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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.
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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 *saquiya* 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”. Montevecchi 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

² Hengstl 1972, 35-60.
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 gymnasion), 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. 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), 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: 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), 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). P. Ryl. II 157.16 n. shows a saquíya 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. 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), 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

---

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 Swiderèk 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 ὀκτω” 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.\textsuperscript{11} \textbf{01} is 80 years earlier than XIV 1692 (188), the earliest lease of \textit{ampelika erga} of which we know.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13} The term \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textbf{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 28\textsuperscript{th} August.\textsuperscript{15} The vintage usually took place in Mesore and Thoth (August and September),\textsuperscript{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) \textit{μέχρι τοῦ ἐσομένου ἀπὸ ποτισῦν \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

---

\textsuperscript{11} Hengstl 1972, 52ff, for whom these are \textit{“Werkverträge”}; Jördens 1990, 220-232; 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 \textit{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), I. 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.

\textsuperscript{12} Jördens 1990, 226.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{14} Bonneau 1993, 216-220, and see also LXX 4773 4 n.

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

the meaning of ἀπὸ ποδὸς ποτισμοῦ was unclear; the flood coincided with the harvest, and there was evidence for artificial irrigation then. 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 shaduf 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. 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 shaduf 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]ς Ἄβριος τοῦ Φιλοξένου ζευγηλ(άτης)
2 τῶν ἀπὸ Χύσ[εως, Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς, Ἰφι]βο[ώνει Ἀπιος

17 Ruffing 1999, 95-96, 138-140, 168. See also Swiderek 1960, 84-86.
18 Swiderek 1960, 86.
3 τοῦ Ἀρσιή[σιος] τῶν ἀπὸ Ὄξυρυ[γ]χ(ων) πόλ(εως), ἰερεῖ Θοὴρ[ι]δος καὶ Ἅμιδος
4 καὶ Σαράπιδος καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγί(στων), ἐκουσίως παρέξασθ(αι)
5 τὰ αὐτάρκη βοικὰ κτήην καὶ τοὺς αὐτάρκεις μηχαναρίους
6 πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἑγεστώσης ἡμέρας ἔως ἑπαγο(μένων)
7 τρίτης τοῦ ἑνεστ[ῶ]τος δεκάτου ἔτους Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος
8 τοῦ κυρίου ποτισμοῦ καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἑπαγομένας ἀλλοὺς
9 ποτισμοῦ δύο τοῦ ὑπάρχουντος τού Ἡρθοῶνει περὶ τῆ[ν]
10 Χῦσιν ἐν το(ῖσ) Ἐρμοπολ(ίτικοῖς) ἐδάφειθα ἐκ το(ῦ) Πτολ(εμαίου) ἰπ(τίκος) ἀμφοτέρων
11 τῆι ἀλλη καταρτεία καὶ κλούσιοι ἐν ἑπιδέσει, ἦ καὶ
12 οἱ Ἀμοῖτας κ[αι ὁ] Λόλλιος χρώνται, μισθῶν δὲ τῶν συμ-
13 φοινηθέντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπὲρ τῶν ποτισμῶν ἄργ(υρίου)
14 τὴν ἀλλη λεπτεία καὶ κλούσιοι ἐν ἑπιδέσει, ἦ καὶ
15 ὁ Ἀμοῖτας κ[αι ὁ] Λόλλιος χρώνται, μισθῶν δὲ τῶν συμ-
16 δραχμῶν διακοσίων ἐκκοσίου καὶ παρὰ λῆν(ῶν) τῇ τρύγῃ
17 ἐς τὸν ὁμολογοῦντα παρὰ τοῦ Ἡρθοῶνει δραχμὰς τεσ-
18 σαράκ[α]ντα, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰ[ῖς] χορηγεῖτω αὐτῶι ὁ Ἡρθοῶ(νις)
19 τῇ μὲν τριακάδι τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος μηνὸς Παῦνι δραχμὰς
20 ὁγῳδοήκοντα, Ἐπειφ λῦ ἐξήκοντα, Μεσο-
21 ρῆ κε ὑμὸς λοιπὰ[ῖς] δραχ(μὰς) τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ παρὰ λῆν(ῶν)
22 τῦ τοῦ ὁίνου κεράμου ἐν. τοὺς δὲ ποτισμοῖς ποιεῖσθω
25 ὁ ὀμολογῶν ἔως τῶν ἐπαγομένων σὺν ... [ ] ὦν τὸ κτῆμι·
26 μα δι[ι'] ἕμερῳ[ν] τεσσάρων ποτισμών ἐνὶ καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἐπαγο(μένας)
28 π ... [ ] ἐκάστοτε[ν] ποτισμοῦ οὗ ἔαν μη ἔπι τοῦ δέοντος
29 καὶ τὸ βλάβος διπλοῦν καὶ ἐπὶ ἕως τῶν ἐπαγομένων συν·[ ...[ ]...]
30 τοὺς δύο[π]τοισιμοῦ[ζ] ἀνεμπο[δ]ίστως καὶ ἀνεγκλήτως
31 ἑκάστοτε Ἀρθοώνιος ἔκ[τοῦ] ὀμολογουστοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν βοικῶν
32 [α]τὸ[ς] ἐπί[ζυγίων] ἐπὶ τῶν[πά]τρων, τοιο[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] ...
33 [ ] ὑπαρ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Back, along the fibres:

34 ( m. 2) ὀμολογία ποτισμοῦ Λμό(ι)τοῦ(σ). Ἀρθοώνιος
1 ξευγηλίξεμεν 4 μεγ[ ] παρεξας 5 βοικα 6 επαγο 7 τραίαντος 9 τη
10 το ἐρμοπολία πτολείμῳ 16 ἀργ[ ] 17 ληνή 20 ἀρπια 23 λοι ἀρχ
26 επαγο 28 δέοντος 30 αλαλελφί ομολογηλποτ[ ] ποτι

“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 Amoitas 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 .........."


1 Ἄβριος. Ἁβρόν and Ἅβρων 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 Χύσ[εως. I have restored this here because the reference to τή[ν] Χῦσιν at 9-10
indicates that the name appeared earlier. For Chysis see 10 n., Benaissa 2009, 364-366 and
03.1 n.

Πέρσ[ης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς. This expression appears frequently in papyri until the mid-2nd
century but disappears by the late 2nd/early 3rd. It originally designated descendents 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, *Asylwesen* 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]ρθοόνης [Ἀ]πιός τοῦ Ἀρσιή[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[iptables] καὶ Ἰοίδος καὶ Σαράπιδος καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγίστων. 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 fulfill 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 beasts 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 ποτισμοὺς. The usual term for irrigation which is carried out at all times of the year (Bonneau 1993, 210).
Χῦσιν ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμοπολιτικοῖς ἐδάφεσι. 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.

Πτολεμαeus 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 ψ[εό]φυτού. 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)).

ὅσων 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 μηχανῆν. For a description of how the saquiya 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 saquiya 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 saquiya’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 saquiya.

13-14 ἔξηρτισμένην τῇ ἄλλῃ καταρτείᾳ. For references to this technology see 02.5-6 n.
κλουίοις ἐν ἐπιδέσει. 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 χλούια (=κλούια) σχοινία), and 9900.8 (a 3rd century lease fragment from Oxyrhynchus). P. Lond. III 1177 viii. 164 (see Habermann 2000) shows a payment for σχοινία λεπτὰ εἰς ἐπιδέσεων κεραμείδων. 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 κλουίοις 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 ἀντληται, 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 ληνὸς. ληνὸς 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 τρύγῃ. 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]νου κεραμίου ἑνὸς. 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 κτήμα. 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 πὶ 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[οζυγίων]. I have found only four papyrological instances of this word AD: P. Cair. Masb. 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 ψι, or an abbreviated form of διά, but that does not make sense. Could it be καί?
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. 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 XLl 2973.
This lease is in the so-called “private protocol” form, a term coined by Herrmann, the body of the document is written objectively, in the third person, and would have begun ἐμίσθωσαν. In the Oxyrhynchite nome these “private protocols”, which have been found from 19 BC (II 277), were the predominant form of lease documents in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD; hypomnemata become more popular during the 3rd century, when private protocols began to become common in the Fayum although for different types of documents. This shows independence of form between the nomes and is probably due to “local predilection” rather than any deeper economic or sociological reason.

For information about leases of buildings generally see Hansgünter Müller, Untersuchungen zur ΜΗΜΙΣΘΩΣΙΣ von Gebäuden im Recht der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri, Cologne 1985. 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. 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). 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.


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. This would have been set out in lines 4 to 6, where the papyrus is badly damaged. The references to an ἑργαστήριον ((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. 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). 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. 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).
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 θαλλός 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.


ουξ . . . υης καταρ[τε]ς[α] . [ . . . 10? . . ]
6 ... 20? ... ὁ μεμισθωμένος ὁ ἀργυρίων καθ' ἡμέραν ἔνεργ[ῶν] ὑπὲρ τῶν μεμισθωκότων, παρέχων

7 [.... 28 .........] ὑπηρεσίαν, [ἐ]νοικίου καὶ φόρου πάντων κατ' ἐτος ἀργυρίων δραχμῶν ἐκατόν ἐκκοσι. ὁμολογεῖ δὲ ὁ με-

8 [μισθωμένος ἔχει διὰ χειρὸς παρά τῶν μεμισθωκότων ἀργυρίων] τριακοσίας ἀργυρίων ἐκατόν ἀναποδότους τὰς δ' ἄλλας

9 [δραχμάς τριακοσίας εἰς λόγον προχρείας ἐργαστηρίου ἀστερ δραχμάς τριακοσίας ἀποδώσει ὁ μεμισθωμένος ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς τριετίας, τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐρ-

10 [γαστηρίου ... 12? ... πελωχί]κού καὶ ἐξαδραχμίας ὑπὲρ τῶν πάντων δημοσίων ἢ ἰδιωτικών ὄντων πρὸς τοὺς μεμισθωκότας.

11 [οὐκ ἔχεσται τῷ μεμισθωμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἐργαστηρίῳ ἀρτοποιών γενέσθαι ἢ ὑπηρεσίας ἢ ἀλέκτρας ἢ ἄλλο τι παρασχεῖν εἰς παρουσίαν τῆς πόλεως ἢ ἄλλου τι

12 [.νός . 25? . ....] ὑπαρξίας. ἐβεβαιούμενης δὲ τῆς μισθώσεως ἀποδότω ὁ μεμισθωμένος τὸν μὲν φόρον κατ' ἐτος ἐν προθεσμίαις τρισὶ

13 [διὰ τετραμήνου δραχμάς τεσσαράκοντα, τὰς δὲ τῆς προχρείας δεξίας τριακοσίας ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου ὡς ἐπάνω δεδήλωται χωρίς ὑπερθέ-

14 [σεως. ἐὰν δὲ ... 18? ...] ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ πάντων. ὡς ἐὰν μὴ παραδῷ τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις ἔστω  ἐκτελεῖν εἰς τὸν χρόνον ὡς ἐπάνω δεδήλωται χωρίς ὑπερθέ-

15 [παρέξεται ὁ μ] μεμισθωμένος καὶ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον παραδότω ὁ αὐτὸς μεμισθωμένος τὴν μηχανήν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ τὸ ἐργαστήριον ἢ ἀπο-

16 [τεισάτω ὁ ἐὰν] προσοφειλέσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόρου καὶ τῆς προχρείας μεθ' ἡμιολίας, οὐ δ' ἐὰν μὴ παραδῷ τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις ἐστω ἐκ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ

17 [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων α] ὑπαρχόντων. οὐκ ἔξοντος οὐδ' ὁ μεμισθωμένος τῆς προχρείας ὡς ἐξαδραχμίας ὑπὲρ ἀλέκτρας ὑπὲρ ἐκάθtvειν

19 ὁ παραβησόμενος τῷ ἐμείνοντι ἐπίτειμον δραχμᾶς πεντακοσίας καὶ εἰς τὸ
dημόσιον τὰς ἱσας μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τὰ προγεγραμμένα κυ-

20 [πια μεειν, κυρία ἡ μισθωσις. [έτους .] Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτ[ου] Αἰλίου
Αδρ(ί)ανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὔσεβοῦς Ὀωθ 5. (m. 2) ὑπογρ (αφ-)

ἐργαστήριον καὶ τὴν μηχανὴν σὺν στροβείλῳ καὶ

22 [. . . 9? . . ] [θ]υμή καὶ [. . . ] [. . ] ἡ καταρτεία παρὲξ κτηνῶν ἐνοικίου καὶ φόρου
κατ’ ἐτος δραχμῶν ἐκατὸν εἶκοι καὶ

δραχμῶν μὲν ἐκατὸν ἀναποδότους τὰς δ’ ἄλλας δραχμᾶς τρια-

Ἀπίων Εὐδαίμονος ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδότος γράμματα).

της ἀδελφῆς καὶ γυναικὸς μου κύριος καὶ [ἔγρα-

26 [μὴ υπὲρ αὐτῆ]ς μὴ εἰδυίης γράμματα. Ἡρᾶς Ἡρᾶτος συνμεμίσθωσικα ὡς
πρόκειται.

11, 17 l. ὑπνίθας 19 l. ἐπίτειμον ῥασ, .............................., 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] 1” 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 from ......Andronicus,
.............. 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 the ....year 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-lessee 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.

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

2 [τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ . . . καὶ ἀνδρός]. For the restoration see l. 25. P. Kron. 20.4 (146, a loan agreement from Tebtunis) contains τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ [τοῦ] δὲ καὶ ἀνδρός(ς) but the τοῦ has been restored and the expression is awkward. As the first two legible letters are clearly ος, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς (SPP XXII 60.4, 2nd/3rd century, Athribites) does not fit. τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνδρός 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 ἐπίγονης 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), II. 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.

ένεστῶτος. The lease is for three years (see I. 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 ένεστῶτος rather than εἰσιόντος.

3-4 [8] καὶ αὔ[τοι ἔχουσι ἐν μισθώσει παρὰ ...]. Inserted by analogy with VI 912 9-12 (235, lease of a cellar: ἀφ’ ἓς καὶ αὐτή ἔχει ἐμ μισθώσει παρὰ Αὐρηλί(ου) Ἰοιδώρου Χαϊρήμωνος ἔν ἀμφόδου Νότου Κρηπεῖδος 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’ ἀμφόδου Ῥήμης 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 ρώμ[ης] Ὀννώφρ(εως). The street is also attested in PSI IX 1034 (2nd to 3rd century). ἀμφοδόου had replaced λαύρα as the usual term for quarter or district by the second half of the 1st century (Rink 1924, 11).

ἐργ[αστήριον]. 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.

καταρτ[ε]ία. 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 μηχ[αν]ή ἐξηρτισμένη ράος ἐμικηκτεία καὶ οἰδηπ[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[ῶν]. 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 ἑαυτῷ κτήνη (P. Oxy. Hels 41.22).

[ἐ]νοικίου καὶ φόρου. See p. 23.

8 ἔχειν διὰ χειρὸς παρὰ. 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 προχρείας. 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?] . . . πελωχικὸν. Restored by analogy with ὑπὲρ τοῦ μυλαίου 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 πελωχικὸν 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 ἀρτοπωλῶν (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 πελωχικὸν; the normal term for this in the Oxyrhynchite is ὑπὲρ φυλάκτρου (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 ὅνων. 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 ὅνων 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 παρὲξ κτημῶν, excluding animals, so the tenant had to provide them himself.
11 ἀρτοποιίαν γενέσθαι. The ending of ἀρτοποιίαν is not clear; if it is correct the preceding word should be ἐργαστήριον, in the nominative. ἀρτοκόπος is the more usual word for baker but ἀρτοποιός, which is possible here, is attested in SB XX 14197 (253) and in P. Athen. 55 (undated). ἀρτοποιία (or ἀρτοποιεία) 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 ostraca). 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 saquiya 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 girding equipment used in the saquiya (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; ἀλετικὴ [μηχανή]), PSI VII 787 (2nd century: Arsinoite), SB XIV 11705 (213, location unknown, μηχανή σιταλητική), CPR VI 73 (222-235: Heracleopolite, where ἀλετικὴ was restored), P. Cair. Isid. 64 (c. 298: Karanis, μηχανὴ ἀλετική) and BGU II 405 (348: Philadelphia, a μηχανὴ σιταλητική). 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 δὲ τις ἡγενήται ἐπισκευῆς ἢ ἀνοικοδομῆς ἢ καταιάγματος εὐλικῶν 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 τι μέρος κατιακῇ τοῦ ὄργανου, τόσον δώσουσι αὐτῷ οἱ μεμισθωκότες, 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 δὲ τῶν τῆς μηχανῆς κατεαγη ἢ παλαιωθῇ 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 παραδότω δ ἂν τῶν μεμισθωμένων 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 ἀποτεισάτω ὃ ἂν προσοφειλέσῃ. The usual construction in the Oxyrhynchite nome, which is the only nome where this use of προσοφειλέσῃ is attested, is ὃ δὲ ἂν προσοφειλέσῃ, ἀποτεισάτω 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 ή πρᾶξις ἔστω ἐκ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ [τῶν ὑπαρχόντων α]ὐτῷ 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 Exeekturkunde) 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 ἐνκαταλείπειν 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 παραβησόμενος. 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 τὸ 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 κύρια 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.

στροβείλῳ. 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 θυίῃ. This is a reference to a mortar used in the mill. The word occurs with a *strobilus* (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 archephodos, 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 canalicarius (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, 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).

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, 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). 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. 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

---

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, ἀνεί, ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως”) 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

“Adresse, πέμψον τὸν δεῖνα ἐντυχόντος τοῦ δεῖνος”

Arsinoite

“Adresse, ἁνάπεμψον(-πέμψατε) τὸν δεῖνα ἐγκαλούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος εξαυτῆς.”

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 agraphylax) and XLI 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, 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 archephodos 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 archephodos 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 archephodos’ 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.


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 archephodos 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 archephodos 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 Sänger 2005 passim.

between 295 and 309 with the appointment of a dux (first attested 308-9). 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. 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. Petitions to military officers decline by the late 3rd/early 4th centuries, probably as the separation of civil and military authority took effect. 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.

Like the seven considered here, summonses were commonly written against the fibres; 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. 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. 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. 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.
52 See Palme 2006, 382-386; Aubert 1995, 259.
55 Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 81-82.
56 Gagos and Sijpesteijn 1996, 82-85, citing P. J. Parsons.
of the person summoned. IX 1212 contains, on the verso, a list of vegetables delivered to
the archepheidos of Pela, the addressee of the summons, suggesting that the original orders
were retained by the archepheidos 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
archepheodos 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
summoned 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 canaliclarius 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.
It would be surprising if five officers were stationed in Oxyrhynchus at the same time but these papyri may show only two: a \textit{beneficiarius} called Areios who held the rank of \textit{decurio} (see 05.1 n.) and a \textit{canaliclarius}, 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 \textit{βενεφικιάριος στατιζών}, Boak and Youtie suggest that such an officer was in fact a \textit{decadarch} or \textit{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 \textit{beneficiarius}, not the addressee of the petition, who had been entrusted with the decadarchy. They believed that such a person (\textit{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 \textit{στατίζων ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοίτῃ}). Rankov’s interpretation was different: if the addressee of P. Cair. Isid. 62 was a \textit{decurio}, then taken together with P. Cair. Isid. 63 this showed that there could be a \textit{beneficiarius} and a \textit{decurio} in the same nome at the same time.\footnote{Rankov 1994, 230.} I doubt that the addressee of P. Cair. Isid. 62 was a \textit{decurio}: I have found no reference to a \textit{decurio} who is described as \textit{στατίζων} and at XVII 2130 21 n. the editor assumed that a person described as \textit{στατίζοντος} was a \textit{beneficiarius}.\footnote{See also LXIII 4372 5n and 4378 2 n.} I see no reason to assume that all \textit{beneficiarii} held the rank of \textit{decadarch} or \textit{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 \textit{decurio}, as a cavalry officer, probably had more of a roving brief (08.1 n. and P. Meyer 20) while the \textit{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.
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 Φατρεὺς καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ Θατρῆν

3 γαμβρὰν αὐτοῦ ἐντυχ[ ] Όντος Αμόιτος

4 δημοσίων χάριν.

“To the archephodos of Chysis: send Aspasiaus 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 archephodos was one of the liturgical officials or δημόσιοι κώμης responsible for maintaining public order (Browne, P. Mich. X 589-591, Introduction, p. 51). *Archephon* 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 archephodos 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. Φατρέως). 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 Ptollion), 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), XLI. IV 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 ἄμοιτος. 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 rho than an iota; the loop at the top would be tiny but no smaller than in the rho in γαμβρὰν. I have found no name whose genitive would be “Amortos”, while Amoïs is a well-known Oxyrhynchite name (e.g. LV 3786 36, 37, 40, 42), and what appears to be a loop on a rho 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”, “ἐν τυχόντως Ἀπίωνος / πράκτωρ δημοσίων ...[.]ν ......”. 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 χάριν. (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 φύλακας. 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.
Summons to an *archephodos* 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 *archephodos* 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 *archephodos* 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 Θέωνος εὐθ(ημιαρχ.)
4 Ἀλ[ε]ξανδρείας.

“To the *archephodus* of Monimou; come up on the petition of Theon, (ex-?)eutheiniarch 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 archephodos of Monimou. See Benaissa 2009, 159-161.

2 ἄνελθε. 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 archephodos 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 archephodos or archephodoi 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, 164, BGU XVII 2701, LXXIV 5011 and 09 contain similar instructions to other officials. PSI XV 1536 (2nd century, Oxyrhynchite) orders the archephodos of Ibion Ammon to attend with the “accused”, ἄνελθε 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 archephodos 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(α) 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(ηνιάρχου) or εὐθ(ηνιαρχήσαντος). While εξαυτῆς 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), XI 2904 3 (272), XI 3031 1 (302) and two later summonses, BGU XVII 2700.5-6 and 2701.4).
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(αρὰ) τοῦ β(ενε)φ(ικιαρίου)
2 κωμάρχαις καὶ ἐπιστάτης εἰρήνης κώμης
3 Σινκέφα. ἔξαυτῆς παράδοτε τῷ στρατιώτῃ
4 Νεικήρατον υἱόν Ἑλένης ἐντυχόντος
5 Μαξίμου.

1 π’ βφ 21. ἐπιστάτημ

“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 decadarchy, τῷ ἐνπεπιστευμένῳ τὴν 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) επάρχου 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 στατίζον (normally translated as “on duty”), but his position would have been the same. Later in the 4th century such *beneficiarii* 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 *beneficiarii* 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 κομίαρχαις 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.


τῷ στρατιώτῃ. 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 υἱὸν 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 canaliclarius

16 2B.48/E(b)  20 x 7.25 cm  245-275?

06 contains an instruction from a canaliclarius 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 ἥκετε ἅμα τῷ ἀποσταλέντι στρατιώτῃ ἐπαγόμενοι Πάριν τὸν

3 καὶ Ζευξιανὸν καὶ τοὺς τούτου οἰκέτας Ἐρμῆν καὶ Σαραπίωνα καὶ

4 Εὐχάριστον καὶ Διογένην καὶ Βερνεικιανὸν.

5 κωμάρχ(ας) καὶ δημοσίοις κώμης Πέλα.

1 π — 5 κωμαρχ"

“From the canaliclarius. 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 canonarius 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 canonarius: the papyrus was too early and the reading too clear. His view, that the closest approximation was canaliclarius, 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 canaliclarius or
canalicularius, giving evidence of between two and four canaliculii 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 cananicularius 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 canalicularius and (as Parsons) I think he was more like a clerk, ranking below a beneficiarius or decurio. 3366 refers to a cananicularius 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 κανικλέων was a writing instrument (citing du Cange, s.v. caniclinus).

2 ἥκετε ἁμα. 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) ἄρχιερέως τῆς λαμπρᾶς Ἀντινοέως 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.).

στρατιώτης. See 05.3 n.

3 οἰκέταις. 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-
Two summonses of slaves are known; these use δούλος (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). acquire 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(ας) 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.
Summons from a *canaliclarius*

This document is not in the usual format for a “summons”; there is no addressee and the person summoned, 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(αρὰ) τοῦ κανανικλαρίου

2 τὸν Ἀμμωνίωνος τέκτονα παραπέμψαι εἰς .[]

3 Διοσκόρῳ στρατιώτῃ (vac.) ἐν κώμῃ Ἔπιση[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 summoned 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 I.XXIV 5011 (and see 2 n.: 3rd/4th century)). Officials were summoned 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 summoned 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 Διοσκόρῳ στρατιώτῃ. He may be the same soldier as in 08.3. See 05.3 n. and 08.1 n.

ἐν κώμῃ Ἐπισήμου. 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

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(αρὰ) Ἀρείου (δεκαδάρχου).
2 τὰ ἐρίκινα ξύλα σ. . σ. ἐθέμην ἐν ἐριθμῷ ζ̂̄
3 παράδος Ποσοκόρῳ στρ(ατιώτη) καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀνάβα.
4 κηπουρῷ Ἀκτῆς παρ’ αὐτοῦ.

“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 ostracon) 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, I 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 Drekhage 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 . . υο. ἅτινα would give acceptable sense but is hard to make out.

ἐν ἀριθμῷ 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 Διοσκόρῳ στρ(ατιώτη). See 1 n., 05.3 n. and 07.3 n.

καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἀνάβα. See 06.2 n.

4 κηπουρῷ Ἀκτῆς. 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. Koln 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 3\textsuperscript{rd} 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\pi(\alpha rα) & του \ (δεκαδάρ)χ(ου) \ | \ κωμάρχαις \ & και \ επιστάτη \ ειρήνης \ κώμης \ Τήεως. \\
& & | \ \epsilon' & έμου \ στρατιώτη \ | \ Άμμιώνις \ έπικαλούμενος \ Άλακερ \ επελέγ' \ χοντος \ | \ υπὸ \ Πτολλᾶ, \ ή \ ύμις \ αύτοι \ άνέρχεσθε. \\
σ'ση(μείωμαι)
\end{align*}
\]

If the restoration below is correct the sender and village of the addressee 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 \(\pi\text{αρα} \ [τοι]¦\ [\text{δεκαδάρ}]\chi(ου) \ \text{kωμάρχας} \ |

2 \& \pi[\text{διοφύ}]\lambda\xi. \ \varepsilon\zeta\upsilon\tau\iota[\varsigma]

3 \[\text{παράδοτε} \ τω \ \text{πεμβέν-} \]

4 \[\tauτι \ υπ\' \ \text{έμου} \ \text{στρατιώτη} \]

\[\lambda\eta \ldots\]

5 \[\tauτος \ \text{παρ} \ \text{ημιν} \ \text{αλις} \]

6 \[\eta \ \text{αυτοι} \ \text{υμις} \ \text{ανέρχεσθε} \].
7 κώμης Τήεως

8 (m. 2) ἐσημιωσάμην.

3 κ. πεισθέν 4 ὑπ' 51. παρ' ὑμῖν 6.1. ὑμεῖς 8 κ. ἐσημιωσάμην

“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 (δεκαδάρχος) θείου. There is a trace of what may be a χι or a stroke through a φι 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 (05.1n.). I have restored this as decurio because of its similarity to I 64.

2 πε[διοπυ]λαξί. Apart from a single example of λεστιπιασταί (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. πεδιοπυλάκες 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 ἥλιος... 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.

6 ἢ αὐτοῖς 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 ἐσημιωσάμην(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 ἐσημιωσάμην.
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 ύφαμμος).
63 Rowlandson 1996, 128.
64 See Wallace 1938, 6; Bonneau 1971, 21, 65.
affected its efficacy, which varied from place to place.  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. 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.

Land which would have been inundated (*βεβρεγμένη*) in a “normal” year was described as *ἀβροχος* when the flood was insufficient to water it; this term applied only on an annual basis. Land termed *ἐπηντλημένη* in the declarations was *ἀβροχος* land which had been artificially irrigated. Bonneau defines this as meaning water lifted by a mechanical device (usually a *shaduf*, until the *saquiya* became more widespread from the 3rd century and particularly in the 4th and 5th), 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*.

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. 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. It is generally assumed that the tax system worked in an analogous way to the

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 Apollonopolitae 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 *ἐπίσκεψις* 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 been 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

---

\(^72\) 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{80} Most are dated Mecheir to Phamenoth (late January to late April). They would have been followed by an \textit{ἐξέτασις}, when the contents were checked against a register maintained by the \textit{comogrammateus}, probably the previous year’s survey, and also by an \textit{ἐπίσκεψις}, where the land concerned was physically checked by appropriate officials from

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{78} Bonneau 1971, 184; Déléage 1934, 117.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{80} Habermann 1997, 259-261; no months are named in papyri published subsequently. See also Gonis 1999, 207 n. 3.
Declarations were usually written out by and formalised in front of an official.\textsuperscript{83} Up to four copies were made and kept by the appropriate officials; the declarer may also have kept a copy (as \textbf{010}). The officials’ copies were sometimes stuck together to form a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος 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.\textsuperscript{84} There is no evidence that \textbf{010} or \textbf{014} were in a \textit{tomos}, but \textbf{011}, \textbf{012} and \textbf{013} were; as normal, the document on the left was stuck over the left-hand margin of the one which followed it.\textsuperscript{85} Other \textit{abrochia} declarations known to be from \textit{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 XI 3047, as well as papyrus 14 in Hakkert 1967.\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{Title to/ownership of the land}

The declarers of \textbf{010} and \textbf{013} make it plain that they are the owners of the land they are describing; ἡν ἔχω and τὰς ὑπαρχούσας μοι at \textbf{010}.5 and.13, ἣς ἔχω at \textbf{013}.7 The equivalent parts are missing from \textbf{011}, \textbf{012} and \textbf{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.\textsuperscript{87} \textbf{010} and \textbf{014}, like almost half the Oxyrhynchite declarations, refer to land ἐς the names of others and it is likely that \textbf{011} and \textbf{013} did so too; in the Arsinoite many refer to land σωματιζομένη ἐς or διὰ σωματισμοῦ others.\textsuperscript{88} Apart from \textbf{010}, the Oxyrhynchite ones do not use the term ἀναγραφομένη ἐς.\textsuperscript{89} The meaning of these terms is not clear, but they both seem to refer to some form of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{82} Habermann 1997, 261. See also Wallace 1938, 8-9 and 358-9.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Harmon 1934, 157.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Clarysse 2003, 355.
\item \textsuperscript{85} Omar 1981, 233.
\item \textsuperscript{86} On \textit{tomoi} generally see Clarysse 2003, who identified over 230 examples, and, specifically in relation to \textit{abrochia} declarations, Déléage 1934, 117-118; Avogadro 1935, 153; Préaux 1963, 124-127; Kruse 2002, I 249.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{89} ἀναγραφομένη ἐς is a normal term in the Oxyrhynchite to reflect registration of title, including to public land (Rowlandson 1996, 97).
\end{itemize}
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. The βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων contained a record of ownership only. 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. 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. 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. 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. It makes little sense for the person responsible for paying the tax to

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

---

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 ἀναγραφομένη εἰς or εἰς named individuals, as in ll. 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20, and land ἐπὶ 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 Socnopaiou 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; Socnopaiou 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.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{104}

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

\textsuperscript{103} Bonneau 1979, 64-67; Bagnall 1985, 297.
\textsuperscript{104} Bonneau 1971, 191.
\textsuperscript{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 \textit{comogrammateus} was replaced by the comarchs, who did not have the same responsibilities in relation to land assessments.
\textsuperscript{106} See the edict of Aristius Optatus in 297 (P.Cair. Isid. I.1); Bagnall 1985, 300.
Declaration of uninundated and artificially irrigated land

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 oikopeda, 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 τῷ καὶ Ἀπίωνι βασιλικῷ γρ(αμματε) Ὀξ(υρυγχίτου)
2 παρὰ Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου Αὐρηλίου Σαραπίωνος κοσμητεύσαντος βουλ[ευτοῦ]
3 τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων. κατὰ τὰ κελευθέν[τα ἐν τῷ]
4 ἔνεστότι κ (ἔτει) περὶ ἀπογραφῆς ἀβρόχου καὶ ἐπηντλημένης ἀπογράφομαι
5 ἡν ἔχω ἄβροχον καὶ ἐπηντλημ(ένης) τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνεστώτι κ ἐτει., ἐστι.]

6 περὶ μὲν κώμην Μέρμερθα ἄναγραφομένας εἰς Σατ[ο]ρνεί[λον τὸν

7 κ]αὶ Ἕρωτα τινὸς Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἕρωτος ἰδιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου)
ἐπ[ηντλημ(ένης)

8 (άρουρης) δ καὶ εἰς Σιντοτοῆν Ἀπολλωνίου μητρὸς Τεκώσιος ἰδιωτικῆς
(μοναρτάβου)

9 ἐπηντλημ(ένης) (άρουρης) δ καὶ εἰς Ἡρακλείδην Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλεί[δου

10 μ[ητ(ρός)] Ταυσαράπιος ἰδιωτ(ικῆς) (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλημ(ένης) (άρούρας) ε
ίς ΛΒ καὶ εἰς Ἀρτα[]

11 τὸν καὶ Θούνιον παστοφόρον Θοήριδος θεᾶς μεγίστης ἰδιωτικῆς

12 (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλημ(ημένης) (άρούρας) β. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπ’ ὀνόματος Μάρκου
Πετρωνίου

13 Ἡρ[ακ]λαυνοῦ ὁμοίως τάς ὑπαρχούσας μοι ἰδιωτ(ικῆς) ἐπηντλ(ημένης)
(μοναρτάβου) (άρούρας) [.]

14 καὶ εἰς [Δ]ιουύσιον Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Διουύσιον ἰ[δ]ιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου)
ἐτει-

15 τὴν(ένης) (άρούρας) η’ καὶ εἰς Θέωνα Θέωνος τοῦ Θέωνος μητ(ρός)
Δημητροῦ[τος

16 Μενχέως ἰδιωτικ(ής) (μοναρτάβου) ἐπηντλ(ημένης) (άρούρας) ΛΒ καὶ εἰς
Ἡρακλείδην Σάραπη-

17 ωνος τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου πρότερον Παπούθε[ῦτ]ος Σαδάλου ἄβροχ[(ου)
(άρουρ π ).

18 καὶ εἰς Διδύμου Σατόκου διὰ Διδύμου Πτολεμαίου (μοναρτάβου) ἄβροχ(ου)
(άρούρης) δη[

19 ἄβροχου (άρουρης) δη’ καὶ εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν Σαραπίωνα Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Σαρα-
To Horion, also known as Apion, royal scribe of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Lucius Septimius Aurelius Sarapion, former *kosmētes* 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, ¾ of an aroura of private land paying 1 artaba, and

registered to Sintotoes, daughter of Apollonius, whose mother is Tecosis, artificially irrigated, ¾ 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 1/16 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 the same Sarapion son of Heraclides and grandson of Sarapion, whose mother is Tausarapis,
artificially irrigated, 3 ¾ 1/64 arouras of land paying 1 artaba, and
registered to Papontheus 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 Αὐρηλίου Σαραπίωνος κοσμητεύσαντος βου[
λευτοῦ This individual is unattested to date. The *kosmētes* 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-Małowist 1975, 746-7).

3 κατὰ τὰ κελευθέν[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 (ἐτεί). 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 (ἐτεί). 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]ρνει[λο]ν τὸν κ]αὶ Ἐρωτα υἱὸν Τιβερίου Κλαύδιου Ἐρωτός. Saturneinus
and Saturneius (both are possible) are the only names which fit here if the transcription of
ρνει 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 1¼ (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 Ἡρακλε[ίδου | μητ(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 ἑπ’ ὀνόματος Μάρκου Πετρω[νίου] Ἡρ[ακλανοῦ ὁμοίως τὰς ύπαρχούσας μοι..... (ἀρούρας). The land described is part of a parcel ἑπ’ 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 ἦ’ 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 άβροχος, 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 [Αὐρηλίῳ Νεμεσίων τῷ καὶ

3 [Διονυσίῳ βασιλικῷ γρ(αμματεῖ)] Ὀξυρυγχίτου

4 [παρὰ 10 ἀπόγραφοι]  δῶρου

5 [14 .] ἀτου

6 [10 ἀπογράφομαι]

7 [πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστὸς δ(έτος)

8 [Μάρκου Αὐρηλίῳ] Ὀξυρυγχίτου

9 [Αλεξάνδρου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου]
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 Αὐρηλίῳ Νεμεσίῳ νι τῷ καὶ Διονυσίῳ. 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. τοῦ (l.5) may be the end of a name or the definite article.

7 [πρὸς τὸ ἐνεστὸς τὸ ἐτός]. 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 οὖν 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 Θεοδότου ...... προ[σ]θήματος, 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 χι is not correct there are many more possibilities and the preceding μι 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. ἀπὸ in l. 15 signifies that the land first identified was part of a larger holding. The repetition of ἄβροχ( ) 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]υρηλίῳ Νεμεσίων

3 τ[3]ῳ κ(α)ί Διονυσίῳ βασιλικῷ
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 *ταυ* 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 *ετα* is not clear at the start of l. 6 but the only other possibility is a *καμπα* 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 Κερκεθύρεως. A village in the Western toparchy (Benaissa 2009, 114-116).

8 δ(ια) Aurelia makes the declaration through a man, who is not given any description such a secretary or manager (as in XLI 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(ὸς) τὴν [τοῦ] ἐνεστῶτ(ος) δ (ἐτους). 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 ἀπογραφῆν (as P. Rein. II 93, I 171 (published under II 254), VIII 1111 (203), XXXVI 2762), and then by a term like τὴν υπάρχουσάν μοι or τὰ υπάρχοντά μοι. I think it likely that the insertion of τὴν was an error by a scribe used to compiling census declarations (although neither 224 nor 225 was a census year: see XLI 3077); see P. Corn. 17, where a similar omission occurs in a census declaration, and 010.5 n. For the abbreviation of *πρός* as a *ρβ* 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

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 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  [Αὐρηλίῳ] ᾧ Νεμεσίωνος τῷ καὶ Διονυσίῳ βασιλ(ικῷ)

2  |γραμ|ματεῖ Ὀξυρυγχίτου

3  [παρὰ |Αὐρηλίου Ἡρακλάτος Θώνιος μητρόφ][5]

4  |Τσενν]νυφρίος ἀπ’ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως.
ἀπογράφωμαι κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα πρὸς τὸν Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου

Καὶ τὸν κυρίου Ἀλεξάνδρου (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) γὰρ (ἀρούρων) γ’ιβ’

ἐνεστὸς δὲ (ἐτος) Μ[άρκου] Αὐρηλίου Σεουήρου

Ἀλεξάνδρου Καὶ[ίσ]αρος τοῦ κυρίου ἂς ἔχω

Ἀπελήλεως τοῦ . . κλήρου

ἀδελφῆς ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἐπικοῦν

Ἀλεξάνδρου Καὶ ποὶος τοῦ κυρίου ἂς ἔχω

καὶ Τσενοννώφριος ἀδελφῆς

ἐκ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἐπικοῦν

Ζωίλου Ἀχιλλέως τοῦ . . . 

ζωίλατος α . . [ . ] . 

ζωίλατος α . . [ . ] .
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 have ..........of Aurelius Ploution son of .......... and Tsenonnophris [his] sister... from the cavalry allotment of Ptolemaeus ..... 

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

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

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.”

5 κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα. See 010.3 n.

8 If the visible part of the first letter is the end of the stroke of a theta, the line may begin ἐν μισθώσει, 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 κλήρου. 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 ἀνὰ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) γ Some land in the declaration, probably ousiakē 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

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 Ἰβμή, ἀπὸ (ἀρουρών) σ (ἀρούρης) δ’ καὶ

5 ἀπὸ (ἀρουρών) αλ’(ἀρούρης) δ’ μή (γίνεται) οὐσιακ(ῆς)

6 ἀβρόχ(ου) (ἀρούρης) Λ’ μῆ καὶ περὶ Μου-

7 χιναρωῦ ἐκ τοῦ Λεοντί-

8 σκου σῶν τῶ Ηρακλείδου

9 εἰς Καλαμίωνα Διδύμου

10 ἰδιωτικῆς (μοναρτάβου) ἀβρόχ(ου)

11 (ἀρουράς) αδ’ vacat

12 (ἔτους) γ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

13 Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Γορδιανοῦ

14 Εὐσεβοῦς [Εὐ]τυχοῦ Σεβαστοῦ
15 Φαμενώθ θανήθεν

16 (m. 2) Αὐρήλιος Σερῆνος ὁ καὶ

17 Εὐδαιμόνιος ἐπίδοκα.

18 Αὐρήλιος Σερῆνος ἔγρα- 

19 ψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰ- 

20 δυτος γράμματα 

21 (m.1?) ἀπεγρ(ήην) π(αρά) πραγμ(ατικώ) Παλώ-  

22 σεως. 

3 αλλ 4 π, ι, ι, 5 ι, ι, Γ, οὐσιακ 6 αβρον, ι 10 απτ, αβροχν 12 ι, 17 l. 

ἐπιδέδωκα 19 ὑπὲρ 19-201. εἴδότος 21 ἀπεγρῆ, πʹ, πραγμ 

“...registered to Petosiris son of Pathotes and others, rated at 2 1/12 1/48 artabas at basic rate, out of 6 arouras, ¼, and out of 1 ½ arouras, ¼ 1/48, making a total of uninundated imperial estate land of 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 ¼ arouras uninundated.

In the 3rd year of Imperator 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 οὐσιακής. 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 Μουχιναρύω. 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 Thmoisephon (Benaissa 2009, 163-164). Palosis, named in l. 22, is in the Thmoisephon toparchy so it is possible that this is the Thmoisephon Mouchinaryo. For the meaning of περὶ in this context see ΟΙ.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 and SB V 8086.23) and Calamon (P. Strasb. II 139.6).

10 ἰδιωτικής (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 XI.II 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 ἐπιδικώα 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 ἐιδυτος for εἰδότος. See Gignac, Grammar I, 273 for examples of υ being substituted for ο in accented syllables, and 17 n. above.

21 ἀπεγρ (ἀφη) π(αρὰ) 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 basilicogrammateus, 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.
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
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 Νεμεσιανῷ τῷ τιμειω-
2 τᾶτῳ χαίρειν. (vac.)
3 προσενέγκας τοῖς ἄρχουσι τοῖς τὸ
4 σιτηρέσιον πιπιστευμένοις τὸ
5 ἐφεστιόν μου κεχρονισμένον
6 εἰς τὸ ὑ (ἔτος) Παχὼν ἢ, ἐμοῦ δὲ λα-
7 βόντος ἀπὸ τοῦ [. . . . . . ] . ιου σου[
8 τ. . . . . . [  

015 Letter regarding the corn dole
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 ὁὖν πεπιστευμένου τὰ χώματα (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 σιτηρεσίου 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 σιτηρεσίου, XL 2918 to τοῖς αἱρεθεῖσι ὑπὸ τῆς κρατίστης βουλῆς δἐ [i]άδοσιν ποιήσασθαι τοῦ σειτηρεσίου and XL 2924 is a notice from a gymnasiarch, another named individual καὶ τῶν ὁὖν αὐτοῖς ἄρχοντων. 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 ρεμβοί. These were respectively metropolites, namely Oxyrhynchite citizens who had passed their ἐπίκρισις 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 ἐφεστι[ου] τὸ ἀντίγραφον 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 αἰτη[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 ἐπανελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἐαυτῶν ἑφέστια (l.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 ἔξενοι from the obligation unless they had established some sort of residence there (18-20: τὸ ἐφέστιον αὐτὸθι 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 ἑφεστίου τὸ ἀντίγραφον 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 ἑφεστίου, 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 τοῦ γ (ἕτος) Παχὼν 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 . [.] ιου σου [ . The letter before the break may be a θeta; if so, the reading τοῦ θ[ε]ιου σου is possible.
016  List of assistants of praepositi pagorum

Introduction

016 contains a list of assistants of Oxyrhynchite praepositi pagorum, dating from the 4th century, possibly around 338-340. 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. 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); 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 bouleutic class: praepositi are described sometimes as bouleutai and at other times as politeuomenoi, possibly the term for those eligible to be bouleutai, rather than those who actually were. Bowman estimated that there may have been 100 actual bouleutai in Oxyrhynchus at any one time, out of an eligible class of some 300; not all bouleutai 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). 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

---

109 Cited by Lewis 1997, 42.
110 See Gonis 2008 with references to prior literature.
overseeing the apportionment and collection of taxes and army supplies (as in X 1253, see below). Their assistants were called βοηθοί, 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 baule 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.


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. 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 γεοῦχο⟨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. The Eulogius in 3425 is described as being πραιπόσιτος κώμης Τερύθεως; 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. It is a tax receipt signed on behalf of Eulogius praepositus by his son (possibly the son Sarapion mentioned at 3393). 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. Tancheo might however have been in the 8th pagus, which did include some villages in the Lower toparchy, and so the Eulogius in SB V 7756 might have been praepositus of that pagus, which is the one attributed to Eulogius in 016. I have not found any examples of praepositi holding office in different pagni at different times (although Flavius Olympiodorus (no. 40 in Jördens’ list) held office in two pagni 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 βοηθός 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 βοηθοί 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. 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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pagus</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Ἀχιλλεύς</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>XLIX 3479 and BL IX 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Διδύμος Διδύμου</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>LV 3788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Διογένης*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>61?</td>
<td>XLVIII 3415 and 3416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Εὐλόγιος*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>SB V 7756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Εὐλόγιος*</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>c.365</td>
<td>XLVIII 3393, 3400 and 3425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Εὐλόγιος*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.365</td>
<td>XLVIII 3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Εὐτρύγιος</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>LXVII 4598 and 4599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Κλ. Ἡράκλειος</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>XXXIII 2668=SB VIII 9875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Θέων</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>IX 1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(with no. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Θεωνῖνος</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>SB XVI 12543=PSI IV 309, with BL IX 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Ἰαίδωρος</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>PSI X 1106 and 1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Φλ. Π[ (with no. 10)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>IX 1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Πλουτίων</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>LI 3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Πτολεμῖνος</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>P. Harr. II 219 and CSBE² 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Σαραπάμμων</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>LXI 4128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Εὐλογίου*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Σαραπίων</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>LIV 3741 r. descr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Φιλόξενος</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>323-4?</td>
<td>P. Harr. II 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Αὐρ. Χω[**</td>
<td>5 and 6? 319</td>
<td>PSI Congr. XVII 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ψρίων*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>XLVIII 3391, 3392, 3405 and 3412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pagus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀντίοχος</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀφθόνιος</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀπίων</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γερόντιος</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐδαιμών</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐλόγιος*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεόδωρος</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεόδωρος</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κορνήλιος?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παιάνιος</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πτολεμαῖος?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παῦλος</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Occurrences 300-400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀντίοχος</td>
<td>c.150</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀφθόνιος</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀπίων</td>
<td>&gt;700</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γερόντιος</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γιανός</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>37 (at least 12 are 1 person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἑρμεῖας</td>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐδαιμών</td>
<td>&gt;700</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐλόγιος</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεόδωρος</td>
<td>&gt;1,000</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεωνίνος</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰσίδωρος</td>
<td>&gt;1,000</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κορνήλιος</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παιάνιος</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πτολεμαῖος</td>
<td>&gt;3,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παῦλος</td>
<td>&gt;700</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σαρμάτης</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ὡρίων</td>
<td>&gt;1,000</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 λαμπροτάτῳ 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.
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 bouleutic 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 bouleutes 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 bouleutes 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)
Ερμείας βοηθός
Παλαινίου πραι(ποσίτου)

Ὡρίων βοηθός
Παιανίου πραι(ποσίτου)

Θεωνῖνος βοηθός
Παύλου πραι(ποσίτου)

Πτολεμαίου ἀδελφὸς
Πτολεμαῖος βοηθός

“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
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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 diaeresis. 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 (πραιποσι 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
1.6 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 Leukio, which is mentioned twice, is known to have been in
the 3rd pagus (Benaissa 2009, 138).

9 Παύλου. A Paulus was a χωματεπείκτης in 336 and so of bouleutic 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 Απίωνος. There may have been a strategus called Apion in 357 (I 66: see Whitehorne
2006, 112).

14 Θεωνῖνος 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 bouleutic 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) though 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 Σαρμάτης have been replaced by lambda 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 Γεροντίου. 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 gymnasiarch 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. Αφθόνιος ἀδελφὸς Πτολεμαῖος πραιτορ. I cannot make sense of this part of the list unless Αφθόνιος ἀδελφὸς 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 Gascou ultimately became a charge on the large estates rather than on individuals (Gascou 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. Oymniodoros 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 Αφθόνιος. An Aphthonius held office as nyctostrategus, a bouleutic 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]. 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 χωματεπείκται, 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) 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. 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 decemprini 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. 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. 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 χωματεπείκτης is mentioned in papyri from 298 (XII 1469 20, where the title was also given as ὁ τῇ ἐπίξει τῶν χωμάτων ἐπικείμενος (l.7) and ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν χωμάτων (l.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 χωματεπείκτης 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)).

Oertel, Lallemand and Sijpesteijn all suggested that χωματεπείκται 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 χωματεπείκται would assume responsibility for part of the nome (a meris, upper or lower) although sometimes both would officiate in the whole nome. 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 χωματεπείκται 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 *χωματεπείκται* 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 *νοτινής* μερίδος, 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 χωματεπείκτου; see above] τῇ [ης νοτινῆς 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 Phboou 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 ἐπείκταις 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 ἐπείκταις 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 χωματεπείκταις (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 χωματεπείκται (sic) νοτινῶν μερ[ῶν νομοῦ] Ἑρμουπολίτου, suggesting that there may have been four for the whole nome, but each nome need not have ordered its affairs in an identical way.

---

\(^{131}\) Sijsbeestijn 1964 (1), 17 n. 3, but referring to χωματεπείληταί 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, 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. 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 χωματεπείκτης was a liturgy. 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.
135 Oertel 1917, 193.
situation et des arguments s’y opposant même, on peut assurer qu’il était fonctionnaire.  

In his original BASP work on compulsory public services, Lewis had shown χωματεπείκτης 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 ἐπείκτης and to XII 1469. In the 1982 edition he had, as Bonneau wrote, omitted a separate reference to χωματεπείκτης (although still noting under ἐπείκτης 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 χωματεπεικτής was entered as a separate category, responsible for a toparchy or canal and with a three-year term, ἐπείκτης δημοσίων χωμάτων was included as a type of ἐπείκτης (who, based on 4129 and 4130, also had nome-wide responsibility) and the reference to Bonneau’s view was omitted.  

A number of individuals named as χωματεπεῖκται in published papyri are known to be members of the bouleutic 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 bouleutic 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). These examples suggest that the position of χωματεπείκτης 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 κληρόω (6 n.) is used for bouleutic 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 bouleutic 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.
have operated as mere functionaries,\textsuperscript{139} nor would mere functionaries have been entitled, unlike bouleutic liturgists, to enter into an agreement like this one, sharing out their responsibilities.\textsuperscript{140} There is no other evidence that this appointment was made by the \textit{boule}, as would be usual with the appointment to liturgies of the bouleutic class, but that is the most likely explanation. P. Beatty Panop. 2 is 222-226 (300) implies that \textit{χωματεπεικται} were subject to direct instruction by the \textit{epitropos} but that the strategus also had a role in their supervision. In P. Louvre II 121 (351-361), the \textit{χωματεπεικτης} was subordinated to the \textit{strategus-exactor} (see 18n.). These \textit{χωματεπεικται}, although their appointment was nome-wide, would have been selected and appointed by the metropolite \textit{boule} and would have reported to and been supervised by a higher official such as the \textit{exactor}.\textsuperscript{141}

There is no indication in \textit{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.\textsuperscript{142} It would thus probably have covered one entire flood season. A \textit{χωματεπιμελητής} held office for a 3-year term in 116 (P. Giessen 58 and 59) but normally a bouleutic liturgy would be for a single year (and in the 3rd century sometimes for part only of a year).\textsuperscript{143}

**Description**

\textit{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.

\textsuperscript{139} As Bonneau 1993, 161.
\textsuperscript{140} Lewis 1997, 105.
\textsuperscript{141} See Bowman 1971, 107 and Lewis 1997, 75 and 83.
\textsuperscript{142} Bonneau 1993, 159. P. Cair. Isid. 81 (see p.117) is dated 9th April.
\textsuperscript{143} Lewis 1997, 76.
1 μετὰ τὴν ὑπα[τείαν τῶν δεσπ[ότων ἦμων Κωνσταντίου Αὐγούστου

2 τὸ δὲ καὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ ἑπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος (τὸ) Β Φαρμοῦθι εἰ.

3 Αὐρήλιοι Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ Λεοπολύτωνος Πόσιτος καὶ Εὑ-

4 λόγιος Ἀμιμωνιανοῦ οἱ τρῖς βουλ(ευταί) τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)

5 τῶν πόλεως ἀλλήλοις χαίρειν, ἐπιδή ἦμις οἱ τρῖς

6 ἐκληρῶθημεν εἰς χωματεπίκτια δημοσίως χωμά-

7 τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ γομοῦ τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος έτους λά γς καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ

8 ἀμέμπτως τὸ φρόντισμα ἀποπληρώσαι ὀμολογοῦμεν

9 ἀκολούθως τῷ γενομένῳ κλήρῳ τῆν διαίρεσιν εἰ.

10 . . [ . . 9? . . ] ἐπὶ τῷ δὲ τὸν κληρωθέντα ἐκάστη μερίδι τῆς ἀναβολής

11 καὶ διὸ διήθησαν τῶν ὑποστελλόντων χωμάτων καὶ δια-

12 τὸ ὑπό τοῦ ὑποτέρου καὶ ἐπιτάξασθαι ὀμωμέχαμεν

13 τὸν δὲ Εὐλόγιον τὴν μέσην τοπαρχίαν

14 ἐπὶ τῷ δὲ τὸν κληρωθέντα ἐκάστη μερίδι τῆς ἀναβολής

15 καὶ διὸ διήθησαν τῶν ὑποστελλόντων χωμάτων καὶ δια-

16 καὶ διόρθωσεν τὴν ἀναβολὴν καὶ δια-

17 τὸν σεβάσμιον θείον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑποτέρου καὶ ἐπιτάξασθαι ὀμωμέχαμεν

18 τὸν δὲ τὸν κληρωθέντα ἐκάστη μερίδι τὴν ἀναβολὴν καὶ διορθώσει τῶν ὑποστελλόντων χωμάτων καὶ δια-

19 τὸν σεβάσμιον θείον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑποτέρου καὶ ἐπιτάξασθαι ὀμωμέχαμεν

20 [Καίσαρος 17? ] ἦ όμολογία ἦ τις κυρία

21 10? καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες ὡμολογήσαμεν. Αὐρήλιος

22 28? ] ὀμωμέχαμεν
“(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 superintendence 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 CSBE².
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 CSBE², 186-187).

2 Φαρμοῦθι 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 χωματεπείκται 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. ἐπιδή. 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 ἐκληρώ[θημεν ε]ἰς χωματεπι[κ]τίαν. κληρόω is attested in the context of appointments to bouleutic liturgies from 100 (P. Iand. 27) to 392 (P. Herm. 19), although αἱρέομαι (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 χωματεπεικτία (or ἐπεικτία) attested elsewhere, nor a similar construction for other liturgical functions of an ἐπεικτικής.
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)).

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 CSBE2 55-62.

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.

The missing words probably mean either “into three parts” or “between ourselves”. ποιεῖσθαι (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.

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.

The missing word after Ἀχιλλέα may be Πόσιτος, 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 ἕκαστῃ 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 ὁπότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁποτέρου. Elsewhere ὁπότερος 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 ὁμονύτες than ὁμνύομεν, 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 ἥ ἐνοχοὶ εἴημεν τῷ θείῳ ὀρκῷ, 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: γυμνικός 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

---


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. 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. 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 τεχνίται Διονύσου. 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 worldwide (οἰκουμενικαί) 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”. 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.

---

147 See Forbes 1955, 249; Cameron 1976, 216-217; Bagnall 1993 (1), 104-105; Roueché 1993, 76-79.
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 καλλάϊνοι) and the Greens (πράσινοι) became the most prominent.\(^\text{150}\) 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.\(^\text{151}\) 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)\(^\text{152}\) but we have no evidence of them in Oxyrhynchus until 552 (I 145). A 6\(^{th}\) century papyrus from Antinoe shows charioteers in the four Colours, as do, inter alia, 2\(^{nd}\) century mosaics from the Via Cassia in Rome.\(^\text{153}\) 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.\(^\text{154}\) Graffiti from the theatre at Alexandria also mention the Colours:\(^\text{155}\) 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.\(^\text{156}\) See also 018.5 n.

It is generally acknowledged that by the 6\(^{th}\) 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.\(^\text{157}\) It is not known precisely when and how this formal amalgamation took place but it was probably at some point in the 5\(^{th}\) century: Liebeschuetz suggests that it was during the reign of Theodosius II (408-450).\(^\text{158}\) 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* Cameron 1976, 316; Borkowski 1981, 75-96.

\(^{152}\) 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.

\(^{153}\) 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.

\(^{154}\) 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.\footnote{Cameron 1976, 218-222; Roueché 1993, 46, 57.} 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.\footnote{Cameron 1976, 221; Roueché 1993, 46-49.}

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.\footnote{See Gascou 1983, 227; Bagnall 1993 (1), 105 and n. 389.} Gascou describes all these as “personnels du cirque d’Hermopolis”.\footnote{Gascou 1983, 226.} Those papyri are the earliest to suggest a grouping of all these types of entertainers at the circus in a permanent way. Much later, \textbf{2707} and \textbf{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 \textbf{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 \textit{τόπος διαφέρων τοῖς Βενέτοις}, \textbf{030} shows the Blues’ horses kept near the Apions’ stable), and entertainers (like the mimes and men on stilts in \textbf{2480} 43) may have had to remain in the town where they were based.\footnote{Roueché 1993, 10-11 and references at 10.82.} 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 \textbf{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
ceased before the 6th century. 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. Gascou 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 (565/62) and PSI VIII 953 (567-8); these were however all relatively small amounts. In support of his assertion that those responsible at municipal or provincial level were totally indifferent to which Colour was being paid, Gascou relies on the four relevant Apion papyri, one of which, I 145 (552), mentions the Greens while the other three refer to the Blues. 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 μέρος), as evidence that the whole population contributed to one team or the other, with the allocation to Blues or Greens having been 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. 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 Gascou is right that any such funding would not have been determined by area, 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. 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. Such

164 Gascou 1976 (1), 192-193 and n. 3 =2008, 56-57, n. 27. See also LXXVII 5120 Introduction.
167 See Mitthof 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.
169 As Roueché (1993, 46).
170 Zuckerman 2000, 73-78. Cameron (1976, 248-9) considered the aurarii were members of professional claquers 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.\textsuperscript{171} Heracleopolis had areas
which supported a particular Colour (SB XX 14682.1, where the reference is to a laura or
quarter).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textbf{018.2 n.}

It is not clear either whether all the events at these spectacles were competitive, \textit{ἀγώνες},
(as Liebeschuetz) or if some were mere displays or side-shows, \textit{ἐπιδείξεις} (as Potter).\textsuperscript{174}
Musicians, pantomimes and, later, mimes took part in competitions at festivals (\textbf{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.

\textbf{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 \textbf{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. \textit{de cer.} II 153, cited by Morelli at p. 203), but there were no races in P.
Harrauer 56. Both \textbf{2707} and P. Bingen 128 show the procession after the first race. \textbf{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. \textbf{019} and \textbf{020} are too incomplete for us to know whether they included these
items.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{172} See for other references to such terms CPR XXIII 33 3-4 n. at p. 209.
\textsuperscript{173} On funding see also Cameron 1976, 218-221, Roueché 1993, 7-10, 46.
\textsuperscript{174} Liebeschuetz 2001, 203; Potter 2010, 299-300.
\end{footnotes}
The number of races held on a single day varied widely from time to time and from place to place.\textsuperscript{175} \textbf{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 βάϊον 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 \textbf{018}.2 n.) and the procession) were typical elements of \textit{ludi circenses}.\textsuperscript{176}

No races can be read with certainty in \textbf{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 \textbf{020}, \textbf{019} lists one race, at line 2. Together with P. Harrauer 56, papyri \textbf{018} and \textbf{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 \textbf{018} and \textbf{020} may be later than \textbf{019} and from a time when Oxyrhynchus no longer had racing stables.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{175} Cameron 1973, 251-257.
\textsuperscript{176} Morelli on P. Harrauer 56, at p. 203, citing Gascou 1976 (I), 190, n. 4 =2008, 54-55, n. 21.
\textsuperscript{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).
\textsuperscript{178} See Padró 2006, 100 and fig. 71 and 2007, 136-137.
\textsuperscript{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.
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 \textit{alpha} and \textit{upsilon} are higher and smaller than the other letters (particularly in l. 1), the \textit{nu} is curved (l. 7) and the \textit{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 \[\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\varepsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\eta\]
2 \[\nu\kappa\eta\]
3 . [ ]
4 . [ ] . [ ]
5 \[\mu\iota\mu\oslash\]
6 . [ ]
7 \[\gamma\nu\mu\nu\imath\kappa\oslash\]
8 \[\mu\mu\oslash\]
9 \[\beta\omicron\upsilon\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\iota\]
10 . [ ]
11 (\textit{m.2}) \[\delta\iota\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\]

“For good fortune.

Victory.

136
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 ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ 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?

I think it more likely that this is νίκη (as it clearly is in P. Harrauer 56.2) than νίκαι (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 ἡ τύχη τῆς πόλεως (Roueché 1984, 183= I Aph 2007 8.106) and νικᾶ ἡ 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 μιμο[σ] 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 ἔργαστριῶν: 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 καλοπαίκται 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 ἀμαχα (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, Perpilou-Thomas 1995, 230 and references, Cameron 1973, 230-232, 1976 224ff. and, for mimes generally, Reich 1903.

7 γυμνικός. 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 καλοπαίκται (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 ῥωμαιΐζουσι βουκάλιοις at p. 744) and Chron. Pas. 159 (τοὺς δὲ οἴδοντι τοὺς λεγομένους βοκαλίους). Here and in 020.2 it is a noun. I have not found the word used elsewhere in papyri.

11 διέγειται 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

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 \( \mu \[i\]\mu\omicron \)
2 \( \alpha\theta\lambda\omicron \)
3 \( \mu\iota\omicron \)
4 \( \alpha\beta\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron \)
5 \( \alpha\theta\lambda\omicron \nu \)

“Mime
Race
Mime
???????
Race”

1 \( \mu \[i\]\mu\omicron \). See 018.5 n.

2 \( \alpha\theta\lambda\omicron \). 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-4\textsuperscript{th} 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 αβλατον. 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 kappa but that does not help the interpretation; I can find no examples of ακλατον either. Nor is αὐλατον attested.

5 ἄθλον. Restored following line 2. The word could equally well be μῖμον 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.
Circus programme

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[ 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 ἰππασία, 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.]
4 ήθολόγοι

“Mime.

Vocalists.

Dancer with hoop?

Mimics”

1 μῖμος. See 018.5 n.

2 βοκάλιοι. See 018.9 n.

3 γυροπασι[ XCVII 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 γυροπασι[ makes one expect the hoop to be the focal point of the act and from the angle of the legs 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 μίμοι καὶ ἠθολόγοι, in relation to entertainments at drinking parties.
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 overlapping 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 Gabrielia, 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. Some 300 papyri relating to that family or their interests have been published. 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). 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.
183 Jones, LRE II 780.
owned some 25,000 arouras, up to 22,000 of which may have been arable land.\footnote{Hickey 2008 (1), 98. See also Sarris 2006, 83-86 and Ruffini 2008, 99-101.} 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.\footnote{See Sarris 2006, 78-79 for a suggestion as to its mode of operation.} The rural estate was divided into districts; Mazza identified ten of these \textit{pronoesiae} or \textit{prostasieae}, each administered for income and expenditure purposes by a \textit{pronoetes} or “steward”, but there may have been more.\footnote{Mazza 2001, App. 6, XVI 2032 and Hickey 2001, 69.} Apionic \textit{pronoetai} are mentioned in 023, 026, 027 and 028. A number of annual accounts of these stewards have been published, including two for the \textit{prostasia} which included Apelle (023.2 n.) among its \textit{ἐποίκια}: XVI 1911, from 556/557 (now partly restated in SB XXIV 16324), and LV 3804, which is almost complete, from 565/566.\footnote{See Mazza, 2001, App. 8 and Sarris 2006, 29 n. 2 for references for accounts.} These accounts show payments in produce and (the majority) in cash made by farmers in the \textit{epoikia} and disbursements, also in cash or kind, and concessions or reductions made by the \textit{pronoetes}. The meaning of \textit{epoikion} changed over time. In the 4\textsuperscript{th} century it seems to have evolved from an enclosed and gated complex of farm buildings and accommodation to a sort of \textit{villa rustica}, which might have incorporated former villages as well as farmlands, vineyards and orchards (SB VIII 9907 (388)).\footnote{Lewuillon-Blume 1977, \textit{passim}, relying \textit{inter alia} on P. Thead 17 = P. Turner 44 (331-2).} By the 6\textsuperscript{th} century (but possibly in some instances as early as the 4\textsuperscript{th}) 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 \textit{epoikion}, see LXX 4787 9-10 n. Hickey calls them farmsteads or hamlets,\footnote{Hickey 2007, 295.} 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.\footnote{Possibly as many as 200-300 persons may have lived in an \textit{epoikion}: Banaji 2007, 11-12, Sarris 2006, 115-116.} We would I think best translate it as hamlet, a less loaded term than “labour settlement”.\footnote{Following Benaissa 2009, 7 n. 4.} An \textit{epoikion} did not have any administrative autonomy.\footnote{Mazza 2001, 79.} Some \textit{prostasieae} (see I 136) comprised or included villages, \textit{κώμαι}; these were self-administering, but the \textit{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 \textit{παγαρχούμεναι} or administered by an estate-
owner (as for example LXX 4787 9-10 n. and see below pp. 155-158). A different official, called an ὁινοχειριστής, 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 ἐποίκια. 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. 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 ἐποίκια and had enapograpbais georgai (SB XVIII 14006, a guarantee of service) and employed a pronoetes (XVI 1950). Euphemia employed a pronoetes (P. Mich. XV 733 (548)) and an enoikológes 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.

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
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196 See generally on other large estate-owners Hardy 1931, 39-49 and Ruffini 2008, 43-93.
197 Hardy 1931, 50-55, 90.
199 Mayerson 2003.
200 For a list of occurrences of this term see Hickey 2001, Table 2.1.
201 Banaji 2007, 95.
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 (φόρος, ekphorion or apotaktion) 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 ἀμπελουργόι. In any event these payments clearly did not cover all or even most of the land to which the γεωργοί had access, as not all ἐποίκια paid them. In the προστασία which included Apelle, for example, payments of ἀπότακτον χωρίων were received from γεωργοί and ἀμπελουργοί at Apelle, Paciac and Luciu (3804 34, 47, 101), but not from the other four ἐποίκια. The pronoetes’ accounts record some payments as φόρος (rent), usually for items like a dovecote or olive press, and some as apotaktion chorion, but most sums collected from the γεωργοί were not specifically described; the ekphorion in 024 may be such a payment. Gascou termed these “rent-taxes” and suggested that the γεωργοί also supplied liturgical agricultural labour.²⁰⁶ In his view, although the estates did not have the right of ἀυτοπραγία, the landowner/farmer relationship was a fiscally-driven quasi-public law relationship imposed by imperial policy. For the peasants, whom he assumed to be ἐναπογραφοί (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” (ἔποικια) and rental access to its associated allotments in return for labour on the ἀυτουργία; this was a wage in land. He saw the estate as bi-partite, comprising only ἀυτουργία and ἔποικια, and believed that the ἀυτουργία (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.
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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{epoikia} had to work on the \textit{autourgia}. First, P. Wash Univ. \textbf{II} 102 contains a list of \textit{ἐργάται}, or workers, who have come from a number of named \textit{epoikia} to work on the \textit{γεουχικὴ 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.\textsuperscript{209} Secondly, guarantees of service, sometimes called deeds of surety and known as \textit{enguai}, of \textit{ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί} (such as I \textbf{135} (579) and \textbf{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 \textbf{PSI I 61} and \textbf{XXVII 2478}, it is also clear that they had to sow or perform other agricultural services. That this relates to the \textit{autourgia} of the Apions is nowhere explicit; even in \textbf{2478}, references to the landlord’s possessions and orchard are probably to land leased,\textsuperscript{210} nor is a reference to the landlord’s vintage, for example, necessarily conclusive that a reference to the \textit{autourgia} is meant: in \textbf{XVI 1859} (\textit{6\textsuperscript{th} /7\textsuperscript{th} century}), the \textit{γεουχικὴ ῥύσιν} could be from land in an \textit{epoikion}, as in \textbf{XVI 1896} (577).\textsuperscript{211} The extent to which such work was required can only be surmised.\textsuperscript{212} Interestingly, such guarantees do not cover only residents of \textit{epoikia} but also villagers, who can also be \textit{enapographoi} (\textbf{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 \textit{georgoi} in return for their labour on the \textit{autourgia}, or that the \textit{autourgia} was a substantial part of the estate.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{208} Sarris 2004, 65-66; 2006, 33-34, 53-55, 59, 86-88. He saw the \textit{exotikoi topoi} as part of the \textit{autourgia}; see \textbf{023.3} n. for a discussion of this.
\textsuperscript{209} Mazza 2008, 152-3.
\textsuperscript{210} \textit{φόρον} in l. 19 is translated as taxes but more likely means rent.
\textsuperscript{211} Benaissa 2012. I am grateful to Amin Benaissa for a sight of this as yet unpublished article.
\textsuperscript{212} See Sarris 2006, 62, nn. 47, 48 for a list of these guarantees relating to the Apions, from which deduct \textbf{LXVI 4536}, which is a different type of document, and add \textbf{LXVIII 4703} and \textbf{LXX 4787, 4790, 4791, 4794} and \textbf{4802}.
\textsuperscript{213} See Benaissa 2012, n. 24 for references to documents which attest \textit{enapographoi georgoi} paying rent (categorised as \textit{phoros} or \textit{ekphorion}).
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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”. 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, 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”. 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). All relate to arable land and so far as is apparent prescribe rent payable in kind. The georgoi occupying the ἐποίκια 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. 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 ἀποτακτὸν χωρίον. 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, or that they were long-term or emphyteutic leases which did not require renewal and so were infrequently produced. 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. I find it difficult to believe that even such a bureaucratic system as Byzantine Egypt would have

215 Banaji 2007, 183.
216 Benaisa 2012 esp. n. 27, following Mazza and Hickey.
218 Sarris 2006, 65.
219 As Rowlandson 1994, 499.
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 geouchos/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 adscripticus, 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

224 See 024.6-7 n.
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. The extent to which the georgoi had to bear the market risk themselves is not clear but 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.

**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. 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. 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
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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 pronooetai 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 pronooetai 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 pronooetes’ 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.
233 See Hickey 2001, 57, 68.
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
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236 Hardy 1931, 50-55.
238 Gascou 1985, 4-52 esp. 48-52=2008, 125-175 esp. 48-175.
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 prostasias: 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 Cotyleiu, 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 pronoeTai, 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

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 *ktema* (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 Benaissa 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
I.XII 4350 (576) and 4351. 142 is a receipt for a payment by the *pronoetes* of the *epoikion* of
Leontes 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 *ktema* 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 *ktema* 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 *ktema* 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 Benaissa 2009, 184.
²⁴⁸ Benaissa 2009, 204-207.
documents referred to above (p. 155) is from a resident of or refers to property in an *epoikion* or *ktema*.

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.
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 pronoe tes 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.
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.
1 π

2 + βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου(ου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου μεγίστου

3 εὐρυγέτου Φλ(αουίου) Ἰουστίνου τοῦ αἰώνιου Αὐγοῦστου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους δ´

4 ύπατίας τῆς αὐτῶν γ[α]λνοτήτος το β// Μεχείρ κυ ἰνδ(ικτίνον) β//

5 Φλ(αουίω) Ἀπίων τῷ πανευφήμῳ καὶ ὑπερφυεστάτῳ ἀπὸ ὑπ(άτων) ὁρὴ(αριῶν) (καὶ) πατρικ(ίω)

6 γεουχ[οῦ]τι καὶ ἐνταύθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλ(ει) δ(ιά) Μηνᾶ

7 οἰκ[ετου] τοῦ καὶ ἐπερωτώντος καὶ προσπορίζοντος τῷ ἑαυτῷ ὑπερφυεστῇ

8 τῷ αὐτῷ πανευφήμῳ ἀνδρὶ τῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ ἑαυτῆς, Μηνᾶς

9 θυρουρῆς τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἰκοῦ, υἱὸς τοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου) Σερίνου μετ´ ἐγγυητοῦ

10 τοῦ καὶ ἀναδεχομένου αὐτῶν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ συναλλάγματι

11 ἐμοῦ Ἰωάννου, νομικαρίου καὶ ἐπιτριγιαντοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ μακαρίου

12 Φιλοξένου, ἀμφότεροι ὁμομενοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλε(ως)

13 ἐξῆς ψηφογράφοι[ν]τες ἑαυτῷ χείρι, χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ ἐγὼ

14 ὁ πρωτότυπος Μηνᾶς ἐκουσίᾳ ὑπερφυείς καὶ ἀναδεχομένων ὑπερφυείς καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀνεμητῶν ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῷ προσήκοντων ἐπὶ ἕνα

15 ὑμῖν ὑπερφυείς τῆς καὶ ἐπιτριγιαντοῦ τῶν ἀνεμητῶν ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῷ προσήκοντων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ ἕνα

16 ὑμῶν ὑπερφυείς ἐπὶ διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ ἕνα

17 ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνδοξοῦ ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ ἕνα

18 μηνὸς Μεχείρ τῆς δεύτερης ἑκουσίᾳ και ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ ἕνα

19 χώραν τοῦ θυρουρῆς τοῦ θαυμασιωτάτου ἤτοι διὰ τῶν αὐτῆς ἀναδεχομένων ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ ἕνα

20 καὶ ἀκαταγγεῖστος μισθοῦ παντῶς τοῦ ἑνὸς

21 ἐνιαυτοῦ χρυσοῦ νομίσματα δύο καὶ νεοῦτοι καὶ παντῶς τοῦ ἑνὸς
22 καὶ οἴνου γεουχικά κνίδια εἰκοσι πέντε καὶ μὴ δύνασθαί με

23 πρὸ τέλους τοῦ ἐν[ὸς] ἐνιαυτοῦ ὑπαναχωρήσαι ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης

24 χρείας δὴ[ε] ὑπερθέσεως καὶ πόνου τινὸς. εἰ δὲ τούτῳ ποιήσω

25 πρὸ τῇ[έ]λου[ς] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ ὁμολογῶ ζημιοῦσθαι

26 τοὺς ἐμοὺς μισθοὺς ἢ κἀγὼ ὁ τούτου ἐγγυητής. κύρ(ιον) τὸ

27 [συνάλλαγ]μα ἀπλ(οῦν) γραφ(ὲν) καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθέντες) ὁμολο(γήσαμεν). (vac.)

28 (m. 2) [ Μηνᾶς υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλείου(ιῶτατού) Σερ[ήν]ου ὁ προγ[ραμμένος]

29 πεποίημαι τούτῳ τῷ συν[ά]λλαγμα ].[

30 [ ].

[ 2 ευσεβεστατ 3 φλα 4 ὑπατίας 5 φιλαρχὸς 6 πρωτευτερικὸς 7 ἱδρυτὴς 9 βασιλεύς 12 οἰκεῖς
πολεμικὸς 16 υἱὸς ὑπερφυείας 18 ἱερὰ 24 ὑπερθέσεως 26 κυρία 27 ἀπὸ γραφεὶ ὑπομολογηθῆναι 28
θαυμασάτω

" ?

+In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor, Flavius Justinus, the eternal Augustus and Imperator, 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 π̶̣Τ This looks like a single letter, possibly a π, with a horizontal stoke 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 π 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(λείστα) 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 π̶̣Τ 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 1 134, a stone-mason’s contract, also from the Apion “archive”, but they are in different hands.

5 \(\Phi\lambda(\alphaυ\omega\alpha)\) \(\alpha\pi\iota\omega\iota\varsigma\tau\omega\) \(\pi\alpha\nu\epsilon\upsilon\phi\iota\mu\iota\varsigma\nu\omega\) \(\kappa\alpha\iota\varsigma\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\vartheta\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\). 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 γεουχ[ο\(\nu\)]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 \(M\eta\nu\alpha\) \(oικ\epsilon\tau[\mu\nu\tau\omega\tau\omega\nu\tau\omega\varsigma\kappa\varsigma\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\vartheta\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\]\tau\omega\) \(\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\) \(\pi\alpha\nu\epsilon\upsilon\phi\iota\mu\iota\varsigma\nu\omega\) \(\alpha\nu\delta\rho\iota\rho\iota\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\) \(\alpha\nu\delta\rho\iota\rho\iota\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\). This phrase and the reference to Menas \(o\i\kappa\epsilon\tau\upsilon\) (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 \(\alpha\nu\tau\iota\gamma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\) or \(\upsilon\iota\varsigma\delta\omega\omicron\nu\) 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 θυρουρὸς. 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 έις 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), nomicarius 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 nomicarii 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 nomicarius 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 nomicarius 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 nomicarii 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 nomicarius 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 ἕνα ἑνιαυτόν. 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 τῆς μεγάλης 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 axles 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 και σίτου καγκέλλω ἀρτάβας δώδεκα καὶ οἴνου γεουχικά 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 familiarius 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 familiarius 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 διὰ[...]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 ζημιοῦσθαι [...]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 ἐνδοξὸς 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 ἀγγαρευται (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.
τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης ἑξῆς ὑπογράφοντες

τῶν διαφέροντων αὐτής οἰκών καὶ ἀποστάσεων καὶ ἄλλων προσήκοντων καὶ ἀκαταγνώστως ταδε ὡς ἐπὶ τοῖς πρὸς ἐμοῦ γενομένων δίχα τοῖς πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐνοικολόγου δίχα τήν νύστα ὑπερθέσεως . . . . 8?
20 τοῦ ἐνδόξου οἴκου τῆς ὑμῶν ὑπερφυείας ............... 20? ..............

21 .................. 45? ......................

22 τοῦ ἐνοικολόγου εἶτε οἰκοδόμων λί [ ............... 26? ..............

23 φίλων εἰς ἑνδόξου ἀνθρώπων ἂνθρώπων 22? ...........

24 πρὸς τῷ καὶ δὲ δέξασθαι με λόγῳ μισθοῦ ἦτοι ὥσπερ οἰκολόγου. δύσω δὲ τοὺς λόγους 7? ....

25 ἐνοικολόγου κατὰ τίς μήμησιν τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοὶ ἐνοικολόγου. δύσω δὲ τοὺς λόγους 7? ...

26 πάσῃς τῆς ἐποδοχῆς τοῦ τε λήμματος καὶ ἀναλώματος 7? .

27 λόγους καὶ κατὰ τὴν [σ]υνήθειαν ............... 30? ..............

28 .................. 48? ......................

29 δίχα ὑπερθέσεώς τινος. προσομολογῶ δὲ καὶ ἔγῳ Φλάουσιος Ἰοῦστος

30 διάκονα καὶ ἐνοικολόγου ἐν τούτῳ τῷ συν[α]λλάγματι καὶ εἰ λοιπανάριος

31 φανεῖ ἐμε ὁμοθέτης ὡσπερ οἰκοδόμων καὶ ἐναδέχεσθα [τὸν προγεγραμμένον Μηνᾶν]

32 δίχα ὑπερθέσεως τινος ἂνποτα[ττόμενος τῇ νεαρᾳ

33 διατάξει τῆς οὐσίας κατὰ τῇ .... 27? .........

34 .................. 32? ......................


37 αὐτοῦ ὑποδοχῆς ὑποθέσεοι ἀμφότεροι [εἰς τὸ δίκαιον τούτου τοῦ

38 συναλλάγματος

39 πάντα ἡμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπάρχοντα ἡμῶν καὶ γενικῶς ἑνεχύρου

40 λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίως. κύριον τὸ συν[α]λλαγμα ?δισσόν? γραφ(έν),
καὶ ἐπερωτηθέντες ὁμολογήσαμεν.† (m. 2) \[Μηνᾶς σὺν θεώ διάκονος υἱὸς

Οὐκίκτωρος πρε(αβύτερο)), ὁ προγεγ[ραμμένος, πεποίημαι τούτο τὸ συνάλλαγμα τοῦ

καὶ ὡμολογήσαμεν.† (m. 3) † Φλ(άουιος) ἱοῦστος σὺν θεῷ διοικ(ητής) υἱὸς ..........

ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἑγγυώμαι καὶ ἀναδέχομαι τὸν προγεγραμ(μένου) \[Μηνᾶ

dιάκον(ον) καὶ ἐνοικολόγου πάντα διδοῦντα πληρο[ύντα τὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ὑποδοχῆς, καὶ

eὶ λοιπαδάριος φανεῆ περὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ε...[ οἰκοθεν καὶ εξ ἰδιών μου

dιδόναι καὶ πληρώσει τή[[ν ύμών υπερφυείαν ......... 19? ........

ἀπέλυσα (vac.)

di cm(u) Papnuiiou symboi]ιογράφου ἐτελείωθη]

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 indication], 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 . . . . . . 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 CSBE2 51-52 and 260-265.

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 Imperator, 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 Μηνᾶς 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 Aphroditto, which attest a priest who is a pronoetes, and P. Cair. Masp. III 67325 viii r. 22 (6th century, also from Aphroditto), 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 eulabestatos, 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 ἕπὶ ἕνα ἕναυτόν. One year was the usual term for an appointment of this sort: see 021.16-17 n.
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 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 (heortikon), 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 ἀναλωματοῦ. It is not clear what this line means, even if ἀναλωματοῦ 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 μισθά) 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 *aggareutai* (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 λόγῳ ἀναλωμάτων (των) by an Apion *enoikologos* to three *symmachoi*. Oil frequently formed part of wages; see Morelli 1996 *passim*.

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 Thedelfphia*) 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.).

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

22 οἰκοδόμων. Architects or builders on the Apion estate are known from XVI 1834 4, 1910 5 and 1912 122, XIX 2243A 79 and L.V 3804 151, 215. φιλοκαλίας 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.
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 Aphroditos. 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 ἐτοῖ | ὅψωνίου παυτός τοῦ ἐνὸς | ἐνιαυτῷ κατὰ μίσθον τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐνικολόγου. 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 νεαρᾷ διατάξει τῇ βουλομένῃ 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 νεαρᾷ διατάξει τῇ περὶ ἐγγυητῶν καὶ ἀντιφωνητῶν ἐκφωνηθείσῃ, and LVIII
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 δευτέρᾳ τάξει, ἀπόρων τούτων εὐφρέντων, κατὰ τῶν μανδατώρων 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 ἀπέλυσα. This word, repeated in a different hand and spelling at l. 4, the equivalent of the Latin absolvē, 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 ἀπέλυσα at the end of his subscription.
Φλ(άουιος) Ιούστος σύν θεῷ 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[ίογράφου 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 (ψαμμόχωστος) (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 ἐάν οἱ γεωργοὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀπελλῆ παρέχουσιν πεντήκοντα ὀλοκλήρως τῆς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καταβολῇ

3 μὴ θελήσῃς λαβεῖν παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ μὴ τό τρίτ[ον]. [ ] ἐάν δὲ εἰσὶν ἐξωτικοὶ ἢ ἄλλοι μὴ σπείραντες

4 μήπω μὴ θελήσῃς αὐτοὺς τέως ἠπατήσαι. ἐπ[ρ(ωςῳ)

On back, along the fibres:

5 ἐπίδ(ος) τῷ θαυμάσ|ωτάτῳ Μηνᾷ προν(οτή) π(αρά) τοῦ βοηθοῦ

4 ἔ[πιδ] προς π

“+ 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 πi 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(λείστα) 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.

Ἀπελλὴ 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 Cotyleeu (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 ὅλοκότ’ 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 *ἀπαιτῆσαι* (4 n.) can be used in a tax context but are not necessarily so used (see *024*.6-7 n. for the use of *apaiteitimon* 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.

*ὁλοκότ’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., I1 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* 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. I 1 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 protonasia 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.

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 τρίτον 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.

ἐξωτικοί The most frequent use of ἐξωτικός, in the Apionic context, is qualifying τόποι or γῆ, in conjunction with the names of ἐποίκια or villages in the description of an area for which a προνοετὴς has responsibility. It appears in prescripts and adscripts to accounts and in προνοετής work contracts: I 136, VI 999, XVI 2019 and 2038, XVIII 2196 and 2204, XIX 2243A, LVIII 3952. The προνοετης’ accounts do not contain receipts directly referable to ἐξωτικοὶ τόποι 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 κτέμα in the heading of the relevant section of the accounts.

When related to land, ἐξωτικός is usually translated as “outlying” but the precise meaning has been the subject of some debate. Banaji’s assumption that it means ἐποίκια is clearly wrong, as identified by Benaissa (Banaji 2007, 173-4; Benaissa 2007, 85 n. 21). The ἐξωτικοὶ τόποι 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 προνοετής on the Apion estate, where the προνοετής agreed to be responsible for arrears in relation to the ἐποίκια, but had a collection function εἰς πληρεῖς in relation to the ἐξωτικά. 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 ἀυτουργία and ἐποίκια and ἐξωτικοὶ τόποι were not the latter, they had to be the former, namely the ἀυτουργία 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 ἀυτουργία. Sarris’ view was refuted by Mazza in her review of Sarris 2006 and by Benaissa, who showed that ἐποίκια and ἐξωτικοὶ τόποι were treated identically in P. Ct.YBR inv. 325, part of a προνοετής 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 ἔξωτικοί, namely farming (or possibly from) the epoikia (here this must be the meaning of ktema: 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 ktema 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 πλῆρες* in relation to the *exotikoi* topoi (Sarris 2006, 53). In practice there may be little difference.

*Stencilkai μή 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 ἀπαίτησαι The term used for a *pronoetes* collecting a payment in XVI 1868.

ἀπαίτησιμον 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 Gascou 1985, 18=2008, 140) but the usage had become more general in Byzantine times.

5 ἔπιδ(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.
This honorific is frequently used of lower-grade officials, including *oinocheiristai* and *zygostatai* as well as *pronoetai*. See I.LVI 3869 14 n., de Groote 2002, 29. It is used of a *pronoetes* in *inter alia* XVI 1838, 1894, 2000 and 2006. See Azzarello and Gonis 2009, 212.

Μηνᾷ̣ Μenas 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 *prostasieae* 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.

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(αρὰ) 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* παρὰ 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: ἔσχον παρὰ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Ποῦ-λοις γεωρ(γῶν) ἐποικ(ίου) Ἀκινδύνου κατὰ τέσσαρα 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 ύπερ ἐκφορίου πεν-
4 τεκαίδεκάτης ἰνδικ(τίονος)
5 τὰ ἐρούντα ση πλήρης
6 ἀκολούθως ἀπετη-
7 σίμου κατὰ τὸ τέ-
8 ταρτον μέρος τῶν
9 ἐκφορίων ὡλῶν
10 †ρπγ ρνβ Μεσορῆ
11 κς ιε ἰνδικ(τίονος) λο . . ᾦ( ) λοιπ(ά?)
12 |ησι γί(υ.) λοιπ(ά?)
13 | .οι.[
“† 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 ἐπικ(ίου) Ἀκινδύνου. 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 ἐποίκιον, 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 ὑπὲρ ἐκφορίου. Whether ἐκφορίου 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 ἐκφορίαι τῆς ἐπ’ αὐτὸν γεουχικῆς μηχανῆς; 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 ἐκφορία 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 ἐξαγμὸς 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 (Aphroditos, 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 ἐκφορίου 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 ἐκφορίου 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 ἐκφορίου meant a rent payment in kind and φόρος a rent payment in money, in Byzantine times ἐκφορίου rarely appeared and φόρος incorporated both (Herrmann 1958, 99-100). This papyrus suggests that, although it appears only rarely in documents from Oxyrhynchus, ἐκφορίου 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 προτέρου ἀπαιτησίμου: 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 ρπγ ρνβ I have found no other published papyrus from this era year (= 506/7).

11 λο . . !(?) λοιπ(α?) 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 Gabrielia, 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 Gabrielia’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 6\(^ {th} \) and 7\(^ {th} \) 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.
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 διὰ τοῦ θαυμασίωτά ὕπερ τιμῆς ὡς ὁμορρασθέντος καὶ δοθέντος ἑωΝ χρηστοτέτος Ιωάννου ζυγὸν (οὐσίατος) ὑπὲρ τιμῆς Ιωάννου (πεντεκαιδεκάτης)

2 ἐπὶ μην ἑοὺς Φαρμοῦθι καὶ Παχών καὶ Παῦνι ἐπὶ μην ἑοὺς Φαρμοῦθι καὶ Παχών καὶ Παῦνι ἐπὶ μην ἑοὺς Παχών καὶ Παῦνι ἐπὶ μην ἑοὺς Φαρμοῦθι καὶ Παχών καὶ Παῦνι ἐπὶ μην ἑοὺς Παχών καὶ Παῦνι

3 .....10..... δ ὑπὲρ οἴνου νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα ἑπτὰ γί

4 (ἔτους) σκη ρητή της ἑτεροτική τέσσαρα παρὰ κεράτια δέκα ἑπτά γίνεται νομίσματια τέσσαρα παρὰ κεράτια δέκα ἑπτά γί

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 Mitthof 2005, 77-78 and LXXVII 5123.
Back, along the fibres:

5 (m. 3) † πιττάκ(ιον) τοῦ οίνου (vac.) ἐπὶ μην(ῶς) Χοιακ [ 1 ]

11. θαυμασιωτάτου ἱαννου ζυγοστατου τιμὴς οἰνος αγορασθη δοθῆ ἱαννου π. ἱαννη οινοχείρ 2 ἵδικτες οἰνὼς ἕξες 3 χρυσῆς γὰρ νὰ δὴ κερὶ ἐξ 4 ἵδικτες γὰρ χρυσὸ κερὶ ἐξ 5 πιττάκιον οἰνὸς 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(ν) δι(ὰ) το[ῦ]. 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).

θαυμασιωτάτου. 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.

ἰαννη 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

201
(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 \( \text{zygostatai} \) (Carlà 2009, 200). \( \text{Zygostatai} \) 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 \( \delta \varepsilon \mu \omicron \omicron \nu \iota \sigma \iota \sigma \iota \tau \iota \sigma \nu \iota \sigma \varsigma \) is still attested until 609 (BGU III 837.18-19), by the 6\(^{th} \) century some at least were acting on behalf of, and probably employed by, major landowners. At 3805 30 a \( \text{zygostates} \) is recorded as paying a premium to the Apions for the right to hold office (like the \( \text{pronoetes} \) 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 \( \text{zygostates} \) 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 \( \zeta \upsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \sigma \omicron \tau \alpha \tau \omicron \upsilon \alpha u \tau \iota \varsigma \) (l. 22) and although Gascou considered that this did not show definitively that he was in her private employment (Gascou 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 \( \text{zygostates} \) 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 \( \text{zygostates} \) 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 6\(^{th} \) century. See generally on \( \text{zygostatai} \) Rea on 4395 26-7, Gonis 2000, 182, de Groote 2002, who sets out a list of attestations, and Carlà 2009, 196-205.

\( \text{\acute{a}gora}s\beta\epsilon(\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma) \text{ kai } \text{doth}e(\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma) \). 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)).

\( \text{I} \omega \acute{\alpha}n\nu\omicron\text{o} \text{i}o\nu\chi\epsilon\iota(\iota\sigma\tau)\). The genitive ending of \( \text{I} \omega \acute{\alpha}n\nu\omicron\text{o} \) does not make sense, unless it should have been preceded by \( \delta \iota \alpha \), \( \pi\alpha\rho \alpha \) or \( \upsilon\pi\omicron \), showing that he was the person who supplied the wine. There are instances of such a construction following \( \text{\acute{a}gora}s\beta\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \) or \( \text{\acute{a}gora}s\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma \), 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 \( \text{\acute{a}gora}s\beta\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{ kai } \text{doth}e(\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma) \) appears, it is followed either by \( \tilde{t}i \varsigma \) 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. Ca ir. 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 οἶνοσπαραλήμπτης 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) πεντεκαϊδεκάτης. 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 ἰδιωτικῷ ζυγ(ῶ) παρὰ κεράτια δέκα ἐπτά. 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 ½ carat per *solidus* deduction for dealers when exchanging *folles* for gold and a bankers’ commission of 1½ carats per *solidus*. See Banaji 1998, 183-192, 195, 201. In 025, the deductions are 4¼. 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 budgetaire” 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) σκθρϙη . . . [νδικτίονος 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 πιττάκιον. See 022.18 n.

ἐπὶ μην(ός) Χοίακ [ This probably incomplete endorsement shows when the payment was made, or (less likely) the date of the accounting entry: see 4 n.
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 gloriae 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 σακχαρία τόπτου Ἡλιό, 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 Ὀρος (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.
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 pronoetes 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 ἁγί(αν) προσφορά(ν) 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 προσφορά 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 Gascou, 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 Gascou

271 Schmelz lists references to gifts by the Apions to religious establishments (Schmelz 2002, 208 n. 36).
272 Wipszycka 1972, 65.
274 See Benaisa's introduction to 4926-4929 in LXXII pp. 172-174.
explained it as a remunerated private enterprise. 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. Gascou, 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. 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. 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

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{280} Hardy 1931, 140, 143-144.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{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, I.VIII 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 ἐμβολῆς) ἐνάτης and in 028 it is made ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμβολῆς ἐνάτης while the receipt is dated in Epeiph in the 3rd indiction (ὑπὲρ ἐμβολῆς) 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 ὑπὲρ τῆς .. ἱνδίκτιονος, 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 προσφοράν τῆς σύν θεῶν ἐκτῆς ἐπινεμήσεως, while that in LXI 4131 23-25 (600) is τὴν ἐξ ἔθους προσφοράν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς παρούσης τετάρτης ἱνδίκτιονος. In 026.2-3 the payment is ἀπὸ γενήματος ἡτοιδάτης ἵνδ(ίκτιονος) 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.
ινδ(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).
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 *prostasias* (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 *prostasiæ* 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.
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.”

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 Netnēu, 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 ἁγίου 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 ἅββα, 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 ἅββα are often more prestigious than those called ἅγιος ἄπα, as ἅββα 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 landowning 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(άτος) δωδεκάτης ἱνδ(ικτίονος). This may have read ἀπὸ γενήμ(άτος), as for example XVI 1911 (557), or ἀπὸ γενήμ(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 CSBE2 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 Ἐπεὶφ ἱ. ἱνδ(ικτίονος) ἐνδεκάτης ύπὲρ 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 contains the lower part of a receipt for 319 artabas of wheat paid by a pronoeites to the cenobite monastery of Abba Petros. It is interesting because of the references to the patrikia Gabrielia (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 pronoeites Anoup may be known from other papyri but Anoup is a common name (8 n.).

Flavia Gabrielia

The patrikia Gabrielia (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 Gabrielia 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 Gabrielia 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 ἐνδοξος οἶκος (10 n.) proves that it in some way relates to the Apions. I think that either Flavia Gabriella 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 Gabriella 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 Gabriella with 4396 or with 026.

In 2780, Gabriella is addressed as τῇ ἐνδοξοτάτη καὶ ύπερφ(υεστάτη) πατρικία, λαχούσῃ τὴν λογιστείαν καὶ προεδρίαν καὶ πατερίαν ταύτης τῆς λαμπρᾶς Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως ύπερ 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 Gabriella (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 Gabriella 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”.
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. Timagenes may have been elected personally to these offices originally, or on Gascou’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 landholding that caused the original appointment to be made; the original estate names may have been retained for ease of book-keeping, as Gascou 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, 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 *politeuomenor* 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). At some time after that date, the estate subject to the relative duties must have passed into the hands of Gabrielia; following Gascou, 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

295 Azzarello 2006, 211-212 and passim.
296 Heil 1966, 50-67, esp. 64.
298 See LXVII 4614 2 n., LXIII 4390 2-3 and Gonis 2004, 176-177. See also Azzarello 2007, passim.
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.
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 – 670005, 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 ktemata the term πατριμούναλ (..).

It appears between Skytalitidos (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). Benaissa considered that Πατριμούναλ (..) was the name of a place. 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. 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 πατριμούναλ (..), also spelled πατριμοναλ (..), and the related πατριμούνι (also πατριμον, πατριμων, πατριμουν) 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

---

305 The abbreviated word in P. Iand. III 51.7 may be the dative πατριμογωνάλιος, 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.\textsuperscript{306} At P. Charite Introduction, p. 13, the editor suggested that in that papyrus patrimonialia 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 6\textsuperscript{th} century there are four papyrological attestations: SB XX 14669 (the 524 cadaster from Aphrodisio), 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 7\textsuperscript{th} 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 οὐσιακή γῆ, and part of the old patrimonium principis, which by the 6\textsuperscript{th} 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 χρυσάργου or collatio lustralis;\textsuperscript{307} it was administered, separately from the emperor’s private estates and from other imperial property, by the comes sacri patrimonii. The θείος 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{306} Other 4\textsuperscript{th} 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).
\item \textsuperscript{307} Gascou 1987, 115=2008, 260; VI 900 5 n.; Jones LRE I 237, 425-427.
\item \textsuperscript{308} See for example P. Harr. I 88 and II 239, XVI 1892 and 2020, LXXII 4906, SB XXIV 16312, Kaplan 1976, 16, followed by Tacoma 1998, 126.
\item \textsuperscript{309} As Kaplan 1976, 11-16. Delmaire considered that the sacrum patrimonium was still part of the res privata (Delmaire 1989, 674-709).
\end{itemize}
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, Evangelion, Terythis and Pangouleeiou, all of which are mentioned in it, in different prostasiae, and some of the places were in different toparchies.\footnote{Mazza 2001, 29 n. 142, 179 to 187.} 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 θειοτάτου οίκου 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 \textit{res privata} and the \textit{patrimonium} as well as the estates of the \textit{domus divina}, and their administration may have been another \textit{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 \textit{solidi} υπὲρ 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.\footnote{For emphyteutic leases see pp. 148-149 and Jones LRE I 417-420, Simon 1982.} Rea, at 3805 12 n., suggested
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 “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 Ὁρυγχίτων πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ
2 [έγω ὁ αὐτὸς εὐλαβέστα[τος Ἀνούπ]πρεσβύ[τερος καὶ] μο[νάζων
3 [ειληφέναι καὶ πεπ[ληρώθ[αι πα[ρά τῆς ὑμ[ῶν ἐν]δοξότητος [... c.9 ... ]
4 [............c.14 -18............]. σιτον.[ c.4 ]ον μοι ἡ.[  c. 6  ].νει.[ ... c.9 ... ]
5 [............c. 12 -16 ......]πατρικίας Γαβ[ριηλίας ὲ[... c.7 ... ]].[... c. 9  .......]
6 ..[........c. 10 ..... πρ]ός τὸ ἔθος καὶ ύπέρ καρπῶν τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας
7 ἵνδικτίονος). [... c.7 ... ].αμ... πλήρης τουτέστιν σίτου ἀρτάβας τριακοσίας δέκα
8 ἐννέα ταῖς καὶ δοθείσας μοι διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βαυμασιωτάτου Ἀνούπ προνοιτοῦ
9 τῶν αὐτῶν κτημάτων πατριμουναλίων γι(νοται) οί(του) ἀ(ρτάβαι) τιθ καὶ
πρὸς ἀσφάλειαν
10 τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου οίκου καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βαυμασιωτάτου Ἀνούπ ταύτην
πεποίημαι
11 τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν αὐτ[ῆς]ν τριακοσίας δέκα ἐννέα ἁρταβῶν τοῦ σίτου ὑπέρ
12 καρπῶν τῆς αὐτῆς δευτέρας ἵνδικτίονος), ἤτις κυρία οὕσα ἀπλ(ὴ) γραφ(εῖσα)
καὶ ἐπερ(ωτθεῖς)
13 ὠμολ(όγησα), ὑποθέμενος αὐτῇ πάντα τὰ τε ἐμὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τὰ τοῦ
14 αὐτοῦ ἁγίου ὁπότου ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἑνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίω
15 (vac.) (m. 2) Ἀνούπ πρεσβετέρου (vac.)
16 (m. 3) + τὸ εὐαγές κοινόβιον καλούμ(ενος) ἀββᾶ Πέτρου ὁ προγεγραμμένος
πεποίημαι
17 τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπόδειξιν δέξάμ(ενος) πάσας τὰς τοῦ σίτου ἀρτάβας τριακοσίας
dέκα ἐννέα ὑπέρ
18 καρπῶν δευτέρας ἰνδ(ικτίονος) καὶ στοιχεῖ μοι πάντα ως πρόκ(ειταί). Ἀπολῶς
υίος Ἀπανακίου ἀξ(ιωθεῖς) ἑγγαραφα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.

19 πρὸ ἐμοῦ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτ[ο]ῦ τὰξ(αντος) τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ χερὶ+.

20 (m. 4) + di emu Uictoros etelioth . . . . . . . . . . . . . +

Back, downwards along the fibres:

21 |απ . . ( ) μο( ) ὑποδοχ(ής) σίτου ἀ(ρταβῶν) τίθ καρπ(ῶν) β̣ ἰνδ(ικτίονο)(ο)ς

3 ὑμ. 6 ὑπὲρ 7 ἰνδ̢ 9 γῆ 11 ὑπὲρ 12 ἰνδ̢ απ̣κ γραφ̣ επε̣ 13 ὑμοί ὑποθεμενος
ὑπαρχοντα 14 ὑποθηκης 15 λ. Πρεσβυτέρος 16 καλομί 17 αποδειξ̣ δεξαμί 18 ἰνδ̢ προκ̣
υίος αξ̣ 19 ταξ̣ 21 ὑποδοχ̣ς α καρπ̣ς

“................. 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 Gabrielia .........................

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 indication, 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 indication, 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.+ ... receipt for 319 artabas of wheat from the harvest of the 2nd indication.”

(4th hand) Completed by me Victor. ...................... +”

Back: “...... receipt for 319 artabas of wheat from the harvest of the 2nd indication.”

230
The missing lines would have included the date, the address to the relevant landowner, if that was an Apion the Menas ὀικέται 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 πρεσβυτέρῳ 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 ὑμῶν ἐνδοξότητος 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 ἐνδοξότατη καὶ ὑπερφυστήτης 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 ὑπερφυστήτατος, 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 εὐσεβεῖς(εστάτου) ἡμῶν δεσπότου Φλ(αουίῳ) Ἰουστινιανοῦ | τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος ἔτους καὶ τοῖς τό | μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν | Φλ(αουίῳ) Βασιλίου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ......

ινδ(ίκτονος) | ἐν Ὀξ(υρύγων) πόλ(ει).

If Gabrielia is the addressee:

[Φλ(αουίῳ) Γαβριηλίᾳ τῇ ἐνδοξοτήτα καὶ ὑπερφυστήτης] πατρικία διὰ σοῦ τοῦ ἑαυτοκράτορος Αὐγούστου τοῦ | αὐτῆς προνοητῶν τῶν κτημάτων πατριμοιοτάτων ἐν ............ τῶν ............. ὑπὸ τοῦ | ἐνδόξου οἴκου, τὸ εὐαγές κοινῷ τόπος οὗ τὸ καλῳδίουν ἀββᾶ Πέτρου δι(ί) ἐμοῦ | Ἀνουπ πρεσβύτερος καὶ μονάζων υἱοῦ ........ τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας

1 | [μνήμης ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως χάιρειν. ὀμολογῶ]

or

Ἀνουπ πρεσβύτερος καὶ μονάζων τοῦ κοινῷ τόπος οὗ τὸ ἀββᾶ Πέτρου υἱοῦ τοῦ καλῳδίουν ἀββᾶ Πέτρου υἱοῦ

231
Alternatively, if one of the Apions is the addressee, his name would be substituted for Gabriela’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 Apion II has been addressed through an intermediary other than Menas.

2 εὐλαβέστατος 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.

πρεσβύτερος καὶ μονάζων 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 μ in is not an epsilon.

3 εἰληφέναι καὶ πεπληρῶσθαι Restored following inter alia P. Iand. III 43.9-10 (525), P. Got. 9.9 (564) and XVI 1898 20 and 1993 23 (587). ἔσχηκέναι would also be possible, as would ταύτου ἁγίου τόπου, but it is more usual for πεπληρῶσθαι to be accompanied by another infinitive.

πατρικίας Παρά τῆς οὐμών ἐν δοξότητος As in 2780 17.

5 πατρικίας Γαβριήλιας 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 Gabriela’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 ἁγίαν προσφοράν τῆς μάμμας; 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 πρὸς 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 παρούσης δευτέρας ἰνδ(ἰκτίονος) 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 Ἀνουπ προνοητοῦ. αὐτοῦ shows that there was a reference to this Anoup in the missing part at the top of the document. θαυμασιωτάτος is an honorific frequently used in relation to pronoei; 023.5 n. We have four references to Apionic pronoei 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 πατριμοιοναλα(). It is possible that the Anoup in 2024 12 may be the pronoeis in this papyrus; although the papyri are probably 9 or 10 years apart there is evidence for pronoei 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 pronoei in 1916 may be the person named here.

9 τῶν αὐτῶν κτημάτων πατριμοιοναλίων. 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 τά τε ἐμὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ τά 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 κοινόβιοι. A term for a monastery where monks shared a way of life; see 026.1 n.

ἀββᾶ 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 ἁγιος 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 eteliothē 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(κ)ξις, like the dockets on XVI 1898 and 1993 and LVIII 3936.
Receipt for wheat paid to the monastery of Abba Castor

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 [ἐδόθ(ησαν) δι(ά ... c.6...) προ(νοητοῦ) Φάκρα (vac.) εἰς τὸ κοινόβι(ον) ἀββᾶ
Κάστορο[ς λόγῳ προσφορ(ᾶς)]

2 [ἐξ ἔθους καὶ ἐμπὶ τῆς ἱνδ(ικτίονος) οίτου καγκ(έλλω) ἄρταβας πεντήκοντα
γ[ά](νο)ται) [σί(του) κ(αγκέλλω) ἄρτα(βαι) ν μό(ναι)

3 . . c.8 . . . μη(νί) Ἐπεὶφ ἱνδ(ικτίονος) τρίτης (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) τετάρτης + (m. 2)
+γί(νοται) σί(του) κ(αγκέλλω) ἄρτ(άβαι) ι [μό(ναι)

Back, along the fibres:

σί(του)

“... 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(νοητώ) 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.

tὸ κοινόβι(ον) ἀββᾶ Κάστορος 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 ἔξ 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 ἔξ ἔθους διδομένου ὑπὲρ τῆς ἅγιας προσφορ(ᾶς) ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμβολῆς δευτέρας ἐπινεμήσεως. A payment ἔξ ἔθους προσφορὰν was recorded at LXI 4131 23 (600) and ὑπὲρ τῶν προσφορῶν (ἢν) at XVI 1906 2, 9, 18. For other examples of payments by the Apion family to monasteries and churches being made ἔξ 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 πρὸς τὸ ἔθος καὶ ὑπὲρ καρπῶν τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας ἕπνων (κτίσioνος). The second word here could alternatively be εὐσεβεί(ας) as in λόγῳ εὐσεβεί(ας) ἔξ ἔθους (καὶ) ἐπὶ τῆς ἑβνω(κτίσioνος) (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.

ἐπὶ τῆς δ ἑβνω(κτίσioνος). The word ἐπὶ before ἑβνω(κτίσioνος) here, with the reference to ὑπὲρ ἐμβολῆς (ἡς) 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 πεντήκοντα. 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) ἐμβολῆς 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 *saquiyas* 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+ ἐδοθ(ησαν) δι(α) τῶν μοναζ(όντων) {μοναζ(όντων)} μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀββᾶ
Κάστορος (vac.) ἵωσήφ καταμείν(αντι) εἰς χρεί(αν) τῆς μηχ(ανῆς). [. ] [. ] .π.ε.[

2 ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἐπὶ τῆς τρισκαιδεκάτης ἱνδ(ικτίονος) ὑδροπαροχί(ας) ἰδ
σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίων) ζυγ(ίων) ἵς καὶ εἰς χρεί(αν) τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) τόπ(ον) Ἡλίου
σχοινί(ων)

3 ἦτοι κρικ(ίων) ζυγ(οί) δύο γι(νονταί) σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίων) ζυγ(οί) γ μό(νοι)
(m. 2) γί(νονταί) σχοινί(ων) ἦτοι κρικ(ίων) ζυγ(οί) τρεῖς μό(νοι) (vac.)

4 (m. 1) (ἔτους) ἀκή ῬΦε Ἀθύρ κα ἱνδ(ικτίονος) τρισκαιδεκάτης

1 ἐδοθς δι μοναζς μοναζς μοναστηρ καταμείν χρεί μηχς 2 ἤνθ ὑδροπαροχί ἰδ= σχοινί κρικ
ζυγς ἵς 1 εἰς χρεί μηχς τοῖς 3 κρικ ζυγς γα σχοινί κρικ ζυγς μιθ γα σχοινί κρικ ζυγμ " 4
“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 *μοναστηρ* 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*(ιο) άββα Κάστορος. See 028.1 n. This is an example of *μοναστήριον* being used interchangeably with *κοινόβιον*.

*Ιωσὴφ 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, L1 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 *καταμείν*( ) τοῦ βοηθ(ού) (l. 39) and *καταμείν*( ) τοῦ κόμ(ετος) Σχολαστικοῦ (l. 65).

At XIX 2243A 18 (590), a list of receipts and expenditure, one of the payers is described as *καταμι( ) 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 *καταμείν*( ) 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 καταμι( ) 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
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 a *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*, *Πιεσούρις* or *Πιεσιής*, none of which is very common, but which might possibly be preceded by *γηδί* (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 "Ἔξω 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) *δ* 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(ὸς) (ἡ)Ις Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, gives masculine, feminine and neuter forms of ζυγ( ). the following word (ε)Ις 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(ὸν) ἐν ημιο. As suggested at LI 3640 4 n., with reference 241
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 saquiya 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.
Receipt for ropes from the monastery of Abba Castor

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 saquiya 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+ ἐδόθ(η) δ(ιὰ) τῶν μοναζ(ῶν) τοῦ κοινοβίου ἀββᾶ Κάστορος (vac.) εἰς χρεὶ(αν) τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) ἀρδευόσ(ης)

2 εἰς τὸ βαδιστικ(ῶν) στάβλ(ου) καὶ τῶν ἵππ(ῶν) τοῦ ἵππικ(οῦ) μέρ(ους) Βενέτων σχοινία τοῦ λάκκ(ου) ἦτοι κρίκιον

3 ἐν, γί(νεται) σχοινί(ου) ἦτοι κρίκ(ίου) α ὑό(νου) (m. 2) + γί(νεται) σχοινί(ίου) ἦτοι κρίκ(ίου) ἐν ὑό(νου)

4 (m. 1) + σξ σκθ Θωθ θ ἱνδ(ικτίονος) δευτέρ(ας)

1 ἐδοθε ὅ μοναζζ χρεὶ μηχ ἀρδευωσ 2 βαδιστικ σταβλ ἵππικ μερ λακ 3 ἐν γί σκοιν κρίκ μο 4 ἐν δευτέρ
“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) ἀρδεύουσ(ης) I have not found ἀρδεύω used elsewhere in this precise
context, although ἀρδεύω appears in one Apion papyrus, XVI 1913 3 (555); the usual
verb would be ἀντλέω, as in ΙΙ 3640 2-3 (τῆν μηχ(ανῆν) ἀντλούσαν εἰς τὸ μικρ(όν)
πωμάρ(ιον)) or XVI 1900 13 (ἀντλούσαν εἰς ἄμπελον), which may however apply only
when irrigation of land is concerned. See Bonneau 1993, 212-216.

2 τὸ βαδιστικὸν 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 Ι.Ν. 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 βαδιστικὸς in 140
but as the stable from which the ὅξυς 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 *saquiya* 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).

For ἵππικος 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 χρείαν τῶν ἵππων τοῦ δημοσιοῦ(ου) κιρκου μέρους Βενέτων. The others refer to the Blues: I 152 2 τοῦ ἵππικου μέρους Βενέτων, PSI VIII 953.42 εἰς χρείαν τῶν ἵππων τοῦ ἵππικου(ου) μέρους Βεναίτων (see also 61, 77, 91), XXVII 2480 10 εἰς βροχὴν τῶν Ἴππων [τ]ου ἱππικοῦ μέρους 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 *saquiya*: see LXVI 4537 Introduction, 4538 and Bonneau 1993, 56-61.
031  Order to the monastery of Abba Castor to supply ropes

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[̣ω] εὐλαβεστάτω ἀπα [][α]Παύλω ἁρχ(ιμανδρίτη) μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀπα
Κάστορος Ἀνοῦπ νο[τάριος

3 παράσχου εἰς χρείαν τῆς μηχ(ανῆς) καλούμ(ενης) Χοιριδίων σεν.ειτο.( ) Ψαει[

4 [. . . c.10 . . ] . σχοιν(ίου) α μό(νον ) (m. 2) Τῦβι κδ ια ıν[δ(ικτίονος) [+

"                                                        +

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 εὐλαβεστάτω A common epithet for a man of the church: see 027.2 n.

ἀπα [][α]Παύλω ἁρχ(ιμανδρίτη) The scribe probably started to write ἀπα 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.
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 Wipszycyka 1994, 31, 33, 38-39).

Ἀνοῦπ νοτάριος An Anoup notarius employed by the Apions is attested at LXI 4131 29-30 (600).

Χοιριδίων σεν.ειτο I have not seen any other reference to this saquiya, 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 ktema 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 saquiya (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.
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 διὰ. 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 kolleisis 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 kolleisis.
1 δ(ιά) κλ(ηρονόμων) Κόλλοθου χαρτουλαρ(ίου)  (νομ.) 1 (κερ.) ις

2 δ(ιά) Φοιβάμμωνος Φαβ..  (νομ.) Θ  . . .  έσχ[...

3 δ(ιά) τής άγι(ας) Αναστάσεως  ..[...

4 δ(ιά) τοῦ άγι(ου) Μάρκου  (νομ.) 1 [ κερ.

5 δ(ιά) κλ(ηρονόμων) τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Θεοδοσίουπολέως  (νομ.) ε (κερ.) [.

6 δ(ιά) τοῦ μον(αστηρίου) ἀββὰ Κάστορος  (νομ.) λ (κερ.) π

7 δ(ιά) Γεωργίου νουμεραρίου (κερ.) [.

8 δ(ιά) κλ(ηρονόμων) Σερήνου σχολ(αστικοῦ) Σιγκλητικῆς (κερ.) ν[.

9 δ(ιά) τοῦ κόμε(τος) Ἀπφαύν(τος) . . .ει χαρτ(ουλαρί..)  ..[.]] (κερ.).[.

10 δ(ιά) Κοσμᾶ ἄρχιάτρου (κερ.) .

11 δ(ιά) τοῦ εὐλαβεστ(άτου) Κομητᾶ (κερ.) β[.

12 δ(ιά) τοῦ άγι(ου) Ἱερημίου  (νομ.) αγ̣(κερ.) [.

13 δ(ιά) τοῦ σχολ(αστικοῦ) Φιλοξένου (ὑπέρ) κλ(ηρονόμων) Κυρίας  (νομ.) λε (κερ.) η

14 δ(ιά) . ο κ( ) τῆς άγι(ας) Μαρίας  ..(κερ). χ

1 δ(ιά) χαρτουλαρ 2 δ(έκα) αγιάς 4 δ(έκα) αγιάς 5 δ(έκα) κλήρον(υ)πολεως 6 δ(έκα) μονής 7 δ(έκα) 8 δ(έκα) κλήρον(υ)
1. Σιγκλητικῆς 9 δ(έκα) κομ(ι)πού αποφού χαρτίς 10 δ(έκα) 11 δ(έκα) εὐλαβεστὶς 12 δ(έκα) αγιάς 13 δ(έκα) σχολὴ (ὑπὲρ) κλήρον(υ) • 14 κ( ) τῆς άγιας

“1 Through the heirs of Kollouthis, chartularius

Through Phoibammon son of Phab . . .
Through the holy Resurrection
Through St Mark's
5 Through the heirs of Bishop of Theodosioupolis
Through the monastery of Abba Castor
Through George numerarius

sol. 10, carats 16
sol. 9½
xxx
sol. 10
sol. 5, carats [.
sol. 30, carats 6[.]
carats 10, n[.
Through the heirs of Serenus lawyer of Sincletice carats ..
Through count Appheus, ........, chartularius xx. , carats [ 10 Through Cosma, chief physician carats ]
Through the most pious Cometas carats 2
Through St Jeremiah’s sol. 13 carats 10 [ Through the lawyer Philoxenus, on behalf of the heirs of Kyria sol. 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 Θεοδοσι(ωνπόλεως). 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 Ṭaḥa al-ʿAmida, 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 μον(αστηρίου) ἀββᾶ Κάστορος. See 029.1n.

7 νομεράριου 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,
8 Σερήνου σχολαστικής. 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 ἐκδικός 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 ἐλλογιμώτατος. 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 σιγκλητικής. The term syncleticus 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 Syncletice 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 Syncletice, who was born in Alexandria, is known from Vita Sanctae Syncleticae (PG28, 1486 -1553) and from the Apothegmata Patrum περί 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 Syncletice at Oxyrhynchus, but I would have expected an epithet such as ἄμα or τῆς ἁγίας 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 Syncletice; 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 ὀψωνίου by the Apions at XXVII 2480 63 may have been employed by them, unlike those who were paid λόγῳ (ὡς) πιλοτιμίᾳ (ἰασ) 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 eulogiotatos scholasticus and ektikos of the city of Oxyrhynchus but that papyrus is much earlier than this one.

9 κόμε(τος) Απφού(τος) ...εἰ χαρτ(ουλαρί);) Apphous 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 κόμες χαρτουλαρίος καὶ διοικητής. Apphous may have been at a higher level than Kollouthos (l.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.
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 Gascou 1972 (2), 248-250, Beaucamp 1992, 402, Gonis 2002, 86-88, 4917 3 n. and Ruffini 2008, 44-49.

14 τῆ(ς) ἁγί(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 saquiya 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.
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