

## 29. Petition to a *Praepositus Pagi*\*

Nikolaos Gonis

E 02572  
Theadelphia

32.9 × 25.4 cm

6 April 343  
Plate 25

The papyrus contains a duplicate of P.Sakaon 48, a text that bears the distinction of being one of the latest exactly dated documents from Theadelphia,<sup>1</sup> and the only secure piece of evidence for Christianity in this village.<sup>2</sup> The story told by the petition and a precedent were eloquently related in the first publication of P.Sakaon 48, and I thought it worth reproducing it here, with a few adjustments (Barns 1957: 3–4; see also Horsley 1983: 149–155 and Grey 2011: 66–67):

‘The present document . . . is a petition addressed to a *praepositus pagi* by one Aurelius Zoilus son of Melas, who describes himself as a ‘deacon of the Catholic Church’. . . Zoilus tells us that one of his sons, Gerontius, married Nonna, daughter of a woman named Anou[s]. When Gerontius was lying mortally ill, Sakaon, accompanied by his brothers, and with the collusion of Anou[s], forcibly entered the father’s house to abduct the young wife. Zoilus, as befitted his holy orders, refrained from resistance, but his other son Pa[nis], venturing to remonstrate with the intruders, was murderously attacked and barely escaped with his life. The feud between Sakaon and the petitioner’s family was of long standing; for in [P.Sakaon 38], a petition to the Prefect of Egypt, dated 312, we hear of a similar act of violence perpetrated upon Zoilus’ father Melas. In that petition Melas says that his son Zoilus (our petitioner) had been betrothed to the daughter of his (Melas’) aunt; when the girl’s mother died and her widower, Sakaon, married again, Melas cared for the girl and married his son to her. Then Sakaon at his second wife’s instigation undertook to upset the marriage on a pretext concerned with marriage settlements, and abducted the bride. Negotiations followed; but in spite of an agreement that after a financial settlement the bride should be restored, Sakaon would not give her up, but was preparing to marry her to his wife’s nephew. Sakaon was already known to be alive and litigating in 342 (see [P.Sakaon 46–47]); we see him now, at the age of at least seventy-three [cf. Boyaval 1990], behaving towards Zoilus’ family much as he had behaved thirty-one years before, and with him another person familiar from the Theadelphia archive, and presumably by now very old—Anou[s], the mother of Nonna, wife of Zoilus’ son Gerontius.’

---

\* I am indebted to Dr. W. B. Henry for comments and corrections.

1 Theadelphia is mentioned only in one later document, P.Col. VIII 237.4 (381 or 382, with BL XIII 71).

2 P.Bas. II 43, described by the editor as ‘the oldest datable Christian documentary papyrus’ (before 239) and plausibly associated with Theadelphia, attests a Christian person from the Arsinoite metropolis present in this village. In P.Sakaon 48, we have a church deacon who is resident in Theadelphia.

This narrative needs qualification in the part that refers to the abduction of Nonna and the attack on Panis. The petition distinguishes between what happened ‘then’ (11, τότε) and ‘now’ (12, νῦν); these events most probably did not take place in quick succession but were ‘a decade or more’ apart (Bagnall 1982: 54).

Though marred by numerous holes, **29** helps resolve several textual difficulties in P.Sakaon 48, some of them previously unnoticed, especially in places where the reading is obscured by abrasion. The sense overall and the details of the narrative, however, are not affected. The two copies are the work of two different scribes, but the second hand, responsible for the subscriptions, is the same in both. This is not a common arrangement; see Whitehorne 2003: 204 n. 6, whose sole examples of petitions written by different scribes but signed by the same second hand are P.Oxy. XXXIII 2672 (218) and P.Stras. VIII 714–715 (late 4th cent.). Another such case is P.Sakaon 44 = P.Turner 44 (see below).

The two copies do not offer an identical text. A number of variants are present in one copy but not in the other. Most of them can be explained as phonetic spellings (the correct form is given in bold type):

<b>29</b>	P.Sakaon 48
4 γάμω	5 γάμου
5 εὔνοιαι	6 εὔνοιαν
6 νόσφ	7 νόσου
7 χρεών	7 χρεόν
7 ἀποδιδόνε	7 ἀποδιδόναι
13 ὕβριζόμενων	14 ὕβριζόμενον
16 σωο[π]οίαν	18 ζωοποίαν
17 μισθώσι	19 μισθώσει
22 Αὐστοποταμίας	25 Αὐγουστοποταμίας

But there are also substantive variants:

5 (omitted)	6 αὐτήν
7 τοῦνομα	8 τουνομου
13 τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν	14 τῶν
14 δικαιολ . . .	15 δικαιολογουμένου
15 αὐτὸν καὶ [το]ῦ ζῆγ {αὐτὸν}	17 αὐτῶ καὶ τοῦ ζῆγ

**29** offers the correct text in two instances and P.Sakaon 48 in two others; in one other place, each has a different error. It is clear, then, that the two copies are independent. The original may be the petition submitted to the *praepositus pagi*; SB IV 7464 (248) provides an example of a petition written in triplicate. It is unclear, however, why a petitioner would produce three copies and retain two. If one of them had been meant to be served on his opponent, it would have been submitted with the original (cf. Kelly 2011: 70). See further 13–14 n.

Two other petitions in the archive survive in duplicate.<sup>3</sup> One is P.Sakaon 45 = 45A (334), a petition to an eirenarch from Sakaon. 45A is a copy of 45, as the mistakes indicate; both seem to be the work of the same clerk. The main text and the subscription are in the same hand. The other is P.Sakaon 44 = P.Turner 44 (331/2), a petition to the prefect from three men, one of them being Sakaon. The editor of P.Turner 44 observed that '[t]he subscriptions are in the hand of the same *amanuensis*, but the bodies of the texts are in different hands.' We find the same pattern in P.Sakaon 48 = **29**, and the affinities do not end here. The dimensions of P.Sakaon 48, 32 × 26 cm, are almost identical to those of **29**. The same has been noticed for P.Sakaon 44 and P.Turner 44; it is suggested that they were 'pieces cut from the same roll' (P.Turner 44 introd.). Luiselli 1999: 31 has further demonstrated that they are copies made independently of one another 'from a common ancestor'.

It has been observed that P.Sakaon 48 was probably not part of the archive of Sakaon but only mentioned him (France 1999: 158). The discovery of this duplicate shows that it was not 'preserved in a "wrongdoer's" archive' (Kelly 2011: 70 n. 121): Sakaon would not have held two copies of a petition filed against him. It is only part of Sakaon's dossier, a contemporary text from Theadelphia that would presumably have been recovered somewhere else. There is no information available about the acquisition of P.Sakaon 48, which belongs to the collection of the Egypt Exploration Society, like P.Turner 44. 'Both of these might possibly come from a purchase of papyri made by J. de M. Johnson in 1914, see *CE* 24 (1949) 295' (P.Turner 44 introd.), but there is no way of verifying this hypothesis.<sup>4</sup> P.Turner 44 certainly belongs to Sakaon's papers, and is a duplicate of a papyrus from the find or finds that produced P.Thead. (P.Sakaon 44 = P.Thead. 17). If P.Sakaon 48 was acquired with P.Turner 44, it would be part of the same find.

The acquisition history of **29** complicates matters further. This and one other papyrus were presented to the University of Pennsylvania Museum by 'Mrs. Dillwyn Parrish, May 1914';<sup>5</sup> they will have been among the '2,000 artifacts from her husband's private collection' given to the Museum then.<sup>6</sup> Both papyri were said to have been 'Collected [by] Grenfell & Hunt'. Though they were active papyrus dealers, I am not aware of any papyri that Grenfell and Hunt privately sold or 'donated' to American collectors, though nothing can be ruled out. Mrs Dillwyn Parrish was not a stranger to their world, since she had contributed to the funds for the Oxyrhynchus excavations;<sup>7</sup> a 'donation' is not inconceivable. Grenfell and Hunt had bought a number of papyri from the Theadelphia/Sakaon find, which they sold to the John Rylands Library (e.g. P.Ryl. IV 656, now P.Sakaon 3); the last time they were both in Egypt was in 1906/1907. But if P.Sakaon 48 and **29** were in their hands, why were papyri as sizeable as these not sent to Manchester? In short, nothing can be said with certainty.

3 P.Sakaon 46 and 47 (342) were written on the same day and concern the same topic but are addressed to different officials (P.Sakaon 47 = P.Abinn. 44).

4 Barns, the first editor of P.Sakaon 48, had edited a number of Fayum papyri in his doctoral thesis that do not stem from Grenfell and Hunt's excavation, one of them published in Barns 1949: 295 and said to derive from Johnson's purchase.

5 Images of the record cards are posted at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/ppenn/museum/greek/02572-card.jpg> and <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/ppenn/museum/greek/02576-card.jpg>.

6 See Abercrombie 1985: 14.

7 Abercrombie 1985: 9 n. 9. On the financial contributions from Philadelphians, see Johnson 2012: 214–215.

The two papyri donated by Mrs Dillwyn Parrish were catalogued in 1937 and later photographed, but can no longer be located in the museum.<sup>8</sup> The edition below is based on scans of the negative.<sup>9</sup>

Αὐρηλίῳ Ἰσίῳν[ι π]ροπολ(ιτευομένῳ) πραιπ(οσίτω) [η] πάγου νομοῦ Ἄρσ[ι]νοῖτου  
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ζωῖλ[ου Μέλα]νος διάκονος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίαι[ς ἀπὸ κ]ώμης  
 Θεαδελφίας τοῦ ὑπὸ σαι πάγου.  
 οἱ τὸν ἀναδῆ καὶ ληστρικὸν βίον ἐπανηρημένοι, καθαρῶτατε τῶν ἀνδρῶν, δίντε τῆς τῶν  
 νόμων ἐπεξε-  
 λεύσεως τυχεῖν. ἔτι περιόντος τοῦ μακαρίτου μου υἱοῦ Γεροντίου τοῦ υἱοῦ συνῆλθεν,  
 ὧς εἴθε μήποτε, πρὸς γάμω  
 5 κοινωνίαν γυναικὶ Νόννα θυγατρὶ Ἄννοῦτος ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμ[η]ς, νομίζων εὐ{ε}νοιαγ  
 καὶ στοργῆν ἀπο-  
 σφῆζιν πρὸς τὴν συμβίωσιν, ἡ δὲ τοῦναντία διεπράξατο· τοῦ γὰρ προκιμένου μου υἱοῦ νό-  
 σφ κατακλιθέντος καὶ μέλλον-  
 τος τὸ χρεὼν τοῦ βίου ἀποδιδόνε, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως Σακαῶν τις τοῦνομα ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κώ-  
 μης ἦθος ληστρικὸν ἀναλαβόμενος  
 ἐπιστᾶ[ς] διήρπαξεν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μου υἱοῦ καὶ προκιμένην Νόνναν καὶ ταύτην  
 ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὴν  
 ἑαυτοῦ οἰκίαν οὐ δεόντως καὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς νόμους, συνεργοὺς ἐσχηκῶς τῆς τηλικ-  
 αῦτης παρανομίας  
 10 τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὴν μητέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ προκιμένην Ἄννοῦν. ἀλλὰ πάραυτα  
 τοῦ αὐτοῦ μου υἱοῦ[υ] τελευτήσαντος  
 ἐβ[ο]υλόμην τότε τῆ τῶν νόμων ἀκολουθία χρήσασθαι περὶ οὐ ἐτόλμησαν ῥιποκινδύνου  
 πράγματος καὶ δὴ  
 εἶξα τὸν ἀπράγμονα βίον ἀσκῶν. ἀλλ' οὐκ [ο]ἶδα τίني λόγῳ γῶν τοῦ ἐτέρου μ[ου] υἱοῦ  
 Πανι τοῦνομα θεωρήσαντος  
 τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάππον ὑβρίζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν πανκακίστων ἀνδ[ρ]ῶν καὶ προκιμέ-  
 νων ἐ[σ]θηθῆς ἀπὴν-  
 τησ[εν ἐκε]ῖσαι κ[α]ἰ δικαιολ . . πρὸς αὐ[τ]οὺς περὶ τού[τ]ου, οἱ δὲ [πά]λιν ἐκ τῶν ἐναν-  
 τί[ων] ἦθ[ο]ς πανκάκιστον καὶ [ἀ]πογοίας  
 15 μεσ[τὸ]ν ἀναλαβόμενοι ἐπελθόντες καὶ αὐτῶ μετὰ πελεκῶν καὶ ῥοπά[λ]ων ἐβούλοντο  
 αὐτὸν καὶ [το]ῦ ζῆν {αὐτὸν}  
 ἀνελῖν· εἰ μὴ γὰρ τύχης ἔργον γεγένηται, τ[ο]ῦ φυγῆ αὐτὸν τὴν σωο[π]οῖαν [ποι]ήσα-  
 σ[θα]ι, πάλε ἂν καὶ τοῦ ζῆν αὐτὸν ἀνίλ[ον],  
 κα[τ]αφρονήσαντες τῆς τῶν κ[α]μῶν εὐν[ο]μίας καὶ τῆ[ς] ἡμετέρας ἀπραγμοσύνη[ς]. ἐπὶ  
 τοίνυν καὶ ἄπερ εἶχαν ἐν μισθῶσι  
 οἱ αὐτοῖ[ς] μου υἱοῖ πρό[βα]τα πεντακ[ό]σι[α] [καὶ] βόας [ὀκτ]ῶ καὶ ὄνικα τετ[ρά]ποδα πέν-  
 τε ἀφή[ρ]παζα[ν κα]ὶ διεσπάθη[σαν].

8 In an email of 14 Nov. 2018, Jen Wegner (Associate Curator, Egyptian Section) notes, 'it seems that there was a clerical error in the 1930s and that these papyri were never accessioned into our collections'.

9 I first saw the image posted at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak//ppenn/museum/greek/02572-32087-archive.jpg> by R. A. Kraft. I have also used a TIFF image of the same negative, purchased from the Museum. It is reproduced courtesy of the Archives of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.

κάγ[ὸ αὐτὸ]ς ὁ [ἄθλιος ἀναγκάζ]ομαι ὑπ[ὸ τ]ῶν δεσπο[τῶν] ταῦτα[α] ἀπ[ο]δοῦ[να]ι, διὰ  
 20 σῆ [ἐμμε]λε[ία] ἀξιῶν ἀχ[θ]ῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ σοί, καὶ πρῶ[τ]ον μὲν [οὐ ἐτό]λμησαν [π]αρα-  
 νόμου καὶ ῥιψοκινδύν[ο]υ πράγματος  
 ἐκδ[ικίας] τυχεῖν, ἔπειτα ἐπαναγκασθῆναι αὐτοὺς τὴν [τῶν π]ροε[ιρημέν]ων τετραπόδων  
 ποιήσασθαι· εἰ δὲ μή,  
 ἐ[κπέμπεσθαι] αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ μέγα δικαστήριον τοῦ κυρίου μο[υ] διασημ[ο]τάτου ἡ[γε]-  
 μόν[ο]ς τῆς Αὐστοποταμίας Φλ(αούου) Ὀλυμπίου,  
 ὄ[πως ἡ] δέουσα ἐπιστρέφεια] προχωρήσῃ κατ' αὐτῶ[ν]. διευτύχει.  
 ὑ[πατείας] Φουρίου Πλακίδου καὶ Φλαουίου Ἰωμύλλου τῶν λαμπροτάτων, Φαρ[μουθι]  
 25 [ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀγρ(αμμάτου).] *vac.*

1 ἴσιων[ *rap.* 2 ζῶιλ[ *rap., l.* Θεαδελφείας, σέ 3 *l.* ἀναιδῆ, δεῖνται (δέονται) 4 το ὑμακαρ του *rap.,*  
*l.* γάμου 6 *l.* σφάζειν, προκειμένου 7 *l.* ἀποδιδόναι, ὅπως σακαων *rap.* 8 *l.* προκειμένην  
 11 το ὑμακαρ του *rap.* 12 ἀπραγ'μονα *rap.* 13 *l.* ὕβριζόμενον, προκειμένων, *l.* αἰσθηθεῖς  
 13, 14 *l.* παγκακ- 14 *l.* ἐκέισε, παν κακίςτον *rap.* 16 *l.* ἀνελεῖν, ζωοποιίαν, πάλαι, ἀνεῖλον  
 17 ἀπραγ'μοσυνη[ *rap., l.* ἐπεί, μισθώσει 18 πεντε *congr.* from πεντα 20 πραγ'ματος *rap.*  
 21 ἐπαναγ'κασθῆναι *rap.* 22 *l.* Αὐγουστοποταμίας, 24 ζῶιλος *rap.*

‘To Aurelius Ision, *propoliteuomenos*, *praepositus* of the 8th pagus of the Arsinoite nome, from Aurelius Zoilos son of Melas, deacon of the catholic church, from the village of Theadelphia of the *pagus* under you.

‘Those who have taken up the life of shamelessness and robbery, you purest of men, need to obtain the punishment of the laws. When my blessed son, Gerontios by name, was still alive, he came—if only he had never!—into the communion of marriage with a woman, Nonna daughter of Annous, from the same village. He thought that (she) maintained goodwill and affection towards their common life, but she brought about the opposite. For when my aforementioned son was lying ill and about to repay life’s debt, for some unknown reason a certain man, Sakaon by name, from the same village, took up the attitude of the robber and coming near he abducted Nonna, the wife of the same son of mine, and mentioned above, and carried her off to his own house wrongfully and against all laws, having as accomplices in this great illegality his own brothers and Annous, the girl’s mother, and mentioned above. But since my same son died immediately, I wished at that time to avail myself of the consequence of the laws concerning the reckless act that they had dared (to commit); and indeed I gave way, practising the quiet way of life. However, I do not know for what reason, now, when my other son, Pasis by name, observed his grandfather being ill-treated by the same and above mentioned utterly villainous men, when he perceived (this), he went there and argued with them about it, they on the contrary again took up an attitude utterly villainous and full of madness, and set upon him too with axes and clubs, and wanted to do away with him even from living; for had not an act of fortune occurred, that he saved his life by flight, they would long ago have done away with him even from living, in contempt of the good order of the times and of our love of a quiet life. Since, therefore, they also carried off and plundered the five hundred sheep and eight oxen and five donkeys that my same sons had on lease, and I myself, a wretched man, am compelled by the owners to return them, for this reason, then, I submit this petition to Your Diligence asking that they be brought before you, so that first I may obtain redress

for the illegal and reckless act they have dared (to commit), and then that they may be compelled to make (redress) of the aforesaid animals; or else that they be sent on to the high court of my lord Flavius Olympius, the *perfectissimus praeses* of Augustopotamia, so that the appropriate severity may proceed against them. Farewell.<sup>7</sup>

‘In the consulship of Furius Placidus and Flavius Romulus, *virī clarissimi*, Pharmouthi 11.’ (2nd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Zoilos, have submitted this. I, Aurelius ..., wrote on his behalf because he is illiterate.’<sup>10</sup>

**1 Αὐρηλίω Ἰσίωνι [π]ροπολι(τευομένω) πραι(οσίτω) [η] πάγου νομοῦ Ἄρσινοῖτου:** [π]ρ[ο]πολι(τευομένω) was read in P.Sakaon 48.1 (Worp 1997: 204 = BL XI 192), but nothing is currently visible on the papyrus before π, while there is a high trace after Ἰσίωνι: read π[ρο]πολι(τευομένω). Ision is also the addressee in P.Sakaon 46.1–2 (342) π[ρα]ι(ποσίτω) π[ά]γ(ου) η πολ(τευομένω) | Πεντακωμίας, a curious sequence. The papyrus is abraded at the end of the line; Worp 1997: 204 (= BL XI 192) tentatively proposed π[ρο]πολι(τευομένω) π[ρ]αι(οσίτω). (The anomalous word order π[ά]γ(ου) η seems to be paralleled only in two other addresses to *praepositi* in the archive: P.Sakaon 39.1 (318) [π]άγ(ου) η, but the photograph indicates that η π[ά]γ(ου) is a better reading; and P.Sakaon 43.1 (327) π[ά]γ(ου) [η], but every letter is dotted and there is no photograph of the papyrus.) One Fl. Ision, πολιτευόμενος καὶ ἐξάκτωρ, occurs in an unpublished fourth-century Arsinoite petition (P.Lond. inv. 2180; see Lallemand 1964: 264).

**2 Ζωίλου Μέλαινος:** On this person, see above, introd., and Bagnall 1982: 44.

**διάκονος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας:** The use of term ‘catholic church’ gains ground in this period, and this is its earliest example; cf. Wipszycka 1994: 198 (but note that P.Oxy. XXII 2344 has been redated to c. 351–352 [BL X 148]). On ‘catholic’ churches of villages, see Wipszycka 1994: 209–211.

**τοῦ ὑπὸ σαί (Ι. σέ) πάγου:** also in P.Sakaon 48.2, where read τοῦ ὑπὸ σαί π[ά]γου instead of τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ. This is a standard phrase in this period; cf. e.g. P.Sakaon 39.6 (318).

**3 ἀναδῆ (Ι. ἀναιδῆ):** On the spelling, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 194. ἀν[αιδ]ῆ is restored in P.Sakaon 48.3.

**βίον ἐπανηρημένοι:** [βίον ἐ]πανηρημένοι is to be read in P.Sakaon 48.3, not [τρό]πον ἡρημ[έ]ν[ο]ι. Cf. P.Oxy. L 3577.3–4 (342) τοῖς μὴ πραγματευτικὸν ἐπανηρημένοις | βίον.

καθαρώτατε τῶν ἀνδρῶν: a unique expression. καθ[α]ρώτ[ατε] κύριε was read in P.Oxy. XXIV 2418.10 (5th cent.), but the reading cannot be confirmed.

**3–4 δίντε τῆς τῶν νόμων ἐπεξελεύσεως τυχεῖν:** P.Sakaon 48.3 will have had δῖν[τε] τῆς where δίκα[ιοί εἰσι] <τῆς> is printed. Cf. P.Cair.Isid. 75.17 (316) δεομένης τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων ἐπεξελεύσεως. δίντε, *l.* δεῖνται, for δέονται, retains the -ει- of the singular δεῖται on the analogy of κείνται beside κείται. For a literary example, see [Cyrill. Alex.] PG 77.1228.29.

**4–5 πρὸς γάμω | κοινωνίαν:** The same phrase occurs in P.Sakaon 38.5 (312). Arguing from other verbal affinities, Barns 1957: 8 thought that the same person composed both P.Sakaon 38 and 48, but this particular phrase is very common.

10 Four translations have been published: Barns 1957: 4–6; Parássoglou 1978: 121–123; Horsley 1983: 150; Bryen 2013: 263 (no. 106). I have drawn on all of them with profit.

**5 Νόννη:** cf. 8. See Bagnall 1982: 46 (C11), who surmises that ‘Nonna was probably born by 310 and perhaps earlier’.

**Ἄννοῦτος:** cf. 10. See Bagnall 1982: 40–42 (B5), 53–54 (no. 11). Annous is first attested in 284 (P.Sakaon 37) as the owner of property inherited from her father; she was probably an adult at that time. Her next dated appearance comes from 318–321 (P.Sakaon 40). She was dead by 336 (P.Sakaon 10; for the date, see Bagnall 1982: 52–54).

**5–6 εὖ{ε}νοιαν καὶ στοργὴν ἀποσφῶζιν:** αὐτήν [δ]ι[ασ]φῶζ[ε]ιν was read after στοργὴν in P.Sakaon 48.6, but there too we find ἀποσφῶζειν (read by Dr Henry). Our copy omits αὐτήν by mistake (parablepsy). For the expression, cf. P.Oxy. XXXIV 2711.4 (271) ἀποσφῶζων εὖνοιαν.

**6 τὴν συμβίωσιν, ἡ δέ:** also in P.Sakaon 48.6 τὴν συμβίω[σι]ν, ἡ δέ. This removes the problem of μου read instead of ἡ δέ in the previous editions (cf. Horsley 1983: 154).

**τοῦναντία διεπράξατο:** τοῦναντία stands for τάναντία, perhaps under the influence of the common τοῦναντίον. For the expression cf. PSI XV 1554.17 (3rd cent.) τοῦναντίον ἔπραξεν.

**7 τὸ χρεῶν τοῦ βίου ἀποδιδόνε (I. -ναι):** ἀποδιδόναι is to be read in P.Sakaon 48.7 instead of ἀποδοῦναι.

**ἦθος ληστρικών:** also in P.Sakaon 48.8, ἦθ[ο]ς λη[στ]ρικόν, instead of ἦθ[ι]ρό[γ] μ[ου] οἶκον. This is the only documentary papyrus that attests this expression; there are instances from literary texts. References to thefts perpetrated ληστρικῶ τρόπῳ are of course commonplace; see Mascellari 2021: 467–473.

**8 τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μου υἱοῦ καὶ προκιμένην Νόνναν:** Barns 1957: 6 spoke of the substitution of καί for the definite article here and in lines 10, τὴν μητέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ προκιμένην Ἄννοῦν, and 13, τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν πανκακίστων ἀνδ[ρ]ῶν καὶ προκιμένων. There is nothing ungrammatical in these constructions, but they are indeed unusual.

**καὶ ταύτην:** [καὶ τ]αύτην may now be read in P.Sakaon 48.9 instead of [καὶ] αὐτήν.

**10 τῆς παιδός:** τῆς [γυναϊκός] in P.Sakaon 48.11 has to cede its place to τῆς [παιδός].

**11 τῇ τῶν νόμων ἀκολουθία:** See P.Ammon II 42.26 n.; another instance in P.Gen. IV 183.5 (5th cent.), a petition.

**12 ἀπράγμονα βίον ἀσκῶν:** Barns thought that ‘ἀσκῶν suggests a Christian writer’, but this use of the verb predates Christianity; cf. e.g. IG II<sup>2</sup> 7227 = CEG 543.5 (4th cent. BC) εὐσεβῆ ἀσκήσασα βίον, or D.S. 3.64.7 (1st cent. BC) δίκαιον βίον ἀσκοῦσι. ἀσκῶ has not occurred in any other Greek documentary papyrus, but cf. the Coptic P.KRU 65.20 (c. 695) ΝΕΤΑΚΚΕΙ ΜΕΝ 2Ν ΠΒΙΟΣ ΝΤΜΝΤΜΟΝΟΧΟΣ.

**οὐκ [ο]ῖδα τίني λόγῳ γῶν:** λόγ[ω] ο]ῖδν was read in P.Sakaon 48.13, but the trace before υν in 29 is an upright, and γῶν seems inevitable (γ]ῶν in P.Sakaon 48.13). Cf. P.Sakaon 45.5 ο]ῖκ ὕδα τίني λόγου (sim. 45A.6), 47.8–9 ο]ῖκ ὕδα | τίني λόγου καὶ ληστρικῶ τρόπῳ (sim. 46.5–6).

**Πανι:** Πάσει may now be read as Πανει in P.Sakaon 48.14. This son of Zoilos is not known otherwise.

**13 τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν πανκακίστων:** cf. 14. P.Cair.Isid. 62.12 (297), another petition, offers the only other attestation of πανκακίστος in the papyri. αὐτῶν is omitted in P.Sakaon 48.14.

**13–14 ἐ[σ]θηθίς ἀπήνητησ[εν ἐκε]ῖσαι:** The passage in P.Sakaon 48.15 was read as ἐσθη[τα] αὐτοῦ καταπελεκίσαι, but this mostly relies on conjecture (ἐσθη[.] . . . υ . . . τ . πελεκίσαι *ed. pr.*). Reading ἐσθηθίς ἀπήνητησεν ἐκίσαι would bring it into line with the other copy, though the dotted letters are difficult to verify. ἐσθηθίς is no doubt a phonetic spelling of αἰσθηθεῖς, but it is not easy to relate this participle to the rest of the sentence. Dr Henry notes:

‘The text is a product of conflation. The author’s original draft will have had ὁ ἕτερός μου υἱὸς Πανὶ τούνομα αἰσθηθεῖς ἀπήνητησεν ἐκεῖσε, οἱ δὲ πάλιν κτλ. This was revised and expanded, and the structure was changed. The first clause was made into a genitive absolute; the neutral αἰσθηθεῖς became θεωρήσαντος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάππον ὑβριζόμενων ὑπὸ τῶν αὐ[τ]ῶν πανκακίστων ἀνδ[ρ]ῶν καὶ προκειμένων, and the plain ἀπήνητησεν ἐκεῖσε was changed to δικαιολογουμένου πρὸς[ ] α[ὐ]τὸς περὶ τού[τ]ου, to indicate that he had behaved peacefully and not sought confrontation despite the outrageous provocation. The desired final text will have been τοῦ ἑτέρου μου υἱοῦ Πανὶ τούνομα θεωρήσαντος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάππον ὑβριζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν παγκακίστων ἀνδρῶν καὶ προκειμένων καὶ δικαιολογουμένου πρὸς αὐτοὺς περὶ τούτου, πάλιν ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων κτλ. The original draft appears to have indicated the desired changes in an ambiguous fashion by means of insertions above the line or in the margin: while the change in case at the start was clearly indicated, the substitution in what follows was mistaken for an addition. Consequently αἰσθηθεῖς ἀπήνητησεν ἐκεῖσε and οἱ δὲ were retained alongside their replacements in the fair copy from which the two surviving copies were made. (For conflation, cf. e.g. J. R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden 2008), Index of Subjects s.v. [p. 984].) The corruption would not immediately be recognized as such by a copyist since the genitive absolute may be used for the subject of a sentence, as in line 4 ἔτι περιόντος τοῦ μακαρίτου μου υἱοῦ . . . συνήλθεν. So the stemma is Draft — Fair copy — A & B.’

**14 κ[α]ῖ δικαιολ . . . :** καὶ δικαιολογουμένου P.Sakaon 48.15. The text in our copy is garbled.

**ἐκ τῶν ἐναντί[ων]:** A common expression, found also in another text of the dossier, P.Sakaon 93.7 (314–23). Barns adduced P.Sakaon 43.23 (327) ἐκ τῆς ἐναντιώσ[εως], a petition of Sakaon.

**15 μετὰ πελεκῶν καὶ ῥοπά[λ]ων:** Clubs are common in assaults, on their own or combined with swords (μετὰ ῥοπάλων καὶ ξιφῶν: P.Amh. II 142.8, P.Abinn. 12.10–11). The threatening use of an axe is mentioned in SB V 8004.6–7 (3rd cent.). ἐβάσταξεν ἡμῶν πέλεκυν.

**15–16 αὐτῶν καὶ [το]ῦ ζῆν {αὐτόν} | ἀνελῖν:** αὐτῶ καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀνελῖν P.Sakaon 48.17. αὐτῶ may be due to αὐτῶ earlier in the line. Both copies have the accusative later, here τοῦ ζῆν αὐτόν ἀνίλογ (16; sim. P.Sakaon 48.18). The genitives of the articular infinitive have been considered errors for the accusative, and this would hold if we had not ἀνελῖν and ἀνίλογ but ἀφελῆσθαι and ἀφείλοντο (see LSJ s.v. ἀφαιρέω II.1, ‘c. dupl. acc. rei et pers. *bereave* or *deprive of* . . . rarely c. acc. pers. et gen. rei’). ἀναρῆν, however, governs a single accusative and means ‘to destroy’, ‘to kill’; while it could have conveyed the required sense without the addition of τοῦ ζῆν, Dr Henry notes that the addition gives rhetorical emphasis, and the construction with the genitive may be compared to that found with verbs of preventing.

**16 τύχης ἔργον γεγένηται, τ[ο]ῦ φυγῆ αὐτόν τῆν σω[π]οῖαν [ποι]ήσας[θα]:** On the genitive of the articular infinitive after impersonal expressions, see Mandilaras, *Verb* §§ 816, 818 (p. 334).



**σωο[π]ορία:** The word is spelled with ζ (correctly) in P.Sakaon 48.18. ζωοποιία is a rare, literary word, not attested in any other papyrus.

**17 εὐν[ο]μία:** After εὐν, it looks as if something was cancelled by an oblique stroke, but cf. the shape of ο in τσι in l. 19. The lacuna is too large for ο alone, but the scribe occasionally leaves blank spaces, perhaps to avoid bad patches on the surface of the papyrus.

**18 ἀφή[ρ]παξα[ν]:** ἀφήπα|σεν is said of another sheep robber in P.Sakaon 46.8–9 (but ἦρπασαι in its copy, P.Sakaon 47.10).

**διεσπάθη[σαν]:** Another word predominantly attested in literature; see Parsons 1969: 321 (9 n.).

**πεντακ[ό]σια:** also in P.Sakaon 48.20 πε[ν]τα[κό]σια. The first edition read πε[ν]τα[κό]σια, but πε[ν]τ[.]ια was printed in P.Sakaon, with the note, ‘seemingly not πε[ν]τα[κό]σια, πε[ν]τή[κο]γτα’.

**19 διὰ τοι τοῦτο:** a common collocation in petitions; cf. Gonis 2021: 186.

**19–20 τῆ | σῆ [έ]μμελεία:** τῆ | σῆ [έ]μμ[ε]λ[ί]α should be read in place of ἐν [άσφ]αλ[ί]α in P.Sakaon 48.22. On the abstract, see P.Harr. II 207.11 n.

**20 ἐπὶ σοῦ:** σοῦ is to be read also in P.Sakaon 48.22 instead of σοί (noted by Dr Henry).

**[οὐ ἐτό]λμησαν [π]αρανόμου καὶ ῥησκοινδύν[ο]ν πράγματος:** The wording is close to P.Sakaon 38.2–3 (312) τὰ παρανόμως καὶ ῥησκοινδύνως ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων τολμώμενα, but this is a stock phrase: P.Oxy. XVII 2131.16 (207) ἀνόμως καὶ ῥησκοινδύνως; P.Cair.Isid. 70.4 (c. 310) ἀνόμως καὶ ῥει[ψ]ονκινδύνως; P.Cair.Isid. 70.11–12 = P.Merton II 91.13 (315) ἀλόγως καὶ ῥησκοινδύνως παρὰ τοὺς νόμους.

**21 ἐκδ[ικ]ίας τυχεῖν:** See Mascellari 2014: 243–248 and 2021: 577–582.

**ἔπειτα:** The word is spelled ἔπιτα in P.Sakaon 48.23.

**τὴν [τῶν π]ροε[ιρημέν]ων τετραπόδων ποιήσασθαι:** P.Sakaon 48.24 τῆ[ν] τῶν προειρημένων [τετρ]απόδων (ἀπόδοσιν) ποιήσασ[θ]αι. Barns posited an omission ‘due to visual confusion with the preceding word’, but this is not necessary. Dr Henry points out that ‘ἐκδικίαν can be understood with τὴν from what precedes. ἐκδικίαν (or ἐκδίκησιν) ποιεῖσθαι is familiar’.

**22 εἰς τὸ μέγα δικαστήριον:** Cf. P.Oxy. LXIII 4382.9 (383?) εἰς τὸ μέγ[α] δικαστήριον.

**Αὐστοποταμίας:** Αὐγουστοποταμίας in P.Sakaon 48.25. This version of the name of the province of Augustamnica occurs only in this petition. For the spelling in this copy, cf. Gignac, *Grammar* i 74.

**Φλ(αουτίου) Ὀλυμπίου:** This remains one of only two exactly dated references to Fl. Olympius, *praeses* of Augustamnica; the other comes from less than a month earlier, 14.iii.343 (P.Oxy. XLVIII 3389). One other probably dates from spring 343 (P.Oxy. LXII 4345), and two others are undated. See further Agostinini 2020: 315–317.

**23 προχωρήση:** προχ[ω]ρήση] instead of προ[σταχθή]σεται] may now be read in P.Sakaon 48.26. Cf. SB VI 9136.13 (4th cent.) ]γ αὐτοῖς προχωρήση, from the end of a petition.

## Bibliography

- Abercrombie, J.R. (1985), 'A History of the Acquisition of Papyri and Related Written Material in the University of Pennsylvania Museum', *BES* 6: 7–16.
- Agostini, G. (2020), *Prefetti e praesides nell'amministrazione giudiziaria dell'Egitto tardoantico: ambiti di competenza e prosopografia (284-397)* (Diss. Sapienza, Università di Roma).
- Bagnall, R.S. (1982), 'The Population of Theadelphia in the Fourth Century', *BSAC* 24: 35–57.
- Barns, J.W.B. (1949), 'Three Fayûm Papyri', *CE* 24: 295–305.
- Barns, J.W.B. (1957), 'A Fourth-Century Deacon's Petition from Theadelphia', *Studia Patristica* 1: 3–9.
- Boyaval, B. (1990), "Les âges" de Sakaon', *CE* 65: 321–322.
- Bryen, A.Z. (2013), *Violence in Roman Egypt: A Study in Legal Interpretation* (Philadelphia).
- France, J. (1999), *Theadelphia and Eubemercia: Village History in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Diss.) (Leuven).
- Gonis, N. (2021), 'Notes on Miscellaneous Documents VIII', *ZPE* 220: 186–191.
- Grey, C. (2011), *Constructing Communities in the Late Roman Countryside* (Cambridge).
- Horsley, G.H.R. (1983), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. III: *A Review of Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1978* (North Ryde).
- Johnson, W.A. (2012), 'The Oxyrhynchus Distributions in America: Papyri and Ethics', *BASP* 49: 209–222.
- Kelly, B. (2011), *Petitions, Litigation, and Social Control in Roman Egypt* (Oxford).
- Lallemant, J. (1964), *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (284-382)* (Brussels).
- Luiselli, R. (1999), *A Study of High Level Greek in the Non-Literary Papyri from Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (Diss.) (London).
- Mascellari, R. (2014), 'Nuova edizione di una petizione di epoca traiana: P.Iand. inv. 16 = SB X 10218 (con un'appendice sul termine ΕΚΔΙΚΙΑ)', *ZPE* 191: 235–248.
- Mascellari, R. (2021), *La lingua delle petizioni nell'Egitto romano: evoluzione di lessico, formule e procedure dal 30 a.C. al 300 d.C.* (Florence).
- Parásoglou, G.M. (ed.) (1978), *The Archive of Aurelius Sakaon. Papers of an Egyptian farmer in the last century of Theadelphia* (Bonn).
- Parsons, P. J. (1969), 'Three Documents from Trinity College, Dublin', *CdÉ* 44: 313–324.
- Whitehorne, J. (2003), 'Strategus, Centurion, or Neither. BGUI 321 and 322 (= *M.Chrest.* 114 and 124) and their Duplicates', *BASP* 40: 201–211.
- Wipszycka, E. (1994), 'Καθολική et les autres épithètes qualifiant le nom ἐκκλησία. Contribution à l'étude de l'ordre hiérarchique des églises dans l'Égypte byzantine', *JJurP* 24: 191–212.
- Worp, K.A. (1997), "Ἀρξάντες and πολιτευόμενοι in Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt", *ZPE* 115: 201–220.