133** 20-21 (550)) or money (XVI **1892** 34-35 (581)), or where a person is acting as surety for another (I **125** 22-23 (560)), XIX **2238** 21-22 (551), XLIV **3204** 24-26 (588)), or under a lease (XVI **1890** 16-17 (508)), or in a contract for future service or services (I **136** 40 (583), LI **3641** 21 (544), LVIII **3958** 32-33 (614), **022.35-36**). I have found only one other example of a pure receipt where a pledge is included, P. Lond. V 1717 (c.560-573), where the person issuing the document used a wide range of terms and combinations of terms and which, the editor wrote, was “of interest

more for its unusual and extravagant verbosity than for anything else". That document was an acknowledgement of repayment of a loan and it is perhaps more understandable that someone should be required to pledge their belongings in such a transaction than in a receipt of a payment like the present. The amount of wheat, 319 artabas, is fairly large but not exceptional (pp. 206-207) and is expressed to be the full amount payable in respect of the specified 2nd indiction year. One wonders why **027** is so different from **026** and **028** and indeed why **4131** and **1993**, which involved only seven and four artabas respectively, were written in the long format. In **1898** and **1993** the wheat was given by the same person, so it could have been a question of his personal style, but that does not apply to **4131** or **027**. Perhaps there was a particularly pedantic scribe or notary, or a particularly fussy priest. It is possible that additional obligations were contained in the missing part of the papyrus (although this is very unlikely) or there may have been concern on the part of the payer to have a full record with recourse, either because a dispute had arisen between the parties in the past, or perhaps because the payment was being made on behalf of the imperial estates by an agent who wanted there to be no risk at all that receipt of the payment would be denied.

Description

The papyrus is torn across the top and it is not possible to tell how many lines are missing; these would have included the dating formula and formal address (see 1n.). There are only traces of the first 5 lines and substantial parts are missing from lines 6 and 7. From line 6 onwards both side margins are intact, as is the bottom one. Lines 4 and 5 may have been shorter than the following ones, as there are no traces of any letters on the small part sticking up on the right-hand side. The writing is along the fibres. There is an endorsement on the back, probably incomplete; it looks as if the papyrus was turned, rolled and then flattened in the same way as **021**.

There are at least four hands; the writer of the main part, who was probably a scribe, Anoup the priest, the person who executed the document for him (16-19) and the notary or *sumbolaiographos* who completed it (20 n.). The endorsement may be in the principal hand or a fifth hand. The principal hand is regular and evenly spaced with medium-sized and easily legible letters. Anoup the priest is almost illiterate but has been able to write his own name and occupation, in a non-cursive hand with one spelling mistake (l.15). The third hand is much less regular and the script tiny. The fourth is in Latin.

- 1 [.....c.14-18.....] τῆς Ὁξ[υρυγχιτῶν πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ
- 2 [ἐγὼ ὁ αὐτὸς εὐλα]βέστα[τος Ἄνουπ]πρεσβύ[τερος κα]ἰ μο[νάζων
- 3 [εἰληφέναι καὶ πεπ]ληρῶσθ[αι πα]ρὰ τῆς ὑμῶ[ν ἐν]δοξότητος [. . . c.9. . .]
- 4 [.....c.14 -18.....]. σιτον.[c.4]ον μοι η.[c. 6] .νει.[. . c.9 . . .]
- 5 [.....c. 12 -16]πατρικίας Γαβ[ρ]ηλίας υ[. . . c.7 . . .]. . . [. . c. 9]
- 6 ..[.....c. 10 πρ]ὸς τὸ ἔθος καὶ ὑπὲρ καρπῶν τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας
- 7 ἰνδ(ικτίονος) .[. . . c.7 . . .].αμ. . . πλήρης τουτέστιν σίτου ἀρτάβας τριακοσίας δέκα
- 8 ἐννέα τὰς καὶ δοθείσας μοι διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου Ἄνουπ προνοητοῦ
- 9 τῶν αὐτῶν κτημάτων πατριμουναλίων γί(νονται) σί(του) ἀ(ρτάβαι) τιθ καὶ πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν
- 10 τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου Ἄνουπ ταύτην πεποίημαι
- 11 τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν τριακοσίων δέκα ἐννέα ἀρταβῶν τοῦ σίτου ὑπὲρ
- 12 καρπῶν τῆς αὐτῆς δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος), ἥτις κυρία οὔσα ἀπλ(ῆ) γραφ(εῖσα) καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖς)
- 13 ὠμολ(όγησα), ὑποθέμενος αὐτῇ πάντα τὰ τε ἐμὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τὰ τοῦ
- 14 αὐτοῦ ἀγίου τόπου ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἐνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ.
- 15 (vac.) (m. 2) Ἄνουπ πρεσβετέρου (vac.)
- 16 (m. 3) + τὸ εὐαγὲς κοινόβιον καλούμ(ενον) ἀββᾶ Πέτρου ὁ προγεγραμμένος πεποίημαι
- 17 τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπόδειξ(ιν) δεξάμ(ενος) πάσας τὰς τοῦ σίτου ἀρτάβας τριακοσίας δέκα ἐννέα ὑπὲρ

18 καρπῶν δευτέρας ἰνδικτίονος) καί στοιχεῖ μοι πάντα ὡς πρόκειται). Ἀπολλῶς υἱὸς Ἀπανακίου ἄξι(ιωθεῖς) ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ

19 πρὸ ἔμοῦ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτ[ο]ῦ τάξ(αντος) τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ χερσί+

20 (m. 4) + *di emu Victoros etelioth* +

Back, downwards along the fibres:

21]απ . . .ι() μο() ὑποδοχ(ῆς) σίτου ἀ(ρταβῶν) τῖθ καρπ(ῶν) β̄ ἰνδ(ικτί[ον]ο(ς)

3 ὑμ 6 ὑπερ 7 ἰνδ° 9 γλ 11 ὑπερ 12 ἰνδ° απλ γραφ̄ επεβ̄ 13 ομολ̄ ὑποθεμενος
ὑπαρχοντα 14 ὑποθηκης 15 ἰ. Πρεσβυτέρος 16 καλουμί 17 αποδειξ̄ δεξαμς 18 ἰνδ̄ προκ
υἱος αξς 19 ταξ̄ 21 υποδοχς α καρπς

“..... from the city of the Oxythynchites [greetings. I, the above-mentioned] most pious Anoup, priest and monk, [agree that I have taken and] received in full from your gloriousness wheat of *patricia* Gabrielaia

6. for custom and on account of the harvest of the current 2nd indiction in full, that is three hundred and nineteen artabas of wheat, which have been given to me by the most admirable Anoup, steward of the same patrimonial farmlands, namely, 319 artabas of wheat, and for security of the same glorious household and of the same most admirable Anoup I have made this receipt of the same 319 artabas of wheat on account of the harvest of the same second indiction, the same being binding, written in a single copy, and in answer to the formal question I gave my consent, pledging thereto all my belongings of mine and those of that same holy place, in particular and in general, by way of pledge and by right of mortgage.

(2nd hand) Anoup priest

(3rd hand)+ The well-sanctified coenobite monastery called of Abba Peter. I the above mentioned, have made this receipt having received all the 319 artabas of wheat on account of the harvest of the 2nd indiction, and it is all satisfactory to me as aforesaid. I Apollus son of Apanakios have written for him at his request, he having set down his name with his own hand before me.+

(4th hand) Completed by me Victor. +”

Back: “..... receipt for 319 artabas of wheat from the harvest of the 2nd indiction.”

1 The missing lines would have included the date, the address to the relevant landowner, if that was an Apion the Menas *oiketes* formula (021.6-8 n.), the name and description of the party giving the receipt, including his patronymic (usually but not always included; it was omitted for example in LXI 4131) and, probably, the name of the institution which he was representing. There is insufficient room for this description of Anoup the priest after πρεσβυτερ in 2 so he must have been mentioned before. In addition, αὐτοῦ in 8, 10 and 14 and αὐτῶν in 9 show that Anoup the *pronoetes*, the glorious household, the patrimonial lands and the holy place or monastery have all been referred to earlier in the document. The use of τῆς ὑμῶ[ν ἐν]δοξότητος in 3 shows that the receipt is not addressed only to the *pronoetes* and suggests that the addressee may be Gabrielia, as although she is described as an ἐνδοξοτάτη καὶ ὑπερφ(εστάτη) πατρικία in 2780, the words τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνδοξότητος are used for her twice, at 2780 17 and 23-24. This is not conclusive, however: the same expression, which is not as high a designation as ὑπερφυεστάτος, was used of Strategius II at LXVII 4616 8 (525) and of Apion II at I 133 8 (550).

I would suggest, following 2780, 4131 and LXII 4349 (504):

+ βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβ(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότη Φλ(αοίου) Ἰουστινιανοῦ | τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Αὐτοκρ(άτορος) ἔτους κζ τοῖς τὸ [ιβ] μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν | Φλ(αοίου) Βασιλίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου
 ἰνδ(ικτίονος) [α] ἐν Ὁξ(υρύγων) πόλ(ει).

If Gabrielia is the addressee:

[Φλ(αοία) Γαβριηλία τῆ | ἐνδοξοτάτη καὶ ὑπερφ(εστάτη) πατρικία διὰ σοῦ τοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου Ἀνούπ τοῦ | αὐτῆς προνοητοῦ τῶν κτημάτων πατριμουναλίων ἐν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ | ἐνδόξου οἴκου, τὸ εὐαγὲς κοινόβιον (οἱ ὁ ἅγιος τόπος) τὸ καλούμενον ἀββᾶ Πέτρου δ(ι') ἐμοῦ | Ἀνούπ πρεσβυτέρος καὶ μονάζων υἱοῦ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας

1 | μνήμης ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ]τῆς Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ

οἱ

Ἀνούπ πρεσβύτερος καὶ μονάζων τοῦ κοινόβιου (οἱ τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου) τοῦ καλουμένου ἀββᾶ Πέτρου υἱός

1 ἀπό τῆς αὐ]τῆς Ὁξυρυγιτῶν πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ

Alternatively, if one of the Arions is the addressee, his name would be substituted for Gabrielia's, and the Menas *oiketes* formula would be included. But in that case there would still have to be a reference to Anoup the *pronoetes*, and I have not found any examples where Arion II has been addressed through an intermediary other than Menas.

2 εὐλα]βέστα[τος This epithet is commonly used to describe priests in papyri of this time and rarely appears other than in relation to members of the clergy: see Dinneen 1929, 23 and Hornickel, 1930, 13. I have not found any other example where the person giving the receipt has repeated the reference to his title in this way, but we are clearly dealing with a repetitive author.

πρεσβύ[τερος κα]ι μο[νάζων I have found these titles together in only four papyri, P. Apoll. 69.7, 15 (651-700), P. Lond. I 77.29 (610), P. Lond. V 1862.2 (501-700) and, in reverse order, LXIII 4397 196 (545). οἰκονόμος is the most frequently attested joint title for the manager of the economic life of a monastery (the person I would expect to issue a receipt such as this) from the 5th to the 8th century: see Schmelz 2002, 163 n.15 for references to 27 occurrences. There is insufficient space for the 14 letters that would be required and the letter before the *mu* is not an *omicron*.

3 εἰληφέναι καὶ πεπ]ληρῶσθ[αι Restored following inter alia P. Iand. III 43.9-10 (525), P. Got. 9.9 (564) and XVI 1898 20 and 1993 23 (587). ἐσχηκέναι would also be possible, as would ταύτου ἁγίου τόπου, but it is more usual for πεπληρῶσθαι to be accompanied by another infinitive.

πα]ρὰ τῆς ὑμῶ[ν ἐν]δοξότητος As in 2780 17.

5 πατρικίας Γαβ[ρ]ιηλίας See Introduction, pp. 219-224. Her name may be included here because the grain was given on her orders, ἐκ κελεύσεως τῆς πατρικίας or κατὰ κελεύσιν τῆς πατρικίας, following XVI 1911 150-1 or LV 3804 186-7, although in those papyri it was clear that such amounts were in addition to what was payable by custom. Alternatively, it is possible that Gabrielia's name is in the genitive because the grain is for a mass for her (εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν τῆς πατρικίας, as in LXVII 4620 2-4, where the largest gift of 416 artabas was expressed to be εἰς τὴν ἁγί(αν) προσφορ(ὰν) τῆς μάμμης; if so, the document would not be addressed to her (1 n.) and the date could well be 15 or more years after 2780. The fact that the payment was made πρ]ὸς τὸ ἔθος (6)

does not preclude this; it could have been an annual payment for that purpose. See pp. 206-211 for a discussion of the terms under which such payments were made.

6-7 ὑπὲρ καρπῶν τῆς παρουσίας δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος) The payment is expressed to be made on account of the harvest of the second indiction. It is likely that the wheat would have been delivered in summer, shortly after conclusion of the harvest, that the second indiction to which reference is made is the fiscal indiction year just begun, and that the receipt was executed before the start of Oxyrhynchite second indiction year (see **026.3** n. and, for the suggestion that the papyrus was dated in 553, p. 227).

8 τοῦ αὐτοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου Ἀνοῦπ προνοητοῦ. αὐτοῦ shows that there was a reference to this Anoup in the missing part at the top of the document. θαυμασιώτατος is an honorific frequently used in relation to *pronoetai*; **023.5** n. We have four references to Apionic *pronoetai* called Anoup: of Evangeliou (XVI **2032** 12, dated 540/541), of Megales Paroriou (XVI **2024** 12, dated 562/563), of Meskanouneos (**2032** 22) and of Skytalitidos (XVI **1916** 24). The first three of these places are listed in P. Iand. III 51 (see 9 n.) and Skytalitidos is immediately before, and Megales Paroriou follows immediately after, the reference there to πατριμουναλ(. It is possible that the Anoup in **2024** 12 may be the *pronoetes* in this papyrus; although the papyri are probably 9 or 10 years apart there is evidence for *pronoetai* holding office for longer periods than a year (see p. 212). As discussed at **026.1** n., *prostasiae* probably changed over time: see Mazza 2001, 101. Alternatively the *pronoetes* in **1916** may be the person named here.

9 τῶν αὐτῶν κτημάτων πατριμουναλίων. There must have been a reference to these lands earlier in the papyrus. See Introduction pp. 224-227 for a discussion of the meaning of this term.

10 τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου. This is a reference to the Apion household (**021.9** n.), which must have been referred to in the missing lines at the top of the document.

13-14 ὑποθέμενος αὐτῇ πάντα τὰ τε ἐμὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου τόπου ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἐνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ. Monks did not take a vow of poverty and were entitled to keep property which they owned when they joined a monastery, although not property acquired afterwards: see Gascou 1991, 1639 and Rémondon 1972, 257, 259-260. This might explain why the pledge is not of future possessions, which is common (as in for example **022.38**). Whether Anoup would have had

power to pledge any of the monastery's possessions would have depended on his position, but we know that monasteries could enter into commercial contracts such as purchases of wine (SB XXII 15595) and leases (P. Ross.- Georg. III 48, P. Strasb. VI 597), and that the archimandrite or another monk in a position of authority would enter into such contracts for them, so there would seem to be no reason in principle why such a pledge should not have been given. What is not at all clear is why there should have been such a pledge in this case: see pp. 227-228.

τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου τόπου. There must have been a reference to the monastery earlier in the papyrus, possibly described in these terms, possibly as a *koinobion* (as in 16).

16 κοινόβιον. A term for a monastery where monks shared a way of life; see **026.1** n.

ἄββᾶ Πέτρου. An abba Petros who was bishop of Oxyrhynchus is attested in XVI **1900** 5 (528) and PSI III 216.4 (534), while XVI **1967** 3 (427) attests an apa Petros. The absence of ἅγιος shows that this is not the apostle Peter. I have not found any other reference to this monastery, which is not listed by Papaconstantinou (2001).

18 Ἀπανακίου I have found only five attestations of this name in papyri, one of which, a river-man, is from the Apionic document LV **3804** (see 221 n.). Apart from the rarity of the name there is nothing to connect the two individuals.

19 τάξ(αντος) I have suggested this abbreviated form, to agree with αὐτοῦ in the previous line, following LXIII **4397** 226 (545).

20 Uictoros The writing is similar to the notarial subscription in XVI **1970** 33 (551) and may be the same hand. The symbols after *eteliothe* are identical to those at the end of **1970** except for the reference to ιδ at the end of that papyrus, where this papyrus has a christogram: see Diethart and Worp 1986, p. 83, Oxyrhynchites 15.1.1 and Plate 45.

21 The endorsement may have started and finished with a cross. The first word may have been ἀπόδει(ξις), like the dockets on XVI **1898** and **1993** and LVIII **3936**.

028 Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Castor

53 1B.26 (F)/C(B)b

18 x 8 cm

25th June to 24th July, 6th century

This receipt for 50 artabas of wheat is in the same format as **026**. A discussion of the nature and size of such payments is set out on pp. 206-211. **028** is interesting because of the reference to the *embole*, which suggests a tax context for the payment (3 n.).

028 contains part of three lines of text. The top and bottom margins are intact but probably some 10 or 12 letters are missing from both the start and the end of each line. The quantity of wheat would probably have been repeated at the end of l. 2, and the Oxyrhynchite era years, and either the word for month or the number of the day of the month, would probably have been stated at the beginning of l. 3, before Epeiph (as in **026**). The writing is large and regular and runs across the fibres. There is evidence of one vertical fold in the centre. There are two letters, the start of a docket, on the back.

1 [ἔδόθ(ησαν) δι(ὰ) ...c.6...] προ(νοητοῦ) Φάκρα (vac.) εἰς τὸ κοινόβι(ον) ἀββᾶ
Κάστορο[ς λόγῳ προσφορ(ᾶς)]

2 [ἔξ ἔθους καὶ ἐ]πὶ τῆς δ' ἰνδικτίονος) σίτου καγκ(έλλω) ἀρτάβας πεντήκοντα
γ[ί](νονται) [σί(του) κ(αγκέλλω) ἀρτά(βαι) ν μόν(ναι)

3 ... c.8 μη(νὶ)] Ἐπειφ ἰνδικτίονος) τρίτης (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) τετάρτης + (m. 2)
+γί(νονται) σί(του) κ(αγκέλλω) ἀρτ(άβαι) ν [μό(ναι)

Back, along the fibres:

σί(του)

1 πρὸ κοινοβς 2 ἰνδο καγκς 1. ἀρτάβαι 3 ἰνδο [symbol for υπερ] ἐμβολς γί σι κ αρτς 4 σί

“There were given by, *pronoetes* of Phakra, to the monastery of Abba Castor [on account of *prosphora*, by custom] in respect of the 4th indiction, 50 artabas of wheat by *cancellus* measure, that is [50 artabas of wheat only by *cancellus* measure. Oxyrhynchite era year, date] Epeiph, in the 3rd indiction on account of the *embole* of the 4th. Total: [50] artabas of wheat by *cancellus* measure [only.]”

1]προ(νοητοῦ) Φάκρα Restored following **026** and PSI I 89.1. Phakra is known from 14 published papyri dating from the 6th to 8th centuries, 12 of which have an Apionic connection. An unnamed *pronoetes* of Phakra is attested in XVI **2031** 9 and **2034** 6 and one named Victor in XVI **2035** 19-20 and **2243A** 62. Unfortunately there is no trace of the *pronoetes'* name here. Phakra was probably in the Lower toparchy (Gonis 2000 (4), 130) and the monastery of Abba Castor may have been located in that area too. On Phakra see Mazza 2001, 138, 184 and Benaissa 2009, 351-2.

τὸ κοινόβι(ον) ἀββᾶ Κάστορο[ς] This monastery has not been attested before. The title Abba is used mainly in monastic contexts and is a more elevated title than Apa (although there are examples of them being used interchangeably: see **031.1** n). We cannot tell whether Castor was the founder or the leader of the monastery or whether he was alive or dead. See **026.1** n. for the meaning of *abba* and of *koinobion*, Papaconstantinou 2001, 241, 242 and Derda and Wipszycka 1994, 28, 31, 32 and 44.

2-3 [λόγῳ προσφορ(ᾶς) καὶ ἐξ ἔθους] I have restored this following PSI I 89.2 (605), a receipt for a payment of 25 artabas of wheat made by a *pronoetes* of Terythis to the monastery of Abba Hermes in respect of the ninth indiction, which like this papyrus specifies that the payment is made on account of the *embole* (see 5 n.). LVIII **3936** 17-21 (598), a priest's receipt for salary which is an Apion document, refers to a payment on 5 May in the first (Oxyrhynchite) indiction of 11 artabas ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀψωνίου ἐξ ἔθους διδομέ(νου) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας προσφορ(ᾶς) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμβολῆς δευτέρας ἐπινεμήσεως. A payment ἐξ ἔθους προσφορᾶν was recorded at LXI **4131** 23 (600) and ὑπὲρ τῶν προσφορ(ῶν) at XVI **1906** 2, 9, 18. For other examples of payments by the Apion family to monasteries and churches being made ἐξ ἔθους or κατὰ τὸ ἔθος see XVI **1910** 2, XVIII **2196** 10, XIX **2243A** 75 and LV **3804** 144. In **027.6** the payment is described as πρ]ὸς τὸ ἔθος καὶ ὑπὲρ καρπῶν τῆς παρουσίας δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The second word here could alternatively be εὐσεβεί(ας) as in λόγῳ εὐσεβεί(ας) ἐξ ἔθ(ους) (καὶ) ἐπὶ τῆς θ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) (XVI **1921** 5 (561 or 621)). *Prosphora* often means the mass, but could also mean any pious gift: see p. 207. No reason for the payment was given in **026**.

ἐ]πὶ τῆς δ ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The word ἐπὶ before ἰνδ(ικτίονος) here, with the reference to ὑπὲρ ἐμβολ(ῆς) in l. 3, may show that the payment was made during the specified year or was in some way due in respect of it, and so may have been an annual one: see p. 210.

σί(του) καγκ(έλλω) ἀρτάβας πενήκοντα. This is not a particularly large amount of wheat for a monastery to receive; see pp. 206-207. For the meaning of *cancellus artabas* see **026.2 n.**

3 (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) τετάρτης The phrase ὑπὲρ ἐμβολῆς occurs in two other receipts for payments of wheat to a church and a monastery: LVIII **3936** 20, a longer form receipt, and PSI I 89.3 (not in the same hand: see Pap. Flor. XII Supp. Plate LV), which is in the same format as this one. *Embole* usually means corn-tax. There is no evidence for tax payments being made to monasteries other than the Metanoia, for onward transportation (see p. 207). The wheat paid in this papyrus was newly harvested and taxable in the 4th tax indiction year. For a discussion as to whether the references to *embole* here and in PSI I 89 and **3936** mean that the payment was in some way related to the tax system, see pp.210-211.

029 Receipt for ropes from the monastery of Abba Castor

53 1B.26(F)/D(9)a

29 x 8.5 cm.

17th November 549

029 acknowledges the receipt of ropes for two *saquiyyas* in the Apion mansion and grounds known as “Outside the Gate”. Ropes for this part of the Apion estate were also supplied from the monasteries of Abba Andrew (SB XVIII 14061) and Apa Hierax (LI **3640**). The recipient, Joseph, is described as καταμείν(αντι) and is probably the same person as in SB XVIII 14061 (see 1 n.). We have similar receipts for ropes from the monasteries of Abba Andrew (I **147** (556), XVI **2015** (555), SB XVIII 14061 and 14063 (both 556)) and Apa Hierax (LI **3640** (533)). Like this document and **030**, they give no indication whether any payment was made for the ropes or whether the monasteries in some way “belonged” to the estate-owner and so were required to produce ropes or other products for it without charge or as a *quid pro quo* for deliveries of wheat or other produce: see pp. 207-211 for a discussion on this aspect particularly in relation to bread-making.

The papyrus is the usual shape and lay-out for such receipts. The top, bottom and left margins are intact but some letters are missing from the end of lines 1 and 2 and there is a hole near the end of those lines where only traces of letters remain. The writing, against the fibres, is formal and like that of I **146** (555). There is evidence of one central vertical fold. The back is blank.

1+ ἐδόθη(σαν) δι(ὰ) τῶν μοναζ(όντων) {μοναζ(οντων)} μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀββᾶ
Κάστορος (vac.) Ἰωσήφ καταμείν(αντι) εἰς χρεῖ(αν) τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) .[] .[] .πιε.[

2 ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἐπὶ τῆς τρισκαιδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ὑδροπαροχί(ας) ἰδ
σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίω)ν ζυγ(ὸς) ἴς καὶ εἰς χρεῖ(αν) τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) τόπ(ου) Ἡλίου
σχοινί(ων)

3 ἦτοι κρικ(ίω)ν ζυγ(οὶ) δύο γί(νονται) σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίω)ν ζυγ(οὶ) γ μό(νοι)

(m. 2) γί(νονται) σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίω)ν ζυγ(οὶ) τρεῖς μό(νοι) (vac.)

4 (m. 1) (ἔτους) πκς ρΦε Ἀθὺρ κα ἰνδ(ικτίονος) τρισκαιδεκάτης

1 εδοθς δι μοναζζ μοναζζ μοναστηρ καταμεινς χρεῖ μηχς 2 ἰνδ υδροπαροχί ἰδ= σχοινί κρικ
ζυγς ἴς ἰ. εἴς χρεῖ μηχς τοπς 3 κρικ ζυγς γλ σχοινί κρικ ζυγς μὲ γλ σχοινί κρικ ζυγς μ 4
L ἰνδ

“There were given by the monks of the monastery of Abba Castor to Joseph, who stays there, for use of the *saquiya* Outside the Gate in the 13th indiction for the irrigation of the [crop of the] 14th one pair of ropes or coils and for use of the *saquiya* in the place of Elias two pairs of ropes or coils, that is 3 pairs of ropes or coils only. Total 3 pairs of ropes or coils only. Year 226 195 Hathur 21, 13th indiction.”

1 The second μοναζζ is written in error and has not been corrected by the scribe, who probably started to write the word for monastery and lost concentration.

μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀββᾶ Κάστρος. See 028.1 n. This is an example of μοναστήριον being used interchangeably with κοινόβιον.

Ἰωσήφ καταμείν(αντι) An individual of the same name and description was the recipient of ropes for a cistern in the same “Outside the Gate” estate in SB XVIII 14061.1 (556) and is probably the same person. Another receipt for ropes for a *saquiya* in the “Outside the Gate” estate, LI 3640 2 (533), is addressed to Phoibammon καταμείν(αντι). The word appears in (probably) the same form in only one other papyrus, XIX 2244, a schedule listing the supply of axles for *saquiyas*, where two individuals are respectively described as καταμειν() τοῦ βοηθ(οῦ) (l. 39) and καταμειν() τοῦ κόμ(ετος) Σχολαστικοῦ (l. 65). At XIX 2243A 18 (590), a list of receipts and expenditure, one of the payers is described as καταμ() ἀπὸ τ[ῆς αὐτῆς κώμ(ης)]; the reading is secure because of other lines which are complete. The usual meaning of καταμένειν is to be resident, but in all the cases which I have found of such use it is followed by ἐν or ἐπί or ἐνθάδε, and the meaning is clear. At 2243A 18 n., the editor suggested a comparison with the medieval Latin uses of *mansionarii* or *manentes*, which can mean serfs or clients, as well as people who stay on land belonging to someone else, a usage akin to that of παραμένειν (which can also mean “to serve”): see Du Cange *sv.* Fikhman had recognised that the word could not just mean “to be resident” in 2243A or 2244, in both of which it seemed to refer to an occupation or employment. In 2244, the employments were stated to be subordinate to a βοηθός (39) and to a κόμης Σχολαστικός (65), the latter of whom is attested in a number of papyri; these were the officials responsible for the relevant areas or aspects of the estate work. Noting that in 2244 most of the other recipients were described as γεωργοί, who in his view would have been *enapographoi* (see pp. 150, 152), Fikhman considered that καταμειν() must designate a different sort of occupancy, and suggested that members of the administration staff of the estate might have handed their plots over to dependents, rather than working them

themselves, with the estate's consent. These dependents, now sub-tenants, would have been termed καταμείναντες (Fikhman 1970 = Fikhman 2006, 42-47, *passim*). The editor of **3640** translated καταμείναντι as “sub-tenant (?)”, noting (at 2 n.) that it seemed to have some technical meaning that was not clear and following Fikhman's analysis (Fikhman 1970, 127-129 = Fikhman 2006, 42-44), which was also noted by Sijpesteijn in relation to SB XVIII 14061 (Sijpesteijn 1987 (1), 55). In a later article, Fikhman correctly refuted Cuvigny's suggestion (in BIFAO LXXXVIII (1988, 37-40)) that the word was an alternative spelling for καταμήνιος, meaning monthly-paid (Fikhman 1990 = Fikhman 2006 279-280), and noted but disagreed with Bonneau's view that when there was a *saquiya* run by a group of peasant farmers in a village community with some sort of independent status, the person in charge of the *saquiya* was described as καταμειν (ος?) (Bonneau 1970, 54). I think the answer is simpler than that, although Bonneau is right that the use is related to the *saquiya*. In four of the five papyri where the word appears, it is in connection with a *saquiya*, and in three of these (**029**, **3640** and SB 14061) that *saquiya* is in the grounds of the Apion private estate Outside the Gate; that may also be the case in **2244** but we cannot tell. There were γεωργοί on this private estate (see XVI **1913** 1, 7, 20), but I think it unlikely that they would have operated there as a village community; they would have lived in a nearby *epoikion* and come to this part of the estate to work on specified fields. Bonneau's explanation is therefore unlikely to be correct for these papyri. No *saquiya* is mentioned in connection with the person described as καταμ() at **2243A** 18, but in that papyrus most of the payers are described by name and location and can be presumed to be γεωργοί, while those with a named occupation (such as I believe this to be) are more likely to have had a different status: priest, *phrontistes*, carpenter, deacon. I think that the term καταμείνας has a distinct meaning when used in the context of a *saquiya*, possibly limited to usage on the Apion estate but more likely of general usage, and means an employee who was responsible for the *saquiya* and who was required to remain there, probably as a maintenance man or caretaker. We do not know his legal status but he may have been employed by a contract like that of the door-keeper (**021**) and may have lived close to the *saquiya*. There would have been a need for such an employee precisely where there were no γεωργοί using the *saquiya* for their own farming. It is possible that this is also the meaning in XVI **1889** 8, where a person may be described as καταμίνη τοῦ δημοσίου λουτροῦ, the public baths which must have used some form of water-lifting equipment (see **2243** 18 n.): Fikhman thought it was unlikely that these were the same type of workers but as described above he was assuming that the term referred to a type of tenancy (Fikhman

1970, 128 n. 5 = Fikhman 2006, 43 n. 5). Here Joseph is shown to be responsible for 2 *saquiyas*.

εἰς χρεῖ(αν) τῆς μηχαν(ανῆς) .[] .[] .πιε. Although a *mechane* is often used in this period to mean a piece of land, it is clear from the context that the reference here is to a *saquiya* or water-lifting equipment: see papyrus 01.12 n. I have been unable to decipher what follows the reference to the *mechane*: the third letter is a long upright which may be an *eta* or an *iota* or, more probably as there seems to be a stroke below as well as above the line, a *phi*, and there may be an abbreviation stroke before the *pi*. If that is correct, we would then have a final word beginning *πιε*, which could either be from *πιεῖν* or, more likely, a name such as *Πιεῦς*, *Πιεκός*, *Πιεσῆς*, *Πιεσοῦρις* or *Πιεσιῆς*, none of which is very common, but which might possibly be preceded by *γηδί(ου)* (as XIX 2244 3). It would be normal for *mechane*, when it means a *saquiya*, to be followed either by *καλουμένης* and its name, as in 2244 *passim*, or by where it is situated (as in l. 2 below, XVI 1913 21-22 and SB XVIII 14063.2-3) or what it irrigates (as in 2244 83-85, LI 3640 2, 030.1-2).

2 Ἐξω τῆς Πύλης This is the name for the *proastion* or principal mansion of the Apion estate and its surrounding grounds; see 021.19 n., Mazza 2001, 84-87, Benaissa 2009, 249. It is attested in at least ten other papyri. XVI 1913 19, 21-23 (an undated list of expenditure on the estate) refers to six unnamed *saquiyas* there, in addition to another in Pkemroch nearby, which Mazza thinks was also on that part of the estate (Mazza 2001, 86). There may have been another three there too, plus one on the boundary (1913 16-18). *Saquiyas* on this part of the Apion estate are also mentioned in LI 3640 2 and SB XVIII 14061.2.

ὑδροπαροχί(ας) ἰδ This is a reference to the irrigation year, which was defined by reference to the harvest for which the irrigation was to be provided, which in turn was defined by the fiscal indiction year in which it was to be taxed. The irrigation year was therefore always one year ahead of the Oxyrhynchite era or indiction year. Bonneau cites examples of its use from 528 (XVI 1900) to 601 (XVI 1991; see BL VIII 145 for revised date): see Bonneau 1993, 216-220.

ζυγ(ός) (ε)ῖς Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, gives masculine, feminine and neuter forms of ζυγ(); the following word (ε)ῖς shows that the masculine is used here and so I have assumed that form and its plural ζυγοί throughout the papyrus. The neuter form, whose first meaning given by Preisigke is “pair”, is used in the same context as in this papyrus in SB XVIII 14063, a receipt for ropes ζυγ(όν) ἐν ἡμῖσι. As suggested at LI 3640 4 n., with reference

also to XVI **2015** 3-4, the fact that no length is specified indicates that a *σχοινίον* and a *κρίκιον* were of a standard length. For *ζυγός* Preisigke gives four meanings: yoke, the constellation Libra, scales and a coin measure or scale, but not “pair”. The feminine form is the least common, with a single meaning “pair”.

τῆς μηχανῆς τόπ(ου) Ἡλίου This *saqiya* is mentioned in SB XVIII 14061.2 where it is clear that it is in “Outside the Gate”. *τόπος* has a range of meanings, including a place of habitation (see Husson 1983, 276-7) and a monastery (see Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, I f) or church (Papaconstantinou 2001, 269-70). There was a monastery of a similar name in the Arsinoite nome (SB 1 3973), but I have not found any reference to a monastery or church of Elias in Oxyrhynchus, and I think it unlikely that one would have been located in the grounds of the family mansion. Here there is nothing to connect it with religious use and it probably means house.

030 Receipt for ropes from the monastery of Abba Castor

13 1B.132 D(a)

32.5 x 8 (max) cm

6th September 583

030 contains a receipt for ropes for use in an irrigation machine in a riding stable and for the circus horses of the Blues, one of the two main chariot-racing Colours known throughout the Empire. See pp. 128-133 for a brief history and description of the sport. The βαδιστικὸν στάβλον suggests a connection with the Apion family and several papyri attest payments by or on behalf of that family in respect of horses used in chariot-racing for both Blues and Greens (2 n.). Gascou uses this evidence of donations to both sides as support for his theory that the payments were not made voluntarily but were effectively taxation, and that the major land-holders had to fund the circus in the same way as the baths and the post (Gascou 1976, 192-195=2008, 56-59: see pp. 131-135 above), but I do not think this is conclusive. καὶ τῶν ἵππων in l. 2 indicates that the Blues' horses were not actually in the Apions' stable but **030** shows that they must have been kept near it, as a single *saqiya* provided water for both. This suggests that the Apions' stable was near the hippodrome (2 n.). Like **029**, this receipt gives no indication whether any payment was made for the ropes.

The papyrus is the same shape and has the same layout as **029**. The writing is against the fibres, regular and thin, in black ink, and the main hand resembles the formal hand in the preceding papyrus. All four margins are intact. The papyrus was folded three times vertically. The back is blank.

1+ἐδόθη) δι(ὰ) τῶν μοναζ(όντων) τοῦ κοινοβίου ἀββᾶ Κάστορος (*vac.*) εἰς
χρεί(αν) τῆς μηχανῆς ἀρδευούσης)

2 εἰς τὸ βαδιστικ(όν) στάβλ(ον) καὶ τῶν ἵππ(ων) τοῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενέτων
σχοινία τοῦ λάκκ(ου) ἦτοι κρίκιον

3 ἔν, γί(νεται) σχοιν(ιον) ἦτοι κρίκ(ιον) α μό(νον) (*m.* 2) +γί(νεται) σχοιν(ιον)
ἦτοι κρίκ(ιον) ἔν μό(νον)

4 (*m.* 1) + σξ σκθ Θῶθ θ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) δευτέρ(ας) +

1 εδοθς δι μοναζζ χρεί μηχαν αρδευουσης 2 βαδιστικ σταβλ ιππς ιππικ μερ λακκ 3 εν γι σχοινς
κρικ μο/ γι σχοιν' κρικ μο 4 θ ινθ δευτερ

“There was given by the monks of the coenobitic monastery of Abba Castor, for the use of the *saquiya* for irrigation in the riding stable and of the horses of the hippodrome which belong to the Blues, one cistern rope or coil, that is one rope or coil only. Total: one rope or coil only. [Year] 260 229 Thoth 9, second indiction.”

1 κοινοβίου ἀββᾶ Κάστορος See **028.1** n. above.

τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) ἀρδευούσ(ης) I have not found ἀρδεύω used elsewhere in this precise context, although ἄρδευσις appears in one Apion papyrus, XVI **1913** 3 (?555); the usual verb would be ἀντλέω, as in LI **3640** 2-3 (τὴν μηχ(ανὴν) ἀντλοῦσαν εἰς τὸ μικρ(ὸν) πωμάρ(ιον)) or XVI **1900** 13 (ἀντλοῦσαν εἰς ἄμπελον), which may however apply only when irrigation of land is concerned. See Bonneau 1993, 212-216.

2 τὸ βαδιστικ(ὸν) στάβλ(ον) This expression appears in only three published papyri: I **138** 10, 12, 17 (610-11), a contract for hire of a person to be in charge of that stable, who was required *inter alia* to provide mounts for senior administrative staff, I **146** 1-2 (555), a receipt for hay brought to the monastery of Abba Andrew from the landlord’s (γεουχικός) barn by the stableman of the βαδιστικὸν στάβλον, and LV **3804** 225, 226 (566), accounts of a steward on the Apion estate which show payment for animals and fodder. βαδιστικός is used to describe animals used for long-distance travel, or articles associated therewith (Gascou 1985, 57=2008, 180). I believe that in **030**, βαδιστικὸν στάβλον means the private stable of the Apion family, as it clearly does in **138** and **3804**. Ruffini, relying on the fact that the stable-hand in **146** (15 November 555) and the one appointed by Flavius Serenus in **140** (26 April 550) were both called Serenus, suggested that Flavius Serenus may have been the landlord of the monastery of Abba Andrew and that it was by his stable-hand and from his barn that hay was delivered to that monastery in **146**, but I think that is unlikely to be correct: the stable of Flavius Serenus is not described as βαδιστικός in **140** but as the stable from which the ὄξυς δρόμος or *cursus velox* is being operated (ll. 7 and 12), while from I **138** 9-10 it is clear that in the case of the Apions their own riding stable and that of the postal service were distinct even if they were employing a single person to run both at that time. The monastery of Abba Andrew was connected with the Apions (see **026.1** n.) and I think that in **146** 1-2 the reference to the stable is also to the Apions’ stable. See Ruffini 2008, 67-69 and on the βαδιστικὸν στάβλον Hardy 1931, 106-108 and Gascou 1985, 56-57=2008, 179-180 who explained the operation of the *cursus velox* as in effect a *munus* fulfilled by different landowners at different times. The delivery of ropes in

SB XVIII 14063 (19 June 556) was to the *cursus velox* stable; we do not know who was running it at that date but it may have been Flavius Serenus, or the Apions, or another major estate-owner. Mazza thought that the riding stable may have been near Apelle and Paciac (Mazza 2001, 88, citing LV **3804** 226) but this papyrus suggests that it was near the hippodrome, as it shared the use of a *saguiya* with the Blues' horses and they would have been stabled close to it. The "Outside the Gate" *proastion* (**021.19** n.) was also near the hippodrome and it is logical that the stables would have been convenient for the family and the senior officials whose mounts were kept there (who would probably have lived in the city).

τῶν ἵππ(ων) τοῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενέτων For ἵππικός as a noun meaning hippodrome, see LXXVII **5120** 3 n. and for its location in Oxyrhynchus see pp. 134-135. Four papyri evidence payments by the Apions or their staff in support of the hippodrome or circus. Only one refers to the Greens: I **145** 1-2 (552) contains a receipt for a payment by the Apion banker Anastasius for an embrocation εἰς χρεῖαν τῶν ἵππων τοῦ δημοσί(ου) κίρκου μέρ(ους) Πρασίνων. The others refer to the Blues: I **152** 2 τοῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενέτων, PSI VIII 953.42 εἰ[ς χρεῖ(αν) τῶν ἵππ() τοῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενάιτ(ων) (see also 61, 77, 91), XXVII **2480** 10 εἰς βροχ(ήν) τῶν ἵππέων [τ]οῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενέτων (see also 28, 82, 83, 90, 96, 97, 98, 100, 106, 108, 118). In papyri, μέρος or part (Latin *pars*) is the word commonly used to designate the different Colours; as Cameron pointed out, this was not the same as the Latin *factio*, which meant the performers (Cameron 1976, 13-15). There has been scholarly debate over whether its use in the racing context has a specific meaning, possibly geographic (as it clearly has in the Heracleopolite papyri such as P. Ross. Georg. III 56, where it is used with *laura*: see references at Gascou 1976, 196 n. 1= 2008 59 n. 37). Gascou believed that the use of μέρος in this context in the Apion documents, which he termed "parafiscal", was only to indicate for internal record-keeping purposes for which side expenditure was incurred (Gascou 1976, 199=2008, 61). This is consistent with the view that by the 6th century racing was organised by one entity which supplied teams wearing different colours, such that those teams had come to be considered as parts of a whole (see p. 130); if there was only one entity there would be no external reason for the payer to specify to which side a payment had been made, and if the circus was funded by "taxation" one would have expected taxation payments to be made generically to "the circus", to be apportioned by the management between the teams. I can accept that references in Apion records such as **030** to payments being for one Colour or the other were for internal record-keeping purposes, part of the detailed financial

accounting of the officials who were recording expenditure, but I am not convinced that the payments were by way of tax or allowable against tax. One wonders how the cost of the ropes in this papyrus would have been split between private and public uses. I believe these Apion payments were more likely voluntary. See pp. 131-133. Whether or not there was a single organisation which organised the racing, it is clear from **030** that the horses of the two Colours were kept separately.

λάκκου The cistern or underground reservoir of a *saqiya*: see LXVI **4537** Introduction, **4538** and Bonneau 1993, 56-61.

031 Order to the monastery of Abba Castor to supply ropes

30 4 B.35/H(1-2)d

24.5 x 6.5 cm.

6th century

This papyrus contains an order to the archimandrite of the monastery of Apa Castor to supply ropes to a *saquiya*, the location of which is not clear.

The top margin is intact, but the others are damaged. About 6 letters may be missing from the end of l. 2, and some 10 letters are missing from the start and possibly from the end of l.4. There may (but I think it unlikely) have been another line of text at the bottom. The writing is against the fibres and large and untidy. There are some letters on the back of the papyrus, which are not Greek, some of which may be Coptic.

1

+

2 +τ[ϙ̄] εύλαβεστάτω ἄπα [[α]] Παύλω ἀρχ(ιμανδρίτη) μοναστηρ(ίου) ἄπα
Κάστορος Ἀνοῦπ νο[τάριος

3 παράσχου εἰς χρείαν τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) καλούμ(ενης) Χοιριδίων σεν.ειτο.() Ψαι[

4 [. . . . c.10 . . .].. σχοιν(ιον) α μό(νον) (m. 2) Τῦβι κδ ια ἰν[δ(ικτίονος) [

1 αρχς μοναστηρ̄ 2 μηχς καλουμς 3 σχοινς ϙ̄/

“

+

To the most pious Apa Paul, archimandrite of the monastery of Apa Castor, from Anoup notary. Provide for use of the *saquiya* called “of the Piglets” Psaei one rope only. 24th Tubi, 11th indiction....”

2 εύλαβεστάτω A common epithet for a man of the church: see 027.2 n.

ἄπα [[α]] Παύλω ἀρχ(ιμανδρίτη) The scribe probably started to write ἄπα again in error. An Apa Paul at Oxyrhynchus is known from P. Wash. Univ. II 89 (6th century), an undated list of payments. Archimandrite was a term for the leader of a monastery: see Cabrol and Leclercq *s.v.*, Schmelz 2002, 163. Sometimes an archimandrite was also described as a priest or deacon but the usage is equally frequent without and there is no reason to suppose that this Paul was a lay person. See also 028.1 n. and 029.1 n.

μοναστηρ(ίου) ἄπα Κάστορος The use of Apa rather than Abba, as in the other four papyri which refer to this monastery, may be an error on the part of the writer, who had already written apa once, and probably started to write it twice, in the same line. Apa is considered to be a less prestigious title than Abba, but there are examples of both being used to describe a bishop, and of each being used in relation to the monastery of Titkois, which is sometimes called Apa and sometimes Abba Apollo (Derda and Wipscycka 1994, 31, 33, 38-39).

Ἄνοῦπ νο[τάριος An Anoup *notarius* employed by the Apions is attested at LXI **4131** 29-30 (600).

3 Χοιριδίων ρεν.ειτο .() Ψαι[I have not seen any other reference to this *saqiya*, whose name suggests that there was a pig farm on the estate, and have been unable to work out what follows Χοιριδίων. The sign before Psaei may be the abbreviation for ὑπέρ.

Alternatively it could be a letter with an abbreviation stroke; *pi* would give τόπ(), but that form of *pi* is not used in the rest of the document. A *ketema* called Psaei is attested in one published papyrus, XVIII **2197** 34, 39, an account of bricks: it is on the Apion estate and has a *saqiya* (see Benaissa 2009, 368). If that is meant here (and there are no traces of any following letters), then ὑπέρ is wrong. There is also a name, Psaeis, the genitive of which is either Ψάειτος (X **1299** (4th century)) or Ψαείου (LXVIII **4686** (440)). After the name of the *mechane*, I would expect either its function or location, or an alternative name.

032 List of payments of money

7 1B.217/C(b)

16.5 x 18.5 cm

early 7th century?

This papyrus records payments in money through a number of persons or institutions, including senior provincial officials and churches. There were over forty churches in 6th century Oxyrhynchus: see Antonini 1940, 172-183, XI **1357** and LXVII **4617-23**. **032** is similar to XVI **2020** and **2040**, both of which undated 6th century papyri list payments by or on behalf of a variety of individuals and institutions, including, at **2020** 16 and 38, the holy church and the monastery of Musaeus. Payers and payments of tax (*arcarica*) are recorded in **2020** and **2040** lists contributions to a public bath. The list in P. Lond. V 1762 (see BL VII, p 193, BL X p 108, cf LXVII **4618** 12 n.) is similar: it was described as a list of expenses from the 6th or 7th century, although it may have been a record of payments made—as here, each line starts with $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$. Unlike in **2020** and **2040**, none of the persons named in this papyrus is given an honorific epithet, while some are identified by a patronymic and others by a position held. A number of the officials were probably resident in Oxyrhynchus, but the inclusion of the Bishop of Theodosiopolis (l. 5) suggests that the payments were made in respect of property in Oxyrhynchus. The largest payments are the 35 *solidi* and 8 carats paid by Philoxenus on behalf of the heirs of Kyria (l. 13) and 30 *solidi* paid by the monastery of Abba Castor; all others which are legible are less than 20 *solidi*.

The papyrus is undated. The use of the small circle as an abbreviation for *nomismata* in many of the lines suggests a later date than the other papyri in this group: see Gonis 2001, 119.

The left margin is intact but the top and bottom are missing, and there is no title to indicate why the payments were being made, or to whom. All the lines except 5, 8 and 9 have been crossed out, possibly by someone who was crossing off payments which had been made or who was annotating the list for use at a later period. There is a *kollesis* on the right with traces at the end of lines 2 (and possibly 11) of letters which seem to belong to another document or column, and the crossing-out lines go over the join. The writing is with the fibres. There is writing on the back which I have not read and which also goes across the *kollesis*.

1 δ(ιὰ) κλ(ηρονόμων) Κολλούθου χαρτουλαρ(ίου)	(νομ.)ι (κερ.) ις
2 δ(ιὰ) Φοιβάμμωνος Φαβ..	(νομ.)θ ς . . . έσχ[
3 δ(ιὰ) τῆς ἀγί(ας) Ἀναστάσεως	[...] . . . [
4 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Μάρκου	(νομ.)ι [
5 δ(ιὰ) κλ(ηρονόμων) τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Θεοδοσ(ι)ουπόλεως	(νομ.) ε (κερ.) .[
6 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ μον(αστηρίου) ἀββᾶ Κάστορος	(νομ.) λ (κερ.) π
7 δ(ιὰ) Γεωργίου νουμεραρίου	(κερ.)ι [
8 δ(ιὰ) κλ(ηρονόμων) Σερήνου σχολ(αστικοῦ) Συγκλητικῆς	(κερ)ι ν[
9 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ κόμ(ε)τος Ἀπφοῦ(τος) . . .ει χαρτ(ουλαρί..)	[. .] (κερ.) .[
10 δ(ιὰ) Κοσμᾶ ἀρχιάτρου	(κερ.) .
11 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ εὐλαβεστ(άτου) Κομητᾶ	(κερ.) β[
12 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ ἀγί(ου) Ἱερημίου	(νομ) αγ' (κερ.)ι[
13 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ σχολ(αστικοῦ) Φιλοξένου (ὑπὲρ) κλ(ηρονόμων) Κυρίας	(νομ.) λε
(κερ.) η	
14 δ(ιὰ)] . ο κ() τῆ(ς) ἀγί(ας) Μαρίας	..(κερ) γ

1 δ κλ` χαρτουλαρ 2 δ 3 δ αγι 4 δ αγι 5 δ κλ Θεοδοσουπολεως 6 δ μον` 7 δ 8 δ κλ σχολ
 1. Συγκλητικῆς 9 δ κομ` απφου` χαρτς 10 δ 11 δ ευλαβεστς 12 δ αγι 13 δ σχολ` (υπερ)
 κλ` 14 κ τῆ αγι

“ 1 Through the heirs of Kollouthis, <i>chartularius</i>	<i>sol.</i> 10, carats 16
Through Phoibammon son of Phab . .	<i>sol.</i> 9½ [
Through the holy Resurrection	xxxx
Through St Mark's	<i>sol.</i> 10
5 Through the heirs of Bishop of Theodosiupolis	<i>sol.</i> 5, carats [
Through the monastery of Abba Castor	<i>sol.</i> 30, carats 6[.]
Through George <i>numerarius</i>	carats 10, n[

Through the heirs of Serenus lawyer of Sinclitice	carats ..
Through count Appheus,, <i>chartularius</i>	. xx. , carats [
10 Through Cosma, chief physician	carats [
Through the most pious Cometas	carats 2
Through St Jeremiah's	<i>sol.</i> 13 carats 10 [
Through the lawyer Philoxenus, on behalf of the heirs of Kyria	<i>sol.</i> 35 carats 8
Through the of Saint Mary	carats 3 [."'

1 χαρτουλαρ(ίου) Usually translated as secretary, such officials could work either for a large estate like the Apions' (I **136, 138**) or possibly (in PSI VIII 894 a *scholasticus* had a *chartularius*) in the public sector. It is not entirely clear how senior they were: see XVI **1844** Introduction for the suggestion that the position was senior to the ἀντιγεοῦχος but in **136** 17 a *chartularius* was supervising a *pronoetes* who was at a lower level in the estate hierarchy. The seniority probably depended on the level and status of the person for whom the *chartularius* worked; see 9 n. Some were clearly senior and combined a number of roles, like George in XVI **1860** v. a *comes*, *chartularius* and *dioecetes*, Sergius in LVIII **3942** 7-8 (*chartularius* and *riparius* and Theodorus in I **156** 6 (*chartularius* and *anti-geouchos*).

έσχ[It is not clear how this word fits in; it may be from a different document.

3 τῆς ἁγί(ας) Ἀναστάσεως A church of the Holy Resurrection at Oxyrhynchus is attested at XXVII **2478** 8 (595 or 596), a deed of surety. The editor pointed out that the same term is used of the Easter festival (see PSI VIII 953.56 and XXVII **2480** 84, both of which record payments of wine to prisoners over the festival) but here as in **2478** the name of a church is clearly meant.

5 τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Θεοδοσ(ι)ουπόλεως. Theodosiopolis was named after Theodosius I (379-395) or II (402-450). There were two Theodosiopolite districts, and two cities called Theodosiopolis, in Egypt in late antiquity, one in Arcadia, part of the old Arsinoite nome in the Fayum, and the other further south in the Lower Thebaid, in the northern part of the old Hermopolite nome. The location of the Fayum Theodosiopolis is not clear. In an appendix to CPR XIV 9 (pp. 41-48), analysing a group of papyri which refer to the Arsinoite and Theodosiopolite pagarchy, which is attested between 556 and 622, Fantoni suggested that Theodosiopolis was a later name for Tebtunis, in the Fayum. Although

Hickey wrote that Fantoni “fantasised”, he admitted that he could not put forward any alternative, noting that only one published Theodosiopolite papyrus (Stud. Pal. VIII 1091) referred to the city of Theodosiopolis as opposed to the nome, the *enoria* or the pagarchy combined with the Arsinoite (Hickey 2008 (2), 136-137). The Fayum Theodosiopolite territory is mentioned in LI **3636** 2, a list of tax accounts from nine “territories” in Arcadia, where it is listed after the Arsinoite. Rea, the editor, notes that this list corresponds to the list of nine cities of Arcadia in Hierocles (*Synecdemus* 729.1-730.4: mid-5th century) and a similar list in George of Cyprus (*Descriptio Orbis Romani* 744-751a: probably late 6th or early 7th century). The Hermopolite Theodosiopolis, now Ἱαῖα al-Aʿmida, is probably the former **Τουω Πασκω** (see Drew-Bear 1979, 48; Timm 1994, 2456-2461; Gonis 2003 (2), 178-9). It appears under the Thebaid in Hierocles (730.7) and George of Cyprus (763). Timm (1994) lists at pp. 2456 ff known bishops of the Hermopolite Theodosiopolis; he does not cite any evidence of a bishop of the Fayum town of the same name. A bishop of Theodosiopolis called Phoibammon appears in the Hermopolite tax list P. Sorb II 69, at 18.7 and 20.37 (618-619?). For the Fayum Theodosiopolis see Fantoni at CPR XIV 9, App. (pp 41-48), Timm 1994, 2630-2631 and Hickey 2008 (2). For the Hermopolite Theodosiopolis see Drew-Bear 1979, 48, Timm 1994, 2454-2460 and Gonis 2003 (2). For both cities see Rea at **3636** 2 n. Oxyrhynchus was the metropolis of the province of Arcadia (see references at LV **3805** 59 n.) but it is unlikely that this account would have recorded payments from individual taxpayers in respect of liabilities in other nomes, since payments were recorded on a nome-by-nome basis, as in **3636**. This bishop’s heir (who I think was bishop of the Hermopolite city) was probably making the payment listed here because of property owned in Oxyrhynchus.

6 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ μου(αστηρίου) ἀββᾶ Κάστορος. See **029**.1n.

7 νομειάρχου A *numerarius* was an official with a financial function, particularly related to taxation, who operated at the level of the *dux* or *praeses*, where there was a single *numerarius*, or the augustal prefect, where there were several (P. Wash. Univ. I 7 Introduction, P. Wash Univ. II 88.7 n., Rouillard 1928, 43-44 and 51, Lallemand 1964, 75). Rouillard suggested that where an area had the right of *autopragia* there might also be a *numerarius* at village level (Rouillard 1928, 106). A *numerarius* τῶν χρυσικῶν and a *numerarius* τῆς κριθῆς are attested in P. Iand. III 45 2-3 (6th or 7th century). Daris (1960, 245) gives a list of references, to which add, in addition to those mentioned above, P. Haun. III 58.20, P. Mich. XI 624.26,

XVI **2004** 2, P. Sorb. II 69 103.16, 23.40, 130D.5, 58.40 and 119A10, SB XIV 11992.3, XVIII 13758.38 and XX 14558.5 and 15019.7.

8 Σερήνου σχολ(αστικοῦ) Συγκλητικῆς A *scholasticus* was a lawyer or legal adviser. Usually translated as clerk, that implies too low a status; according to Claus they belonged to the leading circles in the provinces: some worked for the *praeses* or the prefect of Egypt (P. Mich XI 624.30 n., citing Claus 1965, 136). The term is sometimes combined with ἔκδικος or *defensor civitatis* (Oxyrhynchite examples are XVI **1882** 1 (with the same individual at **1883.1** (504) and **1885** 1(509)) and PSI VII 790.2 (6th century)), and frequently appears with the epithets σοφώτατος or ἔλλογιμώτατος. Although there are many references to them in published papyri (a DDBDP search in July 2011 revealed over 150), many (like **032**) show them as parties to contracts or as payers in a list with others and do not cast light on their functions. See Rouillard 1928, 151 and 156, Lallemand 1964, 115, Claus 1965 160 and *passim*. Serenus is described here as *scholasticus* συγκλητικῆς. The term *syncreticus* means of senatorial rank (as in LXXIII **4966** (371), its only appearance in published papyri) but the present papyrus has a noun with a feminine ending, rather than an adjective describing Serenus. The name Syncretice appears in one published papyrus, LIX **4004** 14 (5th century), a letter of condolence which mentions a number of items of clothing including a tunic belonging to a person of that name. A Saint called Syncretice, who was born in Alexandria, is known from Vita Sanctae Syncreticae (PG28, 1486 -1553) and from the Apothegmata Patrum περὶ τῆς ἀμμᾶς Συγκλητικῆς (PG 65, 422-427); see Chapa 1998, 11.14 n at pages 146-7, who suggests that the person in the letter may have been named after the saint. See Rowlandson 1998, 158.14 n., for other references to the name. The context here might have suggested that there was a shrine or church in the name of Syncretice at Oxyrhynchus, but I would have expected an epithet such as ἄμα or τῆς ἀγίας in that case, and I do not think that this can be taken as evidence of a church of that name in Oxyrhynchus. This line must be a reference to a lawyer who is representing a previously unattested (and presumably wealthy) lady called Syncretice; whether he was in permanent employment or a professional in private practice is not clear. This would support Roueché's belief that the term *scholasticus* indicates a professional qualification rather than an official title (Roueché 1989, 76-77). I have been unable to find any other examples where a person so described is clearly privately employed, although Claus suggests that the three *scholastici* who wrote I **128** may have been privately engaged by the *chartularius* who is described there as wanting to resign (Claus 1965, 155), and P. Lond. V 1797 may also reflect a private position (see P. Bingen 129). The *scholasticus* who was paid

wine ὑπὲρ ὄψωνίου by the Apions at XXVII 2480 63 may have been employed by them, unlike those who were paid λόγ(ω) φιλοτιμ(ίας) in XVI 1913 14, 54, 56, but the Apions may have been paying him in an official, quasi-public capacity. The *scholasticus* in l. 13 below was probably also in private employ. PSI VII 790 (546) is a petition addressed to a Serenus who was a *enlogiotatos scholasticus* and *ekdikos* of the city of Oxyrhynchus but that papyrus is much earlier than this one.

9 κόμ(ετος) Ἄπφοῦ(τος) ...ει χαρτ(ουλαρί. .) Arphous was a count and, although I cannot read the letter immediately following, it seems clear that he either was or had been a *chartularius*. The title was frequently held by a *dioecetes*, a senior estate official (Mazza 2001, 137), but could also be held by a *chartularius*, some of whom were more senior than others: see 1 n. It was probably an honorific which entitled the holder to be addressed as περιβλεπτος or *spectabilis* (see Hornickel 930, 31-33). George in XVI 1860 *v.* was a κόμης χαρτουλαρίος καὶ διοικητής. Arphous may have been at a higher level than Kollouthos (1.1).

10 ἀρχιάτρου This word appears in a number of papyri from the 1st century BC (SB I 5216, from the Fayum) to the late 6th or 7th century (I 126 (572) and VIII 1108, a list of “minor officials”). Originally it meant a royal doctor or personal physician to a ruler, but later it came to mean a public doctor, as in this papyrus. See P. Oslo II 53.1n, Nutton 1977, 193, 212-215 and Samama 2003, 42-45. Samama (2003, 45) suggests that in Egypt until the 5th century it meant the imperial doctors, in contrast to the municipal δημόσιοι ἰατροί. See CPR XIII, p 99, for references, to which add BGU XVII 2720.1, P. Sorb. II 69.10.17, 11.35, 20.61, 92.8, 67D3, 117C3, (where Gascou translates it (p. 79) as “médecin public attaché à la cite”) and O. Ashm. Shelt. 75.1.

11 εὐλαβεστ(άτου) This signifies a man of the church: see 027.2 n.

12 τοῦ ἁγίου Ἱερημίου This church may have been attested in XI 1357 46: see Papaconstantinou 1996 at 1357 46.

13 δ(ιὰ) τοῦ σχολ(αστικοῦ) Φιλοξένου. For the meaning of *scholasticus* see 8 n. This is the only item in the list where the name of a person making a payment on behalf of heirs has been given and is another example of a lawyer who has been privately engaged.

κλ(ηρονόμων) Κυρίας This is probably the Flavia Cyria known from several fifth century papyri: SB XVIII 13958 (probably 468/9), XXXIV **2724** (469), P. Lond. V 1798 (470), XVI **1947** (assigned to 471), XVI **2003** (assigned to 472), LXXII **4917** (473) and CPR VII 24 (undated). She was described as λαμπροτάτη (**1947** 1, **4917** 3), a title which she may have acquired by marriage to a man with that social standing or birth to a father of higher rank (Beaucamp 1992, 138-9). Her estates were large enough to require a *pronoetes* (**1947** 1) and a *procurator* (CPR VII 24.5 with and BL VIII 110). The dates of those papyri do not help us to date this one; Cyria is unlikely to have lived beyond the 5th century. Her estate must not have been divided between the heirs for many years but this may not have been unusual; LV **3805**, dated after 566, mentions at l.12 the heirs of Ioannes son of Timagenes, who was dead by 489 (see **027** Introduction pp. 221-222). See Gasco 1972 (2), 248-250, Beaucamp 1992, 402, Gonis 2002, 86-88, **4917** 3 n. and Ruffini 2008, 44-49.

14 τῆ(ς) ἀγί(ας) Μαρίας A church called “of the Holy Mary” at Oxyrhynchus is attested in LXXI **4833** 3-4 (516), part of a lease, XI **1357** 30, 45 (re-edited in Papaconstantinou 1996), a liturgical calendar covering five months in 535-536, I **147** 1 (556), a receipt for ropes for use in the *saqiya* in its garden for filling the font, and XVIII **2197** 11 (6th century, undated), an account of bricks used for cisterns. That the Christmas and Dormition festivals are to be celebrated there, as specified in **1357** (see 30 n. and 45 n.), suggests that it is a church of the Virgin and not of another saint called Mary. The use of the name Mary rather than θεότοκος may indicate that at this time the Egyptian church regarded Mary like any other saint rather than according her a higher or special status (Papaconstantinou 2000, 92). This reference is unlikely to be to the church of Ama Maria mentioned in P. Wash. Univ. 1.6 or the monastery at LXVII **4620** 28. Mary is the most frequently attested name for a church in Egypt; there may have been as many as 26. See generally Papaconstantinou 2000, 84, 92.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams 2007** C. E. P. Adams, *Land Transport in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 2007
- Amelotti and Luzzatto 1972** M. Amelotti and G. I. Luzzatto, *Le costituzioni giustiniane nei papiri e nelle epigrafi*, Milan 1972
- Antonini 1940** L. Antonini, “Le chiese cristiane nell’Egitto dal IV al IX secolo secondo i documenti dei papiri greci”, *Aegyptus* 20 (1940) 129-208
- Aubert 1995** J.-J. Aubert, “Policing the countryside: soldiers and civilians in Egyptian villages in the third and fourth centuries A.D.”, in Y. Bohec and M. Dondin-Payre (eds.) *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l’Armée sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 1995, 257-265
- Avogadro 1935** S. Avogadro, “Le ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΑΙ di proprietà nell’ Egitto greco-romano”, *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 131-206
- Azzarello 2006** G. Azzarello, “P. Oxy. 2039 e la nascita della *domus gloriosa* degli Apioni”, *ZPE* 155 (2006) 207-228
- Azzarello 2007** G. Azzarello, “Vecchi e nuovi personaggi della famiglia degli Apioni nei documenti papiracei”, *Pap. Congr. XXV* (2007) I 33-46
- Azzarello and Gonis 2009** G. Azzarello and N. Gonis, “P. Stras. VIII 800: lettere ad un pronoetes della *domus divina*”, *ZPE* 171 (2009) 211-212
- Bagnall 1985** R. S. Bagnall, “Agricultural productivity and taxation in Later Roman Egypt”, *TAPA* 115 (1985) 289-308
- Bagnall 1993 (1)** R.S.Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993
- Bagnall 1993 (2)** R. S. Bagnall, “Slavery and society in Late Roman Egypt”, in B. Halpern and D. Hobson (eds.) *Law, Politics and Society in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Sheffield 1993, 220-240
- Bagnall and Frier 2006** R. S. Bagnall and B. W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt*, 2nd ed. Cambridge 2006
- Bagnall and Rathbone 2004** R. S. Bagnall and D. W. Rathbone (eds.), *Egypt from Alexander to the Copts*, London 2004
- Banaji 1998** J. Banaji, “Discounts, weight standards, and the exchange rate between gold and copper: insights into the monetary process of the sixth century”, *Atti dell’Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana XII Consegno internazionale* 1998, 183-202
- Banaji 1999** J. Banaji, “Agrarian history and the labour organisation of Byzantine large estates”, in A. K. Bowman and E. Rogan (eds.) *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times*, (PBA 96), Oxford 1999, 193-216

- Banaji 2007** J. Banaji, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity*, 2nd ed. Oxford 2007
- Barison 1938** P. Barison, “Ricerche sui monasteri dell’Egitto bizantino ed arabo”, *Aegyptus* 18 (1938) 29-148
- Battaglia 1981** E. Battaglia, “*Artos*” *Il lessico della panificazione dei papyri greci*, Milan 1989
- Beaucamp 1990, 1992** J. Beaucamp, *Le statut de la femme à Byzance, 4e -7e siècle*, Paris: Vol I 1990, Vol II 1992
- Beaucamp 2007** J. Beaucamp, “Byzantine Egypt and imperial law”, in R. Bagnall (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*, Cambridge 2007, 271-287
- Benaissa 2007** A. Benaissa, “An Estate Overseer’s Work Contract and the Meaning of *Exotikoi Topoi*”, *BASP* 44 (2007) 75-86
- Benaissa 2009** A. Benaissa, *Rural Settlements of the Oxyrhynchite Nome. A Papyrological Survey*, Trismegistos On-line Publications IV, Cologne 2009
- Benaissa 2012** A. Benaissa, “The Economic Arrangements between the Apion Estate and its *ENAPOGRAPHOI GEORGOP*”, in G. Azzarello (ed.) *Ricchezza e potere nell’Egitto bizantino: la famiglia degli Apioni ed altre casate ossirinchiite* (APF Beiheft 31) (forthcoming 2012)
- Berger 1913** A. Berger, “Wohnungsmiete und Verwandtes in den gräko-ägyptischen Papyri”, *Zeit. vergl. Recht* 29 (1913) 311-415
- Biedermann 1913** E. Biedermann, *Studien zur ägyptische Verwaltungsgeschichte in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit. Der βασιλικός γραμματεὺς*, Berlin 1913
- Biezunska-Małowist 1975** I. Biezunska-Małowist, “Les citoyens romains à Oxyrhynchus”, in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergaele (eds.), *Le Monde grec. Pensée, littérature, documents. Hommages à Préaux*, Brussels 1975, 741-747
- Blanchard 1974** A. Blanchard, *Sigles et abréviations dans les papyrus grecs: recherches de palaeographie*, ICS Bull. Supp. 30, London 1974
- Bonneau 1970** D. Bonneau, “L’administration de l’irrigation dans les grands domaines en Égypte VI^e siècle de N. E.”, *Pap. Congr. XII* (1970) 48-62
- Bonneau 1971** D. Bonneau, *Le fisc et le Nil. Incidences des irrégularités dans l’Égypte grecque et romaine*, Paris 1971
- Bonneau 1979** D. Bonneau, “Fiscalité et irrigation artificielle en Égypte à l’époque romaine” in H. Van Effenterre (ed.), *Points de vue sur la fiscalité antique*, Paris 1979, 57-68
- Bonneau 1993** D. Bonneau, *Le régime administratif de l’eau du Nil, dans l’Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine*, Leiden, New York, Cologne, 1993
- Borkowski 1981** Z. Borkowski, *Alexandrie II: Inscriptions des factions à Alexandrie*, Warsaw 1981

- Borkowski Hagedorn 1975** Z. Borkowski and D. Hagedorn, “AMPHODOGRAMMATEUS: zur Verwaltung der Dörfer Ägyptens im 3e Jh. n. Chr.” in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergaele (eds.) *Le Monde grec*, Brussels 1975, 775-783
- Bowman 1971** A. K. Bowman, *The town councils of Roman Egypt*, Am. St. Pap. 11, Toronto 1971
- Braunert 1964** H. Braunert, *Die Binnenwanderung: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit*, Bonn 1964
- Bruun 2000** C. Bruun, “Water legislation in the Ancient World (2200 BC – c. AD 500), in O. Wikander (ed.) *Handbook of Ancient Water Technology*, Leiden 2000, 537-604
- Bülow-Jacobsen 1986** A. Bülow-Jacobsen, “Orders to Arrest”, *ZPE* 66 (1986) 93-98
- Bureth 1964** Paul Bureth, *Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions de l'Égypte, (70 aC – 284 pC)*, Brussels 1964
- Cabrol and Leclercq 1924** F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris 1924
- Cadell and Rémondon 1967** H. Cadell and R. Rémondon, “Sens et emplois de τὸ ὄρος dans les documents papyrologiques”, *REG* 80 (1967) 343-349
- Cameron 1973** Alan Cameron, *Porphyrius the Charioteer*, Oxford 1973
- Cameron 1976** Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford 1976
- Cameron 1983** Alan Cameron, “Review” of Borkowski 1981, *BASP* 20 (1983) 75-84
- Du Cange** D. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, II
- Carlà 2009** F. Carlà, *L'oro nella tarda antichità: aspetti economici e sociali*, Turin 2009
- Carrié 1998** J.-M. Carrié, “Archives municipales et distributions alimentaires dans l'Égypte romaine”, in C. Moatti (ed.) *La Mémoire perdue: Recherches sur l'administration romaine*, Rome 1998, 270-282
- Chalon 1964** G. Chalon, *L'édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander: étude historique et exégétique*, Olten 1964
- Chapa 1998** J. Chapa, *Letters of condolence*, Pap. Flor. XXIX, Florence 1998
- Clarysse 2003** W. Clarysse, “Tomoi Synkollesimoi” in M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions. Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*, Oxford 2003, 344-359
- Clarysse and Thompson 2006** W. Clarysse and D. Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*, Cambridge 2006
- Claus 1965** A. Claus, *ὁ σχολαστικός*. Diss. Cologne 1965

- Clauss 1973** M. Clauss, *Untersuchungen zu den principales des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Diokletian: cornicularii, speculatores, frumentarii*, Diss. Bochum 1973
- Daremborg Saglio** Daremborg-Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, Paris 1896
- Daris 1960** S. Daris, "Il lessico latino nella lingua greca d'Egitto", *Aegyptus* 40 (1960) 177-314
- Daris 1998** S. Daris, "Di un incipit epistolare bizantino", *Pap. Congr. XXII* (1998) I 343-352
- Davies 1989** R. Davies, "The Investigation of some crimes in Roman Egypt", in D. Breeze and V. Maxfield (eds.), *Service in the Roman Army*, Edinburgh 1989, 175-185
- Déléage 1934** A. Déléage, "Les cadastres antiques jusqu'à Dioclétien", *Études de Pap.* II (1934) 73-225
- Delia 1991** D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate*, ACS 23, Georgia 1991
- Delmaire 1989** R. Delmaire, *Largesses sacrées et res privata*, Rome 1989
- Derda and Wipszycka 1994** T. Derda and E. Wipszycka, "L'emploi des titres ABBA APA et PAPAS dans l'Égypte byzantine", *JJP* 24 (1994) 23-56
- Diethart and Worp 1986** J. M. Diethart and K. A. Worp, *Notarunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten*, Vienna 1986
- Dinneen 1929** Sr. L. Dinneen, *Titles of address in Christian Greek Epistolography*, Washington 1929
- Dise 1995** R. L. Dise, "Reassessment of the functions of *beneficiarii consularis*", *AHB* 9.2 (1995) 72-85
- Drew-Bear 1979** Marie Drew-Bear, *Le Nome Hermopolite, Toponymes et Sites*, ASP XXI (1979)
- Drexhage 1989** H. J. Drexhage, "Zu den Überstellungsbefehlen aus dem römischen Ägypten: (1.-3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)", in *Migratio et Commutatio, Festschrift für T. Pekáry*, St. Katharinen 1989, 102-118
- Drexhage 1991** H.J.Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten (bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians)*, St. Katharinen 1991
- Eitrem 1937** S. Eitrem, "A few remarks on σπονδή, θαλλός, and other extra payments", *Symb. Osf.* XVII (1937) 26-48
- El Ghany 1986** El Sayed Abd-El-Ghany, "The problem of ἄβροχος γῆ in Roman Egypt", *Pap. Congr. XVIII* (1986) II 295-299

- Fikhman 1970** I. F. Fikhman, “On the structure of the Egyptian Large Estate in the Sixth Century”, *Pap. Congr. XII* (1970) 127-152 = 2006, 42-47
- Fikhman 1977** I. F. Fikhman, “Les “patrocinia” dans les papyrus d’Oxyrhynchus”, *Pap. Congr. XV* (1977) IV 186-194 = 2006, 152-160
- Fikhman 1990** I. F. Fikhman, “καταμειν() = καταμήν(ιος)?”, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 62-68 = 2006, 279-280
- Fikhman 1991** I. F. Fikhman, “Esclaves et colons en Égypte byzantine”, *An. Pap.* III (1991) 7-17 = 2006, 281-291
- Fikhman 1997** I. F. Fikhman, “Chronique: Le codex fiscal P. Sorb. II 69”, *CE* 72 (1997) 161-168
- Fikhman 2006** I. F. Fikhman, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im spätantiken Ägypten. Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart 2006
- Forbes 1955** C. A. Forbes, “Ancient Athletic Guilds”, *Cl. Ph.* 50 (1955) 238-252
- Fournet and Gascou 2002** J.-L. Fournet and J. Gascou, “Moines pachômiens et batellerie”, in C. Décobert (ed.), *Alexandrie médiévale* 2, Études alexandrines 8, Cairo 2002, 23-45
- Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996** T. Gagos and P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Toward an Explanation of the Typology of the So-Called “Orders to Arrest””, *BASP* 33 (1996) 77-97
- Gascou 1972 (1)** J. Gascou, “La détention collégiale de l’autorité pagarchique dans l’Égypte byzantine”, *Byzantion* 42 (1972) 60-72 = Gascou 2008, 43-50
- Gascou 1972 (2)** J. Gascou, “Notes critiques sur quelques papyrus des V^e et VI^e siècles”, *CE* 47 (1972) 243-253
- Gascou 1976 (1)** J. Gascou, “Les institutions de l’hippodrome en Égypte byzantine”, *BIFAO* 76 (1976) 185-212 = Gascou 2008, 51-71
- Gascou 1976 (2)** J. Gascou, “L’institution des bucellaires”, *BIFAO* 76 (1976) 143-156 = Gascou 2008, 73-83
- Gascou 1983** J. Gascou, “Notes de papyrologie byzantine,” *CE* 58 (1983) 226-234
- Gascou 1985** J. Gascou, “Les grands domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine”, *TMByz* 9 (1985) 1-90 = Gascou 2008, 125-213
- Gascou 1987** J. Gascou, “Le cadastre d’Aphroditô (SB XX 14669)”, *TMByz* 10 (1987) 103-158 = 2008, 247-305

- Gascou 1991** J. Gascou, “Monasteries, economic activities of”, in A. S. Atiya (ed.) *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, New York 1991, 1639-1644
- Gascou 2004** J. Gascou, “Les Pétitions privées”, in D. Feissel and J. Gascou (eds.), *La Pétition à Byzance*, Monographies 14, Paris 2004, 93-103 = Gascou 2008, 441-451
- Gascou 2008** J. Gascou, *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine*, Paris 2008
- Gerstinger 1958** Hans Gerstinger, “Neue Gräko-Ägyptische Vertragsurkunden aus byzantischer Zeit der Sammlung “Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer” ”, *JÖB* 7 (1958) 1ff.
- Ghiron-Bistagne 1976** P. Ghiron-Bistagne, *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique*, Paris 1976
- Gilliam 1976** J. F. Gilliam, “*CANALICLARIUS* and *KANANIKLARIOS* (P. Oxy. XL 2925)”, *BASP* 13 (1976) 49-52 = *Roman Army Papers*, Amsterdam 1986, 373-376
- Gonis 1999** N. Gonis, “Two Declarations of Uninundated Land Reread”, *ZPE* 126 (1999) 207-210
- Gonis 2000 (1)** N. Gonis, “A *symmachos* on mission and his paymaster: P. Herm. 80 enlarged”, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 181-3
- Gonis 2000 (2)** N. Gonis, “Some PRAGMATEUTAI with false identities”, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 187-188
- Gonis 2000 (3)** N. Gonis, “Incestuous twins in the city of Arsinoe”, *ZPE* 133 (2000) 197-198
- Gonis 2000 (4)** N. Gonis, “Some Oxyrhynchite villages in the Eighth Century”, *CE* 75 (2000) 128-132
- Gonis 2000 (5)** N. Gonis, “A Late Byzantine Land Lease from Oxyrhynchus; P. Oxy. XVI 1968 Revisited”, *Tyche* 15 (2000) 93-102
- Gonis 2001** N. Gonis, “Abbreviated *nomismata* in seventh- and eighth- century papyri. Notes on palaeography and taxes”, *ZPE* 136 (2001) 119-122
- Gonis 2002** N. Gonis, “Studies on the Aristocracy of Late Antique Oxyrhynchus”, *Tyche* 7 (2002) 85-97
- Gonis 2003 (1)** N. Gonis, “A declaration of artificially inundated land”, *ZPE* 142 (2003) 171-175
- Gonis 2003 (2)** N. Gonis, “Hermopolite Localities and Splinter Nomes”, *ZPE* 142 (2003) 176-183
- Gonis 2004** N. Gonis, “P. Bingen 135 and Flavius Apion I”, *ZPE* 146 (2004) 175-178

- Gonis 2008** N. Gonis, “πολιτευόμενοι and βουλευταί again”, 195-202 in *Sixty-five Papyrological Texts presented to Klaas A. Worp on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, P. Lugd. Bat. 33, Leiden and Berlin 2008
- Gonis 2009** N. Gonis, “A *symmachos* on Mission: P. Herm. 80 completed”, *ZPE* 197 (2009) 209-210
- De Groote 2002** M. De Groote, “*Zygotatai* in Egypt from 363 AD onwards. A papyrological prosopography”, *BASP* 39 (2002) 27-40
- Gundel 1963** H. G. Gundel “Einige Giessener Papyrusfragmente”, *Aegyptus* 43 (1963) 398-399
- Habermann 1997** W. Habermann, “Aspekte des Bewässerungswesens im kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten I: Die “Erklärungen für nicht überflutetes Land” (Abrochia-Deklarationen)” in K. Ruffing and B. Tenger (eds.), *Miscellanea oeconomica. Studien zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte Harald Winkel zum 65. Geburtstag*, St Katharinen 1997, 213-283
- Habermann 2000** W. Habermann, *Zur Wasserversorgung einer Metropole im kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten, Neuedition von P. Lond. III 1177*, Munich 2000
- Hagedorn 1979** U. Hagedorn, “Das Formular der Überstellungsbefehle im römischen Ägypten”, *BASP* 16 (1979) 61-74
- Hakkert 1967** *Acta Classica 60. A collection of papyri, Greek and Coptic, from the second century B.C. to the eight[h] century A.D.* Amsterdam, 1967
- Hardy 1931** E. R. Hardy, *The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, Columbia 1931
- Harmon 1934** A. M. Harmon, “Egyptian Property Returns”, *YCIS* 4 (1934) 134-230
- Heil 1966** W. Heil, *Der Konstantinische Patriziat*, Stuttgart 1966
- Hengstl 1972** J. Hengstl, *Private Arbeitsverträge freier Personen in den hellenistischen Papyri bis Diokletian*, Bonn 1972
- Hennig 1967** D. Hennig, *Untersuchungen zur Bodenpacht im ptolemäisch-römischen Ägypten*, Munich 1967
- Herrmann 1958** J. Herrmann, *Studien zur Bodenpacht im Recht der Graeco-Aegyptischen Papyri*, Munich 1958
- Hickey 1998** T. M. Hickey, “Notes on some Cairo papyri from Byzantine Oxyrhynchus”, *ZPE* 123 (1998) 161-164
- Hickey 2001** T. M. Hickey, *A “Public” House but Closed: Fiscal Participation and Economic Decision Making on the Oxyrhynchite Estates of the Flavii Apiones*, Ph.D. diss. University of Chicago 2001

- Hickey 2004** T. M. Hickey, “A new fragment from the Apion Dossier in New Haven”, *ZPE* 146 (2004) 165-166
- Hickey 2007** T. M. Hickey, “Aristocratic Landholding and the Economy”, in R. S. Bagnall (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*, Cambridge 2007, 288-308
- Hickey 2008 (1)** T. M. Hickey, “An inconvenient truth? P. Oxy. 18.2196 verso, the Apion Estate, and *fiscalité* in the Late Antique Oxyrhynchite”, *BASP* 45 (2008) 87-100
- Hickey 2008 (2)** T. M. Hickey, “Down and Out in Late Antique Tebtunis” in S. Lippert and M. Schentuleit (eds.), *Graeco-Roman Fayum—texts and Archaeology*, Wiesbaden 2008, 135-142
- Hobson 1989** D. Hobson, “Naming Practices”, *BASP* 26 (1989), 157ff
- Hobson 1993** D. Hobson, “The Impact of Law on Village Life in Roman Egypt”, in B. Halpern and D. Hobson (eds.), *Law, Politics and Society in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Sheffield 1993, 193-219
- Hodeček and Mitthof 2005** S. Hodeček and F. Mitthof, “Ein Weinlieferungskauf aus dem Herakleopolites”, *Archiv* 51 (2005) 76-86
- Hombert and Préaux 1952** M. Hombert and C. Préaux, “Le Recensement dans l’Égypte romaine”, *P. Lugd. Bat. V* (1952) 40-144
- Hopkins 1980** K. Hopkins, “Brother-sister marriage in Roman Egypt”, *CSSH* 22 (1980) 303-354
- Hornickel 1930** O. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden. Ein Beitrag zum römischen und byzantinischen Titelwesen*, Giessen 1930
- Huebner 2007** S. R. Huebner, ““Brother-Sister” Marriage in Roman Egypt: a Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy?”, *JRS* XCVII (2007) 21-49
- Husson 1967** G. Husson, “Recherches sur les sens du mot ΠΡΟΑΣΤΙΟΝ dans le grec d’Égypte”, *Rech. Pap.* 4 (1967) 187-200
- Husson 1983** G. Husson, *OIKLA Le vocabulaire de la maison privée en Égypte d’après les papyrus*, Paris 1983
- Johnson and West 1949** A. C. Johnson and L. C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, Princeton 1949
- Jones LRE** A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602: a social, economic and administrative survey*, Oxford 1964
- Jördens 1990** Andrea Jördens, *Verträgliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten*, (P. Heid. V), Heidelberg 1990

- Jördens 1993** A. Jördens, “Kaufpreisstundungen (Sales on Credit)”, *ZPE* 98 (1993) 263-282
- Kaplan 1976** M. Kaplan, *Les propriétés de la couronne et de l'église dans l'empire byzantine (V^e-VII^e siècles)*, Paris 1976
- Keenan 1973** J. G. Keenan, “The names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations”, *ZPE* 11 (1973) 33-63
- Keenan 1974** J. G. Keenan, “The names Flavius and Aurelius”, *ZPE* 13 (1974) 283-304
- Kruit 1992 (1)** N. Kruit, “The Meaning of Various Words Related to Wine”, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 265-276
- Kruit 1992 (2)** N. Kruit, “Local Customs in the Formulas of Sales of Wine for Future Delivery”, *ZPE* 94 (1992) 167-184
- Kruit and Worp 1999** N. Kruit and K. A. Worp, “Metrological notes on Measures and Containers of Liquid in Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Egypt”, *Archiv* 45 (1999) 96-127
- Kruse 2002** T. Kruse, *Der Königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung*, Leipzig 2002
- La'da 1995** Csaba La'da, “Who were those “of the Epigone”?”, *Pap. Congr.* XXI (1995) 563-569
- Lallemand 1950** J. Lallemand, “La création des provinces d'Égypte Jovia et d'Égypte Herculia”, *Acad. Roy. de Belgique. Bull. (Lettres)* XXXVI (1950) 387-395
- Lallemand 1964** J. Lallemand, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (284-382)*, *Mémoires de l'Académie royale de Belgique, Cl. des Lettres*, 57(2), 1964
- Lang 1976** M. Lang, *Graffiti and Dipinti*, The Athenian Agora Vol. XXI, Princeton 1976
- Lee 2010** J. A. L. Lee, “Auxiliary $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ ”, in T. V. Evans and D. Obbink (eds.) *The Language of the Papyri*, Oxford 2010, 15-34
- Lewis 1970** N. Lewis, “ NOHMATA ΛΕΓΟΝΤΟΣ ”, *BASP* 7 (1970) 15-24
- Lewis 1974** N. Lewis, “The recipients of the Oxyrhynchus siteresion”, *CE* 49 (1974) 158-162
- Lewis 1997** N. Lewis, *The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt*, 2nd ed. Florence 1997
- Lewuillon-Blume 1977** M. Lewuillon-Blume, “Problèmes de la terre au IV^e siècle après J.-C.”, *Pap. Congr.* XV (1977) IV 177-185
- Liebeschuetz 1959** J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, “The Syriarch in the Fourth Century”, *Historia* 8 (1959) 113-126
- Liebeschuetz 2001** J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford 2001

- Lüddeckens 1985** E. Lüddeckens, “Die Theophoren Personennamen”, in *Ägypten: Dauer und Wandel. Symposium anlässlich des 75jährigen Bestehens des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Kairo am 10. und 11. Okt. 1982*, Mainz 1985, 105-113
- MacMullen 1967** R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian in the later Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Mass. 1967
- McCormick 1986** M. McCormick, *Eternal victory. Triumphal rulership in late antiquity, Byzantium and the early medieval west*, Cambridge 1986
- Malouta 2007** M. Malouta, “The terminology of fatherlessness in Roman Egypt. ἀπάτωρ and χρηματίζων μητρός” *Pap. Congr. XXIV* (2007) 615-624
- Maresch 1994** K. Maresch, *NOMISMA UND NOMISMATLA*, Cologne 1994
- Mayerson 2003** P. Mayerson, “ἀμπελουργός: more than a “vine-dresser””, *BASP* 40 (2003) 187-190
- Mazza 1995** R. Mazza, “Ricerche sul pagarca”, *Aegyptus* 75 (1995) 169-242
- Mazza 2001** R. Mazza, *L'Archivio degli Apioni*, Bari 2001
- Mazza 2008** R. Mazza, “Review of Sarris 2006”, *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8 (2008) 150-156
- Melaerts 1994** H. Melaerts, “Le rôle du δεκάδαρχος/δεκαδάρχης dans l'Égypte romaine”, *Studia Varia Bruxellensia* III (1994) 99-122
- Messeri and Pintaudi 2005** G. Messeri and R. Pintaudi, “Ancora a proposito di π(): π(αράκειται)?”, *Comunicazioni* 6 (2005) 145-151
- Milne 1924** J.G. Milne, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, 3rd ed. London 1924
- Mitthof 2001** F. Mitthof, *Annona militaris. Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten*, *Pap. Flor.* XXXII, Florence 2001
- Montevecchi 1973/1988** Orsolina Montevecchi, *La Papirologia*, Milan 1973 (revised ed. 1988)
- Morelli 1996** F. Morelli, *Olio e retribuzioni nell'Egitto tardo (V - VIII d.C.)*, Florence 1996
- Morelli 2000** F. Morelli, “P. Brook. 26: mogli, tasse e ξένοι”, *ZPE* 130 (2000) 218-222
- Moritz 1958** L. A. Moritz, *Grain-mills and flour in classical antiquity*, Oxford 1958
- Müller 1985** H. Müller, *Untersuchungen zur ΜΙΣΘΩΣΙΣ von Gebäuden im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri*, Cologne 1985
- Nelis-Clément 2000** J. Nelis-Clément, *Les BENEFICLARI: militaires et administrateurs au service de l'Empire (Ier s.a.C.- Ve s.a.C.)*, Paris 2000
- Nielsen 1995** B. E. Nielsen, “Application for a lease of vineyard irrigation”, *ZPE* 106 (1995) 179-188

- Nutton 1977** V. Nutton, “Archiatri and the medical profession in antiquity”, *PSBR* 45 (1977) 191-226
- Oates 1963** F. J. Oates, “The status designation Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς”, *YCIS* 18 (1963) 1-129
- Oertel 1917** F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie: Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens*, Leiden 1917
- O’Leary 1937** de Lacy O’Leary, *The saints of Egypt in the Coptic Calendar*, London 1937, Amsterdam 1974
- Oleson 1984** J. P. Oleson, *Greek and Roman Mechanical Water-lifting Devices. The History of a Technology*, Toronto 1984
- Omar 1981** S. Omar, “Part of tomos sygkollesimos of hypomnemata (P. Cairo SR 3049, 36-39) *Pap. Congr. XVI* (1981) 231-238
- Ott 1995 (1)** J. Ott, *Die Beneficiarii—Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Rangordnung des römischen Heeres und zu ihrer Funktion*, *Hist. Einzelschriften* 92, Stuttgart 1995
- Ott 1995 (2)** J. Ott “Die Mechanismen bei der Beförderung von Beneficiariern der Statthalter”, in Y. Bohec and M. Dondin-Payre (eds.), *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l’Armée sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 1995, 285-289
- Otto 1905** W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1905
- Padró 2006** J. Padró, *Oxyrhynchus I. Fouilles Archéologiques à el-Babnasa 1982-2005*, Barcelona 2005
- Padró 2007** J. Padró, “Recent archaeological work”, in A. K. Bowman, R. A. Coles, N. Gonis, D. Obbink and P. J. Parsons (eds.) *Oxyrhynchus: a city and its texts*, London 2007, 129-138
- Palme 1998 (1)** B. Palme, “*Praesides* und *correctores* der Augustamnica”, *An. Tard.* 6 (1998) 123-135
- Palme 1998 (2)** B. Palme, “Flavius Strategius Paneuphemos und die Apionen”, *ZRG* 115 (1998) 289-322
- Palme 1999** B. Palme, “Die Officia der Statthalter in der Spätantike. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven”, *An. Tard.* 7 (1999) 85-133
- Palme 2006** B. Palme, “Spatrömische Militärgerichtsbarkeit in den Papyri”, in H. A. Rupprecht (ed.), *Symposium 2003, Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Vienna 2006, 375-408
- Palme 2007** B. Palme, “The imperial presence: Government and Army”, in R.S. Bagnall (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World 300-700*, Cambridge 2007, 244-269

- Papaconstantinou 1996** A. Papaconstantinou, “La liturgie stationnale à Oxyrhynchus dans la première moitié du VI^e siècle”, *REByz* 54 (1996) 135-159
- Papaconstantinou 2000** A. Papaconstantinou, “Les sanctuaries de la vierge dans l’Égypte byzantine et omeyyade”, *JJP* 30 (2000) 80-94
- Papaconstantinou 2001** A. Papaconstantinou, *Le Culte des Saints en Égypte des Byzantins aux Abbassides*, Paris 2001
- Parássoglou 1987** G. M. Parássoglou, “Return of Uninundated Land”, *CE* 62 (1987) 205-218
- Parsons 1967** P. J. Parsons, “Philippus Arabs and Egypt”, *JRS* 57 (1967) 134-141
- Perpillou-Thomas 1995** F. Perpillou-Thomas, “Artistes et athlètes dans les papyrus grecs d’Égypte”, *ZPE* 108 (1995) 225-251
- Pestman 1963** P. W. Pestman, *A proposito dei documenti di Pathyris II. Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονῆς*, and review of Oates 1963, *Aegyptus* 43 (1963) 15-53, 405-407
- Pestman 1982** P. W. Pestman, “Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς”, *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* 22 (1982) 56-63
- Potter 2010** D. S. Potter, “Entertainers in the Roman Empire”, in D. S. Potter and D. J. Mattingly (eds.), *Life, Death and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*, Michigan 2010, 280-349
- Préaux 1963** Claire Préaux, “Déclaration d’inondation déficitaire du Brooklyn Museum”, *CE* 38 (1963) 117-133
- Pringsheim 1924** F. Pringsheim, “Die Rechtstellung der Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονῆς”, *ZSS* 44 (1924) 396-526
- Pruneti 1975** Paola Pruneti, “I ΚΛΗΡΟΙ del nomo Ossirinichite: ricerca topografica”, *Aegyptus* 55 (1975) 159-244
- Pruneti 1994** Paola Pruneti, “L’archivio di Aurelius Heras *praepositus pagi*”, *Aegyptus* 74 (1994) 33-36
- Rankov 1994** N. B. Rankov, “Die Beneficiarier in den literarischen und papyrologischen Texten”, in E. Schallmeyer (ed.), *Der römische Weibebezirk von Osterburken II*, Stuttgart 1994, 219-232
- Rathbone 1991** Dominic Rathbone, *Economic rationalism and rural society in third-century AD Egypt*, Cambridge 1991
- Rea 1983** J. Rea, “Additions and corrections to documentary papyri in Ox. Pap. Vol. XXVII”, *JEAs* 49 (1983) 180-181
- Reekmans 1985** T. Reekmans, “Ἀργός and its derivatives”, *CE* 60 (1985) 275-291
- Reich 1903** H. Reich, *Der Mimus*, Berlin 1903

- Reil 1913** Theodor Reil, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Ägypten*, Leipzig 1913
- Reilly 1978** L. C. Reilly, *Slaves in Ancient Greece*, Chicago 1978
- Reiter 2004** Fabian Reiter, *Die Nomarchen des Arsinoites. Ein Beitrag zum Steuerwesen im römischen Ägypten*, Paderborn 2004
- Remijsen and Clarysse 2008** S. Remijsen and W. Clarysse, “Incest or Adoption? Brother-Sister Marriage in Roman Egypt Revisited”, *JRS* 98 (2008) 53-61
- Rémondon 1971** R. Rémondon, “Le monastère alexandrine de la Metanoia était-il bénéficiaire du fisc ou à son service?”, in *Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra V*, Milan 1971, 769-781
- Rémondon 1972** R. Rémondon, “L’église dans la société égyptienne à l’époque byzantine”, *CE* 47 (1972) 254-277
- Rink 1924** H. Rink, *Strassen und Viertelnamen in Oxyrhynchus*, Darmstadt 1924
- Robert 1929** L. Robert, “Epigraphica”, *REG* 42 (1929) 426-438 = *OMS* I, 201-221
- Robert 1930** L. Robert, “Pantomimen im griechischen Orient”, *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106-122 = *OMS* I, 654-670
- Robert 1936** L. Robert, “Ἀρχαιολόγος”, *REG* 49 (1936) 235-254 = *OMS* I, 671-690
- Roueché 1984** C. Roueché, “Acclamations in the later Roman empire: new evidence from Aphrodisias”, *JRS* 74 (1984) 181-199
- Roueché 1989** C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity*, *JRS Monograph* 5, London 1989
- Roueché 1993** C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias*, *JRS Monographs* 6, London 1993
- Rouillard 1928** G. Rouillard, *L’administration civile de l’Égypte byzantine*, 2nd ed. Paris 1928
- Rowland 1976** R. Rowland, “The “very poor” and the grain dole at Rome and Oxyrhynchus”, *ZPE* 21 (1976) 69-72
- Rowlandson 1987** J. Rowlandson, “P. Oxy 3047, VII 1044 and the land tax in kind”, *ZPE* 67 (1987) 283-291
- Rowlandson 1994** J. Rowlandson, “Crop rotation and rent payment in Oxyrhynchite land-leases: social and economic interpretations”, *Pap. Congr.* XX (1994) 495-499
- Rowlandson 1996** J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 1996
- Rowlandson 1998** J. Rowlandson, *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt, A sourcebook*, Cambridge 1998
- Ruffing 1999** Kai Ruffing, *Weinbau im römischen Ägypten, Pharos XII*, St. Katharinen 1999
- Ruffini 2008** G. Ruffini, *Social Networks in Byzantine Egypt*, Cambridge 2008

- Sacco 1980** G. Sacco, “Osservazioni su τροφεῖς, τρόφιμοι, θρεπτοί”, *Miscellanea Graeca e romana* VII, Rome 1980, 271-286
- Samama 2003** E. Samama, *Les médecins dans le monde grec*, Geneva 2003
- Samuel 1975** D. H. Samuel, “P. Yale inv. 1642, the new evidence for the ὑπερ ἄπορικῶν”, in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergaele (eds.) *Le Monde grec* (Brussels 1975) 611-624
- Sänger 2005** P. Sänger, “Die Eirenarchen im römischen und byzantinischen Ägypten”, *Tyche* 20 (2005) 143-204
- Sänger 2008** P. Sänger, “Saralaneoan und die Verwaltung Ägyptens unter den Sassaniden”, *ZPE* 164 (2008) 191-201
- Sarris 2004** P. Sarris, “Rehabilitating the Great Estate. Aristocratic property and economic growth in the late antique East” in W. Bowden, L. Lavon and C. Machado (eds.) *Recent Research on the Late Antique Countryside*, Leiden 2004, 55-71
- Sarris 2005** P. Sarris, “Review of Banaji 2001”, *Historical Materialism* 13 (2005) 207-219
- Sarris 2006** P. Sarris, *Economy and Society in the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge 2006
- Scheidel 1996** W. Scheidel, “What’s in an age? A comparative view of Bias in the Census Returns of Roman Egypt”, *BASP* 33 (1996) 25-59
- Schmelz 2002** G. Schmelz, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten nach den Aussagen der griechischen und koptischen Papyri und Ostraka*, Leipzig 2002
- Schnebel 1925** M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten*, Munich 1925
- Schönborn 1976** H.-B. Schönborn, *Die Pastoforen im Kult der ägyptischen Götter*, Meisenheim am Glan 1976
- Seidl 1935** E. Seidl, *Der Eid im römisch-ägyptischen Provinzialrecht*, Pt. 2, Munich 1935
- Sharp 2007** M. Sharp, “The Food Supply”, in A. K. Bowman, R. A. Coles, N. Gonis, D. Obbink and P. J. Parsons (eds.) *Oxyrhynchus: A city and its texts*, London 2007, 218-230
- Shelton 1977** J. Shelton, “Papyri from the Bonn collection”, *ZPE* 25 (1977) 159-183
- Sijpesteijn 1964 (1)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Zum Bewässerungswesen im römischen Ägypten. Der χωματεπιμελητής und der χωματεπεϊκτής”, *Aegyptus* 44 (1964) 9-19
- Sijpesteijn 1964 (2)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Penthemeros certificates in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, *P. Lugd. Bat* XII (1964) 1-83
- Sijpesteijn 1979** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Three papyri from the Michigan collection”, *ZPE* 33 (1979) 244-253
- Sijpesteijn 1982** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Eine Bemerkung zu P. Giss. I 7”, *ZPE* 49 (1982) 210

- Sijpesteijn 1987 (1)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “The Monastery of Abba Andreas”, *ZPE* 70 (1987) 54-56
- Sijpesteijn 1987 (2)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “The title πατήρ τῆς πόλεως and the papyri”, *Tyche* 2 (1987) 171-174
- Sijpesteijn 1988 (1)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “P. Mich. Inv. 3780: a reconsideration”, *ZPE* 71 (1988) 123-126
- Sijpesteijn 1988 (2)** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “Vier byzantinischen Texten des Kairener Museums”, *Aegyptus* 68 (1988) 37-41
- Sijpesteijn 1992** P. J. Sijpesteijn, “The meaning of ἦτοι in the papyri”, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 241-250
- Sijpesteijn and Worp 1990** P. J. Sijpesteijn and K. Worp, “Three London Papyri”, in M. Capasso, G. Messeri Savorelli and R. Pintaudi (eds.) *Miscellanea Papyrologica in occasione del bicentenario dell’edizione della Charta Borgiana*, Florence 1990, II 507-520
- Simon 1982** D. Simon, “Das frühbyzantinische Emphyteuserecht”, *Symposion* 1977, Cologne 1982, 365-422
- Straus 1976** J. A. Straus, “La terminologie de l’esclavage dans les papyrus grecs d’époque romaine trouvés en Égypte”, Actes de Colloque sur l’esclavage 1973, Paris 1976, 333-347
- Straus 1988** J.A.Straus, “L’esclavage dans l’Égypte romain” in ANRW II.10.1. (1988), 841-911
- Straus 2004** J. A. Straus, *L’achat et la vente des esclaves dans l’Égypte romain*, Leipzig 2004
- Swiderek 1960** Anna Swiderek, *La propriété foncière privée dans l’Égypte de Vespasien et sa technique agricole d’après P. Lond.131 recto*, Wrocław 1960
- Tacoma 1998** L. E. Tacoma, “Replacement parts for an Irrigation Machine of the Divine House at Oxyrhynchus”, *ZPE* 120 (1998) 123-130
- Tait 1924** J. G. Tait, “ΠΕΡΣΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΟΝΗΣ”, *Archiv* VII (1924) 175-182
- Taubenschlag 1955** R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 322B.C. – 640 A.D.*, Warsaw 1955
- Thomas 1975** J. D. Thomas, “The Introduction of Dekaprottoi and Comarchs”, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 111-119
- Thomas 2004** J. D. Thomas, “Notes on papyri relating to Claudia Isidora Also Called Apia”, *BASP* 41 (2004) 139-153
- Thompson 1976** Dorothy Thompson, “Imperial Estates” in M. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property*, Cambridge 1976, 35-70

- Timm 1994** S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit*, vol 6, Wiesbaden 1984
- Turner 1973** E. Turner, "The Charioteers from Antinoe", *JHS* (1973) 191-195
- Turner 1987** E. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd ed., ICS Bulletin Supplement 46, 1987
- Uebel 1968** Fritz Uebel, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Berlin 1968
- Vandersleyen 1986** Claude Vandersleyen, "Suggestions sur l'origine des Πέρσοι, τῆς ἐπιγονῆς", *Pap. Congr. XVIII* (1986) ii 191-201
- Vandoni 1964** M. Vandoni, *Feste pubbliche e private nei documenti greci*, Milan 1964
- Vatun 1970** S. Vatun, *Recherches sur le mariage et la condition de la femme mariée à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris 1970
- Ville 1960** G. Ville, "Les jeux de gladiateurs dans l'Empire chrétien", *MEFRA* 72 (1960) 273-335
- Wallace 1938** S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt*, Princeton and Oxford 1938
- Weeber 1994** K.-W. Weeber, *Panem et circenses*, Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie 15, Mainz 1994
- West and Johnson 1944** L. C. West and A. C. Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, Princeton 1944
- Westermann 1921** W. L. Westermann, "The "uninundated land" in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt", Part II, *Cl. Phil.* 16 (1921) 169-188
- Whitehorne 1995** John Whitehorne, "The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus", *ANRW* II. 18.5 (1995), 3050-3091
- Whitehorne 2004** John Whitehorne, "Petitions to the Centurion", *BASP* 41 (2004) 155-169
- Whitehorne 2006** John Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Egypt*, 2nd ed. Florence 2006
- Wipszycka 1968** E. Wipszycka, "Deux papyrus concernant les grands domaines byzantins", *CE* 43 (1968) 344-355
- Wipszycka 1972** E. Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IV^e au VIII^e siècle*. Brussels, 1972
- Wipszycka 1993** E. Wipszycka, "Les ordres mineurs dans l'église d'Égypte", *JJP* 23 (1993) 181-215
- Wolff 1941** Hans Julius Wolff, "The Praxis-Provision in Papyrus Contracts", *TAPA* 72 (1941) 418-438

- Wolff 1946** Hans Julius Wolff, “Consensual contracts in the papyri”, *J. Jur. Pap.* I (1946) 55-79
- Wolff 1968** Hans Julius Wolff, “Some observations on *PRAXIS*”, *Pap. Congr.* XII (1968) 527-535
- Wolff 1974** Hans Julius Wolff, “The So-called Private Protocol”, *Pap. Congr.* XIV (1974) 349-354
- Wolff 1978** Hans Julius Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemäer und des Prinzipäts Vol II Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs*, Munich 1978
- Wolff 1968/1998** Hans Julius Wolff, *Vorlesungen über Juristische Papyruskunde*, Berlin 1998
- Yiftach-Firanko 2003** U. Yiftach-Firanko, “Regionalism and legal documents. The case of Oxyrhynchus”, *Symposion* 2003, 347-366
- Youtie 1974** H. C. Youtie, “Critical trifles”, *ZPE* 15 (1974) 143-144
- Youtie 1975** H. C. Youtie, “ὑπογραφεύς: the social impact of illiteracy in Graeco-Roman Egypt”, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 201-221
- Youtie 1979** L. C. and H. C. Youtie, “Three declarations of uninundated land”, *ZPE* 33 (1979) 193-200
- Youtie 1981** L. C. Youtie, “Declaration of uninundated land”, *ZPE* 42 (1981) 89-90
- Zucker 1964** F. Zucker, “Beobachtungen zu den permanenten Klerosnamen”, in H. Braunert (ed.), *Festschrift Oertel*, Bonn 1964, 101=106
- Zuckerman 2000** C. Zuckerman, “Le cirque, l’argent et le peuple. À propos d’une inscription du Bas-Empire”, *REB* 58 (2000) 69-96
- Zuckerman 2004** C. Zuckerman, *Du village à l’Empire. Autour du registre fiscal d’Aphroditô, (525/526)*, Paris 2004

Abbreviations and short titles

- CLRE** R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz and K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the later Roman Empire*, APA Monograph 36, Atlanta 1987
- CSBE²** R. S. Bagnall and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2nd ed. Leiden, 2004

Gignac, Grammar F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, Milan 1976, 1981

Lewis and Short C. T. Lewis, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1897/1998

LSJ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon, with a revised supplement*, Oxford 1996

PLRE A. H. M. Jones, *The prosopography of the later Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1971, 1980, 1992

Preisigke, Wörterbuch F. Preisigke, *Wörterlist der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*, Berlin 1925

References to editions of papyri are from the list of abbreviations in J. F. Oates et al., *Checklist of Editions of Greek Papyri and Ostraca*, except that papyri from the Oxyrhynchus series are cited in bold and without a title.

References to journals are from the list of abbreviations in *L'Année philologique*.

DOCUMENTARY PAPYRI
FROM
ROMAN AND BYZANTINE OXYRHYNCUS

by

MARGARET MOUNTFORD

UCL

Submitted for the degree of PhD in Papyrology

APPENDIX