**FIVE DOCUMENTS FROM ROMAN FAYUM**

This article is a sequel to my ‘Three Receipts from Soknopaiou Nesos’, published in ZPE 200 (2016) 411–19. Like those three, the five papyri edited below were acquired by the British Museum from Chauncey Murch on 8 December 1906, and were originally intended for publication in P.Lond. VI. Soknopaiou Nesos is the origin of two of the five papyri; the other three come from elsewhere in the Fayum.¹

1. Lease of a date-palm grove

P.Lond. inv. 1602a

The papyrus preserves the upper part of an offer to lease one and a half arura of a palm grove at Ibion Eikosipentarouron for four years. Unlike many other documents of this kind, the lease does not include the grounds around the trees, which could be treated as arable land. The annual rent is 180 drachmas, two palm trees bearing fruit, and one artaba of dates. The text breaks off where the agricultural tasks incumbent on the lessee were to be described. The regnal date clause that would have concluded the document is lost, but the reference to Trajan’s year 10 in a manner suggesting that the harvest would take place in the following year (see 7 n.) points to spring or summer 91.

The vast majority of palm-related leases come from the Fayum. A detailed list is offered by N. Hohlwein, EtPap 5 (1939) 40–41, updated on several occasions later; I single out S. Omar, P.Soter. p. 39 n. 29, and D. Hagedorn, P.Hamb. IV 269 introd. These lists refer both to leases of palm groves, which are land leases, and to leases of date crops, essentially offers of a price for them. A consolidated list of leases of palm groves, but limited to the Fayum in the first three centuries of Roman rule, is appended to the commentary below.

The text runs along the fibres and the back is blank.

[ c.6 ] Πτο[λεμαϊ]ου μετὰ κυρίου [τ]ο[ῦ][骺] ἀνδρὸ(c)
[αὐτῆς] Παρμενίςκρο[υ] (vac.)
(vac.)
[ἐπιγονὴϲ]. β[ο]ύλομαι[i] μιϲθώϲαϲθαι παρὰ σοῦ
5 [εἰϲ ἑτῇ τέ]ϲϲαρα καρποὺϲ τέϲϲα[ρα]ϲ ἀμ[ε]-
[tαμίϲθωτα] κ[αί ἑ]νετρόγρηγητα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπι-
[κειµένων τοῦ] ἐνεκτότου δεκάτου ἐτουϲ
[Αὐτοκράτωροϲ Καίϲαροϲ Δοµιτιανοϲ Σεβαϲτοϲ]
[Γερμανικοῦ] φυνικικὸν καρποϲ τοῦ ὑπάρ-
10 [χοντὸϲ σοι π]ερὶ Ἰβιῶνα Εἰκοϲι[π]εραρ[
[φυνικῶϲ] ἄροϲcps ὑµᾶϲ ἡµίϲουϲ ἡ ὅϲω]
[ἐὰν ἡ ἐκπττὸϲ εξενίαιϲτα φόροϲ]

¹ I became aware of these papyri from H.I. Bell’s provisional transcripts, kindly shown to me by Cillian O’Hogan in July 2015. I am grateful to Ben Henry for comments on a penultimate draft, to Gabriella Messeri for comments on early drafts of texts 2–5, and to Federica Micucci for research assistance with text 1. The images are reproduced by permission of the British Library Board.
I wish to lease from you for four years, four crops, you having no power to sublet it or to cultivate it yourself, (reckoned) from the hanging date-palm fruits of the current tenth year of Imperator Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, one and a half arura, seven in.

III.7 as.

4 (87), 3 (89/90), extracting parties, and the lessee (?)

11 l. φοινικῶνος, ὄςων 13 l. κατ’ 15, 16 l. φοινικῶς 15 l. ἕγκαρπου

'To … daughter of Ptolemaios with her husband Parmeniskos as her guardian, from … son of Petesouchos, Persian of the descent. I wish to lease from you for four years, four crops, you having no power to sublet it or to cultivate it yourself, (reckoned) from the hanging date-palm fruits of the current tenth year of Imperator Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, one and a half arura or as many as they are, of a date palm that belongs to you around Ibion Eikosipentarouon(?), the fruits falling in the following year, at a total annual rent of one hundred and eighty silver drachmas and a special payment of two fruit-bearing date-palms and one artaba of patetoi (= juicy?) dates subject to no deduction or risk; and I shall carry out …'

1–2 The description of the lessor is followed by a blank space, with the name of the lessee given in a separate line. There is no reference to the origin of any of the contracting parties, and the lessee is a ‘Persian of the descent’. These features are common in Arsinoite leases of this period; cf. P. Soter. 4 (87), 3 (89/90), P. Prag. I 38 (96), P. Mich. IX 561 (102), P. Heid. IV 329 (105/6?), etc.

1 Πηγήλεματου, read by Bell, is plausible but not certain.

3 ἵπ[p]ος. Bell read Ἡρ[ων]ς, but the space seems too narrow. It is also possible that up to two letters were lost in the initial lacuna.

5 [εἰς ἔτη τέξ τοις]: παροικῶς τέξ τοις[ρα]. Other four-year leases that involve palm trees are P. Corn. 10 (119), P. Stras. VI 571 (175), and P. Corn. 11 (204/5 or 233/4), all three from Philadelphia. Leases of longer duration are also known: five years in P. Oxf. 13 (154/5), six in P. Soter. 4, seven in P. Stras. IV 267.

5–6 ἀμ[εταμιήθατα] καὶ ἄνευτορήγητα. Cf. P. Soter 3.38f. n.; M. Hombert in J. Bingen et al. (edd.) Le monde grec … Hommages à Claire Préaux (1975) 607f. (26/29 n.). As F. Micucci points out to me, this clause is only attested in Arsinoite land leases.

7 τοῦ ἕνεκτότος δεκάτου ἔτους. ἔξενιατα (l. 12) refers to the ripened fruits to be harvested ‘in the following year’ (probably in October). From this we may infer that the lease was made before the end of Year 10 Domitian (29 August 91), probably in the summer or late spring. When the name of the month is extant and the fruits are described as still on the trees, leases of palm groves or crops date from between late May and September; cf. e.g. P. Corn. 10 (119), BGU II 603 (168), P. Mich. XII 631 (185), SPP XX 21 (215).

10 Εἰκοσιαπτοτομικαὶ ἔργαμαι. Eikosipterophóreous is expected, but I cannot match the traces at the end of the line with any letters; it is also possible that there is a correction. The village of Ibion Eikosiptarouon (TM GeoID 885) was located in the division of Polemon, in the southwest of the Arsinoite nome, near Kerkeosiris. The presence of a palm grove in the village is also attested in P. Mil. Vogl. IV 209.iii.7 (108).

Duplicate of P.Mich. II 128.iii.15, which may or may not belong; P.Laur. III 72.10 (118–38) ἐκ θατομον κατ’ έποιφο του ταντα; κατ’ έποιφο would suit the context of this lease, which concerns an olive grove, palm-trees, and other plants.

This is the highest rent attested in a lease of this kind; it corresponds to 120 dr./ar. Only P.Stras. VI 571 (175) comes close, with a rent of 1000 drachmas for 9 aruras, which however will also be sown with other crops.

For the extras described here, cf. e.g. SB XVIII 13850.10–13 (141?) ὕξιαρέταιν ἐπὶ τὴν [τατραμεταν] κατ’ έποι θοιονκοκ Ώπιτητου, άρετα [-] και (ai) ἐπὶ τὴν δῆλη τατραμεταν φοίνικου [οικ] στατος διὸ ἐπι ἐκλογη.

For the term φοίνικος, cf. SB XVIII 13850.13, φοίνικος would then need to be corrected to φοινικες, but perhaps no letter was lost in the break after ἐκάρπου, and the scribe began to write as if there were only one date-palm required (I owe the suggestion to Ben Henry); cf. P.Flor. III 369.12–13 (Herm.; 149 or 159) φοινικος ἐπὶ παντητου ἀρτάβα δῶ αι φοινικος κατ’ ἐπι ἐκάρπου ἐκλογη ἐνός (the grammar is at fault, under the influence of the earlier genitives; J. Kloppenborg, Tenants in the Vineyard (2006) 514, mistranslates ‘one choice cluster of fresh dates’). P.Soter. 4.20–21, φοινικον ἐκάρπων ἐκλογην | ἐπι | ἐκλογη πεταρότων, also shows that the reference is to a number of trees.

[και φοινιξ]π ΄ατερτου. It is uncertain whether και was written, but there is clearly no room for ἐκαρπο in the lacuna. On the term, see G. M. Parássoglou, EEThess 15 (1976) 250; P. Mayerson, ZPE 136 (2001) 225–8.

έπαρτε[λ]λεκσ[α] was followed by the agricultural tasks (ἔργα) that the lessee promised to carry out.

APPENDIX:
Leases of date-palm groves in Roman Fayum2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>location of lease</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>duration</th>
<th>rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. V 240.i.15</td>
<td>Tebunis</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>φοινικον</td>
<td>225 dr.</td>
<td>440 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Soter. 4</td>
<td>Theadelphia</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.5 ar. φοινικον</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>50 dr. + extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond.inv. 1602a</td>
<td>Ibion Eikosi-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.5 ar. φοινικον</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>180 dr. + extras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 I have not included CPR I 47 (ii), which may or may not belong; P.Laur. III 72 (118–38), a lease of land with olive and date-palm trees and other plants; P.Oslo II 36 (Thead.; 146), a contract to build a wall around a leased palm-grove of 0.875 ar. (pace Hohlwein, it is not of annual duration). Leases of date crops: P.Duk. inv. 85, ed. R. Mairs, ZPE 172 (2010) 183ff. (Bakch.; 14); P.Mich. XII 630 (Thead.; 26 ix.38), BGU II 591 (Ars.; 56/7), P.Hamb. I 5 (Philad.; 89); P.Stras. IX 812.15–20 (Ars.; 128/9 or 149/50), SB XVI 13008 = 13009 (Thead.; 144), P.Phil. 12 = PSI I 33 (Philad.; 150/51 or 173/4), BGU III 862 (Ars.; 154/5?) (said to be a lease of ‘palmeriae’ by Hohlwein, p. 40), BGU II 604 (Philad.; 167/8), 603 (Philad.; 28.viii.168), P.Mich. XII 631 (Ars.; 13.viii.185), P. Aberd. 57 (Sokn. Nes.; II).
3 The note ad loc. associates this entry with P.Mich. II 128.ii.21, which refers to a rent of 360 dr.
4 Duplicate of P.Mich. II 128.iii.15, which is slightly different.
5 Duplicate of P.Mich. II 128.ii.18; the amount is restored.
The document is virtually complete but abrasion and some small holes obscure the reading at some important points. A man possibly from Dionysias (see 5 n.) writes to the royal scribe to notify him of the death of his sister’s husband, who was registered in Philoteris. Several death declarations are submitted by widows, sometimes with their brothers as guardians (C.Pap.Gr. II 7 and 24), but this is the first time we find a widow’s brother in this role. The term used to describe the deceased person’s relation to the poll-tax, ὄπολεξιμένος τῆς λαργαρίας (11–12), is unparalleled and not easy to restore; all we can tell is that he was over-age and presumably no longer liable to the poll-tax, which is normally expressed by the participle ὄπολεξιμένος, ‘released’. Another point of

6 ‘The size of the grove and the period of time covered by the lease are not presented in the extant portions of the lease.’ (BGU XV 2484 introd.) The editor argues that ‘the lease was to cover only a portion of a year or of a two year period’, but there is nothing to indicate that this would have been longer than twelve months.

7 The date is given as ‘167/192’ by Hohlwein, retained in HGV, but the text dates from a year 10, which would be of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius.

8 Line 7, . . . ἁπαυλοῦ, о( ). о( ) υποκεκραπο( ).


10 Dated to year 21 Caracalla (= 212/13), with the crop said to ‘fall’ in year 21, which cannot be later than autumn 212.

| P.Heid. IV 329 | Theadelphia | 105/6? | 1 ar. φοινικόν + ἔδαφος | 2 years | land: 52 dr. + extras crop: 24 dr. + extras |
| P.Corn. 10 | Philadelphia | 23.viii.119 | 1.5 ar. arable land with palm trees | 4 years | 120 dr. (for both land and palm trees) |
| P.Stras. IV 267 | Soknopaiou Nesos | 126–128 | 7.875 ar. φοινικόν | 7 years | 80 dr. (+ proseidigraphoph meno) |
| P.Mich. IX 564 | Karanis | 29.xi.150 | 1 ar. φοινικόν | 3 years | taxes paid in lieu of rent |
| P.Oxf. 13 | Boubastos | 154/5 | 4(?) ar. φοινικών ὑποκεκραπόμενοι + 1.33 ar. vineyard | 5 years | 200 dr. + extras |
| P.Phil. 13 | Philadelphia? | 12.vii.150 | 0.95 ar. φοινικόν | 1 year | 280 dr. + extras |
| SB I 5670 | Boukolon | mid II | φοινικών ὑποκεκραπόμενος | 1 year | 300 dr. |
| P.CT YBR inv. 9629 | Thphois | II | φοινικόν | 1 year | ? |
| P.Stras. VI 571 | Philadelphia | 29.ix.175 | 9 ar. φοινικών ὑποκεκραπόμενος | 4 years | 1000 dr. + extras |
| SB XVIII 13582 | Theadelphia | 19.ix.184 | 1 ar. with palm and fig trees | 1 year | ? art. dates |
| P.Corn. 11 | Philadelphia | 204/5 or 233/4 | 5 ar. φοινικών ὑποκεκραπόμενος + 1 ar. other land | 4 years | year 1: 100 dr. years 2–4: 200 dr. |
| P.Ryl. II 172 | Hephaistias | 14.ix.208 | φοινικόν | unspecified | 1000 dr. + extras |
| P.Stras. V 336 | Hephaistias | 21210 | φοινικόν | 1 year | 1200 dr. + extras |
| SPP XX 21 | Kerkesoucha | 29.v.215 | 6 ar. φοινικών ὑποκεκραπόμενος | 1 year | land: 10+ art. wheat crop: 60 dr. + extras |
| SB IV 7441 | ? | 230 (?) | φοινικόν | 1 year | 160 dr. + extras |
| SPP XX 70 | Dionysias | 1.iii.261 | φοινικών + 7(+) ar. of ἥλαι | 3 years | 100 dr. + extras (for the φοινικών) |
| P.Hamb. IV 269 | Pyrria | late III | 7 ar. φοινικόνον | 2 years | 35 art. wheat |

2. Notification of death

P.Lond. inv. 1594

8 (w) × 22.5 (h) cm 11 December 117
interest, though likewise affected by physical damage, is the attestation of a new royal scribe of the division of Themistos, Theon alias — on.

For a bibliographical update on texts of this type, see P.Monts.Roca IV 68 introd.; add PSI Com. 6.13, SB XXVIII 16834–5, and perhaps XXVI 16494.

The text is written along the fibres and the back is blank.

‘To Theon alias — on, royal scribe of the Arsinoite (nome), division of Themistos, from Apollos son of E —, one of those from the village of Dionysias. The husband of my sister …, Protas son of Heron grandson of Protas, mother …, who, being over-age (and?) removed(?) from the poll-tax in the village of Philoteris of the same division, died in the month of Choiak of the present 2nd year of Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus. Therefore I request that he may be listed in the list of the deceased.’

(2nd hand) ‘To the village scribe: if it is really so, do what is appropriate.

‘Year 2 of Hadrianus the lord, Choiak 15. …’
1. The letter before ω is epsilon or iota, less likely sigma. I have tried to read Εἰ[ε]ίωνι or Δέονι but had no success. No royal scribe of the division of Themistos has been attested between 109 and 128, other than someone whose name in the dative ends in ὶνι, in office sometime under Hadrian (SB XIV 12117.3); see Th. Kruse, Der Königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung (2002) ii 981.

2. There are scattered specks of ink where the text is shown as if totally lost. Θεμιστός is unclear, as is the division of Themistos. Our papyrus had been written by the strategus (or the royal scribe) are poorly documented. Was this an extraordinary situation? The official’s involvement could have been due to a dispute that may have been reported to or resolved by the strategus, who is thought to emanate from the strategus’ office.

3. There is an extraordinary situation. The official’s involvement could have been due to a dispute that was referred to him.

4. The strategy issued a summons to divide the shore-land. This is one of the shorter versions of the instructions given to the village scribe; see L. Casarico, Il controllo della popolazione nell’Egitto romano I: Le denunce di morte = C.Pap.Gr. II.1 (1985) 20. The closest parallel comes from P.Col. VIII 218.17–18 (Tebt.; 139), where however τῆς ἁλογραφίας is read. The declaration was submitted not more than two weeks after the person’s death, which could be remarkable for someone no longer liable to the poll tax.

5. These are the remains of a registration note; see C.Pap.Gr. II.1 9.19 n. (cf. p. 20). The line might have ended γ'ρ(αμματεύς) ζ[ε]ίο(μίαμα). It is unclear whether this was written by another hand.

3. Order to divide shore-land

P.Lond. inv. 1578b  
22.5 (w) x 9.5 (h) cm  
Second/third century

An unnamed authority orders the archepthodos and village elders of Soknopaiou Nesos to divide the shore-land ‘equally’, no doubt for leasing: parcels of shore-land reclaimed from the lake were leased from the state. The division had to involve the priests, but their role is unclear, as is the background to the whole affair.

The format and structure of the text are similar to those of summonses, which are generally thought to emanate from the strategus’ office. The strategus was responsible for the leasing of shore-land (the same holds for the royal scribe), and the issue would have fallen under his remit. The unnamed official speaks of an encounter in the village, where he gave instructions in person; such visits to the rural hinterland by the strategus (or the royal scribe) are poorly documented. Was this an extraordinary situation? The official’s involvement could have been due to a dispute that was referred to him: SB I 4284 (207) is a petition submitted to the strategus by ‘a committee of
twenty-five, active as spokesmen for the state farmers of Soknopaiou Nesos',\textsuperscript{11} who had been prevented from working on shore-land by five other persons. If there were a dispute, did it involve the priests? Was the land to be divided 'equally' between the village authorities and the priests? If so, this might imply that not more than half of the population of the village were members of the priestly class, or that the priests could for some reason\textsuperscript{12} claim half of the land available for leasing for themselves regardless of their number.\textsuperscript{13} Or perhaps there was no dispute, and the village authorities had to supervise the division of the land in equal shares jointly with the priests. In that case, the exercise would have defined the acreage of these parcels, but to judge from the extant leases of shore-land and rent accounts, the acreage varied. Another implication of this alternative scenario would be that in this case the state put the priests at the same level as its agents at village level, but there is no other evidence for such a practice.

The village scribe is not among the addressees; it is likely that there was no one in office at that moment, and, as often, the village elders exercised his functions. More remarkable is the presence of the archephodos, responsible for public order; it could be that the division of the land required the presence of the security apparatus of the village, or that the archephodos is included because the order concerns all the local agents of the state, the so-called δημόσιοι κόμησις. It may also be relevant that a village elder and an archephodos headed the 'committee' from Soknopaiou Nesos that petitioned the strategus in SB I 4284.

The text is presumably blank, since the papyrus is mounted on paper.

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

3 ὡμεῖς, ἱερεῖς, ὑμῖν

‘To the archephodos of the village of Soknopaiou Nesos and to the elders of the same village. Immediately divide the shore-land equally, you as well as the priests, as I told you in person at the village.’

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] ἀρχερφόδῳ κόμης Σοκνοπαίου Νήσου καὶ πρεσβυτέρας. Cf. SB XVIII 13172.1 (88–96) ὁ στρατηγὸς πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἀρχερφόδων Καπνής (text after D. Hagedorn, \textit{ZPE} 159 (2007) 265); cf. also P.Lond. II 379.1 or P.Petaus 58.8f. The two offices are juxtaposed also in SB I 4284, mentioned above; BGU I 6.5 (157/8) γραφή πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἀρχερφόδου καὶ ἀλλον δημοσίου; sim. P.Oxy. XVII 2121.4 (209/10).
\item[3] ἐξ ἵσου. Cf. SB I 4284.16 ἐξ[ε]κθέσθαι ἐξ’ ἵσου [ἡ]μᾶς πάντας τής σπορᾶς τῆς ἀποκαλυφείσης γῆς, though there the expression refers to equal opportunities rather than to equal shares.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{11} Expression borrowed from N. Lewis, \textit{Life in Egypt under Roman Rule} (1983) 181.

\textsuperscript{12} Priests petition the prefect in P.Tebt. II 302 = \textit{W. Chr.} 368 (71/2) concerning their right to cultivate state land that earlier was temple land.

\textsuperscript{13} The prospective lessee is not described as a priest in any known offer to lease shore-land, but this need not be conclusive. Such offers are found in SB VI 8976 (105), BGU II 640 (185), III 831 (201), P.Lond. II 350 = \textit{W. Chr.} 353 (212), and CPR I 32 (218).
4. Acknowledgement of debt of vegetable-seed(?)

P.Lond. inv. 1708b  8.7 (w) × 9.4 (h) cm  23 September 215

The document is complete but abrasion obscures the reading in places. Two men, probably brothers (see 8 n.), receive a quantity of λάχανον at the end of the month of Thoth, which they promise to repay in Payni, eight months later. Loans involving this product are rare; the only parallel I have found is BGU IV 1015 (Herm.; 221/2), which concerns one artaba of λάχανον to be repaid also in Payni. In the Berlin text, the description of λάχανον as καθαρόν ἀδόλον ἀβολόν] κεκ[οκτόνω[βοῦ] (12–13) makes it clear that the word was used in the sense of λαχανόπερμον, ‘vegetable seed’, as in other documents of other texts (see below, 12 n.). This may also apply to our text.

The creditors are two village elders (πρεσβύτεροι), two local notables (εὐχήμονες), and one other described as ‘chief of the thief-catchers’ (unless the last three were all ‘chiefs’). Somewhat reminiscent of this grouping is BGU I 43 (Π/ΠΙ), which refers to an εὐχήμονα, a πρεσβύτερος, and an ἀρχεφωδός, another police officer; N. Lewis, BASP 30 (1993) 112, was surely right to speak of ‘members of a police supervisory board’, as when an ἀρχεφωδὸς and εὐχήμονες appear together. What connects them all in this document is a matter of speculation, but it would probably be fair to say that they were a committee representing the administration of the village, which may explain the unusual expression heading the text, ‘agreement of the village of Soknopaiou Nesos’. Whether this had any relation with the (unknown) occupation of the two debtors, we cannot tell. It is also unclear who exactly possessed the product given out on credit.

Most of the persons mentioned in this text are known from the documents of the so-called ‘tax archive’ of Soknopaiou Nesos (TM Arch ID 337). Could this be part of it? At least one other London papyrus (inv. 1590a, ed. ZPE 200 (2016) 418) acquired with this one may have belonged.\(^\text{14}\)

The text is written along the fibres and the back is blank.

\(^{14}\) G. Messeri observes that the hand is very similar to, if not identical with, that of P.Louvre I 46 (217–20), one of the archive texts.
THE OFFICE OF CHIEF CATCHER IN ROMAN EGYPT

Agreement of the village of Soknopaiou Nesos. (To) Akas son of … and Abous son of Aionis, the 2 elders, and Stotoetes son of Herieus and Sinas son of Paoueites, the 2 notables, and Pabous son of Pabous, chief(s) of the thief-catchers of the same village, likewise, (from) Paemis son of Kanis and Petesouchos … We acknowledge that we have received from the elders and notables of the same village six artabas of vegetable-seed(?) total 6 art., and I shall repay (them) in the month of Payni of the current 24th year. Year 24, Thoth 25.’

1 ἵτος κό Θωθ κε.

2–7 The names are given in the nominative instead of the expected dative; for other erratic instances of the use of cases cf. 3 (with n.) and 6. I have indicated what was probably the intended structure in the translation, but have decided not to burden the apparatus with the regularized forms.

2 Ἀκᾶς Ἀκᾶς. The name Ἀκᾶs is attested in Soknopaiou Nesos but apparently not this person. I have not managed to match what I can read of the name of his father with one recorded in this village.

3 Ἀβοῦς Ἀιωνέας: is attested as πράκτωρ ἄργυρικῶν in 225 BGU I 42.4. τῶν β. Cf. 6. The genitive does not correspond to what is described, given in the nominative.

4–5 Στοτοῆς Θερίως. Cf. SPP XXII 169.18 (216), 174.26 (218), BGU I 35.3–4 (222); not all of them necessarily refer to the same man. In D. Hobson Samuel’s list of ‘Taxpayers at Sopnopaiou Nesos, A.D. 207–209’, there are two persons of this name, nos. 99–100; see BASP 14 (1977) 202f.

5 Αιωνέας Πλαοειτῆς = BASP 14 (1977) 200f., no. 98. On this well-known person, see P.Louvre I 46.5 n., and P.Eirene III 3.3 n. He was a πράκτωρ ἄργυρικῶν in years 20 and 25.

6 εὐχήμονος. On this term, see generally N. Lewis, BASP 30 (1993) 105–13. In Soknopaiou Nesos it has occurred in PSI VIII 927.3 (after 186) εὐχήμονες [ο]ίσιῶν, and in BGU II 381.2ff. (II/III), εὐχήμονες παραλήμπται | συναγορασμικῆς κρίθης | Ἡρακλείδου μερίδος, who interact with πρεβυτεροι. εὐχήμονες and πρεβυτεροι appear together also in P.Stras. IV 245 (215–16), in another liturgical context; cf. also O.Leid. 328 (II).

6–7 Παβοῦς Παβοῦτος is probably identical with no. 53 in BASP 14 (1977) 194f. A Pabous son of Pabous is nominated as ἀργύριος in P.Ryl. II 89.10 (191/2), and as πράκτωρ ἄργυρικῶν in P.Gen. Ι 37.17 (186).

7–8 πρεβυτεροι λῃστοπατητῶν. Does πρεβυτεροι (l. προεκτότων) refer to the two εὐχήμονες and Pabous, or should it be corrected to προεκτότως? Or do we have to articulate πρεβυτεροι (l. προεκτότως) τῶν λ.? The number is wrong in 6, singular for plural. A ‘chief thief-catcher’ occurs in P.Oslo II 20.1 (III) προεκτότως λῃστοπατητῆς κόμης Καρανίδου, also in a peculiar spelling. A plurality of ‘chiefs’ and thief-catchers are mentioned as two distinct groups in SB XX 15095.8–9 (Herm.; IV) τ[o]ις προεκτότως καὶ τούς λ. ... λῃστοπατητῶς (the restored καὶ τούς suit the space). Of the five λῃστοπατητῶν of Soknopaiou Nesos mentioned in BGU I 325 = W.Chr. 472.7–9 (III), the first is described as προεκτότως ...; I have tried to read προεκτότως on the basis of the online image, but it is very difficult.

The office of λῃστοπατητής is first attested as liturgical in 265, with a poros of 2,000 drachmas; see N. Lewis, The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt (1997) 36. Such a poros suggests a person of some means, as presumably the εὐχήμονες were.
8 ὁμιῶς may imply that Pabous was also an εὐχήμων; the creditors are said in 10–11 to be ‘elders and notables’, with no separate mention of the chief(s) of thief-catchers. It is less likely that ὁμιῶς should be taken with τῆς αὐτῆς(ης) κόμης.

9 Pássimos Kánteitos is listed as no. 59 in BASP 14 (1977) 194f. καὶ Πετεσοῦχος δὲ. The traces at the end of the line are not compatible with ἀδελ(φὸς) (Paemis and Petesouchos were brothers; see CPR XV 37.20 n.).

9–10 The addition of the second debtor in 9 led to the added μεν in the left-hand margin of the next line, to go with the preceding ὁμολογῶ (l. ὁμολογοῦμεν). ἀποδόω in 13–14 was left unchanged.

12 λαχάνων. See above, introd. I n a few texts λάχανον was used in the sense of λαχανόσπερμον, ‘vegetable seed’; see H. C. Youtie, ZPE 29 (1978) 287 (the first text mentioned there is now P.Col. VII 183), and LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v.


5. Tax receipt

P.Lond. inv. 1712a + 1573b15 14 (w) × 9.5 (h) cm 6 September – n November 237

Two contiguous fragments kept under different inventory numbers preserve the upper part of the document except for some loss on the right. The text is a cumulative receipt for money paid by the heirs of a veteran to the πράκτορε ἀργυρικῶν of ‘Bakchias Hephaisias’ in the first three or four months of the Egyptian year. Before the papyrus breaks off, five payments are recorded, all made in tetradrachms, totalling 44 drachmas (28 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4). The name of the charge is not given, but the sums suggest it was the συντάξιμον, for which a rate of 60 drachmas is attested in the Fayum in the early third century; see J. Shelton, ZPE 25 (1977) 165f. The latest receipt for συντάξιμον published to date is P.Münch. III 111 (222–35), also from Bakchias; our papyrus is slightly later. But it is also possible that the payments concerned a different tax.

This is one of the latest dated documents from Bakchias, if not the latest; previously this position was held by W. Chr. 49 (6.viii.237). Only SB XXVI 16540, which refers to years 5 and 6 of an unnamed emperor could postdate it: it was assigned to the second half of the third or the early fourth century, but the single year figures rule out a date in the Tetrarchic period; it cannot be later than the reign of Probus (years 5 and 6 = 279/80 and 280/81).

The text is written along the fibres and the back is blank.

5 ἔτους δ[π] 2 Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξίμου [μίνου]
{Μεγίστου} ¶ Δ] Εὐσεβίους Εὐσυνοὺς Σεβας[τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ]
Μεγίστου Δακικοῦ Μεγίστου Σαρματ[ικῶν Μεγίστου]
καὶ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Οὐήρου Μαξίμου Γερ[μανικοῦ]
5 Μεγίστου Δακικοῦ Μεγίστου Σαρμ[ατικῶν Μεγίστου]
τοῦ ιεροτάτου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ὕιοῦ [ὁ Σεβαστῶν]
{ὑἱοῦ τοῦ Σεβαστῶν}, Θωθ ἦ. διέχρ(ανεν) Ἀдрес(ηλίῳ) c. 8]
αλή καὶ μ(ετόχοις) πράκ(τορίν) ἄργ(υρικῶν) Βακχί(αδοις) Ἡρακτητά[δοις c. 8]
οὐ(νὸϲ) διὰ κ[ληρονόμων] (δραχμάϲ) εἴκοϲ ὀκτώ, (γίνονται) (δραχμαί) κη. (m.2) Θωθ[0]
[Chuck] 10 δραχμάϲ δέϲαρεϲ, (γίν.) (δρ.) δ. (m.3) Φω[τοϲ] [Chuck] δραχμάϲ δέϲαρεϲ, (γίν.)[Chuck]

15 The two fragments were transcribed separately by Bell, who did not make the connection.
Year 4 of Gaius Iulius Verus Maximinus {Maximus} Pius Felix Augustus Germanicus Maximus Dacicus Maximus Sarmaticus Maximus, the most sacred Caesar, Augustus, son of the Augustus, {son of the Augustus} Thoth 8. (Name), veteran, through (his?) heirs paid to Aurelius—ales and associates, collectors of money taxes at Bakchias Hephaistias, twenty-eight drachmas, total 28 dr.’ (2nd hand) ‘Thoth n, four drachmas, total 4 dr.’ (3rd hand) ‘Phaophi n, four drachmas, total 4 dr. … , four drachmas, total 4 dr. …’

The mistake was corrected only in part.

The restored Μεγίϲτου looks too long for the break, but its omission would be unwarranted.

I have restored the grammatical form of the verb, in the construction called ‘Formulaire II’ by Nachtergael (below, 8. n.), p. 303. Nachtergael argues that when scribes wrote out the verb in full, they normally used the passive form (διεγράφη), which should not be corrected to διέγραψε. This use is not limited to Bakchias; see O.Tebt.Pad. 13.2 n. The passive occurs also in the Heracleopolite P.Vind.Sal. 14.5 and 11, but there the name of the taxpayer is introduced by ὑπό.

If tax was the syntaximon, death did not end liability to it: as was first suggested by Wilcken, Grundzüge 196, the full amount of poll-tax was due if someone died after Mecheir, the sixth month of the year, and half of it if this happened in the first half of the year (cf. Casarico, Le denunce di morte 17).

Among Arsinoite texts of this date, we find this sum in O.Oslo 8 (Tebtynis; 210), paid for laographia, and P.Vind.Sal. 13 (Hephaistias; 219), as the annual quota for a τέλοϲ paid by a τέκτων; cf. also the tax rates of 28 drachmas in O.Mich. I 8 (II/III).

The line would be too short unless there was a date at the end, for a new entry. If so, this would be a date in Choiak rather than another in Hathyr.

Possibly ὁ̣ μοίωϲ ἄλλαϲ δρ[αχμάϲ, as Ben Henry suggests.

δέϲ<αρεϲ>, I. τέϲϲαραϲ. The third hand adopts the same spelling with the additional simplification of sigma in lines 11 and 12 (hence the restored δέϲαρεϲ in l. 10).
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The restored Μεγίϲτου looks too long for the break, but its omission would be unwarranted.

I have restored the grammatical form of the verb, in the construction called ‘Formulaire II’ by Nachtergael (below, 8. n.), p. 303. Nachtergael argues that when scribes wrote out the verb in full, they normally used the passive form (διεγράφη), which should not be corrected to διέγραψε. This use is not limited to Bakchias; see O.Tebt.Pad. 13.2 n. The passive occurs also in the Heracleopolite P.Vind.Sal. 14.5 and 11, but there the name of the taxpayer is introduced by ὑπό.
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