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PREFACE

The present volume is a record of two years' excavations in the Fayûm, the first in 1895–96 conducted by D. G. Hogarth and B. P. Grenfell, who were joined subsequently by A. S. Hunt; the second in 1898–99 by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

With regard to the division of work among the editors, Part I (introductory), Part II. iv–vii describing the excavations at Kašr el Banât, Harît, &c., and Part III, containing texts of papyri, ostraca, and indices, are by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt; Part II. i–iii, describing the excavations at Kom Ushôm and Úmm el 'Atl, with Plates II and III, are by D. G. Hogarth; Part II. viii on the coins is by J. G. Milne.
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PART I.
INTRODUCTORY.

I. THE ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY OF THE FAYUM.

The Arsinoite nome of antiquity, the Fayûm of to-day, consists of a leaf-shaped depression on the west of the Nile valley, with which it is connected only by a narrow break in the chain of the Libyan hills between Illahûn and Hawâra. Through this neck the Bahr Yusuf, a natural channel which leaves the Nile a little north of Assiût and runs along the edge of the western desert, empties itself into the province and is diverted at the entrance into numerous branch canals. These, with the solitary exception of the Bahr Gharâk, which waters the south-west portion of the Fayûm and ends in a series of pools at the west end of the Gharâk basin, find their way down the slopes of the province and dispose of their superfluous water in the Birket el Kurûn, a brackish lake covering about seventy-five square miles. That the Birket el Kurûn is the shrunken representative of the great Lake Moeris, which, when it filled nearly the whole depression of the Fayûm, excited the marvel of Herodotus and other early travellers in Egypt, was clearly demonstrated in 1892 by Major R. H. Brown in his monograph The Fayûm and Lake Moeris. The view of Linant Bey that Lake Moeris was an artificial high-level lake near the entrance of the Fayûm and restrained by embankments from falling into the Birket el Kurûn, is there shown to be contrary alike to the evidence and to common sense (cf. our article in Arch. Rep. of the Egypt Explor. Fund, 1899, pp. 13 sqq.; and Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, pp. 172 sqq.). The engineering aspects of the Lake Moeris problem are fully treated by Major Brown, whose authority on these points stands second to none; but since his
book was written much new archaeological evidence has been discovered, especially for the Graeco-Roman period, from the Petrie Papyri and our own excavations, and it is now possible to exercise a closer check than before upon the statements of ancient authors, and of Strabo in particular, about Lake Moeris. Full use of the new materials however cannot be made until the levels of the various sites at which we have dug have been ascertained; and there remain several important problems which can only be solved by systematic excavation. The level of the Middle Empire cemetery at Úmm el Baragāt, the scene of our last winter’s work (Athenaun, May 12, 1900, Archiv für Papyrusforschung, I, pp. 376–8), is likely to provide the lowest terminus ad quem for the height of Lake Moeris in the XIIth Dynasty; a somewhat extensive use of the spade is still necessary to decide among the very divergent views which have been taken concerning Dimē. We propose to continue our researches in the Fayûm next winter, and shall at some future time investigate thoroughly the question of the levels. We therefore hope to be ultimately in a position to discuss the history of the Fayûm more completely than at present. But since not a few definite results have been secured by our excavations, it seemed worth while to make a provisional sketch of the ancient geography of the district. For the history of the district down to the time of Herodotus we rely mainly on the conclusions of Major Brown, whose general theory of Lake Moeris has been, so far as we know, confirmed by all our excavations.

To understand the series of changes which finally converted the Fayûm from a large lake into a flourishing and populous province, it is necessary to bear in mind certain general facts about the levels. The central part of the district is formed of three plateaux sloping downwards in a north-westerly direction. The highest of these consists of the strip from Illahûn, which is twenty-five metres above sea-level (Reduced Level 25), to Medinet el Fayûm (R. L. 22–5). From there the slope descends more rapidly to the bottom of the second plateau, on the edge of which Senûres, Senhûr, and Abûka are situated at R. L. 10. Below this is a still more rapid descent to the Birket el Ḫûrûn, which in March, 1892, was forty-three metres below sea-level, and has fallen a little since then. The pre-Ptolemaic antiquities of the Fayûm are for the most part situated on the first and highest plateau between Illahûn and Medinet el Fayûm, or within a few miles of the latter town, and were to a large extent examined by Prof. Flinders Petrie in 1888–90. No pre-Ptolemaic remains are known to exist in the Fayûm on the level of the third plateau, or more than half-way down the second plateau. Graeco-Roman remains however are found on all three plateaux of the central slope of the Fayûm, and in still greater abundance on the side-slopes. Our excavations have, for reasons which will hereafter appear,
been at various sites on the outlying parts of these side-slopes, those described in the present volume being in the north-east and north-west. The lowest site which we have examined is Kašr Kurûn near the west end of the Bîrket el Kurûn. This is known to be at R. L. 4; Wadîa, Kašr el Banât, Harît, and Kôm Ushim are a few metres higher, Úmm el 'Atî is somewhat higher still, though certainly not above R. L. 20. All these sites therefore are below the level of the first plateau.

In 2500 B.C., according to the calculations of Major Brown, the basin of the Fayûm was filled, at any rate up to R. L. 22-5, by the Bahr Yusuf, which flowed in by the Hawâra channel. When the Nile fell in spring the surplus water from the lake flowed back again by the same channel into the Nile valley. Since the bottom of the channel is at one part a rock-bed which is still eighteen metres above the sea, no return flow can have taken place when the water inside the Fayûm fell below that level. This fact, though it comes into importance later, does not yet affect us, for it is a question whether, before the time of the Old Empire at any rate, the site of Medineh and the banks of the Hawâra channel were not also under water. Whether the highest of the three plateaux had to be reclaimed by artificial means, as the other two certainly were, depends on another question, whether the Nile bed has been rising in the last five or six thousand years. If it has remained approximately the same, then in reconstructing the early history of Lake Moeris the basis of the calculations can be the existing Nile levels. On this theory in 2500 B.C. the Bahr Yusuf would have filled up the Fayûm to about R. L. 25, unless artificially controlled. On the other hand, if Prof. Petrie is right in supposing that the level of the Nile bed has been rising for many thousand years at the rate of about four inches a century (Brown, ibid. p. 87), then in 2500 B.C. the Nile flowed at a level four and a half metres lower than at present, and the high ground at the entrance to the Fayûm, comprising the first plateau, would have been out of the water before any attempt had been made to regulate the inflow. Throughout his reconstruction of the early history of Lake Moeris, Major Brown gives two alternative series of levels of the lake at different epochs to suit both views about the Nile level, but without definitely deciding in favour of either. Apart from the arguments urged by Prof. Petrie (l. c.), which seem very strong and have recently been corroborated by fresh discoveries, the lower series, which proceeds on the assumption that the Nile has been rising and supposes Medinet el Fayûm to have been naturally above water in 2500 B.C., is the more probable. From an engineering point of view it is the easier hypothesis (Brown, ibid. pp. 88, 92); the levels of the Middle Empire cemetery at Úmm el Barâgât (cf. p. 6) seem to suit the lower series better than the
higher; and the earliest historical facts known about the Fayûm accord better with the view that Medineh was inhabited before the inflow of the Bahr Yusuf was checked by the building of the great dam at Illahûn. The credit of executing this important engineering project has generally been assigned to the kings of the XIIth Dynasty, who certainly took a great interest in the Fayûm. It is even usually stated that a king of that dynasty founded Medinet el Fayûm, which in Pharaonic times was called Shetet. This view however is not quite correct, for, as M. Maspero has pointed out to us, the name Shetet occurs in the Pyramid texts, so that there must have been a settlement there in the time of the Old Empire. If the Nile bed has not risen in the last five or six thousand years, we should have to suppose that it was one of the Old Empire kings who built the dam at Illahûn and thus caused the site of Medineh to emerge from the lake. But it is from all points of view more satisfactory to adopt the hypothesis that in the time of the Old Empire, which must in any case partly precede 2500 B.C., the first plateau was naturally raised above the water level, and that the regulation of the inflow of Lake Moeris was first undertaken by the kings of the Middle Empire, whether, as Prof. Petrie thinks, following Manetho, their date was about 2500 B.C., or, as some other Egyptologists assert, several hundred years later. We may therefore picture to ourselves the Fayûm in the time of the Old Empire as a lake filling the basin in flood time up to about the level (R. L., 22.5) of the town of Shetet, which was surrounded by some miles of marshy land left bare when, through evaporation and the outflow in winter and spring, the level of the lake sank about three metres. No monuments which can be certainly ascribed to the Old Empire have yet been found in the Fayûm. Shetet itself was most likely nothing more than a fishing village. But the half-excavated mastaba high up on the hills to the east of Sela is probably a work of the Old Empire, and it is possible that the remarkable temple discovered by Dr. Schweinfurth behind Dimê on the north side of the Birket el Kûrun may belong to that period, though it is generally assigned to the Middle Empire.

The position of the inhabitants of the first plateau cannot however have been very secure so long as the inflow of the Bahr Yusuf was unchecked. An unusually high flood might at any time overwhelm the site of Shetet, and the mere rise of the Nile bed through centuries would ultimately threaten to submerge it. To secure even the ground already under cultivation from encroachment, it became necessary to construct a great dam with powerful locks at the entrance of the Fayûm, and probably also at Hawâra. By these the maximum level of the lake was permanently kept below the level of Medineh, and the surplus water of the Bahr Yusuf over and above what was required for
the Fayûm was diverted, as it is now, by an escape leading from Illahûn into the Nile. There is, as we have said, good reason for identifying the king Moeris, whom ancient geographers declare to have been responsible for the dyke at Illahûn, with one of the kings of the XIIth Dynasty. The interest which one of the greatest of those monarchs, Amenemhat III, took in the district is shown by the number and splendour of his monuments there, notably the famous Labyrinth and the pyramid of Hawâra, the one his palace, the other his tomb, and the two colossal statues of himself at Biaâmû, which Herodotus saw standing. In his reign the Fayûm was a summer resort of the king, where he could ‘enjoy the desert air cooled by the immense surface of the lake and indulge his taste for crocodile hunting’ (Brown, ibid. p. 72).

While the history of the Fayûm before the XIIth Dynasty and the area which was above water at different times must be largely a matter of conjecture, the area under the XIIth Dynasty can be determined and the subsequent extensions traced with a very fair degree of precision, which is susceptible of still further definiteness. The chief aim of the construction of the Illahûn dam may well have been to secure pre-existing land from encroachment and to obtain better drainage; but it also served two other important objects. The ancient authorities who refer to the Fayûm, Herodotus, Strabo and Diodorus, agree that Lake Moeris served as a reservoir from which the falling Nile could be augmented; and though their statements about the Fayûm, especially those of the two last authors, have, as will appear, to be received with much caution, there is no reason to question the correctness of their general assertion that Lake Moeris was used as a reservoir at some period. No doubt, even before the building of the dam at Illahûn, the outflow from the lake acted to some extent as a check on the falling Nile, but it cannot have been of much practical value, since the outflow would have been strongest just after the turn of the flood, when an increase of the volume of the water in the river would do harm rather than good. By the construction of the Illahûn dam however the level of the lake could be kept up and the surplus store drawn off in the early summer when water was most precious.

Secondly, though the first plateau was above the lake level long before the time of the XIIth Dynasty kings, some progress in reclaiming the second plateau was made by them. The average height of the lake at this period can fortunately be fixed within definite limits. Its maximum level already did not exceed R. L. 22.5, the height of Medîneh, and since the lake would cease to have any outflow when it fell below R. L. 18 (vide supra) its average height must have been above that figure, for it still served as a reservoir for the Nile valley in the time of Herodotus. Important evidence for fixing the margin of the lake is
afforded by the remains of the colossi at Biahmu excavated by Prof. Flinders Petrie, and by the existence of a XIITH Dynasty obelisk at Ebgig, three miles south-west of Medîneh. For a full discussion concerning the height of Lake Moeris under the Middle Empire and the arrangements for letting the water in and out of it, the reader is referred to Major Brown's book, especially pp. 87–92. He there supposes that the level of the lake ranged between R. L. 20·5 and 17·5, and that there were regulators at Illahun and Hawâra. Between Hawâra and Edwa was the mouth of the lake; the newly reclaimed area consisted of about 27,000 acres which were above R. L. 17·5. These were protected by a bank (part of which still remains) running west from Edwa past Biahmu to Sinru or a little beyond, and then probably doubling back south-eastwards past Medîneh to the desert opposite the Hawâra pyramid. At Biahmu was the principal port, the landing-stage probably being, as Prof. Petrie suggests, the steps of the platform upon which stood the colossi. In addition to this newly reclaimed belt of land in the centre of the province, there would also have been a certain amount of land available for cultivation round the margin of the lake. Though the Birket el Kurûn is now naturally brackish, since it is far below sea-level, there is no reason to think that the water of Lake Moeris was so, at any rate before the great reclamation which took place in Ptolemaic times; and the existence of early settlements far out of the reach of canals and necessarily dependent for their water on the lake proves that formerly the water was sweet enough for both drinking and irrigation purposes. In the south of the Fayûm the site of Úmm el Baragât (Tebtunis), where though the town ruins are Ptolemaic or later the earliest tombs go back to the XIITH Dynasty (Athenaeum, l. c.), was one of the first villages to spring up. On the north side of the Birket el Kurûn the temple and remains of a village behind Dimê discovered by Schweinfurth probably belong to the Middle Empire. It is possible that at Dimê itself there was an early settlement. In the time of the Middle Empire the site would, as the levels show, have been on an island (cf. its name in Greek and Roman times, Σωκυναδου Νήσος); and the stone causeway, that runs through the middle of the town up to the temple on the summit of the slope on which Dimê stands, has been supposed by Major Brown and others to have been originally a quay. If this were really so, the level of the supposed quay would be an important piece of evidence for the height of Lake Moeris at the time when it was built. But a visit to Dimê last April has made us sceptical about the correctness of this explanation of the causeway. It is absolutely certain that Dimê was not an island in the Graeco-Roman period, and that it was well above the lake then is shown by a comparison of the level of the lower end of the causeway, R. L. 22·6, with the level of Kâsr Kurûn, R. L. 4. The ruins, which
have for the most part been thoroughly ransacked by native diggers, have not disclosed anything pre-Ptolemaic; and since the causeway is clearly connected with the temple to which it leads, we should prefer, unless traces of an earlier temple can be found underneath the present Ptolemaic one, to suppose that the causeway is of the same date as the ruins of the rest of the town. In that case it is not likely to have had anything to do with a quay.

Another part where remains of the Middle Empire period might reasonably be expected is in the neighbourhood of Úmm el 'Atl in the north-east corner of the Fayûm. The direct route across the desert from Arsinoë to Memphis, in Graeco-Roman times (pp. 196-7) as now, passed by Úmm el 'Atl. Before the Ptolemies however, when the country between Biahmu and some point close to Úmm et 'Atl was under water, the natural course for those who wished to go to Memphis direct instead of by the canal from Illahun to the Nile, would have been to sail from Biahmu to a port in the north-east corner. From the point of view of this route, Pliny (Nat. Hist. v. 9) is correct enough in saying that Lake Moeris lay between the Memphite and Arsinoite nomes. But though such a port must have existed and have been a place of some importance, the site of it cannot be identified with any existing ruins. Whether Úmm el 'Atl is a little above or a little below the 17.5 contour which probably represents the shore of Lake Moeris under the Middle Empire we do not yet know; but after excavating that site we can state with confidence that there are no ruins there prior to the Ptolemaic period. Neither we, nor so far as we know any one else, have found Pharaonic remains at Kôm Ushîm, though our own excavations there were not on a sufficiently large scale to be conclusive as to the earliest date of the town. But, though the lake may well have come up to Kôm Ushîm in Graeco-Roman times, that site was probably under water previously, and it is too far to the west to serve as a convenient port for persons coming from Arsinoë. Possibly the small mound to the east of Úmm el 'Atl, which is apparently the ruin of an ancient flint factory, and the tombs behind it (p. 42), had some connexion with the port, but the remains there are insignificant. Further examination of the hills round the north-east corner might however lead to the discovery of a Middle Empire cemetery.

Under the New Empire the geographical conditions of the Fayûm underwent little or no change. Not that the task of reclaiming more land can have presented great difficulties; for when once the inflow of the Baḥr Yusuf had been securely regulated, it would have been easy by reducing the supply of water to lay bare the slope down to the edge of the second plateau at R. L. 10. Perhaps the monarchs of those times refrained from such a scheme because it would necessarily have destroyed the services of Lake Moeris as a reservoir for
the Nile valley (vide supra). But it is evident that neither the Theban kings of the XVIII–XXth Dynasties nor their foreign successors who made their capitals in the Delta paid much attention to the Fayûm. Thothmes III built a temple at Gurob near Ilalahûn, but no attempt was made to rival the splendour of the buildings of the Middle Empire; and even the ubiquitous Ramses II was apparently for the most part content to destroy the buildings of his predecessors in the Fayûm in order to make his own new temple at Heracleopolis. Outside the first plateau the only traces of the New Empire are at Úmm el Baragât, and perhaps the flint factory near Úmm el 'Atî mentioned above; and even at Úmm el Baragât there is a gap in the series of tombs between the later Middle Empire and the XXIIInd Dynasty, during which period the site may have been deserted.

The evidence of archaeology thus fully prepares us for accepting the general account of the Fayûm given by Herodotus (ii. 148–50). Inaccuracies of course there are in it. The lake was not χειροποιητός καὶ ἄρνυτη, and if the colossi stood at Biahmu, they must have been on the edge of the lake, not ἐν μέση τῆς λάμης μάλιστα κυρίου. The statement that the lake was six months filling and six months flowing back is probably not precise. The story about an underground inlet into Libya, which caused even Herodotus some doubts, has of course no foundation. But taking it as a whole, Herodotus' account of the Fayûm, so far as can be ascertained, conveys quite an accurate general impression. Whether he made the Nile tour to the First Cataract and back or not, Herodotus seems to have secured one advantage over most travellers to Egypt who have succeeded him, and to have visited the Fayûm in person. His description of that remarkable and too neglected province is much more valuable than that of Strabo, in comparison with which Herodotus' account has often (e.g. by Mahaffy, Emp. of the Ptol. p. 176) been depreciated. Herodotus implies that he went to the Fayûm, and his mistakes, such as they are, are those which an uncritical eye-witness might make. Strabo too states that he visited the Fayûm, but if he did, his account is only partly based on what he saw, for the state of the province which he describes had, as will be shown, ceased to exist more than 200 years before his time.

The visit of Herodotus marks the close of the second epoch in the history of the Fayûm. For this period we are not almost entirely dependent, as we are for the period before the Middle Empire, on conjecture; but the comparative paucity of literary and archaeological evidence still causes many points to be left in doubt. With the succeeding period, from the third century B.C. to the seventh century A.D., the case is very different, since in addition to the slight evidence of ancient geographers there is a wealth of geographical information
to be gained from the countless Greek papyri, which have made us better acquainted with the life of the inhabitants of the Fayûm in the Graeco-Roman period than with that of almost any other part of the ancient world. But since in the case of the majority of Fayûm papyri no record exists of their provenance, most of the geographical information was useless until systematic excavations had settled the general position of the three divisions (μεσπόδες) of the province in Graeco-Roman times, and had made some progress in the identification of the most important sites. This preliminary task we have now performed, and when the time comes for collecting the geographical data, as we hope to do when we have finished our researches in the Fayûm and when more Fayûm papyri have been published, the positions of a considerable number of villages are likely to be determined.

When the curtain which hides the history of the Fayûm during the two centuries between the visit of Herodotus and the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus is at length drawn aside, the picture disclosed by the Petrie Papyri is very different from the Fayûm of Herodotus and much more like the Fayûm of the present day. A very large number of villages have sprung up, the recent foundation of many of them being proved by the occurrence of such names as Ptolemais, Theadelphia, and Philoteris. The numerous papyri dealing with the building of new dykes and canals show that extensive reclamations were being executed. After many centuries of neglect the Fayûm once more became the object of royal attention and favour. The province which in the Revenue Papyrus, written in B.C. 258, was still officially known as 'The Lake' was renamed after the queen, and the name of its capital gradually changed from 'the City of the Crocodiles' to 'the City of the Arsinoëtes.'

In this newly reclaimed area of cultivation Philadelphus found a convenient home for many soldiers from his army which was disbanded after the first Syrian war.

Turning to the geographical results of our own researches, the excavations recorded in the present volume led to the identification of five new sites, Karanis (Kôm Ushîm), Bacchias (Úmm el 'Atl), Euhemeria (Kašr el Banât), Theadelphia (Harit), and Philoteris (Wadfa). Our work at Úmm el Baragât in
1899-1900 showed that place to be the site of Tebtunis (or Teptunis). Adding these to the sites previously known, Arsinoë (Kôm el Fâris, strictly speaking the name of only one of the many mounds at Medinet el Fayûm, but generally used of the whole site), and Soconopaei Nesus (Dimê), we have eight sites certainly identified by documents found in them. Before discussing other sites, the identifications of which are only probable in a greater or less degree, it will be well to indicate the general position of the three divisions of the Fayûm, called, perhaps after the names of their first administrators, the μερίδες of Heraclides,Themistes and Polemo (cf. map, Plate XVIII). Arsinoë, Soconopaei Nesus, Karanis and Bacchiās were in the division of Heraclides, which must have embraced the eastern half of the province. Euhemeria, Theadelphia and Philoteris were in the division of Themistes, which occupied the north-west. The remaining division, that of Polemo, in which Tebtunis was situated, was in the south. The boundary between the μερίδες of Heraclides and Themistes, if it was nearly straight, probably started at a point very little west of Soconopaei Nesus, for even so the division of Heraclides is larger than the other two put together. That it was the most important of the three is indicated by the administrative arrangement of the μερίδες in Roman times, when the divisions of Themistes and Polemo were united under the control of one strategus, the other strategus being assigned to the division of Heraclides. Why the three divisions were so unequal in size does not appear. It is true that if the lake was filled in Graeco-Roman times up to about sea-level (p. 15) the outline map of the Fayûm as it is to-day is rather deceptive, for a somewhat larger piece must be subtracted from the division of Heraclides than from that of Themistes, while the division of Polemo, being far away from the lake, remains unaffected. But when the large strip of desert along the east side of the Fayûm and the smaller belt in the north-west corner, both of which in Graeco-Roman times were under cultivation, are taken into account, the proportional size of the three μερίδες would be much the same as if the present instead of the ancient cultivated area were the basis of comparison.

The μερίδ of Polemo no doubt included the Gharâk basin, and probably the southern boundary of the μερίδ of Themistes started from about the site of Medinet Mâdi and ran in the direction of Medinet el Fayûm. Some uncertainty exists about the Hawâra plateau. In the Roman papyri found by Professor Petrie lying in the desert at the cemetery of Hawâra, and published by Professor Sayce (Petrie, Hawara, Biahnu and Arsinoë, pp. 28-37), the μερίδ of Polemo is twice mentioned. On the other hand if we are right in placing Ptolemais Harbour at or near Illahûn (p. 13), the north side at any rate of the Bahr Yusuf between Medinet el Fayûm and Illahûn appears to be in the μερίδ of
Heraclides. The Bahr Yusuf itself may well have been the boundary or part of the boundary between the μερίδας of Polemo and Heraclides.

Of the other sites which can be identified with a greater or less degree of probability, Philadelphia is the most certain. As we have already pointed out (Gr. Pap. II. p. 79), it is to be looked for on the edge of the old margin of cultivation to the south of Bacchias. The large number of extant Fayûm papyri written at Philadelphia makes it almost certain that they were found on the actual site of the village. Under these circumstances we proposed to place it at the mound five miles east of Rubayyat, which is a well-known source of papyri. This identification is, we believe, confirmed by the mention of Philadelphia on the portraits of the Roman period which were found in the cemetery of that site. From P. P. II. xlvii, where we hear of a person who farmed the tax upon vineyards and gardens in the villages of Philadelphia and Bubastus, it may be inferred that Bubastus was in the immediate neighbourhood of Philadelphia. Probably Bubastus is to be identified with one of the ancient sites in the cultivation near the modern village of Rubayyat.

The site of Dionysias we have already discussed in the Arch. Report, 1899, p. 13. The frequent mentions of Dionysias in papyri of this volume from Euhezeria and Theadelphia indicate that it was in the neighbourhood of these villages. Pap. lxviii shows that it was on the borders of the Fayûm, with a custom-house for caravans going probably to one of the Oases, while the position assigned to Dionysias in the map of Ptolemy points to its being at the west end of the Birket el Kurûn, a natural place for the fort which, as we know from the correspondence of its praefect Abûnaeus, existed there in the fourth century. Under these circumstances we proposed to place Dionysias at Kašr Kurûn. M. Daressy, however (Annales du Service des Antiquités, i. p. 26), chiefly on the evidence of a very fragmentary inscription which he found at Yâkûta on the side of the lake opposite to Kašr Kurûn, and which contains the combination ἐναῖοί, wishes to identify that place with Dionysias. The distance between Yâkûta and Kašr Kurûn being inconsiderable, most of the arguments in favour of the one site being Dionysias could be used in favour of the other, though the map of Ptolemy suits Kašr Kurûn slightly better, and that site is still on the road to the southern Oases, while Yâkûta is a little out of the way. Since the remains of the town at Kašr Kurûn produced no papyri (p. 63), the question can only be settled by excavations at Yâkûta, which would be a matter of much difficulty, owing to its great distance from fresh water. In 1898–99 the

1 M. Daressy spells it Ysouta, as indeed it is more commonly pronounced, especially by fellahin, but some of the local Bedawîn call it Yagûta, from which we may infer the presence of a ʿ.
site was not included in our concession, but we hope next winter to be able to work there for a short time.

Several villages called Ptolemais are known, and as a rule they are distinguished by various additions. The most important was Πτολεμαῖος Ὀρμὸς or Πτολεμαῖος Ὀρμὸν, which frequently occurs in the Petrie Papyri, especially in connexion with dykes, canals, and waterworks (e.g. P.P. II. xiii. 18 a, xxxvii, xxxix), and is mentioned also by Ptolemy the geographer, who places it 10' south of Arsinoë. Before the publication of those papyri Professor Petrie (Illahun, Kahun and Gurob, p. 29) proposed to place the site of Ptolemais at the mound near Talit, relying partly on the evidence of Ptolemy, partly on an inscription said to have been found in the ruins of a fort close by, in which 6470 ἕθηθενκότες from ἡ τῶν Πτολεμαίων πόλις return thanks to the Emperor Nero; partly on the correspondence between Ptolemy's description of Ptolemais as a Ὀρμός and the site of Talit, which is situated precisely at the entrance to the Gharaḳ basin, where a sluice diverts the Bahr Gharaḳ into a number of brooks. But this proposed identification, though at first sight attractive, must be wrong. In the first place ἡ τῶν Πτολεμαίων πόλις, whether the inscription was really found at Talit or not, cannot possibly refer to a Ὀρμός such as Πτολεμαῖος Ὀρμὸν, but must, as the existence of 6470 ἕθηθενκότες indicates, mean no other than the great Ptolemais Hermiou which Soter founded on a Greek model. Secondly, with regard to the position assigned to our Ptolemais by Ptolemy, the principle on which Ptolemy's maps were compiled (Petrie, Illahun, &c., p. 29; cf. Brown, ibid. pp. 46, 47) is well illustrated by the places in the western desert which are mentioned by that geographer. Skiathis, Bacchis (= Bacchias), Dionysias, and the Small Oasis, which are connected by Ptolemy, are on one itinerary, that from Alexandria to the Oases; and no doubt, as Professor Petrie points out, Ptolemais Harbour was on the itinerary from Arsinoë to Oxyrhynchus. But though Talit is on one of the roads across the desert from the Fayûm to Behnasa, the fact that Ptolemy places Ptolemais due south of Arsinoë is not sufficient to prove that he was thinking of this little pursued land route. On the contrary the old interpreters of Ptolemy's geography placed Ptolemais on the canal leading from Arsinoë to Behnese, which is the natural inference from its position on Ptolemy's list. A glance at the map will show that no person travelling to Oxyrhynchus from Arsinoë by water would go near Talit. Thirdly, the Bahr Gharaḳ seems to us too small a stream, and the ruins at Talit are much too insignificant, to account for the addition of such a title as Ὀρμός to Ptolemais and for the large amount of traffic which in Ptolemaic and Roman times passed by Ptolemais Harbour, the second town in the Fayûm. Lastly, what is in itself
almost decisive, Ptolemais Harbour seems to have been in the μετάσ of Heracleides; for, as Mr. J. G. Smyly informs us, the νομάρχια of Aristarchus is shown by an unpublished Petrie papyrus to have been in that μετάσ, and from P. P. II. xxxviii. recto I. 18, verso III. 3 it appears that Ptolemais Harbour was in the νομάρχια of Aristarchus. This fact is fatal to the view that Ptolemais was in the south of the Fayûm. If then we reject the proposed identification of Ptolemais Harbour with Tallit and ask where are we likely to find its site, the answer readily suggests itself—at Illahûn. Both a priori and a posteriori evidence lead to this conclusion. Even now, when practically all the exported produce of the Fayûm leaves by railway, there is still at Illahûn a kind of port where there is a broad expanse of water; and in Graeco-Roman times, when most of the produce must have left the Fayûm by water, a port of considerable size must have stood there. It is certain that whatever the name of this was, it was the port par excellence of the Fayûm, and there is therefore a strong presumption in favour of placing Ptolemais Harbour, which so far as we can judge was the principal port of the Fayûm, at Illahûn. This hypothesis accords very well with the rest of the evidence. Ptolemy, as has been said, seems to have placed Ptolemais on the canal leading from Arsinoë to Oxyrhynchus. If Ptolemais was an important town on the Bahr Yusuf at the frontier of the Fayûm, Ptolemy’s mention of it is quite intelligible: in the same way when giving the land route from Alexandria to the Oases he mentions Bacchias, the first town to be reached in the Fayûm, and Dionysias, the last to be left behind. The distance (10') between Arsinoë and Ptolemais according to Ptolemy is very close to the actual distance between Medinet el Fayûm and Illahûn; and the fact that Ptolemais is placed due south of Arsinoë instead of, as it really is, east-south-east, need not trouble us, for the general direction of the traveller from Arsinoë to Oxyrhynchus is of course south, and Ptolemy had already placed Arsinoë too far west in relation to the Nile valley. Corroborative evidence is given by P. P. II. xx, which is a copy of official correspondence concerning the export (ἔκτυρµ) of government corn by water from the Fayûm to Memphis, and shows that Ptolemais (Ὀµµού) was on the route. We quote Mr. Smyly’s translation of Col. IV. 2–8 of that papyrus as emended by him: ‘To Heracleides, oeconomus, from Theophilus, the agent of Anticles for the transport of the king’s corn in his (Anticles’) boats. The boat belonging to Anticles in the royal dockyard, of 900 artabae burden, bearing the sign of the heifer, having been commandeered by you on the 10th of the same month at Ptolemais, I hurried to you at the Labyrinth on the 11th, desiring you to release it. You said, however, that you had need of it to carry . . . for the elephants at Memphis.’ Both the mention of the royal
dockyard at Ptolemais and that of the Labyrinth, which was half-way between Arsinoē and Illahûn, suit the identification of Illahûn with Ptolemais Harbour. In fact the Gurob cemetery where the Petrie papyri were found, which is at the end of the bank across the mouth of the Fayûm, was itself very likely the cemetery of Ptolemais. In this connexion it is interesting to note that the Charta Borgiana, the first Greek papyrus from Egypt ever published, is a list of 181 persons who worked the usual five days (cf. p. 204) at the embankments of Ptolemais Harbour¹; and that this great dyke on which the welfare of the Fayûm depends is called in P. P. II. xxxvii. I. 20 the μέγα χώμα, and is stated to be κατὰ Πτολεμαίου μαθήμα.

A comparative study of the modern village names in the Fayûm with those found in Graeco-Roman and Coptic times might lead to the identification of a number of sites solely on the evidence of names. Striking verbal coincidences occur, such as Νέολα and Nezla. But for the present we confine ourselves to suggesting two such identifications for which there is some corroborative evidence. Psenuris was not only in the μερίς of Heraclides (B. G. U. 579. 5) but probably near Karanis, for a letter with instructions to the ἄρχηφοδος of Psenuris was found at that place (Pap. xxxvii). Under these circumstances its site may well be the ancient village under the modern Senûres, now the second town in the Fayûm. The village of Taleith or Talei is known from an unpublished Hawârâ papyrus to have been in the μερίς of Polemo, and it is mentioned several times in our papyri from Úmm el Baragât. We have already had occasion to refer to the ruins at Talit, which Professor Petrie proposed to identify with Ptolemais. Not improbably they are the site of Taleith.

It is, however, from geographical indications in the papyri that most information will be gained. But as we shall treat this subject more fully on a future occasion, we conclude with pointing out that Polydeucia, which is shown by Pap. cvii to be on the road between Theadelphia (Harit) and Arsinoë, and probably the first village reached after leaving Theadelphia, was most likely at or near the modern village of Gebâla at the end of the tongue of desert which runs south-east from Harit. Berenicis Ἀγιολή (lxxxii. 3) was, as its name implies, on the shore of the lake, and being in the μερίς of Themistes was probably to the north-east of Kaṣr el Banât.

Turning to the general aspect of the Fayûm in the Graeco-Roman period, the Petrie Papyri carry back the foundation of the identified villages on the

¹ See Wilcken, Ott. i. 339. The workers themselves seem to come from another village; cf. the phrase διὰ τὰ χαματαὶ ἁμα Τεσσάρων(ε) (so Wilcken doubtlessly) with lxxxi–lxxx of this volume, which show that the name following the date (i.e. Προευθεία ὸρφος) is that of the place where the dyke was. Is the correct reading Τεσσάρων(ε)? If so, the Charta Borgiana and its companion rolls which were burnt by the natives may well have been found at Úmm el Baragât (Telâunu).
lower part of the second and on the third plateaux (cp. pp. 3 and 9) to the time of Philadelphus. Our own excavations on the sites, so far as they go, show that they had no earlier existence. Only at Úmm el Baragât, which was one of the earliest settlements of the Fayûm and is on comparatively high ground, have we found pre-Ptolemaic monuments. But though the second and greatest reclamation of land in the Fayûm was brought to completion under Philadelphus—and owing to the rate at which evaporation when unchecked tends to dry up the lake (about two metres a year) the work was no doubt carried out speedily—the scheme probably originated with Soter or even one of the Persian kings, who may well have reduced the lake to the maximum of ten metres above sea-level and so brought the edge of the second plateau out of water. For determining the height of Lake Moeris in Ptolemaic times, the sites near the west end of the lake, being the lowest, are the most important. Of these Philoteris (Wadfa) is the lowest at which dated Ptolemaic documents have been found (cf. p. 63), but there is little doubt that Kašr Kurûn, which is some metres lower, and only four metres above sea-level, was founded in Ptolemaic times. For even if it is not the site of Dionysias (cf. p. 11), which already existed in the third century B.C., the well-preserved temple there is most probably Ptolemaic. Lake Moeris, therefore, can hardly, if at all, have been above sea-level after 200 B.C., and it was consequently not more than twice its present size. On the north side there can have been very little change, but the lake probably extended further towards the east and south-east as far as Kôm Ushim, perhaps nearly up to Senûres. The area of cultivation, however, in Graeco-Roman times was not much smaller than at present, for on the east side of the province the old Bahr Wardan, which left the Bahr Yusuf south of Hawûra and can be traced round the edge of the hills past Philadelphia and Bacchias, enclosed a large area which subsequently became desert. A branch of the Bahr Wardan probably continued its course round the north-east corner of the lake to Socnopaei Nesus and beyond (cf. P. P. II. xxxvi. (1) τὴν διόροις τὴν πρὸς λ/βα Ἡφαιστιάδος (sc. Bacchias, cf. note on xv. 4) πρὸς νότον τὴς Κλέωνος διόρους); for fields and dykes at Socnopaei Nesus are frequently mentioned in papyri from Dimû, and when the lake was reduced to sea-level it must have soon become too salt, as well as too low, for irrigation purposes. The plain, too, between Euhemeria and Kašr Kurûn was cultivated in Graeco-Roman times, as is shown by the numerous traces of old canals.

From the reign of Philadelphus to the third century A.D. the prosperity of the Fayûm was at its height; ἠπάτη δὲ ὁ νομὸς ὅτι ἐξουσιώτατος τῶν ἄπαντων κατὰ τὴν ὅψιν καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν, says Strabo (xvii. 35). In
the third century of our era it not only shared in the general decline of Egypt, but owing to its peculiar dependence on careful methods of irrigation suffered greater encroachments from the desert than the other nomes in the Nile valley. It is to this fact indeed that the pre-eminence of the Fayûm as a source of Greek papyri is largely due, since many villages were left stranded in the desert, and remained therefore comparatively well preserved. Socnopaei Nesus, the irrigation of which must have been always precarious, was among the first places to be deserted. There are no Dimê papyri so far as is known later than the third century. The fourth century saw the complete or almost complete abandonment of Bacchias, Philadelphia, and the other sites on the Bahr Wardan, the Bahr Tamia becoming the new eastern boundary of the Fayûm; and in the same century Kasr el Banât and the other sites in the north-west corner were deserted. Even Karanis and Tebtunis, which remained on the edge of the cultivation, shrank to a much smaller size. In the last few years, however, owing to improved methods of irrigation and increased enterprise, not only is the land lost to cultivation on the east and north-west sides being recovered, but the traveller across the desert from Wasta to Medineh is, near the station of Séla, greeted by fields at a height which no ancient methods of engineering could have supplied with water.

Such being in outline the condition of the Fayûm in the Graeco-Roman period as attested by archaeological evidence, it remains to inquire how far this coincides with the description of the nome by Strabo, who visited Egypt shortly after the Roman conquest. Diodorus, who came to Egypt about the same time, in describing the Fayûm (i. 51) concerns himself almost entirely with the foundation of the province by King Moeris (i.e. Amenemhat III), and his account is obviously not first-hand, though it is useful in supplementing that of Herodotus, especially on the subject of the canal connecting the mouth of the Fayûm and the Nile (Brown, *ibid.* pp. 82, 83). Strabo, on the other hand, not only professes to give an account of the Fayûm as it was in his own day, but implies that he visited it himself. His statements, therefore, require very careful consideration. To his general description of the Arsinoite nome, part of which is quoted above, no exception can be taken. But his account of Lake Moeris raises grave doubts whether he had ever seen it. He says (xxvii. 35), θαυμαστὴν δὲ καὶ τὴν λίμνην ἔχει τὴν Μοῦριδος καλομένην πελαγίαν τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῇ χρώμα θαλασσικῷ καὶ τῶν αἰγιαλοῦν δὲ ἑστὶν ὁρῶν διοικήσας τοῖς θαλασσίοις ὅσον ὑπονοεῖν ... (here follow some geological speculations). § 37 ὡς οὖν Μοῦριδος λίμνη διὰ τὸ μεγέθος καὶ τὸ βάθος ἱκανή ἔστι κατά ταὶ ἀναβάσεις τὴν πλημμυρίδα φέρειν καὶ μὴ ὑπερπαλάξειν εἶτα τὰ ἀκομήματα καὶ πεφυτευμένα, εἶτα εἶν ὑπὸ ἀποβάλει τὸ πλεονάζου ἀποδοθανῇ τῇ αὐτῇ διώργῃ κατὰ δότερον τῶν στομάτων ἔχειν
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υπολειπόμενον τὸ χρήσιμον πρὸς τὰς ἐποχεῖσις καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἡ διώρυξι τάντα μὲν
φυσικά ἐπίκειται δὲ τοῖς στόμασιν διμοτέρου τῆς διώρυγος κλείσα τὰς ταμεώσουσιν
ὁ δραχτέστατος τὸ τε εἰσόρον ὑδαί καὶ τὸ ἐκρέον. The first sentence (§ 35) was
true enough of Lake Moeris in the time of Herodotus, when the lake filled
four-fifths of the Fayûm depression and must have been a conspicuous feature
in the landscape. It is to say the least of it a somewhat exaggerated descrip-
tion of Lake Moeris in Strabo’s time, when it only filled two-fifths. § 37,
however, presents greater difficulties. Into the problems connected with the
precise situation of the two στόματα we do not propose to enter (cf. Brown,
ibid. p. 81); but this much is clear, that Strabo considered Lake Moeris to be
large enough and at a sufficiently high level to act as a reservoir for the Nile,
receiving the surplus water at the time of the inundation and giving it back
afterwards. It is, however, absolutely impossible that in Strabo’s time the lake
could have served any such function. Considering the low level to which
the lake has fallen (43 metres below sea-level in 1892, now somewhat more),
it is very doubtful whether it ever received enough water since the great
reclamation by Ptolemy II to counteract the effects of evaporation; and in any
case, if the lake had risen in Strabo’s time to such a height that the water
flowed back from the Bahr Yusuf into the Nile, it would have inevitably sub-
merged nearly half the villages of the nome. Yet from Strabo’s story of the
sacred crocodiles being fed by his host, ἄνηρ τῶν ἐντιμων αὐτοῦ μοσαγωγῶν ἡμᾶς
(§ 38), we are made to understand that he visited the Fayûm.

The conclusion seems to be that, though Strabo’s description of the Fayûm
as far as Arsinoê may well be based on his own observations, his account
of Lake Moeris is mainly borrowed from older literary sources. There is no
reason for supposing these to have been other than trustworthy, but they had
long ceased to be applicable to the Lake Moeris of Strabo’s own day.

II. THE DISCOVERY OF PAPYRI IN THE FAYÛM.

The first Greek papyrus which reached Europe from Egypt came from
the Fayûm. It was the so-called Charta Borgiana, containing a list of persons
who worked on the embankments at Ptolemais Harbour (cf. p. 14), and was
found in 1778 along with about fifty other rolls. The rest however were burnt
by the natives—so the story runs—for the sake of the aromatic smell. The
reason assigned is not a very good one, for the smell of burning papyrus is no
more aromatic than that of burning paper; but there is no doubt about the
disappearance of other rolls. It was a long time before the learned world awoke
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to the importance of Greek papyri, and for just a century the native diggers in the Fayûm whether for antiquities or sebkh went on destroying in undis turbed ignorance such papyri as they came across.

The new era began in 1877, when large finds of papyri were made by natives in the ruins of the ancient Arsinoë in the Fayûm, as well as at Henassich (Heracleopolis) and Ashmunên (Hermopolis) further south. No record of the circumstances under which they were discovered was kept at the time, though there has been a good deal of discussion, necessarily somewhat unprofitable, on the subject. The Graeco-Roman site of Arsinoë consists of ruined buildings more or less covered by débris, with large rubbish mounds at intervals. There is not the least doubt that the Greek papyri were found, as they still are, scattered over a considerable area of the mounds; but the view of Karabaçek (Denksch. K. Akad. Wien 1882) probably has this amount of truth in it that large masses of papyri were found together in one or more of the rubbish mounds where the contents of some record office had been thrown away, as was the case at Oxyrhynchus. Most of the Arsinoë papyri found their way to Vienna or Berlin, a few to Oxford, Paris, London, and elsewhere; but for some time very little notice was taken of them, and Wilcken and Wessely were almost the only scholars who took advantage of the new material. The bulk of these early finds consisted indeed of Byzantine documents; and it is difficult for those who are accustomed to the startling and far-reaching discoveries in the last decade to realize that for several years prior to 1888 one of the burning questions in ‘papyrology’ was whether the beginning of the indiction year in Egypt depended on the rise of the Nile.

But though the first find of papyri at Arsinoë has been put in the shade by subsequent discoveries, it led to important consequences. The natives realized that the Fayûm, which hitherto had not been a very profitable field for antiquities, after all offered a lucrative sphere of work. With the value of papyri rapidly rising, owing to the increased influx of tourists after the British occupation and the competition of foreign buyers, the process of digging the ancient sites in the Fayûm proceeded merrily under the encouragement of the Museum authorities. The ablest and most enterprising of the Gizeh dealers, aided in those days by his now more ambitious and successful rival, received permission in two successive winters to excavate at Dimê (Socnopaei Nesus) on the north side of the lake. The difficulty of moving large blocks of stone prevented him from clearing out the temple, in which were found a number of late Ptolemaic votive statues (the largest is at the bottom of the Birket el Kurûn, but some of the others by their hideousness strike the attention of the visitor to the Graeco-Roman rooms at Gizeh); but in the houses he found
enormous quantities of papyrus rolls of the Roman period, which on account of their good preservation have made Dimê, considering its size, by far the richest site for papyri in Egypt. During this period, 1887–94, dealers' agents were busy at other sites, especially at Kôm Ushím, where the houses in the suburbs are said to have been almost as fruitful as those at Dimê, and at the other places on the east side of the Fayûm, which had been deserted since the fourth century. The result was a large flow of papyri to the museums of Europe, principally Berlin, Vienna, and London, and a series of important publications. Prof. Flinders Petrie too in the course of his excavations on the Hawâra plateau in 1888–90 found some Greek papyri scattered about in the desert in the cemetery of Hawâra, and—what was much more important—by his discovery of early Ptolemaic mummies with papyrus cartonnage at Gurob reopened an avenue for obtaining Ptolemaic texts which had been forgotten since the days of Letronne. Since 1894 Fayûm papyri have become more scarce in the dealers' shops. Sporadic finds continue to be made in overlooked houses at Dimê, though part of what had been left was destroyed by a Copt who received permission to dig there, and being interested only in statuettes tore up the numerous papyrus rolls that he came across. Kôm el Fâris too still yields plenty of fragments every year, but since the recent discoveries at Ashmunên, especially that of the Bacchylides papyrus, that site attracts most notice from the native papyrus-seekers, and the Fayûm has fallen into comparative neglect.

Considering the wholesale plundering of Egyptian antiquities which has marked the last twenty years, and which now at the eleventh hour real attempts are being made to check, scholars may well be thankful that so many Greek papyri from the Fayûm have been safely housed in museums. But this must not blind them to the amount which in the Fayûm has been, and elsewhere may be, irrevocably lost. On this subject we, who have only too much reason to realize the extent of the mischief done by native digging in the Fayûm, and who perhaps better than others can appreciate the dangers and difficulties which attend the transference of so fragile a substance as papyrus from its resting-place in the ground to its ultimate home in a museum, may be permitted a few observations. The collections of Berlin and Vienna, great and representative as they are for the Roman and Byzantine periods, possess practically no Ptolemaic documents and hardly any literary fragments. No doubt this is partly due to the sites from which those collections are drawn. For literary fragments no town has ever been found at all comparable to Behnesa, and Fayûm villages are not the places in which to look for a classical library. No doubt too Ptolemaic papyri are scarce in Fayûm sites as elsewhere. But that
is far from being the whole explanation for the extreme rarity of these two classes of Greek papyri. If we, who have only had to glean the remains of the rich harvest gathered by our native predecessors, have been able to discover some Ptolemaic papyri and literary fragments in practically every town-site that we have excavated, what must have been found by those who had an untouched field to work upon? What has become of the papyri which were found in the houses of Kaṣr el Banāt before we went there? To any one who knows the care necessary to extricate papyri from the earth intact and the habitual recklessness of the native in handling them afterwards, the answer is easy. There is unfortunately little doubt that quite half the papyri discovered by natives in the Fayūm since 1877 have perished altogether.

The third period in the history of papyrus digging in the Fayūm begins with our appearance upon the scene in the winter of 1895–96. The outlook at that time presented peculiar difficulties. Scientific excavations in Egypt have with very few exceptions been restricted to temples, palaces and tombs; and in proposing to dig Graeco-Roman towns we were practically breaking new ground, for which the experience of Egyptologists could not act as a guide. Still less was anything then known about the circumstances under which papyri were found, or the principles which should direct the excavator in selecting not only a good site for papyri but the precise places where he should dig. For it must be remembered that, though the ideal excavator of a town would no doubt begin at one end and clear out all the buildings down to the native rock until he emerged at the other, the actual excavator who has neither unlimited money nor even unlimited time at his command, cannot hope, unless he meets with extraordinary success, to dig out more than a comparatively few parts of any site which is large enough to be worth digging at all. The question of his success therefore, since no site with the possible exception of Dimê has papyri spread evenly over it, depends largely on his ability to select the right places for his trenches. If we had tried to clear away the rubbish mounds of Behnesa systematically we should have been excavating there still, and should have expended many thousands of pounds with results probably not much better than those which we obtained in four months with a few hundreds. But the principles of papyrus digging, for success in which luck is of course a necessary, though not the most important, factor, were naturally unknown to us in 1895.

In the choice of our site we were led to Ūmm el 'Atl in the north-east corner of the Fayûm, which seemed the most promising of the towns on the old Bahr Wardan visited by Prof. Petrie in 1890, and which owing to its distance from cultivated land had not been much disturbed. But as it was difficult to begin work at so remote a site, where moreover it was quite uncertain that any papyri at
all were to be found, we decided to have a preliminary excavation at Kôm Ushim, a known source of papyri, situated on the edge of the cultivated land six miles from Úmm el 'Atl. Under the circumstances the choice was as fortunate as could be expected. We identified Kôm Ushim as Karanis, the provenance of many papyri at Berlin, London, and Vienna, and added one to the three already uncovered inscriptions in the temple enclosure. But both town and cemetery had been too hopelessly plundered to justify a long stay at Kôm Ushim. Úmm el 'Atl was more profitable. The identification of Bacchias laid at rest a long-standing dispute, and the find of over 4,000 tetradrachms (p. 40) was an unexpected piece of good fortune. But as regards papyri, Úmm el 'Atl, judged even by the moderate standard which experience has led us to expect in Fayûm towns, was not very productive, being in that respect the poorest of the Fayûm sites at which we have dug on an extensive scale. Our hopes too of finding another cemetery of papyrus mummies like that at Gurob were not destined to be realized, for the Ptolemaic cemetery of Kôm Ushim escaped us and that of Úmm el 'Atl had been plundered in ancient times.

After the conclusion of our excavations in the north-east of the Fayûm, we paid a visit to the western side of the province and fixed upon Kašr el Banât as the scene of our next year’s work. But circumstances led us to alter our plans and to excavate in 1896–97 at Behnasa, and it was not until the winter of 1898–99 that we were able to resume our work in the Fayûm. The delay proved somewhat unfortunate, for in the interval the edge of the cultivation, which in the early part of 1896 was more than a mile from Kašr el Banât, had crept up to the site, and diggers for antiquities or schakh had made havoc with half of it. The remaining half however was fairly productive; one house in particular yielding a large number of documents, many of them in a very fair state of preservation. Besides Kašr el Banât, two other sites were also investigated. At one of these, Wadiâla, we obtained enough evidence to identify it; the other, Harit, was somewhat less rich than Kašr el Banât, though having been less plundered it ultimately produced about the same amount of papyri. Both these sites were much better than Úmm el 'Atl, but in our search for papyrus mummies we were again disappointed, though we came to the very verge of success. At Harit there was a considerable unplundered cemetery containing such mummies, but the tombs were much affected by damp and the papyrus had all decayed. We resolved however to make another attempt, and in the following winter (1899–1900) we chose the south-west of the Fayûm as the scene of excavations on behalf of the University of California. Here we were fortunate enough to find an important site, Úmm el Baragât, which had escaped the notice of the dealers. The temple enclosure and town produced
as many papyri as Kašr el Banāt and Harit combined, and somewhat superior in quality, while in the cemetery not only did we at last succeed in obtaining the long-wished-for papyrus mummies of the earlier Ptolemaic period, but fortune, to make amends for previous disappointments, bestowed upon us a large collection of later Ptolemaic papyri, found in a novel and unexpected manner inside the mummies of crocodiles.

The arrangement of ancient Fayûm villages is naturally very much the same. There is always a small temple, of stone at Dimê, Kôm Ushim, and Kašr Kurûn, of brick at Umm el 'Atîl, Kašr el Banât, Harit, Wadīa, and Umm el Baragāt. Sometimes, as at Kašr el Banât and Harit, the temple stands by itself a little outside the town; sometimes, as at Dimê, Kôm Ushim, and Umm el Baragāt, it is inside a large walled enclosure containing subordinate chapels or houses of the priests. The crocodile god Sebek was the nome god of the Fayûm, and most of the temples were dedicated to him under some form, e.g. Socnopaeus at Socnopaei Nesus (B. G. U. i. 18, &c.), Suchus (probably) at Euhemeria (p. 45), Sokanobkonoeus at Bacchias¹ (Pap. xviii), Seknebtunis² at Tebtunis, Petesuchus³ at Karanis (p. 30). With Sebek was often associated Isis and other σωματικ θεοί, e.g. Isis Nephreses⁴ at Socnopaei Nesus (B. G. U. 296. 14) and at Euhemeria (p. 45), Pneepherses⁵ at Karanis (p. 30). At Dimê there was also a temple to Isis Soûnaœs, Harpocrates and Premarres (Strack, *Dynastie der Ptolemäer*, Inscr. 141); and at Tebtunis, besides the λόγιον τεος of Seknebtunis, was a smaller temple of Sarapis, Isis and Osiris, a common triad in the Graeco-Roman period. All these temples date, so far as can be judged, from the Ptolemaic period; and it is noteworthy that in nearly all of them or in their enclosures papyri of the Ptolemaic period, both Greek and demotic, have been found, but hardly anywhere else in Fayûm town sites. From Dimê no Ptolemaic papyri seem to have reached Berlin, Vienna, or London, but two years ago we bought a find which obviously came from the temple there, and consisted of nearly a hundred well-preserved second-century B.C. demotic or Greek rolls concerning the priests. The Greek documents (about fifteen in number) are now in the collection of Lord Amherst of Hackney and will be published next year; the demotic are in the possession of Mr. F. L.L. Griffith. At Karanis, which site continued to be inhabited in Byzantine times, the temple was covered over by mounds of later rubbish and yielded no papyri

¹ *Σωναβόκονεύς*, a compound of *Σωνι* (Sebek) + *Βόκο* (Anubis) + *νεφρεύς* (meaning obscure) according to Prof. Spiegelberg, to whom we are indebted for the elucidation of these new names of deities.
² I. e. 'Sebek, lord of Tunis' (Spiegelberg).
⁴ Nephreses = *nfr* st Isis = 'with the beautiful throne' (Kreis, *Aeg. Zeitshr.* 1893, p. 32).
⁵ *Pneepherses* is compounded of *p_, the article, and *nfr-πθ*; = 'with a beautiful face,' an attribute of Egyptian gods, e.g. Ptah and Atum (Spiegelberg).
having any connexion with the priests; but at Bacchias, where the temple had been partly cleared previously, we found some Ptolemaic and Augustan papyri, as also at Euhemeria, where two-thirds of the temple had been dug out before our arrival. At Theadelphia the temple (which was unusually small) had already been excavated, but in some adjoining houses we found several Ptolemaic documents; and at Tebtunis, though the temple itself produced no antiquities of any kind, the priests' houses yielded, besides a large quantity of later papyri, some Greek and many more demotic documents of the Ptolemaic period. The excessive rarity in museums of Ptolemaic papyri from Fayûm sites is largely due to the fact that nearly all the temples in the Fayûm have been more or less completely plundered by natives in search of statues and terracottas. Plans are given on Plates II and III of the temples of Karanis and Bacchias, two of the best preserved and the only two which were worth clearing. The plans of those at Euhemeria and Theadelphia were very similar. A noticeable feature in these late Fayûm temples is the occurrence of chambers with no visible means of entrance, though a parallel may be found in the much earlier temple discovered by Schweinfurth to the north of Dimê. Perhaps these were store-rooms, if we may judge by the similar instances in the houses (p. 24).

Of the sites described in the present volume, Úmm el 'Atl, Kaşr el Banât and Harit are all about the same size, and, like Dimê, cover an area not exceeding 500 metres by 300. Kôm Ushim is larger, but that site, like Úmm el Baragât, continued to be inhabited in later times, while the other sites were abandoned in the fourth century. Wadfa, on the other hand, is much smaller. While Dimê was laid out on a symmetrical plan, the houses being on either side of the stone dromos which led through the middle of the town up to the temple, in the sites which we have excavated the houses are grouped together not much more regularly than in a modern Egyptian village. They were constructed with unbaked bricks, generally large and solid. In the size of the bricks, the regularity of the courses, and the accuracy of the corners, the buildings of the Ptolemaic and Roman period offer a marked contrast to those of Byzantine and Arab times, a contrast which is nowhere better shown than at Úmm el Baragât, where the south side of the site is Roman, the north Arabic. Stone doorways were occasionally found in the houses of the better class, especially at Úmm el Baragât. Probably some of these were public buildings; but we gained little definite information about the distinction between public and private buildings except in the case of temples. The houses consisted of one or occasionally two stories above ground. At Úmm el 'Atl and Úmm el Baragât underground cellars were very common; they were much less so at Kaşr el Banât and Harit. The roofs were made of reeds plastered over with
mud and laid on palm logs. At Harit, where the houses in the centre of the site are better preserved than anywhere else in the Fayûm except perhaps at Dimê, the ceilings of the lower stories were found in some cases intact, but they had generally collapsed, even where the walls of the upper story were partly standing; and at Úmm el 'Atl and Kašr el Banât the surface of the mounds was within a few feet of the ground level. The walls of all but the poorest houses were plastered inside, but traces of painting were rare. In every site were found large walled enclosures, perhaps used as markets, which were generally filled up with sand. A feature of Úmm el 'Atl and Kašr el Banât was rows of small chambers about a square metre in size, apparently used as store rooms.

The method of digging for papyri in a town site presents some parallels to that of gold-mining. The gold-seeker follows a vein of quartz, while the papyrus-digger has to follow a stratum, or vein, of what the natives call afsh,—one of those convenient 'blank-cheque' words which in the limited vocabulary of the fellahin can take a variety of meanings. The gold-digger does not look for gold where there is no quartz, and similarly the papyrus-seeker may practically disregard any other kind of earth than afsh. Objects of stone, wood, or pottery he may find elsewhere, but without afsh he will hardly ever find papyrus. It is the more difficult to describe afsh in general terms because, although we can from experience to some extent state the conditions under which antiquities, and papyri in particular, are as a rule found in ancient towns, we are not able in most cases to explain how these conditions arose. Afsh consists of earth mixed with little bits of twig or straw; and the depth of a stratum of it may vary from a few inches to several metres. Good afsh must not be too hard, for coagulation is somehow fatal to the preservation of papyri nor yet too soft, for then it tends to become sebakht, i.e. fine, powdery earth in which any fragile substance such as papyrus has decomposed, and which on account of its nitrous properties is the best kind of earth for manure, though, since all the earth of ancient sites contains nitre in some degree, sebakhtin do not limit themselves to one kind of soil. No doubt in a general way afsh is to be explained as house-rubbish, in the sense of what was rubbish at the time the house was being used, but how afsh comes to lie in the particular ways in which it is found is not in our power to explain. We can only state the main conditions under which it occurs in Fayûm sites.

From the point of view of excavating for papyri a town site may be divided into three classes: (1) rubbish mounds pure and simple which cover no buildings; (2) remains of buildings which are partly filled up with or buried in rubbish; (3) buildings which were never used as places for throwing rubbish, but
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have simply collapsed and are filled up by their own débris and wind-blown sand. *Afsh* may be found in all three, but as regards the completeness and value of the accompanying papyri the three classes are arranged in an ascending scale. The majority of rubbish mounds pure and simple are in any site quite useless, for most of them are sure to consist of ashes, *sebak* potsherds, or at any rate earth which has not got *afsh*. In the case of large towns, such as Oxyrhynchus and Arsinoë, those rubbish mounds which had *afsh* were extremely productive in papyri; at Oxyrhynchus there was practically nothing but rubbish mounds to dig, the buildings having been nearly all destroyed. But in Fayûm villages, mere rubbish mounds (called by the natives *kôm*) are rarely worth digging. Papyrus scraps may be found, but in so mutilated a condition that, unless they have some special interest, the work of clearing a rubbish mound is very unremunerative. For a description of a successful excavation of this kind, see *Arch. Rep.*, 1897, pp. 7-8. In the Fayûm the excavator is concerned mainly with classes (2) and (3), and the best finds of papyri are to be made in houses of class (3). Here the *afsh* layer is naturally on the floor and susceptible of an easy explanation. The papyri and other objects are found as they were left when the occupants of the houses abandoned them, the walls having partially fallen in before the objects in the houses had been carried off or destroyed. The houses at Dimê are of this kind. After two or three metres of sand there comes the débris from fallen roof and walls, and underneath this the papyri, which in that site are remarkable for their profusion and excellent state of preservation. That the Dimê houses were so rich is due to the remoteness of the site, which, when the canal supplying it with water failed, was clearly deserted in a hurry and left far in the desert. In other sites our experience of houses which on account of their depth and of their being filled up with sand most closely resembled those of Dimê has not on the whole been at all favourable. At Harit in particular the well-preserved houses, filled up with a wind-blown mixture of sand and ashes, had no *afsh* layer at all at the bottom, and if any papyrus fragments were found they were in the filling as they had been blown in.

Practically all our own finds of papyri were in buildings of class (2), which is much the most comprehensive, and may be divided into (a) houses in which the objects found, though not necessarily on the floor, had a connexion with the particular building, and (b) houses in which the objects seem to have no such connexion, but merely to have been thrown away there after the house had gone to ruin. It is often very difficult to draw this distinction; and there is an infinite number of gradations in class (2), from buildings which approximate to those in class (3) down to others in which the objects are so mixed up that
the mound may be treated as if it contained merely rubbish. At the same time for practical purposes, the distinction between (a) and (b), where it can be drawn with certainty, is of some importance, not only because good finds of complete papyri are found in (a) while the papyri found in (b) tend to be much more fragmentary, but because in the case of houses which are not filled up with extraneous rubbish the evidence of dated papyri is a much surer indication of the date of other objects found with them.

The general characteristics of Fayûm papyri are too well known to need description here. The best town sites in the Fayûm had been plundered before we came; and the selection of texts printed or described in the present volume from sites which were in no case very rich, naturally cannot be compared either in quantity or quality with those which come from Dimê. As might be expected, they tend to run in grooves, certificates for work done on the embankments and receipts for poll-tax or custom duties being extremely common. But besides the geographical information gained from them, the papyri of the present volume serve to supplement on many points, especially with regard to taxation, the knowledge derived from Fayûm papyri already published, and supply a good deal of new and interesting evidence for the history of the period. Our excavations moreover, though the discovery of papyri was of course our chief object, have not been confined to that alone, witness the large find of tetradrachms at Úmm el 'Atl, the well-dated series of Ptolemaic pottery from Harît, and the numerous common domestic objects (see Plates XV-XVII), which bring home more clearly than elaborate ornaments the continuity of life in ancient and modern Egypt. But greater perhaps than the direct results of these two seasons' work were the indirect. It was the discovery of the principles of afsh at Úmm el 'Atl in 1896, which enabled us in 1897, amid the hundreds of acres covered by the ruins of Behnesa, to select those mounds which contained papyri, and to find the 'Logia' on the second day of our excavations; and it was the knowledge of Ptolemaic pottery acquired at Harît that led us in the following winter to the temple and great Ptolemaic cemetery of Úmm el Baragât, by far the most productive site for Ptolemaic papyri that has yet been found.
PART II. THE EXCAVATIONS.

I. Kôm Ushîm (Karanis).

A. The Town.

The remains of Karanis cover a large oval mound lying north-west and south-east, about two miles north-north-west of the hamlet of Ḍasr, four and a half miles west-north-west of the village of Tamia, and eight miles north of Senûres as the crow flies. The mound is primarily a natural lump in the rocky ridge, which here bounds for some miles the northern limit of Fayûm cultivation, rising gradually from the lake-basin and falling abruptly on the north to rise again in a second ridge. On the extreme west and the extreme east of the mound top, however, there is an accumulation of household rubbish and débris of constructions which considerably increases the natural elevation. The high mound itself is not large, but the town was prolonged eastwards from its base over the lower ground for some distance, and to a less extent on the west also. North of the mound lies a deep hollow, beyond which rise rocky shelves, on which the citizens of Karanis built, or in which they excavated, the tombs of their families.

The condition in which we found the site made it appear not worth while to try to recover the plan of its streets and insulae. But the general arrangement of the town is clear. In the middle of the southern slope of the mound, looking towards the Fayûm lands, we have the chief temple buildings communicating on the north through an inscribed propylon, with a large open space occupying about the centre of the mound. This space can hardly be other than the agora or market-place. No other stone-built temple existed in the town; and if other shrines there were, they were but small and constructed, like the houses, of unburnt brick. East and south-east of the market-place rises a high accumulation of brick buildings, evidently dwelling-houses, piled one on the other and divided by narrow lanes as in a modern Arab town. On the
highest part of the south-east mound is a tract of open ground, evidently used for the throwing out of household refuse; and low down on the southern face the diggers for papyrus or sebakhi have laid bare some chambers more spacious, and some walls more solid, than are usual in dwelling-houses of the period. It is probable that here stood the municipal and other public edifices, facing towards the Fayûm. Returning to the market-place, we see that on the high ground to the west the house-remains are less crowded together and of better quality. Almost all round the outer edge of the mound is disposed a fringe of rubbish heaps, and on the steep slopes below them signs of houses begin again, fading away in detached villas and open-walled enclosures in the plain. At the extreme south-west corner stand remains of a high, solidly constructed brick edifice, another public office or such building; but over the rest of this part of the site there is nothing to distinguish one set of brick chambers from another.

We found all the shallower parts of the site so thoroughly rifled that, in digging for rooms, we directed our main efforts to mining the steep western face of the mound, where houses of good class underlie the refuse 'shoots.' Owing, however, to the great mass of loose superincumbent stuff we were never able to clear a complete house, but had to be content with exploring the outlying chambers only. In a vaulted room low down the slope Pap. cxi. was found on Dec. 27, and in a chamber adjacent (apparently part of the same house) a coarse jar came to light on Jan. 1, containing ninety-one Roman tetradrachms. The same house yielded next day many broken scraps of papyrus, and a number of small objects, c.g. a terra-cotta head of good Graeco-Roman style, a bone ring inscribed with numbers similar to dice and evidently used in some game of hazard, beads, fragments of blue Roman ware, &c. This, however, was the only really profitable house out of all that we tried on the west slope, while the crown of the mound both west and north, tested on our return at the end of February, proved quite unproductive, the chambers being all small and mean.

Low down on the northern slope we made a trial in February, and found well-built houses, but apparently of very late period. One was adorned with extremely rude frescoes of Coptic saints. No papyrus rewarded our efforts, either here or upon the east slope, where the remains of constructions proved to be exceedingly shallow, and rather out- or farm-buildings than dwelling-houses. Arab report said that the outlying eastern suburb had been very productive of papyrus to the native diggers a year or two before our arrival, and this statement is probably true; for the clean well-built chambers in that quarter had been dug out more thoroughly than would have been the case had not the fellahin met with great encouragement.
There were hardly any houses left to open on the crown of the eastern half of the mound, but we tried this region here and there in the hope of finding stray documents to confirm the identification of the site. The large refuse-tract at the south-east corner proved most productive, for in it was found Papyrus xxxvii, and a number of inscribed jars. These last lay *in situ* as originally buried in the rubbish at a late period; they were found placed side by side obliquely in a shallow trench, which had been filled in to form a primitive wine-cellar of constant temperature.

Nowhere on the southern or Fayûm face of the mound did we find any papyrus. A set of Roman vessels of green bottle-glass, almost if not quite unused, was discovered in a jar, together with two unused clay lamps, in a corner of a small chamber at the eastern end of the slope—probably a small store or shop. The houses which we opened farther to the west yielded only miscellaneous domestic articles in wood or ware. A large chamber just south-east of the temple buildings was found to be plastered and painted with frescoes, even ruder than those on the north of the mound.

Excavating houses proved, in short, so unproductive of result on this site that we did not continue long to waste energy or money upon it. By the time that the temple had been explored and the cemeteries tested we had gained the objects for which we had come to Kôm Ushîm: we had completed the identification of the site with Karanis and collected a reliable body of men with which to work at Ùmm el ‘Atl. As the houses on the last-named mound were found both better preserved from antiquity and less disturbed by modern spoliation than at Kôm Ushîm, while they date from the same period and belong to the same civilization, it will be best to reserve general remarks with respect to their character and arrangement for the second section.

Both the objects found in the houses at Kôm Ushîm and all the sherds, glass fragments, &c., to be seen on the mound are either late Ptolemaic, Roman, or Byzantine. Not a single piece of evidence ever turned up to prove that Karanis existed in Pharaonic times. Although pieces of syenite, granite, and marble are to be seen frequently, and the main part of the temple is built of stone, no trace of hieroglyphic writing was found. The amount of accumulation on the mounds indicates a period of inhabitation not long-continued; and we must conclude that that period began when Greek influence was fairly established in the Fayûm, and ended with the relapse of the northern region into marsh in the unquiet times which marked the close of Byzantine, and the beginning of Arab rule in Egypt.
B. The Temple of Pnepheros and Petesuchos.

The only clearly defined temple site occupies the centre of the southern face of the mound. It is not alluded to by Prof. Petrie (Ishkun, p. 32), and therefore in 1890 must still have been sunk below the refuse-heaps. When I visited Kom Ushim in 1895 sebakhin were working constantly at these heaps, and they had revealed the tops of three inscribed doorways, as well as the eastern façade of the main temple building. The Bedawi guard of the mound said that the 'written stones' had first come to light two years before.

It will be seen from the plan (Plate II) that the temple itself is a small oblong structure, facing almost due east. The arrangement of its chambers resembles that of the better-preserved temple of the same period at Kasr Kurun at the north-western corner of the Fayum (Plate X*; cf. plans in Belzoni, Pl. XXXII, and vol. ii. pp. 154 sqq., and Descr. de l'Egypt, Pl. XXX, and vol. iv. pp. 437 sqq.). The portal, inscribed with a dedication to the gods Pnepheros and Petesuchos in the reign of the Emperor Nero, gives access to a long prosekos chamber. This is succeeded by a second of much smaller dimensions, and this again by the shrine, at the innermost end of which remains a megalithic platform with a cavity underneath, entered from one of the southern side-chambers. This curious feature finds a parallel in the apparently walled-up chamber at the back of the shrine at Kasr Kurun; and it is far from impossible that both that chamber and this cavity at Karanis were designed for the concealment of an oracular priest. The only other possible supposition is that these secret chambers were treasuries; but in view of the small size of the Karanis cavity, this explanation is the less probable. In the latter we found, among the sand which had filtered down through wide chinks in the platform above, a small object in dark-blue glazed ware shaped to resemble the heart hieroglyph ab, and a mutilated stone statuette of Roman period, bearing traces of gilding. No other small objects, except one or two rude domestic utensils of the early Arab period, were found in any part of the temple.

It will be seen also from the plan that the central chambers are flanked on each side by a series of small rooms entered from the passages which run along inside the outer wall, and are themselves entered from the central chambers. There are also flights of low stairs on either hand conducting to the roof or an upper story; the lowest courses of the latter remain at the south-east corner, where the roof of the lower chambers is intact. The north-east corner we did not think it worth while to explore, having found nothing whatever in any of the lateral rooms or passages, which we cleared to the pavement. The two
small rooms at the extreme south-east were found complete with vaulted roofs intact, and half filled with fine wind-blown sand; the other chambers, small and large, were blocked up mainly with the stones fallen from their own upper courses, from the roof or from the upper story, and over these was a wind-blown deposit of sand some three feet thick. But immediately on the pavement lay everywhere a thin layer of domestic rubbish, demonstrating that the building had been used as a dwelling at a remote period by Bedawin. To that period belong perhaps the ruined brick structures indicated inside the temple on the plan.

The main building is all constructed of blocks of a local limestone, well fitted and mortared. Those forming the exterior face of the outer wall measure 2' 1" x 10" and have the usual Egyptian batter. There is no ornamentation surviving except a row of uraei forming a frieze over the head of a niche on the south of the second prosekos chamber; and the only architectural details of any interest are the window-slits in the outer wall which admitted a little light into the side passages.

A long niche, 2' 6" in height, with vaulted roof, will be remarked in the plan on the south side of the second prosekos. It has a wooden bar fixed across the floor and is blackened with smoke. Evidently the Bedawin have used it as a furnace; but for what purpose it was originally designed, with its two inner recesses, I cannot conjecture.

The walls of the first prosekos show traces of a stucco coating. The outer gateway had been restored in antiquity. We searched under its threshold, and for some distance up the line of the axis of the first prosekos, for a foundation deposit; but, although we laid bare the virgin sand, we found no trace of what we sought.

Guarding the portal on the outside are two small couchant lions in sandstone of coarse work. That on the south has an inscribed base (see below, Inscr. IV a). The dimensions of these lions are 4' 8" tip of nose to rump; 1' across the ears; 2' 2½" crest to fore-paws. The pedestals on which they lie are 1' 2" in height.

The plan shows to the east and south-east of the temple very scanty remains of walls of brick and stone which may pertain to its unpaved outer courts: but it is not unlikely that they represent civic structures. The inscribed propylon on the north (v. plan) seems to give access to the whole group; and the inscribed gateway on the south-east leads off into a distinct brick building, now filled with tightly packed domestic rubbish of Byzantine period, among which fragments of late papyrus are found frequently. The inscription on the lintel shows this building to have been a deipneterion or civic banqueting-hall. It is
probable that small lions flanked this gateway also, for two rough uninscribed specimens in sandstone were found hard by, together with a small and rude croio-sphinx and other stones, set upright in a ring, probably to form an Arab hearth.

We cut trenches through these outer structures, but found nothing of any interest in them, beyond a few papyrus scraps near the surface in one of the southernmost rooms. The buildings are bounded on the south by a street of houses, some of whose chambers we cleared for the usual reward of domestic articles.

The north propylon has been restored—a fact evident even without the witness of the inscription that it bears. The wings of the structure are of mud brick and the whole is much ruined. It had no flanking lions. The inscribed lintel is of a coarse nummulitic limestone, much weathered, and alone among the lintels in this group of buildings shows the disk and wings, which appear above all the principal doors of the Ḷaṣr Kurūn temple.

C. The Inscriptions.

1. A fallen block, which has formed the lower half of a lintel, found lying on its face just south of the propylon. Very fine and regular lettering.

\[
\text{ΤΟΥΧΟ ΤΟΠΡΟΠΥΛΟΝΠΕΦΕΡΩΤΙΚΑΙ}
\text{ΠΕΤΕΣΟΥΧΩΙΚΑΙΤΟΙΣΣΥΝΝΑΟΙΣΘΕΟΙΣ}
\text{ΜΕΓΑΛΟΙΣΜΕΓΑΛΟΙΣΥΝΠΕΡΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΤΗ}
\text{ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣΚΑΙΤΩΝΤΕΚΝΩΝΕΥΧΗΝ}
\text{ΛΙΟ ΜΕΣΟΡΗ ΚΣ}
\]

\[
\text{τών τέκνων} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots 
\text{[Πε]-}
\text{τ[εα]οιχοίν, τό πρόπυλον Πιεφερώτι καί}
\text{Πετεσούχω καί τοῖς συννάοις θεοῖς}
\text{μεγάλοις μεγάλοις ὑπὲρ αὐτῶ καὶ τής}
\text{γυναικὸς καί τῶν τέκνων εὐχήν,}
\text{(ἐτοι) Ἰβ', Μεσορή κ' χ' .}
\]

It is much to be regretted that our diligent search for the upper part of this lintel was unsuccessful; for this inscription, judged by the style of its lettering, is certainly not later than the beginning of the first century A.D., and more
probably belongs to the first century B.C. It is the earliest record on the site, and would have given probably a Ptolemaic date for the first construction of a gate to the temple buildings.

II. On the lintel of the main gate of the temple itself. The lettering is heavy but careful. The emperor's first name has been erased in line 1, and the end of line 4 from LZ and all line 5 are cut over an erasure.

Τὴν Ἑραμικὸν Αὐτοκράτορος Καλύπτεται. Τὸ διπλὸν Τοῦ Παντὸς Διοικήτης, οὐκ ἔχει τὸ βασιλείου τῆς ἧμέρας (ἔτους) ἐκείνου

This inscription was originally a homage to the Emperor Nero, but Νέρωνος has been erased in lines 1 and 4 and over the last erasure ΕΡΟΥ = divi has been cut to strengthen the apparent reference to Claudius. This reading was confirmed by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, who revisited the site in 1900. The praefect, Julius Vestinus, is known from B. G. U. 112, Ox. Pap. II. 250. 2, &c.

III. Lintel of the portal of the south-east building. Third line almost entirely and fourth line entirely defaced.
IV. Lintel of the north gate. Much defaced by the scaling of the stone. Above the inscription a disk with wings.

ὙΠΕΡΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΩΣΚΑΙΣΑΡΩΣΜΑΡΚΩΚΑΥΡΙΙΙΟΥΠΟΔΟΥ
ἈΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΥΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣΤΟΥΚΥΡΙΟΥΕΥΤΥΧΟΥΣΕΥΣΕΒΟΥΣΕΒΑΣΤΟ
.Logf. ΠΕΤΕΣΟΥΧΩΘΕΩΜΕΓΑΛΩΚΑΙΝΠΕΠΕΡΩΤΙΤΟΠΟΠΥΛΑ
ΧΡΩΝΩ,"Ν.ΝΩΡΘΩΝΕΝΕΚΤΟΥΙΔΙΟΥΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ
ΕΠΑΓΑΘΩΝΙΟΣ

Τπωρ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου Αὐρη[λίου [Κ]μβδου
Ἀντωνίου Καίσαρος του κυρίου Εὐτυχοῦς Εὐσεβοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
(ἐτος) α', Ἐπειφ. Πετεσούχῳ βεβῳ μεγάλῳ καί Πεπερώτι
τὸ προπόλειον
Χρόνῳ [διαφθαρέ]ν [α]νθρώπουν ἐκ τοῦ ἔδους Ἀπολλώνιος
5 ἐν' ἀγαθῳ.

Record of the restoration of the propylon in the reign of Commodus at the sole charge of a certain Apollonius, known from the following inscription to have been a σταλόγος or superintendent of granaries at Karanis. There is a difficulty about the year. In Egypt the year of Commodus is regularly reckoned from the accession of M. Aurelius, and if [Κ]μβδου is right in line 1 the number of the year is probably Λ not Λ. The surface of the stone has now worn away, so that the reading could not be verified in 1900.

IV (α). Base of the southern flank, flanking the main gate of the temple. Lettering coarse, and of the same period as IV.

ἈΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣΣΕΙΤ
ἈΝΕΘΙΚΕΕΠΑΓΑΘΟΣ
Ἀπολλώνιος στι(ολγος)
ἀνέθηκε ἐν' ἀγαθῳ.

The history of these temple buildings would appear, therefore, to be this. The first foundation was under Ptolemaic rule, probably soon after the reclamation of the Fayûm. The shrine arose in honour of the local gods Petesuchos and Pnepheros (cf. p. 22 and B. G. U. 707), with whom were associated, according to custom, under a general title the other gods of Egypt. A propylon was added to the precinct on the north under one of the latest Ptolemies, and after two centuries it was restored in the reign of Commodus at the charge of one Apollonius, a patriotic citizen, who at the same time adorned the main temple portal with couching lions, and (if we may judge by the similarity of the restored
mortar and stone work) repaired also the portal itself. The inscription on the lintel is not sufficient to warrant us in ascribing this portal to the reign of Nero. It is rarely the case in Egypt that inscriptions and decorations are of exactly the same period as the fabric on which they are carved. In this case the fabric is almost certainly Ptolemaic. Meanwhile, in Vespasian's reign, a banqueting-hall had been erected at the south-east corner of the precinct. In the Christian period the main temple building evidently became a dwelling-place, and probably was deserted and silted up by the time of the Arab conquest.

II. ÚMM EL 'ATL.

A. The Town.

The Ptolemaic and Roman town of Bacchias lay almost wholly on the northernmost of the two elevations which go by the name of Úmm el 'Atl. The southern mound appears to have been little inhabited until the Arab period, and then by men engaged in burning the stones of the old town for lime. The house-remains on this part of the site are of the poorest quality, very shallow and very sparse, while neither in the great rubbish-heap in the centre nor in any of the chambers did we find any papyrus earlier than very late Byzantine. Indeed almost without exception the script upon these fragments was Arabic.

Bacchias, therefore, may be taken to be represented only by the remains north of the well-defined watercourse which divides the mound. This northern mound attains a much higher elevation than the southern, rising, like Kôm Ushim, gradually from the south, but falling steeply on the north. Also, like Kôm Ushim, it is in the main a natural elevation, a high lump in a long ridge trending north-east and south-west. Only on the extreme north-west and north-east is there any superposition of newer houses on older: the site cannot have been inhabited for more than a few centuries.

The mounds lie out in the desert about five miles as the crow flies north-north-east of Tamia, and three miles from the northern edge of the newly reclaimed land. About three-quarters of a mile to the eastward passes the great caravan track from Cairo and Dahshûr to the Fayûm. White posts here and there in the desert indicate that a survey has been made with a view to conducting water again to this part of the desert, a little within the line of the ancient canal bed explored by Prof. Petrie in 1890 (v. Ithâhûn, p. 36). Within this reclamation Úmm el 'Atl will eventually be included.
The houses are disposed round a central temple, whose remains, much ruined though they are, are conspicuous still from all points. The main streets appear to run towards this building, and the houses lie roughly in line with it. On three sides they approach the temple walls, but on the fourth, the east, where is the portal of the sacred building, lies a considerable open space which may safely be assumed to have been the agora. The best-built parts of the town lie northwest of the temple, both on the lower ground and on the southern face of the high ridge which, divided only by one pass taken by the desert road, skirts the north of the mound. This elevation to the north is due doubtless both at Kôm Ushim and Úmm el 'Atl to the same cause—namely, the banking up of sand by the prevailing south and south-westerly winds.

B. The Temple of Sokanobkonneus.

The temple of Bacchias was a less sumptuous edifice than that of Karanis, for no part of it except its portal is of stone. Its walls of unbaked brick are, however, singularly well laid, correctly squared and massive, the external ones being uniformly nine feet thick. It is also less well preserved than the Karanis shrine. The portal has collapsed altogether, and the walls are nowhere more than double the height of an average man, standing on the floor-level. In the general arrangement of its main halls it will be observed that it coincides with the temple of Kôm Ushim, and its orientation, though less accurate, aims at the same direction. But at Úmm el 'Atl the side-rooms do not open out of passages running inside the outer walls, but lead for the most part out of the central halls or one another. In several instances (e.g. rooms D, E, O, P, and Q) the chambers now surviving had no doorway, but were entered from the top: a stairway is preserved only in room P. Nowhere is there any relic of a roof, and it is impossible to say whether an upper story ever existed: certainly no stairs, which could have led to one, survive.

The bricks, of which the east wall are composed, are unusually large—\(1\'3'' \times 6'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''\): those of the inner walls are of the more usual Roman dimensions. We searched carefully for an inscription among the fallen ruins of the portal, but in vain, although we cleared a considerable space to the eastward of the temple. We found indeed a long block, which appeared to have served for the lintel, but it was blank. The god to whom the shrine was dedicated must be inferred from the documents found in the temple. His name occurs on Pap. xviii (cf. cxxxvii) as Sokanobkonneus, and he must be taken to be a local variety of the same god who gave his name to Soknopaii Nesos (cf. p. 22).
The date of the foundation of the temple must be determined by that of the town to which it belonged. The existence of Bacchias in the third century B.C. is proved by the mention of it in the Petrie papyri; and the occurrence of second and first century B.C. fragments within the temple itself (e.g. xvi and cxxiv) throws the beginning of the building back well behind Roman times; in all probability it is not divided by many years from that of the Karanis shrine.

There was a certain amount of hard-packed Arab rubbish in the first hall A, but none in the side-rooms, filled with the ruins of their own walls and roofs, and none perceptible in the two inner central halls, which had, however, been excavated before our arrival. These facts, taken together with the survival of far more objects of antiquity in this than in the Kôm Ushim temple, go to prove that the Úmm el 'Atl shrine was never used as a dwelling-place for any long period.

To take its halls and rooms in order:—

The portal was apparently double, for a large block of the central post still survives in situ. A stone foundation underlies this block and the lateral brick walls to a depth of eight feet. No trace of door-flaps remains, nor was anything found hereabouts except a few scraps of papyrus just east of the portal.

The first προσκεκλημένος hall A, filled, as has been said, with packed Arab rubbish, underlying the ruins of its roof and overlying a rough stone pavement, yielded a little papyrus, including cxxxvii and cxxxviii, found on the pavement about the middle of the south side. The walls are in more ruinous condition than others in this temple, broken down to only 5' to 7' in height. Pieces of palm-wood beams survived.

The second προσκεκλημένος hall B and the shrine C were excavated two or three years ago by a Semnûnes Greek in the course of a week's hasty plundering. He is reported to have found no papyrus, but several broken terra-cotta images. The walls are well preserved to a height of twelve feet, and those of the shrine have been plastered with a fine stucco. No architectural or other features of interest have escaped time and the Greek.

On the north side of the temple, the westernmost side-chamber D was entered by a stair from the passage G. It was full of fallen bricks and light drift sand overlying hard yellow sand. Among the surface débris we found many objects, evidently thrown away, for example, fragments of painted papyrus cartonnage, such as is used in the decoration of mummies. These were composed in part of pieces of Ptolemaic documents, unfortunately too small and in too bad condition to be of any value. Ornate black pottery of late Ptolemaic period (Pl. XVI, figs. 14, 15), a bronze bell, fragments of amphorae with handle-stamps in Latin, and a broken wooden shrine with bronze fittings, were also found here.
Room $E$, also subterranean and entered apparently from $F$, yielded Ptolemaic papyrus fragments, as did also $F$. In $H$ there was nothing, but on the floor of the passage $I$ occurred the greater part of the first century B.C. papyri found by us in this temple, e.g. xviii, xviii (a) and (b).

Room $L$ was a late addition; both it and $M$ were empty. $O$ we did not dig. In the passage $N$ is a well twelve feet deep, in which were found Roman papyrus scraps and red pottery of Roman period and beads. $W$ and $X$, evidently store-chambers, were unproductive.

Crossing over to the south of the portal we found room $T$ previously dug. The next in order westward, $S$, yielded a small, late Ptolemaic, demotic roll. $R$ and $Q$ had been dug before our arrival. $Z$ contained scraps of Roman papyrus. $Y$ and $P$, subterranean chambers, were filled with loose rubbish similar to that in $D$ opposite. The first yielded a small bronze Osiris head, a ring of fine blue ware, and many scraps of Roman papyrus; the second contained broken-up remains of funerary furniture, such as wooden uraei.

C. The Houses.

The town or village of Bacchias was spread more or less over all the northern mound, but its houses clustered most thickly on the highest parts to the north-west and north-east. At its largest it can hardly have contained as many as 700 houses, and 3000 souls might at a rough guess be put down as its maximum population. For any prosperity it enjoyed, it was mainly beholden to the desert route from Memphis which debouched hard by into the Fayûm (cf. p. 195). The houses themselves remaining on the site are not those of rich men. Their rooms are small and their walls poor in construction: they are not built of any material better than mud-brick, and seem destitute even of the stone doorways common at Karanis. But they are not crowded together, and they appear, when plotted in, to be arranged with a certain view to symmetry.

It must be premised, however, that we excavated Ùmm el 'Atl with no view to obtain the plan of the houses either singly or together. We were in search simply of papyrus, and whenever a house did not contain the peculiar kind of débris among which papyrus was to be expected, we desisted from its exploration. In certain quarters of the town, for instance on the lower part of the southern slope of the northern mound, and on the steep northern slope, we never found papyrus, and therefore did not hold it worth while to prosecute systematic excavation there. The explanation of the unproductive character of such quarters must lie in the fact that either they were appropriated to the
poorest of the population, among whom reading and writing would be as unknown as with any fellahin cultivators of to-day; or they were not residential quarters at all, i.e. the ruined constructions which compose them are remains not of houses, but of farm and garden or factory buildings. This last generalization will apply to the slag-strewn region south and south-west of the temple, and to the lower part of the steep northern and eastern slopes.

Furthermore we found a certain portion of the site excavated already in great part. This portion is that lying north-east of the temple and containing some of the best-built houses. Here, as we were informed, the Greek dealer from Senures had worked at the same time that he explored certain of the temple chambers. To have cleared again the already rifled houses of this region would have been very little worth our while.

The greater part of the chambers opened by us were probably substructures. It appears that many of these Fayûm mounds (cf. p. 24) have been stripped to a large extent of the upper parts of their houses, and that from the materials so obtained the more modern villages within the area now cultivated have been built. At Úmm el 'Atl the chambers were in many cases excavated out of the hard gebel, and without doors opening on to any street, being entered indeed by stairways, of which we found many examples. These stairs are constructed in two or three flights round a buttress of brick-work, and conduct to subterranean vaults under a roof supported on rough stakes and thatched over. In such vaults we hardly ever found papyrus, but often wine-jars, jar-sealings, and various domestic articles in wood. Only when the stairs and vault had come to be used as a rubbish-shoot did papyrus fragments occur.

Where we had to deal so largely with substructures, and so little with remains of the dwelling-rooms, there is not much to be said generally about the character or arrangement of the latter. Add to this fact that the rooms had been most thoroughly rifled long ago of all contents that were ancienly of value. Twice only did we find remains of beds, one nearly perfect, a wooden frame on legs on which netting was stretched; it was so rotten that it fell to pieces as the supporting sand was removed. Broken fragments of tables were not infrequent, and in one house we discovered ornate chair-legs in acacia-wood, carved to represent coursing greyhounds (Plate XVI, fig. 1). Low stone tables on four feet, with a cup at one end, and sometimes adorned with a rude lion's head in relief on one side, were found here and there in the corner of a room: probably they were stands for water-jars. For the rest, beside broken pottery, all indistinctive, and common ware in coarse blue glaze or unglazed wheel-made red stuff, the domestic objects unearthed by us were mainly wooden bowls, wooden hair-combs, baskets, shoe-soles, wooden writing tablets (waxless and blank all but
one, retained by the Gizeh Museum, on which the Greek alphabet was set as a 'copy'), wooden stilli, spits, toilette implements in bone and wood, dice in the same materials, ropes and pins for loading pack-animals, bronze rings and pins, beads in glass and paste, unengraved signet-stones and the like (see Plates XV–XVII for specimens). Three wooden stamps were found, (a) β (έτους) Τραγανὸς Ἀδιάφρας (Plate XVI, fig. 12); (b) Τραγανὸς reversed (Plate XVI, fig. 2); (c) ν ς with figure of goat couchant (Plate XVI, fig. 5).

So far as the plan of the houses could be made out, they seemed to have consisted of from three to six rooms, arranged on no particular plan; one room opened straight on to the street, and the others led out of it and each other. No entrance-hall or passages or colonnades, or any of the luxuries of Italian houses, were present.

Traces of passages and a more elaborate plan were discovered only among the ruins on the high north-east mound, in one large room of which were found many scraps of late Ptolemaic papyri, e.g. Pap. xv. It is probable that here were situated the communal buildings; but even these were of a very poor kind, and were found by us in a ruinous and rifled state. The better-class houses on the lower ground to the west could claim superiority to the general run only on the score of larger rooms and better brick-work.

On the steep outer slope on the west and north occurred several alignments of small chambers with bricked floors, too small for human dwellings, and probably designed for store-rooms. It was under the floor of one of these on the north that we found a great hoard of more than 4000 Roman billon tetradrachms (see pp. 64 sqq.).

Bacchias then was a village of mud-roofed brick dwellings, without architectural adornment or pretension, out of which rose a single massive brick temple, oblong, mud-roofed, and equally devoid of external adornment. Its main avenue lay north and south. It was entered from the desert by the still conspicuous depression between the mounds, which probably lay on the line of the Memphis road, and also from the south-west, the direction of Arsinoë.

III. The Cemeteries of Kôm Ushím and Úmm el 'Atl.

The cemeteries of both Karanis and Bacchias are situated to the north of the town-sites, on the high ridges which rise at the ancient limit of cultivation. The earliest group of tombs explored by us lies about one and a half miles due north of Úmm el 'Atl on a high gravelly plateau, below which runs a broad water-
course. The graves here are all cut in the rock at the base of perpendicular shafts, some round, some square, provided with foot-holes, and varying from fifteen to thirty feet in depth. The chambers are rudely cut and vaulted, and are sometimes large halls with loculi leading off them, sometimes loculi only radiating directly from the bottom of the shaft. The only tomb which was untouched when we excavated it had a square shaft filled in with lightly packed gravel descending fifteen feet. One chamber only led off the shaft on the east, the opening of which was filled with mortared mud-brick work. This having been broken in, we found a small square chamber with a single coffin laid against the south wall, feet to the east. There was nothing else whatever in the chamber. On being opened the coffin, which was rudely painted, was found to contain a female corpse with a linen cartonnage headpiece, breastpiece, and sandals. The mummy, when unrolled, proved to have no ornaments of any kind upon it.

The whole of the rest of the shafts which we cleared out (some twenty-five in all) had been entered centuries ago by plunderers, who had left nothing but the rude coffins with detachable face-pieces, and remains of cartonnage, in a few cases made of gummed papyrus. In vain we searched the plateau up and down for unopened shafts. Two unfinished ones were found that had been abandoned ere the grave-chambers could be cut at their base.

These shaft-graves belong to the earlier Ptolemaic period. A corresponding cemetery must exist somewhere in the Karanis necropolis, but we failed to find it. Behind Kôm Ushím, however, as well as behind Úmm el 'Atl (at a point between the deep shaft-graves and the mound), we hit on groups of less sumptuous rock-cut graves which seem to belong to the late Ptolemaic age. These had short shafts or were approached by inclined dromoi. The dead were laid in radiating loculi or in a bed scooped out of the rocky floor of the passage itself. In one case only—at Kôm Ushím—we found a representation of two occupants of the tomb, a man and wife, rudely scratched in the soft gypsum.

Next in order of chronology are the brick tombs. These are of three kinds.

(a) Subterranean coffin-shaped beds, scooped out of the rock, and bricked over with a rude pointed arch. Úmm el 'Atl only.

(b) Large square or oblong enclosures, apparently houses used for sepulchres. The dead were laid on beds, and supplied with fireplaces and all necessities. These occurred only at Kôm Ushím, at the point of the cemetery nearest to the mound: and in them we found a number of papyrus fragments (including Pap. i, ii, and cv), good ornate blue ware, terra-cotta figurines, many wooden objects, e.g. a little model waggon and a tablet inscribed ἀπόδος Προϊστρας (l. -χφ) Ἰσ | Καρανίδα τοῦ Ἀτρινοῦ.
(c) Small brick mastabas, or beehives, very rude in construction, containing dead bodies without any mumification or adjuncts. Outside the western wall of each is a small niche for offerings. This class is later than b; for the beehives were found sometimes built within, and sometimes across the walls of, the enclosures. They seem to represent the graves of the later Roman period at Karanis. None of this type were found at Úmm el 'Atl.

All classes of tombs had been rifled with impartiality and thoroughness before our arrival; and, so far as we could judge, at a distant period of time. Native report, while eloquent on the finds made lately on the mounds, always denied that any one within living memory had made any discovery of note in the cemeteries. We had had two objects in view in attacking the tombs at all—papyrus, either in rolls or mummy-cases, and portraits on wood. Of the last-named only two broken bits were unearthed, thrown away by early plunderers; but two little painted panels, not portraits, had survived for us. Papyrus-rolls, if they ever existed, had decayed long ago: papyrus mummy-cases we found only in minute fragments and so rotted by damp and salt as to be worthless.

A small mound, which Prof. Petrie numbered 5 on his walk (Illahun, p. 31), should be described in this connexion. It lies nearly two miles slightly south of east from Úmm el 'Atl. Our Bedawi camp-guard had been producing from time to time flint knives and beads, which at last we traced to this site. It proved when visited to be strewn with worked flints, and we had it searched thoroughly. Some shallow remains of brick walls were disclosed on the east of the summit, but we got no antiquities beyond the knives. There must have been a small factory situated here. In the cliffs to the north are a small number of tombs, all rock-cut, which we also explored. Some were shallow hollows containing rude wooden coffins, with vessels in rough red ware and wooden head- rests of a Pharaonic type. There was nothing to give a precise date, but it is certain that these tombs, and the flint factory, must belong to a much earlier period than the remains on either Úmm el 'Atl or Kôm Ushim. Farther west we found some well-cut rock-tombs of a different type in the base of the cliff; these had been entirely rifled. Their vaulted chambers led off from shallow square shafts; and the wrecks of coffins in them made it appear that they were of a period not earlier than Ptolemaic. Like the shaft-graves of Úmm el 'Atl, each tomb here contained many skeletons, and must have been used by successive generations.
IV. *Kašr el Banāt (Euheremia).*

In the winter of 1898–99 we obtained permission to excavate in the desert at the north-west corner of the Fayūm, between Gebāla and the south-west end of the Birket el Kurūn. This tract of flat desert, in which several sites are situated, was for the most part irrigated in Ptolemaic and Roman times, and remains of the old canals are clearly traceable. Here, as on the east side of the Fayūm, the margin of cultivation receded in the fourth century, and the outlying villages were abandoned. Now however the reclamation is proceeding rapidly under the easy terms offered by the Egyptian Government to those willing to undertake the construction of the necessary canals. The most promising site in our concession was *Kašr el Banāt* (‘The Maidens’ Palace’), which in 1898 was on the edge of the desert, and we began work there on Dec. 9.

The low, undulating mounds of *Kašr el Banāt* (Pl. VII*), intersected by sandy hollows, cover an area of about a quarter of a square mile. Nearly half the site had been dug not very long before our arrival, especially the houses on the west and north sides and on the tops of mounds. Elsewhere there were occasional probings, but no systematic clearances. It is not reported that the natives had found much, and the fate of what was discovered is uncertain. But as they had naturally selected what appeared to be, and no doubt were in most cases, the best parts, the damage done was considerable. In some places too the surface of the low ground had been scooped into hollows, perhaps by *sebakhtu*, though this did not affect papyri which lay beneath.

The undulations of the site are to a large extent natural, for the ground-level was generally not much deeper in the higher parts of the site than in the lower. Since the underground cellars, which were so conspicuous a feature of *Ūmm el ’Atl*, were here very rare, and those houses which had had more than one story had been denuded down to the levels of the rest, the site was as a whole unusually shallow. The floors of the buildings were rarely more than two metres from the surface, and often much less, though the foundations were of course somewhat deeper.

The houses as usual were built of unbaked brick, generally plastered inside, and, if somewhat more substantial than those of *Ūmm el ’Atl*, were much inferior in point of solidity to those of Harit. Stone was very sparingly used. A few fragments of limestone columns were found, and stone blocks were occasionally used in doorways. The commonest kind of houses were filled up with sand, mingled with the débris of the roof and walls, and contained few papyri or antiquities of any sort, though in an oven in a house of this description we found
a large number of ostraca (e.g. nos. 41-3). More fruitful than these were houses and adjacent lanes into which rubbish had been thrown, and which had an *afsh* layer. The papyri found in these were of mixed dates, first to third century A.D., and for the most part fragmentary. One mound in particular at the extreme south-east of the site was productive of some early first century A.D. papyri (e.g. the two Homeric fragments, Pap. vi and vii). The plaster on the walls of a house which was underneath part of this mound had been painted, but only the feet of a series of figures were preserved, together with a few much defaced demotic graffiti (one of these is now at Gizeh). In mounds of this kind covering buildings the *afsh* layer was generally near the surface, and not more than a foot or so in thickness. Underneath, the earth had a marked tendency to become *sebakh*, i.e. fine and powdery.

Our chief finds however, whether of papyri or miscellaneous antiquities, were in those houses which had an *afsh* layer at or near the bottom covered by débris for the most part from the house itself. The best of these, on the south side of the site, yielded nearly a hundred papyri, half of them being well or fairly well preserved. They belong to the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, and consist of letters from Lucius Belenus Gemellus, a veteran who had property in the town, to relatives, and of other documents, chiefly letters, connected with the family (pp. 261-3). These were found in two adjoining rooms about a foot from the floor; the other rooms of the same house, though possessing an *afsh* layer, produced no papyri, but Inscription V (p. 48) was found here, having been sawn down and used as a doorstep. Some of the other best-preserved papyri were discovered in small chambers not more than a square metre in area, similar to those at Ùmm el 'Atl. These were often arranged in one or more rows side by side, the row consisting of four or five, or even as many as ten chambers, occasionally varied by a somewhat larger one. There was no means of getting in or out from the sides, so presumably the entrance was from the top, and probably they were granaries or store-rooms. In one of these we found four rolls tied up together, dating from the early part of Augustus' reign (ci, cxxxii-iv), and in another a number of documents belonging to the middle of the first century A.D. (e.g. xxix, xlvi). Rubbish mounds as such were very unremunerative. Several of them consisted merely of ashes, and none of the others produced anything but mere fragments of papyrus. The *afsh* in these mounds had a tendency to coagulate into a hard mass which a *thyræa* could hardly penetrate.

By the end of four weeks we had finished the south-east, by far the richest, part of the site. The centre was mainly occupied by large walled enclosures filled up with sand, and the rest of the site had been too much dug already to
make a systematic clearance profitable, so that we had to be content with digging out isolated houses or rooms which had been passed over.

The temple of Euhemeria (for this was soon shown by papyri and ostraca to be the ancient name of Kašr el Banât) stood a few yards away from the town on the north-west, and was constructed mainly of brick. Its corners point almost exactly to the four quarters of the compass, the entrance being in the middle of the south-east side, facing the town. In its general arrangement it resembled the somewhat smaller temple of Bacchias (Pl. III). About three quarters of it had been dug out by natives, and been filled up with sand, but some small chambers (2½ to 2 x 2 to 1½ metres) along the north-west and south-west sides had not been opened, and in these and the underground rooms beneath them we found a few papyri, Greek and demotic, some ostraca, and a pot (Pl. XII, fig. 3) containing several bronzes, a large ring with a sphinx in relief (now at Gizeh), an incense-burner, and a statuette of Osiris. In none of the Greek papyri found in the temple or elsewhere on the site is the name of the local deity written out in full, but on ccxli θεός μεγάλος μεγάλων occurs, and since a Σουχεών at Euhemeria is mentioned in P. P. II. ii. (1) 18, the mutilated name may be confidently restored as Σουχεών or some other form of Sebek; cf. p. 22. With the crocodile god were associated not only Isis, who in Ostr. 38 is called θεία κόμη, but other gods. A demotic fragment found in the temple, for the translation of which we are indebted to Prof. Spiegelberg, mentions 'Isis with the beautiful throne' (nfr st, i.e. Isis Νεφερης, cf. p. 22); and on another demotic papyrus of the late Ptolemaic period occurs 'Isis the goddess [mother], Harsiesis the great god, and... the great god and the gods and goddesses united to her (σύννοις).' If Inscription V (p. 48) was originally erected at Euhemeria, another temple must have been built there during the reign of one of the later Ptolemies.

To summarize the objects found at Kašr el Banât. Out of more than 400 papyri which we unrolled (ten demotic, all at Gizeh, the rest Greek, not yet divided) about a quarter are in a good or fair state of preservation. A few late Ptolemaic documents, chiefly demotic, together with some Roman, were found in the temple, and a fourth century letter (cxxxv) in the rubbish on the top. In the town the papyri dated from the first to third century A.D., with the exception of a small number belonging to the end of the first century B.C., a few others which are or may be of the early fourth century, and one late Byzantine scrap which was discovered near the surface and had no doubt been blown there by the wind. The largest groups of papyri found together are mainly of the first century A.D., but most parts of the site yielded, as is usual in the Fayûm, documents of the period from Trajan to Severus Alexander. In the fourth century of our era Euhemeria decayed, and was abandoned like the other sites described in this volume, except Karanis (cf. p. 16).
Ostraca from the Fayûm have hitherto been extremely rare (cf. p. 317); and the provenance of even those is uncertain. No doubt the explanation is partly that in the Fayûm ostraca were less commonly used than elsewhere as a substitute for papyrus in writing short tax receipts, orders for payment, and accounts. But there is another reason for their rarity, which we suspect to be much more potent. While Greek papyri have been yearly increasing in value, so that the price now demanded for them by dealers (and unfortunately often obtained) is in most cases quite preposterous, Greek ostraca can still be bought anywhere for a few pence. Hence in a district like the Fayûm, which is extremely rich in papyri but in very little else that appeals to the average buyer of antiquities, the native diggers have not paid any attention to ostraca; and these are very easily passed over amid the thousands of uninscribed potsherds. As a matter of fact, ostraca are not really rare in the Fayûm. Byzantine ostraca from Kom el Faris are nearly always to be seen at Medinet el Fayûm. At Ûmm el 'Atl indeed we found only two or three, perhaps because our workmen were inexperienced, and at Ûmm el Baragât not more than thirty; but while digging the towns of Kaṣr el Banât, Harit, and Wadī, hardly a day passed without one or more turning up. Kaṣr el Banât produced altogether over a hundred Greek ostraca covering the same period as the papyri, and one demotic (from the temple, now at Gizeh). The largest find has already been referred to (p. 44).

Coins (Roman billon or copper, with some Ptolemaic) were found all over the site, but no hoards were discovered. For a description of them see pp. 64 sqq.

Amongst the wooden objects may be mentioned four stamps, inscribed respectively, Ἡρων Πτολεμαῖος, Α Β Γ Μαρρής (these two at Gizeh), Καίκαρός and Επμούγεω; ten small combs (cf. Plate XV, fig. 7); two larger combs with handles (? for carding hair or wool, Pl. XV, figs. 15, 16); six mallets (one at Gizeh; cf. Pl. XV, figs. 10, 11, 12); a rattle; several spindles (cf. Pl. XV, figs. 14, 18); the head of a rake (Pl. XV, fig. 5); numerous little boxes, two with lids, another enamelled, another containing blue dye; a lock (cf. Pl. XVI, fig. 6); a knife-handle; pegs (cf. Pl. XVI, fig. 8); funnels (cf. Pl. XV, fig. 9); two spinning-tops (cf. Pl. XVI, fig. 16); a draughtsman; door handles.

Terra-cotta figures, generally very rudely executed and in many cases probably intended for toys, were very common here, as in all Fayûm sites. The best, a figure of a man holding a lantern, is at Gizeh. Isis suckling Horus, Harpocrates in various postures but generally with his finger in his mouth, Sarapis, female figures, dogs, camels, horses, and cockers were the usual subjects.

Of blue glazed ware from the town there was one large two-handed vase (Pl. XII b, fig. 11), a small figure of 'Venus Anadyomene,' a lion, numerous
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beads, and a Bes amulet. In the temple we found a statuette of Isis and Horus, an eye, a rosette, beads, and five dark blue glaze cylinders (Pl. XVI, fig. 18) intended to be joined together by a piece of wood running through the centre.

Ordinary earthenware pots were found in great variety and profusion (twenty-four left at Gizeh, Journ. nos. 33368-33391; see Pls. XII and XIII), and numerous lamps of the Roman period (cf. p. 57; one, found with first century papyri, at Gizeh). The only complete objects of glass were one or two larcymatoria, and some marbles and centres of rings, and of course beads. The iron implements included a sickle (Pl. XV, fig. 2), two swords, two knives with handles (Pl. XV, fig. 3), and the head of a hoe similar to that figured on Pl. XV, fig. 1. One small silver and numerous bronze rings were found in the town; other bronze objects included fish-hooks, small plates, needles, fibulae, bracelets, nails, arrow-heads, pins, statuette of Horus (?), and small bells; and in the temple, besides the objects mentioned on p. 45, a lamp and a surgical instrument. Ivory or bone hairpins were common, but only two dice were found. The inhabitants of Euhemeria do not seem to have been so fond of gambling as those of Oxyrhynchus. A small bowl, fish and snake of lead, a small calcite vase, a few stone weights, a square palette, two water-troughs, one of limestone, the other of granite with a rude lion’s head carved on it, numerous baskets both large and small, a camel muzzle (Pl. XVII, fig. 7), blinkers (?) (Pl. XVII, fig. 5), a fishing net, sandals of rope and papyrus (Pl. XVII, figs. 1, 3), a fringed cap (?) (Pl. XVII, fig. 4), and three writing tablets may also be mentioned.

The evidence of the papyri and coins shows that all the other objects belong to the Roman period, mostly to the second or third century rather than to the first, except (1) those found in the temple, which are probably late Ptolemaic or early Roman, and (2) a flint knife picked up on the surface of the site. Flint knives of uncertain period are to be found throughout the desert bordering on the Fayûm, and in some parts they are very common. Though we have found occasional specimens on the surface of purely Graeco-Roman sites, we have no trustworthy evidence as to their date.

The following inscription (V, Pl. VIII, now at Gizeh), containing part of a petition, was lying face downwards, and had served as a doorstep in the house where the Gemellus papyri were found (p. 44). The surface of the stone is much damaged and worn, and the upper portion of it has been sawn away. The letters, which are well cut, average 2 cm. in height; they are sometimes rather crowded at the ends of lines. The whole stone measures 89.5 x 51.5 cm. In deciphering the inscription we have had the assistance of Mr. Hogarth, to whom we are indebted for several suggestions.
ΠΙΠΙ... ΙΟ... ΣΜ... ΣΙΜΝ... ΟΝ
ΕΠΙΤΕΛΩΝΤΑΙΚΤ. ΣΘΕΝΤΟΣΤΟΥΣΗΜΑΙ
ΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΙΕΡΟΥΥΠΕΡΤΕΣΟΥΚΑΙΤΩΝΠΡΟ
ΓΟΝΩ... ΟΥΜΕΝΟΥΣΗΣΚΑΙΤΗΣΠΑΡΑ

ΤΩΝΠΛΗΣΙΩΝΙΕΡΩΝΣΥΝΚΕΧ... ΗΜΕΝΗΣ
ΑΣΥΛΙΑΣΜΗΔΕΝΟΣΕΙΣΤ... ΜΕΝΟΥ
ΜΗΔΕΚΣΠΑΝΤΟΥΣΕΝΤΩΙ... ΩΚΑΙ
ΠΑΣΤΟΦΟΡΟΥΣΚΑΙΤΟΥΣΔ... ΥΛ... Σ
ΤΟΥΣΚΑΤ... ΕΥΓΟΝΤΑΣΚΑΘΩΝΔΗΠΟ

ΤΟΥΝΤΡΟΠΟΝΔΕΩΜΕΝΟΥΤΟΥΝΙΚΗ
ΦΟΡΟΥΘΕΟΥΕΙΔ... ΕΙΟ... ΟΥΣΤΟΥ
ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΟΣΥ... Ο......... ΡΙΝΟ
ΕΧΕΙΣΠΡΟΣΤΟΙΕΡΩΝΕΥ... ΙΕ... ΠΡΟΣ
ΤΑΞΑΙ; ΗΡΙΔΙΤΩΙΣΥΓΓΕΝΕΙΚΑΙΥ... ΟΜΝΗ

ΜΑΤΟΓΡΑΦΩΙΟΠΩΓΡΑΨΗΤΩ... Τ. ΥΝΟΜΟΥ
ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΙΚΑΙΟΙΣΚΑΘΗΚΕΙΝΕΙΔΩΕ
ΠΟΝ... ΜΕΝΟΝΤΑΓΗΣΑΝ......... Σ
ΠΡΟΝ... ΣΗΝΑΙΟΣΜΕΙΚΤ... ΣΑΣΥ
ΛΙΑΣΤΟΠΟΝΗΕΝΚ... Ω... Η ......Η

ΥΠΕΜΟΥΣΤΗΛΙΑΝΑΘΕΣΙ....
ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΥΣΑΤΗΣΕΝΤΕ... ΞΕΩΣ
ΚΑΙΤΗΣΠΡΟΣΑΥΤΗΝΧΡΗΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ
ΤΟΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΟΝΤΟΥΤΟΥΔΕΓΕΝΟ
ΜΕΝΟΥΕΣΟΜΑΙΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΗΜΕΝΟΣ

ΔΙΕΥΤΥΧΕΙ
ΛΙΓ ΗΡΙΔΟΣΓΕΙΝΕΣΘΩ
ΕΓΡΑΨΕΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣΣΙΔΑΥΜΟΥ
ΚΟΙΝΟΣΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ

. . . . .

ἐπιτελοῦνται κτίσθεντος τοῦ σημανικοῦ λεροῦ ὑπὲρ τε σωτο καὶ τῶν προγόνων όνομας καὶ τῆς παρὰ

τῶν πλησίων λερῶν συνεχωρημένης ἀσυλίας, μηδενὸς εἰσ... . . . . μένου
As stated in lines 19 sqq., the inscription is a copy of a petition which was addressed to the king, and of the official answer of the ἔσωμυματογράφος. Unfortunately the stela is so much mutilated and defaced that only a general idea of its drift is obtainable. The upper part of the stone, which must have contained a considerable number of lines, has been cut away; and in the surviving fragment the letters towards the ends of the lines are mostly very indistinct, and in places have disappeared altogether. Moreover the difficulties of decipherment are increased by the fact that the Greek of the inscription is not of the best; τῆς χρισματισμοῦ in line 22, for instance, is not calculated to inspire confidence.

The subject of the petition is the right of asylum in connexion with a newly erected temple in which the writer was in some way interested. By an unlucky chance the three lines which contained the gist of his request (17–19) are among those which have suffered most severely, and their sense is hardly recoverable. The identity of the petitioner and the locality of the temple are also matters of conjecture. The temple had evidently been quite recently built, for it was erected in honour of the reigning Ptolemy (l. 3). From the fact that the inscription was found at Euhemeria it may be assumed, in the absence of other evidence, that the temple belonged to that town. It was not
however the principal temple of Euhemeria, which was dedicated to Suchus, Isis, and other gods, and was of much earlier foundation; cf. p. 45. The petitioner may have been concerned in its erection, or merely a local official. Perhaps a more likely supposition is that he was a priest associated with the temple service. His purpose apparently was to secure that the temple in question should stand upon a footing of equality with certain neighbouring temples which enjoyed the right of inviolability with reference to their ordinary inmates as well as to those who sought temporary refuge within their walls. Hence we may conclude that such inviolability did not attach to every sanctuary as such, but was a privilege which could be granted or denied at the royal pleasure. In the present case the petition was successful, and the coveted privilege was conceded (l. 26).

The date of the inscription certainly falls in either the second or the first century B.C.; and the mention of the thirteenth year (l. 26) limits the possibilities to the reigns of Epiphanes and Philometor in the second century, and that of Neos Dionysus in the first. We have therefore to choose between the years B.C. 192–2, 169–8, and 69–8; the last seems to be the most probable of the three.

Line 4 sqq. The object of this clause was perhaps to conciliate the ‘neighbouring temples,’ who might suppose that their rights were being encroached upon. τοῖς πλησίους ἵπποις might be expected rather than παρὰ τῶν πλησίων ἵππων, which must mean ‘the right of asylum which has hitherto been conceded (to suppliants, &c.) by the temples remaining undisturbed.’ The character of the privilege is further explained in the following clause.

8. δ᾽ οὕτως ἡ λέξ: the reading is rather doubtful, the traces being very faint and the supplements somewhat short for the lacunae. The habit of runaway slaves to seek sanctuary in temples is illustrated by Pap. Par. 10, which is an advertisement for the recovery of two slaves who had taken flight. Their persons and dress are described, and a scale of rewards is announced. The actual production of one of the fugitives is valued at two talents 3000 drachmae of copper; the disclosure of the temple where he had taken refuge, at one talent 2000 drachmae; the proof that he was being harboured by a person of good position, who could be made to pay, at three talents 5000 drachmae.

10. δεόμενος σοι: the stone apparently has δεόμενον, which makes no good sense and leaves us without a principal verb. Some such correction as that adopted in the text seems necessary.

12. If ΡΙΝΟ is rightly read, χῶμα δ preceded by a genitive may be restored; or some such phrase as καθ’ ὧν ἐχει ... εἰπόντων would suit the passage. In 13, ΕΤΟΜΕΡΕΙΑΣ is too long.

14. ΥΠΙΔί is probably for ΥΠΙΔί; the nominative appears as ΥΠΙΔΟΣ in l. 26.

συγγεγενεῖ: this is one of the commonest of the honorific titles which are characteristic of the second and first centuries B.C., and appear to have been first introduced by Epiphanes; cf. Strack, Gr. Titel im Ptolemäerreich in Rhein. Museum für Philol., iv, pp. 161 sqq.

18. Either προονέται καὶ or προονετῆναι would be expected, but the traces on the stone seem inconsistent with both.

22. τοῖς: ΤΗΣ inscr.


27–8. The title κατὰ γράμματα is new, and owing to the mutilation of the inscription it is not clear on whose behalf Ptolemy, son of Dydymus, was acting. Perhaps he was the representative of the priests. Ἐγναθάρι seems to refer to the whole stela, meaning that he was responsible for the copy which was set up.
V. Harit (Theadelphia).

The traveller from Gebala (Polydeucia? see p. 14) to Kasr el Banat will, about one and a half miles from his destination, where the belt of cultivation on his left hand ceases, pass the remains of an old town, called Harit. Our excavations there occupied us for the last three weeks of our season's work in 1898-99, the intervening period being taken up with the examination of the cemeteries at Kasr el Banat and Harit, which are described in the next chapter.

The town of Harit (Pl. VII) is of about the same length as Kasr el Banat but not so broad, and the ruins are less undulating, tending to form one continuous mound which was highest in the middle. The south side of the site consisted of rubbish mounds partly covering large walled enclosures. One of these mounds was composed of ashes and cinders, the others had been much dug by sebakhtu, but seemed to have contained little or no afsh. Sebakhtu had also been busy in other parts of the site where there was rubbish on the surface, while many of the houses which were filled up with sand (see below) had been tried with a view to finding antiquities, but only a few buildings, including the temple, had been cleared out.

The mounds of Theadelphia, as the ancient name proved to be, are lower than those of Kasr el Banat, but are in reality deeper, for most of the rise was artificial, while at Kasr el Banat it was largely natural. In the higher parts of Harit the ground-level was fifteen feet from the surface of the ruins; at Kasr el Banat, on the other hand, it was seldom more than seven or eight feet.

A very noticeable feature of Harit is the definiteness with which the walls of most of the houses are to be traced along the surface of the mounds by the little chips of white limestone used in making the bricks. These houses were filled up with sand or a mixture of sand and fine dust or ashes, and in their height, solidity of construction, good state of preservation and absence of extraneous rubbish resemble those of Dimé, and are much superior to those at Kasr el Banat. In most cases the ground-floor walls were intact, and sometimes the roofs, consisting of bricks laid on reed matting across logs of palm wood, were standing, though generally, as was natural, they had fallen in. As regards antiquities however, and papyri in particular, these houses at Harit were singularly barren. Sometimes the sand mixed with the bricks and reeds continued right down to the bottom, sometimes at the bottom was a layer of soft earth or rubbish or straw, but there was no real layer of afsh. A well-preserved plough (Pl. IX, at Gizeh) was found in one of these houses, and in another two.
hoes, hardly distinguishable in shape from the modern tūrya (one at Gizeh, the other figured in Pl. XV, fig. 1); while Ostraca 24-29 were resting on a niche in the wall of a third. But hardly any papyri were obtained except fragments (third century) which had apparently been blown in while the house was in process of being filled up. The central and western parts of the site, which were occupied by these well-preserved houses, thus proved to be of little use for our purposes; and the south side, where the houses were not of similar description, was occupied by mounds of pure sebakh which were equally unproductive. The north side of the site was somewhat better, for here the rubbish covering the houses contained ašh. Papyri were, as a rule, very sparse, but ostraca were not uncommon. The only place that was really rich was a rubbish mound underneath two to five feet of sand at the extreme north-east corner of the town. This mound covered the foundations of a good-sized building, and here many papyri, mainly of the second century, were found either in the rubbish or at the bottom. Separated from it by a lane was the façade of another large and better preserved building with a stone door. This second building was filled with the usual sand and black dust, and yielded nothing. But possibly one of the two had contained the local archives.

The next best part of the site was the houses round the temple, which, like that of Kašr el Banât, stood at a little distance (about 30 yards) outside the town on the west side. The temple itself, which was a good deal smaller than that of Kašr el Banât, had been dug out by natives; subsequently the walls had partly fallen in and the hollows filled up again with sand. It is said that masabkhāt (‘statues,’ i.e. Roman terra-cottas probably) were found there, and in clearing away some ašh which had been thrown out from it we came upon some fragments of second or third century papyri, and one complete document. The houses round, which were not deep, had also been dug, though not very systematically; and in them we made some interesting finds of papyri, either late Ptolemaic or of Augustus’ time (e.g. xi, xii, xiv, xvi, and xiv), not mixed up with later documents. The objects found with them no doubt belonged to the same period as the papyri; and this conclusion is confirmed by the identity of the pottery from these houses with that found both in the tombs which we had already had reason to think late Ptolemaic (see pp. 56 sqq.), and in the ruins of a house in the Ptolemaic cemetery (cf. p. 53). Altogether Harit produced about the same number of papyri as Kašr el Banât, while the miscellaneous antiquities, especially the pottery, were of greater interest owing to the more detailed information obtained concerning their dates. We subjoin a list of all the more interesting finds in the town, the numbers being those of our inventory of the Harit objects.
(a) Late Ptolemaic or very early Roman, all found in the houses round the temple:—231, large amphora (Pl. XI b, fig. 13, now at Gizeh); 232, large cylindrical pot (Pl. XI b, fig. 11); 233, small jug (Pl. XI b, fig. 16; cf. Pl. XIV b, fig. 20, a very common Roman shape); 234, vase (Pl. XI b, fig. 15, Gizeh Journ. 33,226); 235, top of a similar vase found with 231 (Pl. XI b, fig. 18, Gizeh Journ. 33,228); 236, found with 232 (Pl. XI b, fig. 1); 250 (found with 251–4), small black two-handled vase with a Bes head on either side (at Gizeh; cf. Pl. XVI, fig. 15, a similar vase); 251, lamp with two Cupids; 252, small wooden box shaped like the lower part of an amphora; 253, terra-cotta head of Isis or Hathor; 254, iron knife; 256, terra-cotta figure of a woman playing a musical instrument; 257, small wooden box; 258, beads and some Bes amulets (now at Gizeh); 259, six copper coins (Soter II and Cleopatra VII); 260, bone amulet (Bes ?); 261, bronze head of a goose and piece of a fibula (now at Gizeh); 256–261 were found together with 231 in the same house as 262–5; 262, amulets (Thoth, Horus, Bes and rosettes; now at Gizeh); 263, three coins (Euergetes II and Soter II); 264, wooden box; 265, clay disk pierced with holes (at Gizeh); 266, bronze ring; 267, terra-cotta figure of a boy, found with 268, a coin of Euergetes I; 269 and 270, black lamp with a long spout and with pierced handle; 271, ditto, with short spout and handle; 272, reddish brown lamp with a small side handle but not pierced; 273, comb (at Gizeh); 274, rude wooden figure of Osiris; 275, comb; 276, male figure in blue glaze (at Gizeh); 277, large bronze ladle; 278, fragment of a pot ornamented in relief (at Gizeh); 350, two Bes amulets; 436, 437, 450–3, Greek ostraca (450 at Gizeh); 481, clay jar stopper inscribed ΚΑΙΣΘΕΑΔΕΑΦ. Here we may also mention a series of pots found together with some late second century B.C. papyrus fragments in a house among the Ptolemaic tombs; cf. p. 58. These were: 150 a, brown jug (Pl. XI b, fig. 3, Gizeh Journ. 33,296); b small black jug (Pl. XI a, fig. 5, Gizeh Journ. 33,290); c, d, e, f, g, h, i, l, n, o (= Gizeh Journ. 33,297, 33,298, 33,294, 33,311, 33,320, 33,299, 33,295, 33,301, 33,303) other pots of the usual Ptolemaic types.

(b) Amongst the objects found in the houses of the Roman town (all probably second or third century, except where otherwise stated) the plough and hoes have already been mentioned. For the pottery (numbered 211–30, and 237–9) see Plate XIV b with the description, and cf. Pl. XIV a, which gives specimens of the pottery from the Roman tombs. Besides these we may mention—279, a pair of papyrus slippers; 280, an inscribed slate; 281, a reed musical instrument; 282, wooden stool (Pl. XVI, fig. 4); 283, sandal of basket-work (Pl. XVII, fig. 2); 284, two small pottery lids (one at Gizeh); 286, wooden figure of Sarapis; 287 and 306, spindles; 288, small wooden comb? (Pl. XV, fig. 17);
289, bronze lamp; 291, iron knife; 292, iron drill, with wooden handle (Pl. XV, fig. 4); 293, small calcite vase; 294, 295, palettes; 296 and 311, wooden tops; 297, clay seals attached to a cord; 298-303, 305, and 308, terra-cottas (Harpocrates on a cock, Silenus (?), female figures, &c.); 304, frog lamp; 307, bronze bell; 310, wooden stamp, ΘΕΑΔΕΛΦΕΙΑΣ; 312, eight ivory or bone pins; 313, three bronze surgical instruments; 314, four fish-hooks; 315 and 320, bronze rings; 316, glass weight (?) with head of a third or fourth century emperor on one side, and another head on the reverse; 317, five glass centres of rings; 318, three Bes amulets; 319 and 327, bronze signet rings (probably Ptolemaic); 321, small bronze tongs; 322, papyrus chain; 324, 325, glass buttons or counters; 328, bronze bracelet; 331, 332, beads, chiefly green glass and blue glaze; 333, large blue and yellow glaze bead; 339 bird snare of string and horsehair; 340, blue glaze vase found with some third century papyri; 348, clay impressions of seals; 351, fringed cap (?) now at Gizeh; 401-435, 438-449, 454-480, Greek ostraca (409 and 429 at Gizeh).

The following inscription (VI), rudely cut upon a roughly shaped limestone block measuring 34 x 29 cm., was found in situ let into the wall of a large room which, as the inscription states, was the dining-hall of the 'elders' of the corporation of weavers, erected in A.D. 109.

ΔΙΠΝΗΣΘΡΙΟΝ ΠΡΕΠΕΙ
ΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝΕΡΕΡ
ΔΙΩΝΕΡΙΝΕΦΕΡΩ
ΤΟΣΤΟΥΚΕΦΑΛΑ
5 ΤΟΛΦΡΟΝΤΙΟΥ
ΗΡΩΝΕΡΓΑΤΕΝΕ
ΠΑΓΑΘΩΛΙΒ
ΤΡΑΙΑΝΟΥΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ
ΤΟΥΚΥΡΙΟΥΑΡΜΟΥ
10 ΟΗΕ

ΔΙΠΝΗΣΘΡΙΟΝ ΠΡΕΠΕΙ
ΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝ ΓΕΡ-
ΔΙΩΝ, ἐπὶ Νεφερά-
ΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΕΦΑΛΑ-
5 ΤΟΛΦΡΟΝΤΙΟΥ
ΗΡΩΝΕΡΓΑΤΕΝΕ
ΠΑΓΑΘΩΛΙΒ
ΤΡΑΙΑΝΟΥΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ
ΤΟΥΚΥΡΙΟΥΑΡΜΟΥ
10 ΟΗΕ

9-10. In the word Φαμυούδη, the stone-cutter forgot to insert the cross-strokes of φ and θ, which consequently appear as omicrons.

VI. CEMETERIES OF KAŚR EL BANĀT AND HARĪT.

We excavated the cemetery of Kaśr el Banāt for nearly a fortnight after finishing the town, and then moved our encampment to Harīt, where we devoted
the first three weeks to the tombs. As the Harit cemetery was dug much more extensively and was much more productive than that of Kašr el Banát, and the tombs of the latter place could only be dated by the information which we obtained at the former, it will be convenient to describe the Harit cemetery first.

This stretched from the west side of the town for some distance. The tombs fell into three well-defined classes which may be called (1) the earlier Ptolemaic (from about 250 to 150 B.C.); (2) the intermediate (later Ptolemaic and early Roman); and (3) the Roman (second and third century A.D.).

In the first class, a group at the north-west end of the cemetery, the bodies were generally mummmified and buried in plain wooden sarcophagi, roughly shaped as a mummy, and with rude heads similar to those found by Prof. Petrie at Gurob. In a few instances the sarcophagi were painted. Pottery coffins were also common, sometimes with a face engraved on the lid (cf. Pl. XIa, figs. 9, 19), sometimes plain, the lid consisting merely of stone slabs. In the poorer tombs no coffins at all were used. The graves were uniformly shallow, generally from four to six feet deep; and the sarcophagi were placed either at the bottom, with or without a covering of bricks, or in a narrow recess bricked up, or in some cases in a vault of which the brick roof was only a few inches under the surface of the ground. A single tomb frequently served for several burials—in one case as many as seven mummies in plain wooden sarcophagi, and one on a bier, were found together.

Most of the mummies were decorated with the usual painted cartonnage (headpiece, pectoral, leg pieces and slippers). The background for the plaster was sometimes cloth, but generally papyrus, of which several layers were stuck together. More rarely there was but a single thickness of papyrus between the two coatings of plaster, and usually in these cases the cartonnage was confined to the headpiece and pectoral, while a scarab and disks of gilded plaster were placed on the head. The ornamentation was, as a whole, very crude, only one mummy being somewhat elaborately gilded, and having a handsomely painted pectoral. The writing on the papyri belonged to the third or, in some cases, the second century B.C.; but in every case the cartonnage had been completely ruined by damp, assisted perhaps by imperfect methods of mummmification, and either had already crumbled to powder, or did so at the touch. A recess at the bottom of one tomb contained a painted cinerary urn (Pl. XIa, fig. 17, Gizeh Journ. 33,394), and a lamp (Pl. Xb, fig. 7, Gizeh Journ. 33,393), but these earlier Ptolemaic tombs were singularly destitute of small antiquities. No beads, amulets, or alabaster vases were found, nor indeed any objects, except a few earthenware pots, either broken or complete, in the filling. These were of the same
character as those found in the later Ptolemaic tombs (class 2), but in much less variety, and chiefly of the shapes figured on Pl. XI, figs. 2, 6–10.

The tombs of the second class, or intermediate period between the earlier Ptolemaic and the characteristically Roman, were to the south-east of the earlier Ptolemaic burials, and probably tended to become later as they approached the town. As is natural, there were several points of connexion with the earlier tombs. Pottery coffins and gilded plaster scarabs were found, and occasional lamps of the same form as those on Pl. X, figs. 1, 7; and the limited number of forms of pots from the earlier Ptolemaic tombs occur also among the much more numerous and varied forms from the later. On the other hand, there are several points of contrast. In the earlier class, the tendency is for attention to be mainly devoted to the preparation of the body of the deceased, which was mummmified and adorned with cartonnage, while the tomb itself was of the simplest description, and no objects were placed with the body. In the later tombs the tendency was quite the reverse. The bodies were but rarely mummmified, and in no case were adorned with cartonnage, but the tombs were, as a whole, much more elaborate, and there was not the same dearth of objects buried with the dead. Wooden sarcophagi, which were common, were no longer in the shape of a mummy with rude headpieces, but box-shaped with arched lids, and not infrequently painted with a rude design, generally festoons of flowers. Limestone sarcophagi were also found, though more rarely. Over the bodies, whether placed in coffins or not, was built a solid arch or flat pavement of bricks, of which large quantities were used in order to fill up the tomb. When, as sometimes was the case, the graves were both broad and long, e.g. 4 × 2½ metres, quite a mausoleum was erected, even though the depth of the tombs did not exceed 2½ to 3 metres. The largest tombs were often divided by a brick wall in the middle into two compartments, with a communicating door bricked up. Usually a flight of steps led down to this door, and sometimes there was a burial at the bottom of the steps, as well as behind the door. Another feature of many later Ptolemaic burials was the occurrence of a stake or branch, sometimes of a bunch of reeds tied together, which had, no doubt, formed part of the bier, placed vertically at the head or foot just under the surface. Neither at Harit nor at Ümm el Baragāt were these evidences of a tomb found in the early Ptolemaic burials, while by the Roman period they had at both places become practically universal. Possibly in some cases they had originally projected from the ground, like the palm branches which are placed on modern Moslem graves, but in most cases, at any rate, the top of the stake must always have been under the surface. The object of them clearly was to indicate to any one digging a fresh pit the existence of those previously dug.
While the majority of the tombs, as is the case with most cemeteries of the Graeco-Roman period, contained no antiquities beyond common earthenware pots, some objects of greater interest were found. One tomb, which had a plain wooden sarcophagus under a solid brick vault, yielded seven small flasks of thin black ware, with narrow red and white concentric stripes, one of similar shape, but red, and a couple of small alabaster vases (no. 1 in our inventory, see p. 59 and Pl. Xb, figs. 6, 11, 12, 18, 24). In another large tomb, which contained two limestone sarcophagi, a small blue glaze vase with lid, and a bronze tray (this now at Gizeh) were found above the foot of one, and a calcite tray inside it at the head; above the other sarcophagus were some broken calcite vases (no. 7). This tomb was much affected by damp and salt. In a third tomb, in which was no coffin, but the body was buried under bricks, there was an alabaster pot at the head, and at the feet a round two-eared pot covered by a plate, with two lamps inside, and a small black flask and bronze tray (no. 5). Similar alabaster and calcite vases were found in other tombs. Blue glaze was rare, but see Pl. Xb, fig. 3 (now at Gizeh). Lamps were, as has been said, sometimes of the shapes figured on Pl. Xb, figs. 1 and 7, but the normal form was that shown in Pl. Xb, figs. 10, 13, 15. Sometimes the small projecting handle was pierced, but frequently it was not, and in other cases the handle was omitted. Ornamentation was rarely employed; one lamp had three Cupids on it, but it was noticeable that no 'frog' lamps were found in these tombs. This kind, which is so common in Roman times, does not seem to have been introduced before the Christian era. The colour of the lamps was either black (e.g. Pl. Xb, fig. 10) or reddish-brown (e.g. Pl. Xb, figs. 13, 15), the latter being the colour of nearly all the ordinary pottery. Light yellow earthenware was rare throughout the Ptolemaic cemetery.

The commonest forms of pots were those figured on Plate XIa, figs. 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, made generally in red earthenware, more rarely in finer and more polished black ware, and occasionally stamped with a triple leaf-shaped mark. They were sometimes at the bottom of the tombs, sometimes in the filling, while fragments of pots were scattered about on the surface of the desert in which the Ptolemaic tombs were situated. But that the tombs were not any later than the pottery is shown by the identity in shape of pots placed inside a sarcophagus beside the deceased with those found in the filling. Numerous fragments of large amphorae occurred, in several cases inscribed. Three of these (nos. 39, 43, 110) were stamped on the handles, and had been imported probably from Rhodes, but the rest were no doubt of Egyptian workmanship. The writing (late Ptolemaic or very early Roman) on these consisted generally of (1) a year, doubtless that of the vintage; (2) a numeral, either α, β, or γ, perhaps
expressing the quality; (3) the measure of capacity, nearly always five shoes, abbreviated $\frac{1}{2}$. Ptolemaic amphorae can, as a rule, be clearly distinguished from Roman by their superior polish and by the shape of the handles, which in the earlier period are generally large and raised (cf. Pl. XI*), figs. 4, 13), while in Roman times they are small and round (Pl. XIII*). But amphorae with round handles, identical in shape with the Roman amphorae, were already in use in later Ptolemaic times. At Harit indeed we had only one such instance, in a tomb which from its position in the cemetery and the presence of a pottery coffin we felt sure was Ptolemaic. But our excavations at Úmm el Baragât, where numerous round-handed amphorae were found in the Ptolemaic cemetery, have left us no doubts on the subject. Ribbing is of little use as a criterion for date, for though it was more extensively used in Roman times, Ptolemaic amphorae are often ribbed in the upper part. Beads (generally carnelian or glazed pottery) and amulets (usually blue glazed figures, Bes or rosettes) were not infrequent; and a few small coins (chiefly Ptolemaic, but two of Claudius and one of Nero) were found, one of them adhering to a mummy, the others in the filling of tombs. They show that the late Ptolemaic style of burial continued with little change well into the first century A.D.

In some parts of the cemetery were remains of buildings, the connexion of which, if any, with the tombs is not clear. For the most part the ruins were very shallow and had been already dug out. In one a tomb of the usual late Ptolemaic style had been dug, and from another part of the same building was obtained a curious wooden shield cased in leather (Pl. IX*, now at Gizeh). But in the other cases no tombs were found actually in the houses, which all seemed to belong to the late Ptolemaic period. One of them yielded a number of late second century B.C. papyrus scraps, and several pots and lamps resembling those found in the intermediate class of tombs and in the houses round the temple (190, p. 53).

The tombs of the third or Roman class were partly to the south-east of the late Ptolemaic, between them and the temple, partly on the south side of the Ptolemaic cemetery. Those near the temple were as a whole probably somewhat earlier. Since most of the changes in pottery from the Ptolemaic to the Roman style took place in the first century A.D., and at Harit it is on the evidence mainly of pottery that late Ptolemaic tombs can be distinguished from Roman, it is very difficult to ascribe with confidence any tombs in that cemetery to the first century A.D., except a few in which first century A.D. coins were found (see p. 60). Neither at Harit nor anywhere else have we found any large and well-defined group of tombs which could be separated by their contents from the late Ptolemaic on the one hand and the second to third century Roman
on the other; nor in any town site have we obtained a sufficient quantity of certainly dated first century pots to give us a clear idea of the pottery of the transitional period. Judging by the evidence of the coins of Claudius and Nero found in tombs in which the pottery resembled that of the preceding century, the majority of the first century A.D. tombs were among the second class; but there may have been some dating from the latter part of the first century among the Roman tombs near the temple. These were small (average $2 \times 1 \times 2$ m.) and had no sarcophagi; the bodies (which were in no cases mummified) being buried under a covering of bricks and stone, frequently with a lining of bricks round the top of the tomb. Pots were scarce, but some painted ones were found—similar to those from the houses at Harit (cf. Plates XIV$^a$ and XIV$^b$), and from the other Roman tombs; the amphorae were of the normal Roman type, one fragment being inscribed $\Sigma j\pi\nu \beta$. A couple of jar stoppers, one inscribed $\Delta I \Delta Y M H E$, were also clearly Roman. In the filling of one tomb were two bronze rings with rudely cut gems.

The other Roman tombs to the south of the Ptolemaic cemetery were mere shallow slits in the ground, just large enough to admit the body which was not even placed under bricks. Roman pots, both painted and plain (see Pl. XIV$^a$), were common; and some lamps of the ordinary light yellow variety and a few miscellaneous antiquities were found (p. 61). These tombs were sometimes dug in remains of houses which had stood there before that part was used as a cemetery. In neither division of the Roman tombs were there any traces of the portrait mummies which occur in several Roman cemeteries in the Fayûm.

We subjoin a list of objects from the cemetery of Harit.

From (a) the earlier Ptolemaic tombs come: no. 13, lamp (Pl. X$^b$, fig. 7) and 149, painted cinerary urn (Pl. XI$^a$, fig. 17), found together (Gizeh Journ. 33,393, 33,394); 20, small pot with handle (Pl. XI$^b$, fig. 14); 21, gourd; 130, black incurved bowl (Pl. XI$^a$, fig. 6); 131, red outcurved bowl (Pl. XI$^a$, fig. 8); 132, plate (Pl. XI$^a$, fig. 7); 133, large red bowl; 134, small ditto (Gizeh Journ. 33,316); 135, plate; 136, red incurved bowl; 137, smaller ditto; 138, three pieces of a red pot with black stripe (Gizeh Journ. 33,395); 139, small bowl (Gizeh Journ. 33,323); 140, tall pot with raised handle (Pl. XI$^a$, fig. 14, Gizeh Journ. 33,288); 143, handle of an amphora inscribed $\epsilon\beta$; 146, wooden bowl; 148, basket.

From (b) the intermediate tombs come: nos. 1 $a$–$f^1$ and 4, long, thin, black flasks ($1 a$–$d$, see Pl. X$^b$, figs. 11, 12, 18, 24: $1 b$, $c$, $e$, at Gizeh); $1 k$, similar shape, but red (Pl. X$^b$, fig. 6, at Gizeh); $1 k$, calcite flask (Pl. X$^b$, fig. 5, at Gizeh); $1 l$, alabaster flask; 2, thin red pot with handle (Pl. X$^b$, fig. 16); 3 $a$, small flask.

$^1$ Where a number is subdivided ($a$, $b$, $c$, &c.) all the objects were found in one tomb.
(at Gizeh); 3 b, outcurved bowl; 4 a, two-eared round pot (Pl. XI* fig. 3); 4 b, incurved bowl (Pl. XI* fig. 4); 4 c, lamp; 5 a, thin black flask; 5 b and c, alabaster flasks; 5 d, small incurved bowl; 5 e, plate; 5 f, large incurved bowl (Pl. XI*, fig. 12); 5 g (at Gizeh) and 5 h, lamps; 5 i, two-eared round pot (Gizeh Journ. 33,329); 6 a, top of an amphora; 6 b, plate; 6 c, coarse plate (Gizeh Journ. 33,329); 6 d, small incurved bowl (Gizeh Journ. 33,317); 6 e, two-eared round pot; 7 a, broken alabaster pots; 7 b, lid of blue glaze; 7 c, calcite tray (Pl. X*, fig. 17); 7 d, bronze tray (at Gizeh); 8 a, 8 b, 8 c, alabaster flasks (a and b, Pl. X*, figs. 21, 22, both at Gizeh); 10 a, alabaster flask (Pl. X*, fig. 14, at Gizeh); 10 b, small wooden box with bronze inside it; 10 c, alabaster flask; 10 d, very minute blue beads, Bes amulet and cowries; 11, alabaster flask; 12, alabaster flask (Pl. X*, fig. 9); 16, alabaster flask (Pl. X*, fig. 20); 17 a, thin blue glaze pot with handle (Pl. X*, fig. 3, at Gizeh); 17 b, ditto; 18, small black jug (Pl. X*, fig. 4, at Gizeh); 19, long thin pot (Pl. X*, fig. 2); 22–29 and 34, small red lamps with handles (24 = Pl. X*, fig. 13, now at Gizeh; 26 = Pl. X*, fig. 15); 30–33, small black lamps (31, Pl. X*, fig. 10, now at Gizeh); 35–37, lamps similar to 13 (35 = Pl. X*, fig. 1; 37 at Gizeh); 38, wooden awl with gimlet; 39, amphora handle with a rectangular stamp containing a magistrate’s name and month (cf. 43 and 110), ΕΠΙ ΜΥΣΙΝΟΣΔΙΑΛΙΟΥ; 40, limestone female figure; 41, 42, small red pots; 43, amphora handle stamped ΕΠΙ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΑ; 44, lamp with three Cupids on it; 45, 48, 52, 53, 73, fragments of painted pots; 46–47, blue glaze fragments; 49, rude wooden Osiris figure; 50, little plate; 51, terra-cotta head; 54, feet of a figure in blue glaze; 55, small pot; 56, clay doll; 58, die; 69, blue glaze and carnelian beads, small bone figure, three bronze bracelets and blue Bes amulet; 70, terra-cotta head of a goose, painted; 71, blue Bes amulets and a few carnelian and blue glaze beads; 72, blue glaze ring; 74, 77, wooden boxes; 75, two bronze rings; 76, coin of Claudius; 78, coin of Claudius; 79, coin of Nero; 80–82, Ptolemaic coins; 83, carnelian beads; 84, Bes amulet; 85, bronze ring; 86, glass centres of rings; 87, green glaze rosette; 88, gold ring with glass beads set in it, carnelian and other beads; 89, 90, 92, various beads; 95, very minute beads (at Gizeh); 104, plaster scarabs and disks (some from the early Ptolemaic tombs); 108, small black pot; 110 a, part of an amphora with handles stamped (cf. 39) ΕΠΙ ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑ and ΜΙΚΥΘΟΥΔΙΑΛΙΟΣ (Pl. XI*, fig. 4, Gizeh Journ. 33,287); 112, wreath; 113, fragments of painted pot (Gizeh Journ. 33,27); 114, fragments of amphora inscribed Λξ; 115, ditto inscribed Λξ; 116, ditto inscribed Λξ (found with 92); 119, ditto inscribed Λξ; 120, fragment of red plate stamped ΑΝ on the bottom (at Gizeh); 121, fragment of amphora inscribed Βξ; 123, ditto inscribed Λξ.
124, ditto inscribed Ἰ[α]τ... Ἐ[α]ρ. 127, black incurved bowl with leaf stamp (Pl. Xb, fig. 8); 128, black outcurved bowl with leaf stamp (Pl. Xb, fig. 19, Gizeh Journ. 33,113); 129, similar to 127 (Pl. Xb, fig. 23, Gizeh Journ. 33,289); 150, large two-handled pot (Pl. XIa, fig. 11); 151, pot with dark red stripe on light red (Pl. XIa, fig. 16); 152-160, incurved bowls (153=Gizeh Journ. 33,318; 157=Gizeh Journ. 33,392; 158=Gizeh Journ. 33,319; 160=Gizeh Journ. 33,322); 161, large bowl (Pl. XIb, fig. 17); 162-9, plates (165=Gizeh Journ. 33,308, 166=Gizeh Journ. 33,306; 168, Pl. XIa, fig. 2, = Gizeh Journ. 33,395; 169=Gizeh Journ. 33,307); 170-4, outcurved bowls (172=Gizeh Journ. 33,309; 173. Pl. XIa, fig. 13; 174. Pl. XIa, fig. 9, = Gizeh Journ. 33,310); 175, 176, round two-cared pots; 177, 178, small incurved bowls (177=Gizeh Journ. 33,320); 179, incurved bowl (Gizeh Journ. 33,321); 180, bowl (Pl. XIb, fig. 7, Gizeh Journ. 33,324); 181, small jug (Pl. XIb, fig. 5, Gizeh Journ. 33,325); 182, jug (Gizeh Journ. 33,312); 183, similar jug (Pl. XIb, fig. 8); 184, small bowl (Pl. XIa, fig. 15, Gizeh Journ. 33,314); 185, jug (Pl. XIb, fig. 6); 187, bowl (Pl. XIb, fig. 2); 189, light red jug with dark red stripes (Pl. XIa, fig. 12, Gizeh Journ. 33,293); 191, small black jug (Pl. XIb, fig. 10, Gizeh Journ. 33,291).

(c) From the Roman tombs come: 9, small blue glaze pot (at Gizeh), found with a fragment of a magical papyrus (second to third century A.D.); 15 a, plate; 15 b, painted pot; 56 a, b, c, d, four small flasks (56 a, at Gizeh; 56 b, Gizeh Journ. 33,339); 57, small red lamp; 58, 59, light yellow lamps; 60, fragment of amphora inscribed χε; 61, lamp with A stamped on the bottom; 62, box with lid; 63, blue glaze lid; 64, 65, two spindles; 66, plaster mask; 89, iron ring; 96, two bronze rings with rudely cut gems; 98, earring with fish's head; 99, leaden dish; 101, earring; 105, terra-cotta figure of a man riding a horse; 106, terra-cotta female figure; 109, small calcite pot; 126, clay jar-stopper inscribed ΔΙΑΣΗΜΟΣ; 127, fragment of pottery inscribed Συσωβ (second or third century A.D.); 192-210, various pots, see Pl. XIVa; 309, three walking-sticks, one having a bronze ring round the top.

The cemetery of Kašr el Banat was in a plain to the south and south-west of the town, from which it was separated by a sandy depression. We dug there for nearly a fortnight after finishing our work in the town; but after opening four or five hundred tombs and finding all objects of wood and cloth utterly ruined by damp, it was obviously vain to expect either papyrus mummies or portraits, and we moved our camp to Harit in the hope that the tombs there would be drier. As a matter of fact there was not much improvement in that respect, but the Harit cemetery was much richer in miscellaneous antiquities, especially pottery. From the information gained
there we were subsequently able to fix the dates of the similar but much poorer tombs at Kaşr el Banât, though at the time we were unable to decide whether they were Ptolemaic or Roman.

The tombs were all shallow, none being more than 2½ metres deep, and the general direction was north-west to south-east, with the head at the north-west end. They were divided into five classes: (1) narrow slits 2–5 feet deep, corresponding to the poorest Roman graves at Harit (p. 59), with which they were probably contemporary. (2) Larger tombs, in which the body was under a covering of bricks, sometimes very elaborate: these correspond to the late Ptolemaic tombs at Harit, and to the better class of Roman ones near the temple. (3) Burials in pottery coffins (see Plate XII, figs. 8, 10, 12), either under a thick covering of bricks or in recesses at the side. These too must have been Ptolemaic, and for the most part rather early, but no cartonnage was found. (4) Burials in vaulted tombs, 1–4 feet under the surface (cf. those at Harit, p. 56). These were no doubt of the same date as class (3). In one of them was a painted wooden coffin, having an arched roof, together with a lamp and a small round pot; another contained a mummy with cloth cartonnage; and in a third we found a comb (Pl. XV, fig. 8) and a few beads. (5) Burials in limestone sarcophagi (cf. p. 56), also Ptolemaic, probably late rather than early. A gilded plaster scarab and disks were found in one of these and in some of the pottery coffins (a selection at Gizeh). The only other objects from the tombs were a small nicely-painted terra-cotta head, a small thin black flask, some bronze rings and bracelets, and some fragments of alabaster and blue-glaze pots (all Ptolemaic). Mummification was rarely employed. The ruins of a house in the cemetery, filled with débris, had a number of more or less broken up mummies. Inside two of these were some strips of papyrus, on which a few letters (first or second century A.D.) can be read.

VII. WADFA (PHILOTERIS) AND OTHER SITES.

The traveller from Harit by a direct line to Kaşr Kurun, a well-preserved temple near the west end of the Birket el Kurun (see below), passes on his left hand, five miles from Harit, the ruins of an ancient village, called Wadfa by the natives (magnetic bearing from Kaşr Kurun 127°). The remains of buildings form an oval about 200 metres in length and half that distance in width, so that the place was much smaller than Kaşr el Banât. The ruins are very shallow, not more than a foot or two in depth, except in a few places
where part of a house has been banked up by sand into a small mound. Since the site was obviously very poor and not worth digging extensively, we did not move our encampment there, a proceeding which, owing to the distance from water, would have entailed some difficulty. But as we wished to identify it, if possible, we devoted a few days’ work to searching for papyri. On the first occasion when we dug there, coming over from Kašr el Banát, a strong gale made papyrus finding practically impossible; but on renewing our efforts two months later we secured enough documents (late Ptolemaic or Roman) mentioning the village of Philoteris to make certain that that was the ancient name of the place. Ten ostraca were also found, some beads, a painted pot (Roman), a few coins, bronze rings, and some surgical instruments, but nothing of particular importance.

At Kašr Kurún is a well-preserved stone temple (Pl. X*), probably built in the Ptolemaic period, like that of Kom Ushim, which closely resembles it (p. 30). In former days when the sumptuous Ptolemaic temples of Upper Egypt were buried in sand, Kašr Kurún, in spite of its remote position, was an object of interest to travellers. Now, as is natural, it is rarely visited, but since it has been often described, we need not concern ourselves with it here. Round the temple are traces of a Graeco-Roman town, even shallower than those at Wadfa, and in most parts only a few inches in depth. Parts of two other small stone buildings are still standing. These have been considered to be subordinate temples, but that explanation seems to us doubtful. As we have stated (p. 11), Kašr Kurún probably marks the site of Dionysias, and we were very anxious to verify this hypothesis by papyri found on the spot. In this however we were not destined to be successful. The only place where there was any asfāh to be found was in a rubbish mound against the south wall of the temple, and here we turned up only some fragments of blank papyrus and a piece of pot inscribed περ (probably early Byzantine).

'To the west of Nezleh,' says Murray’s Guide Book (fifth edition, p. 304), ‘are the sites of two ancient towns called Haráb-t-el Yahood (“the Ruins of the Jews”), and El Hammâm (“the Baths”). Neither of them presents any but crude brick remains, and the former has evidently been inhabited by Moslems, whose mud-houses still remain.’ The existence of a site to the west of Nezleh, called Kharabt el Yehudi, is also attested (in the form ‘Rahhab el Yeoud’) by Linant’s map of the Fayūm (Brown, ibid., Pl. VII). The name has always attracted us; but diligent inquiries after the site, both among inhabitants of the north-west and south-west of the Fayûm, and among those natives who are best acquainted with the antiquities of the district, have not
revealed any one who had ever heard of Kharabt el Yehudi; and from our personal knowledge we can state that south of Harit there are no remains of any town or village on the edge of the desert until the ruins called Kharabt Hamuli are reached, somewhat south-west of Nezleh. Further south, between Kharabt Hamuli and Medinet Madii, there are, according to the natives, no more sites, but this we cannot verify from personal observation. Kharabt Hamuli represents what was once a fair-sized Graeco-Roman village, but like several other places in the Fayum, it has been almost entirely destroyed by sebakhen, and to expect papyri there would be vain. With regard to Kharabt el Yehudi there are therefore three alternatives: either it still exists, in which case it must lie between Kharabt Hamuli and Medinet Madii, against which theory is to be set the ignorance of the natives. Secondly, it may have existed and have now disappeared under the cultivation. Or thirdly, and we think most probably, Kharabt el Yehudi never had any existence, but is a mistaken form of Kharabt Hamuli, an error that to any one acquainted with the difficulty of ascertaining the correct names of less-known sites is quite easy to explain. The actual situation of Kharabt Hamuli agrees with the supposed site of Kharabt el Yehudi as indicated both by the guide-book and by Linant's map, though the latter unfortunately is so inaccurate that it is difficult to draw any certain inferences from it. Linant places his 'Rarhab el Yeoud' on the edge of the desert to the south-west of Nezleh, but on the other hand he puts it north of the westward bend in the hills which separate the Fayum from the Wadi Rayân, and indicates an old canal running west from it in the direction of Kasr Kurân. If we were to consider the position of Linant's Kharabt el Yehudi not in relation to Nezleh but to the desert hills and the Birket el Kurân, Harit would be a better site for it than Kharabt Hamuli, which is some way south of the corner where the hills recede to the west.

A similar difficulty occurs in connexion with Medinet Hâti, which is placed by Linant to the west of Medinet Madî, and is mentioned along with Medinet Madî and Kharabt en Nishan in Murray's Guide-book (loc. cit.). Neither Medinet Hâti nor Kharabt en Nishan seems to be known in the Gharak district, but probably one of them is identical with Medinet Nehâs, the high-sounding name of an insignificant site at the extreme south-west corner of the Gharak basin.

VIII. The Coins.

The coins brought to England from the excavations at Karanis and Bacchias in 1895-96 consisted of three hoards, almost entirely composed of
debased silver tetradrachms of the Alexandrian mint and of Roman period. As they thus belong to the same class, they may conveniently be treated together; and, since I hope to give a full account of the types represented in these hoards in an early number of the Numismatic Chronicle, it will be unnecessary here to do more than briefly summarize their general characteristics, and point out what evidence they furnish as to the history of Egypt during the period immediately preceding their deposit.


In a small pot found at Karanis were 91 Roman tetradrachms, belonging to the issues of the following emperors: Claudius, 3; Nero, 49; Galba, 2; Vespasian, 4; Trajan, 4; Hadrian, 18; Antoninus Pius, 7; Marcus Aurelius, 2; Lucius Verus, 2. The latest in date was of the tenth year of Marcus Aurelius, 169–170 A.D., which may be taken as approximately furnishing the time of burial of the hoard.


Three large amphorae, which were filled with coins, numbering in all 4421, were dug out of the cellar of a house at Bacchias. Of the coins two were Ptolemaic, both too much worn for certain identification, one was a large bronze of Antoninus Pius, and the remainder were tetradrachms, classified thus: Claudius, 361; Nero, 2757; Galba, 191; Otho, 58; Vitellius, 19; Vespasian, 235; Titus, 31; Domitian, 1; Nerva, 22; Trajan, 89; Hadrian, 561; Sabina, 6; Aelius Caesar, 5; Antoninus Pius, 73; Marcus Aurelius, 8; Lucius Verus, 1. Of these the latest was of the fifth year of Marcus Aurelius, 164–165 A.D.

A smaller hoard from the same town consisted of 62 tetradrachms, the latest being of the twelfth year of Hadrian, 127–128 A.D., distributed as follows: Claudius, 5; Nero, 44; Galba, 2; Otho, 1; Vespasian, 6; Trajan, 1; Hadrian, 3.

These three finds together furnish an interesting clue to the activity of the Alexandrian mint during the first two centuries of the Roman empire in Egypt, and so assist to show the comparative prosperity of the country throughout the same period; for it may fairly be presumed that the number of coins annually put into circulation would be regulated by the demand. The imperial tetradrachms are of special importance in this connexion, for they, from the time of Tiberius to that of Diocletian, supplied the Egyptian standard both for internal and external exchange, and—with the exception of a few coins struck under Claudius—were the only silver, or nominally silver, issue of the Roman government for Egypt. The bronze coinage for lower values was always irregular, and apparently based on the local value of the tetradrachm; and after the reign of
Commodus it was entirely dropped, except for occasional issues to commemorate special events, which partake almost as much of the nature of medals as of coins.

The great hoard of Bacchia may be taken to give reliable data concerning the numbers of coins belonging to the mintage of each year which were in circulation at the time of its deposit. Its size allows the presumption that the numbers actually contained in it are a fair average of the total in circulation, and the comparative state of the coins shows that they were all collected at approximately the same time, the wear of the various specimens being almost invariably proportionate to their age. In view of these facts, it is worth while to classify the contents of this hoard according to the years of issue. The result gives 1—

A.D. 41–2 [Claudius], 57; 42–3, 91; 43–4, 59; 44–5, 21; 45–6, 183; 56–7 [Nero], 187; 57–8, 59; 58–9, 185; 59–60, 33; 62–3, 6; 63–4, 319; 64–5, 565; 65–6, 612; 66–7, 504; 67–8, 262+[Galba], 118 (Total, 880); 68–9, 73+[Otho] 58+[Vitellius] 19+ [Vespasian] 39 (Total, 189); 69–70, 176; 70–71, 17; 75–6, 3; 79–80 [Titus], 9; 80–81, 22; 86–7 [Domitian], 1; 96–7 [Nerva], 22; 101–2 [Trajan], 13; 102–3, 7; 103–4, 1; 104–5, 1; 105–6, 8; 107–8, 6; 110–11, 1; 111–12, 16; 112–13, 2; 114–15, 6; 115–16, 12; 116–17, 21; 117–18 [Hadrian], 13; 118–19, 19; 119–20, 21; 120–1, 17; 121–2, 23; 123–4, 13; 124–5, 20; 125–6, 56; 126–7, 24; 127–8, 37; 128–9, 44; 129–30, 31; 130–1, 46; 131–2, 35; 132–3, 21; 133–4, 26; 134–5, 32; 135–6, 38; 136–7, 31; 137–8, 25; 138–9 [Antoninus Pius], 12; 139–40, 12; 140–1, 12; 141–2, 2; 142–3, 2; 143–4, 10; 144–5, 5; 145–6, 2; 146–7, 2; 147–8, 4; 148–9, 3; 150–1, 3; 151–2, 2; 152–3, 1; 154–5, 1; 157–8, 1; 158–9, 2; 159–60, 1; 160–1 [Aurelius and Verus], 1; 161–2, 3; 162–3, 1; 164–5, 1.

It will be observed that the coinage of Tiberius is entirely unrepresented in this hoard. From the comparative rarity with which specimens of his reign occur, it would seem that very few tetradrachms were then struck, and that the regular issue of any important quantity of these coins began in the second year of Claudius (41 A.D.). Considerable numbers were struck in this and the four following years, after which the demand appears to have been supplied, and no further issue took place for ten years. In the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years of Nero the mint was again busy; but no coins of the two next years are known, and a few only of the ninth year. The tenth year however saw a very large number of tetradrachms put into circulation, and still larger numbers were sent out in the three following years; so great indeed was the output of this

1 It should be remembered that Alexandrian coins are dated by the Egyptian year, beginning on August 29. In the following classification the year is given first, then the number of coins of the year, the names of the reigning emperors being bracketed.

2 Seventy-five coins of Nero cannot be classed under years, being too mis-struck that the date is not shown.
THE COINS

period, that in the hoard now under consideration, buried more than a century after the issue of the coins, in spite of the natural waste of specimens in the interval the issues of the tenth year of Nero represent 7.2 per cent. of the whole; those of the eleventh, 12.7 per cent.; those of the twelfth, 13.8 per cent.; and those of the thirteenth, 11.4 per cent. In the following year—the last of Nero and first of Galba—the numbers are still very large, 8.5 per cent. of the hoard; but they drop to half this amount in the next two years, and the issue ceases after the third year of Vespasian. A few coins are found of the eighth year of Vespasian and the second and third years of Titus; but there is only one specimen in the hoard of the coinage of Domitian, whose tetradrachms are extremely rare in spite of his sixteen years' reign. The accession of Nerva was marked by a fresh issue; but the regular annual coinage does not appear to have recommenced till the fifth year of Trajan, after which there are a few specimens of each year, the numbers increasing towards the end of his reign; and under Hadrian the issue once more assumed fair dimensions. But very shortly after the accession of Antoninus Pius, the output dwindled away; and the last twenty years before the burial of the hoard are represented in it by an average of about one coin per year.

It is difficult to summarize the exact meaning of the figures given without some basis upon which to judge the annual waste of these tetradrachms during the period under consideration. The evidence is not sufficient for precise calculations; but, from a comparison of the numbers found in the three hoards described above, it would seem that a loss of one-half per cent. yearly of the tetradrachms in circulation is not above the mark. Granting this, the following conclusions may be formed.

There was a demand for a largely increased issue of tetradrachms early in the reign of Claudius, which was satisfied by the coinage of the five years 41 to 46. Ten years later there was a fresh issue, slightly larger than the quantity required to meet the waste of the interval; and in 63 there commenced a coinage of such extent as must in five years have doubled the number of tetradrachms in circulation. After 70 the output diminished rapidly, and for fifteen years—81 to 96—the mint, so far as regards silver coinage, was practically idle. Even after the annual issue had recommenced, it was very small, averaging under Trajan only about one-fourth of the annual waste, and thus showing that the supply of coins in circulation considerably exceeded the demand. In the reign of Hadrian however the supply and demand appear to have been balanced, as the issue was about sufficient to meet the waste. The demand again dropped in the time of Antoninus Pius, and consequently hardly any fresh coins were struck during the rest of the period under consideration.
A point worthy of notice is that, the busier the mint was, the fewer different types seem to have been used. The great issue of the twelfth year of Nero consisted entirely of two types (nos. 163 and 168 in the British Museum Catalogue), of the former of which there were no less than 582 specimens in the great hoard of Bacchias—more than one-eighth of the whole—and a similar proportion in the smaller hoards, 12 out of 91 and 7 out of 62 respectively. In the years immediately following this, when the issue was falling off, about half-a-dozen types were in use; and, for the still smaller output of the early years of Nero, about ten. But in the later period, under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus, there are nearly as many types as coins in the hoards, except during the time of activity in the last ten years of Hadrian's reign, when the thirty or forty specimens of each year belong to three or four types only. It would appear, therefore, that the designing and execution of fresh types were practised by the officials of the Alexandrian mint to fill up their leisure time, when there was no great demand for fresh supplies of coinage.

In this connexion it may also be noted that the chief issues of bronze from the time of Augustus onwards were made in the reigns when the least amount of billon was struck. This agrees with the conclusion just reached with regard to the types of the billon tetradrachms, since, as has been observed already, the bronze coinage of Alexandria was comparatively unimportant for purposes of circulation, and was mainly of a commemorative character. Thus, just as in times of slackness the mint officials employed themselves in designing varied types for the billon series, so they found another occupation in striking bronze coins to celebrate events which happened to interest them. This fact explains the great rarity of bronze of Nero, which is especially noticeable in comparison with the enormous issues of billon in his reign; and with this may be contrasted the coinage of Domitian, whose billon is very uncommon, while his bronze types are more numerous than those of any of his predecessors. From the time of the latter emperor to that of Aurelius, as previously shown, the output of billon tetradrachms was as a rule unimportant; but this is just the period during which bronze was most extensively struck and in the greatest variety of types at the Alexandrian mint, and which covers the whole issue of the most purely medallic of all the Alexandrian bronze—the series of 'Nome coins.'

In the course of the excavations of 1898-99 no hoards were found as in the earlier year's work; but all the coins which were turned up were carefully preserved, and are of interest as giving some clue to the period during which the various sites were inhabited, as well as including a few new types. It may therefore be worth while to give a brief catalogue of the specimens.²

¹ To save space I have given the number of the type in the British Museum Catalogue (B.), or, failing
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[3] EUHEMORIA.

PTOLEMAIC COPPER.

Epiphanes . . B. 47; B. 74.
Euergetes II . B. 69.
Soter II . . B. 34 (eleven specimens).
Cleopatra VII B. 4 (three specimens); B. 6.

ALEXANDRIAN IMPERIAL.

Livia . . . . (2B). M. 51; M. 56? (two specimens).
Claudius . . (3B). B. 80; B. 84.
Nero . . . . . (Bi). B. 112; B. 124; B. 136; B. 163. (2B). B. 185.
Galba . . . . (Bi). B. 197; D. 268.
(3B). B. 276.
Nerva . . . . (Bi). B. 351.
Hadrian . . . (Bi). B. 644; B. 648; B. 657. (1B). B. 739; B. 876.
Antoninus . . (Bi). B. 977; B. 983. (1B). D. 1929; B. 1144; B. 1152; B. 1180?
Faustina II . . (1B). B. 1337?
Aurelius . . . (2B). M. 2117?
Aurelian . . . (Bi). M. 3472; B. 2365; B. 2384.
Diocletian . . (Bi). B. 2511 (two specimens); obv. type, B. 2474; rev. B. 2216;
as B. 2531, but rev. in field L A.
Maximinus . . (Bi). B. 2551; B. 2572.

NAME-COIN.

Arsinoite nome B. 74.

ROMAN IMPERIAL.

Diocletian . . C. 114 (ex. ALE I. XX I).
Constantine I . . C. 66 (ex. ?); C. 760 (ex. SMALE ?); ditto (ex. CONS.); ?.
Urbs Roma . . C. 19 (ex. SMKΔ).

this, in Mionnet (M.) or Fenardent's Catalogue of the Demetrio Collection (D.). Where a ? is added, the
condition of the specimen, or, in the case of the Mionnet and Demetrio references, the insufficient description
in the catalogues, makes the identification doubtful: where the number is in angular brackets, there is
a minor difference from the type. (Bi) marks billon tetrachrons; (1B) (2B) (3B) bronze of three
different sizes.

1 The types of the Roman imperial coins are given from Cohen (C.), with the letters of the exergue and
field added in each case where decipherable.
**FAYÜM TOWNS.**

**Constantius II**  As C. 167, but rev. PROVIDENTIAECAESS (ex. SMNΔ): C. 167 (ex. SMANTH): C. 46 (ex. ALEB): ditto (ex. ALEΔ?): C. 47 (ex. ALE)

**Julian**  C. 151 (ex. CVZB).

*Indecipherable.* Alexandrian billon, four (late third century): first bronze, five (probably Hadrian or Antoninus): second bronze, one (first century): third bronze, two: Roman Imperial bronze, two (fourth century).

**[4] THEADELPHIA.**

**Ptolemaic Copper.**

Euergetes I  B. 17?: B. 125.

Philopator  B. 42 (two specimens).

Ephiphanes  B. 74.

Euergetes II  B. 72: B. 127.

Soter II  B. 34 (thirty-one specimens).

Cleopatra VII  B. 4.

**Alexandrian Imperial.**

Augustus  (2B). Obv., head right laureate; rev., capricorn right, behind ΛΑΗ, in exergue ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ.

Claudius  (2B). B. 82.

Nero  (B). B. 114.


Trajan  (1B). (B. 398): (B. 402): B. 512?: ?. (3B). Obv., AYT ΤΡΑΙΑΝΟϹ ΒΓΕΡΜΔΑΙΚ, head right laureate; rev., hawk right, wearing skhent, on bar, in field ΛΙΑ.

Hadrian  (1B). B. 714: B. 750?: (B. 753): B. 785?

Antoninus  (1B). (B. 1015): B. 1105?: B. 1159?: (2B). 1175?

Faustina II  (1B). B. 1338.

Verus  (1B). D. 2212?:

Gordianus III  (B). B. 1879.

Gallienus  (B). B. 2164.

Carus  (B). B. 2447.

**Roman Imperial.**

Licinius  C. 74 (ex. SMNΔ, f. ήΓ).

Constantine I  C. 21 (ex. SMNΔ).

Constantine II  C. 103 (ex. SM[...]): ?

*Indecipherable.* Alexandrian first bronze, one (second century): second bronze, one (first century): Roman Imperial, six (fourth century).
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Ptolemaic Copper.

Philometer or Euergetes II  ?
Soter II  B. 34 (two specimens).
Cleopatra VII  B. 4.

Alexandrian Imperial.

Claudius  (2B). B. 92?
Vespasian  (2B). B. 264. (3B). B. 275?
Hadrian  (1B). B. 794?: B. 798?: C. 800?: ?: ?.
Antoninus  (Bi). (B. 938): (1B). B. 1068?
Aurelius  (1B). Obv. MAVPHAIIO  ] Bust, right, bare: rev.,
eagle, right, looking back, wings open, wreath in beak; in field
L 1.

Sev. Alexander  (1B). Obv., KAIAIVPAIVPCEV AEISIONADPOCE. Bust, right,
laureate, wearing paludamentum and cuirass; rev., Nilus re-
clining left on rocks, crowned with lotus, himation over lower
limbs, in right hand reed, in left cornucopias, from which issues
a genius: in front palm, in exergue crocodile right, above, U.

Claudius II  (Bi). B. 2333.
Aurelian  (Bi). (B. 2371).
Probus  (Bi). B. 2413: B. 2427.

Roman Imperial.

Constans  C. 50 (ex. SMALA).

Indecipherable. Ptolemaic copper, one.

The only new coins in the foregoing lists which call for special notice
are the bronze of Augustus from Theadelphia, which is of a year hitherto
unrepresented in the dated series of his coinage: and the coin of Severus
Alexander from Philoteris, which adds an interesting type to the bronze series
of the tenth year of that reign.

In addition to the coins above enumerated, a few leaden pieces were
found—two at each of the three sites excavated in 1898–99. Such leaden
pieces have been turned up in considerable numbers in different parts of
Egypt, but have not hitherto received the attention they deserve. The
only systematic study which has been made of them is in a series of articles
by Rostovtsew (Rev. Numismatique 1898, 1899), who recognizes that they
form an entirely distinct class from the leaden tickets found in other parts
of the Greek and Roman spheres of influence. Their types, which are in
the majority of cases copied from those of the Alexandrian coinage, and the
fact that in several instances they are dated by a regnal year, distinctly suggest
that they were struck under some kind of official sanction.
The best known of these leaden pieces is the following:—Obv.: MEMPHIC. Isis advancing left, clothed in a long robe and wearing disk and horns, holding in right hand a serpent, and followed by bull Apis. Rev.: Nilus seated left on a rock, holding in right reed, in left cornucopiae; before him Euthenia holding a crown towards him. It has been usually acknowledged that this leaden piece was a local Memphite token; but other specimens of the same class, without however any inscription upon them, have been put aside as unworthy of notice. The fact that in hardly any instance has a record been preserved of the place where these specimens were found, has added to the neglect with which they have been treated.

The collection of leaden pieces in the Alexandria Museum contains several obvious copies of current coins; among others, of copper pieces of Euergetes II, of third century victoriat, and of fifth century Alexandrian folles. These were possibly struck for fraudulent purposes; but a number of others, which, while not exactly reproducing the regal or imperial coinage, still conformed roughly to the style of coins, may equally have been designed for circulation as money, but with a more legitimate issue.

The excavations at Oxyrhynchus first supplied a large group of these leaden pieces of known provenance. In all 135 were found there, for the most part unfortunately in bad preservation. With six exceptions however all that showed any clear traces of the type had on the obverse a figure of Nike flying to the left, carrying a palm-branch and holding out a wreath—a rough copy of a reverse-type of Vespasian—and in front the letters Ω, which clearly must be taken as the first two letters of the name of the town, and thus supply a ground for classing these with the leaden tokens of Memphis. The reverses also usually represent Athena, the local deity of Oxyrhynchus according to the Alexandrian theologians; sometimes a bust, wearing a Corinthian helmet, sometimes a figure of Athena Promachos, and sometimes a temple with the statue of Athena inside.

Among the pieces from the Fayûm is one which, like those of Memphis and Oxyrhynchus, bears a local name. The obverse type is a head: on the reverse is a much-defaced inscription, of which all that can be deciphered is

\[ \text{A P C} \]
\[ \text{E W} \]

It is tempting to read this \text{APC[IN]OE[ITION]}, supposing the inscription to follow the edge of the piece in the first and third lines and to end across the middle in the second. In any case, the legend must be connected with the Arsinoite nome, in which the piece was found. With this may be classed a leaden token in the Bibliothèque Nationale (no. 680 in the catalogue of M. Rostovtsew and M. Prou, \textit{Revue Numismatique}, 1899), which has on the obverse Tyche reclining left, on the reverse the legend \text{APCINOIT[ION]TOAEW}.C.

Of the other specimens from the Fayûm, two show on one side Sarapis seated left on a throne, on the other Nilus reclining left, both well-known coin-types; and a third has on each side a bust, one of which is that of Nilus with a cornucopiae behind, while the other is too defaced for identification. Another has an unusual figure, unfortunately very battered, which appears to be human down to the waist, and to end in a serpent—on its left hand is a cornucopiae, on its right perhaps a genius: this probably represents Nilus.

For the determination of the use to which these leaden pieces were put, two specimens already published are of primary importance. The first is a Memphite token, described by A. de Longperier (\textit{Rev. Numism.}, 1861, p. 407), which has on the obverse the bull Apis, on the reverse Nilus and Euthenia, with the legend \text{OBOAOI B}; the second, published by A. Engel (\textit{Bull. Corr. Hell.}, 1884, p. 10), bears the legend \text{TPIOMO}. These legends, as the writers cited recognize, show that the pieces represented a definite monetary value; and they naturally concluded that there was a leaden token-coinage of low denominations. M. Rostovtsew, however, in his study (\textit{Rev. Numism.}, 1899, p. 57), argues that the clue to the proper interpretation is given by a piece formerly at Athens, but now lost, which is said to have had the legend on the obverse \text{CYN B OALON}. From this he concludes that these leaden pieces were receipts for the payment of taxes, for which an additional fee of a few obols was charged, and that this additional fee is the value given in the legends above noted. This explanation, however, does not agree with what is known of the practices of tax-collection in Egypt. It is true that a special fee was charged for the receipts given by the tax-collectors to the payers, which is frequently mentioned in tax-receipts under the name of \text{συμβολικά} (cf. p. 161); but the \text{συμβολον} was a written document (cf. p. 125), and it hardly appears probable that, after the tax-collector had written out his receipt on an ostracaon or a piece of papyrus, he should give a further receipt for his fee in the shape of a leaden token.

Taking into consideration the facts that these leaden pieces were clearly struck locally, as shown by the names upon them, that in some cases at any rate they had a given denomination, and that they follow in most
instances recognized coin-types, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they were used as token-money for low values. Their style, in most examples, suggests the second or third century A.D., in the later part of which period the issue by the imperial mint of any coins other than tetradrachms had entirely ceased. The need of some lower denominations, to represent the obols and chalci in which payments were regularly expressed, must have been urgent; and yet no coins are found later than Antonine bronze which can have been used for this purpose, unless the leaden pieces are accepted as such. The only alternative is to suppose that any payment of less amount than a tetradrachm must have been made in kind: which does not appear to be supported by third century papyri. It is to be trusted that future work on Roman sites may throw further light on this problem.

Another question which can only be suggested here, in the hope that further exact records of the provenance of pieces found in Egypt may solve the problem, is, how far the nome-coins of Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus were intended for local emission in the nomes whose names they bear. At Oxyrhynchus, three nome-coins were found, two of the Oxyrhynchite nome and one of the neighbouring Arsinoite nome. In the collections now under consideration there is one only—of the Arsinoite nome, from Euhemeria. So far as this scanty evidence goes, it would seem to favour the idea that the nome-coins were actually issued in the places for which they were struck.

PART III. TEXTS.

I. CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS.

I. Chariton, Chaereas and Callirrhoë, iv. 2, 3.

Kom Ushim. 27.2 x 16.5 cm. Frontispiece.

A fragment from a roll containing Chariton’s romance, Chaereas and Callirrhoë. Parts of three consecutive columns are preserved, covering the greater part of the second and the beginning of the third chapter of the fourth book; but the first and third columns are badly broken, and the whole papyrus.
is much defaced and discoloured. For the identification of the fragment we are indebted to Professor O. Crusius.

The personal history of the romance-writers is perhaps involved in greater obscurity than is the case with any other class of ancient writers; and in no instance is the absence of external evidence more conspicuous than in that of the author of *Chaereas and Callirrhoë*. Absolutely nothing is known of him beyond what may be inferred from the work itself, which, as may be imagined, has led different critics to widely divergent conclusions. It has often been supposed that even the name Chariton is no more than a *nom de plume*. Latterly, however, E. Rohde (*Rhein. Mus.* xlviii. pp. 139 sqq.), on the strength of certain inscriptions (C. I. G. 2782, 2783, 2846) which show that the names Chariton and Athenagoras were in use at Aphrodisias in Caria, has argued that our author's description of himself in the opening words of his book as 'Chariton of Aphrodisias, secretary of Athenagoras the advocate (πτρόπος),' is to be taken literally.

But a more important question is the epoch at which he flourished; for the story possesses peculiar features which render its date a matter of much interest for the history of the development of the Greek romance. *Chaereas and Callirrhoe* is distinguished by a simplicity of both structure and style from most compositions of its class. Since this contrast appears to be the result of conscious choice on the part of the author, who wished to make a new departure, the general tendency of modern critics has been to place Chariton late in the evolution of this form of literature. Rohde, for instance (*Griechische Roman*, pp. 485–498), treats him last in the series of 'sophist-romancers'; and, without assigning a specific date, by implication makes him at least not earlier than the end of the third century, since he is supposed to have imitated Heliodorus, who, Rohde thinks, may have been a contemporary of Aurelian. Both Chariton and Heliodorus have often been brought down much later than this. Schmid, however (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl. s. v. Chariton*), takes a different view. With regard to the supposed imitation by Chariton of other writers, he considers that there is no proof which was the imitator and which the model; and chiefly from the fact that *Chaereas and Callirrhoe* has a historical setting, which he regards as an early characteristic, and from an analysis of the style of the work, arrives at the conclusion that Chariton may have written as early as the second century, or at least not later than the beginning of the third.

The soundness of Schmid's criticism is now fully established by the discovery of this papyrus. It is written in a small upright uncial hand, rather similar in type to that of the Homeric scholia in *Ox. Pap. II, No. 221*, but more
regular and carefully formed. The scribe shows a tendency to vary the size of his letters in different parts of a column; and he once (II. 57 οἰκείων) lapses into a cursive ε. But the papyrus as a whole presents a decidedly neat and well-written appearance. No stops, breathings, or accents occur. There is the usual sprinkling of clerical errors, some of which are corrected by the original scribe, others by a second hand. It is very improbable that the Oxyrhynchus scholia are later than the second century; and we should assign this Chariton papyrus to about the same period. At the latest it may belong to the early decades of the third century. It was found in a tomb of the same kind as those in which were the lyric fragment (ii) and the Latin accounts (cv), both of which were most probably written about the middle or latter part of the second century. It was, moreover, actually accompanied by fragments of two or three cursive documents, which approximately belong to the time of Commodus, and one of which mentions the 19th year; this can at latest be the 19th of Caracalla. If Chariton had become sufficiently well known at the end of the second century to find admirers in an obscure village in the Fayûm, we may conclude—with some confidence that his book was not composed after A.D. 150, and that more probably it goes back to the beginning of the second century, or may even fall within the first.

The evidence for the text of Chaereas and Callirrhoe has hitherto been a single manuscript at Florence, of the thirteenth century. The discovery of this papyrus, which is nearer by a thousand years to the author, and was probably written within a century from the date of the publication of his work, provides a valuable criterion for testing the worth of our sole authority. As might be expected, the papyrus shows a number of variations, which are mostly improvements, from the text of the Florentinus. But the divergences are after all not very considerable; and the general effect of the comparison is rather to increase our respect for the much depreciated Florentine manuscript.

Col. I.

[ἐτο μόνος πλεονεκτῶν ἐν τοῖς
ποιοὶς ἔδωκα α'[α περισσατῆς τοῦ
φιλον καὶ οὗτοι μεν ἦσαν ἔν τοί
[οὐκ εὐμφοροις οὐκ είμηται
5 [θανοὺς τὴν ελευθεριαν ὁ δὲ μι[
[θριάτης ο σεταράτης επανή]
[θεν εἰς καριαν ὁ ἂν τοιοῦτος ὁποῖος
[εἰς μιλήτων έξηλθέν αὖλις οἰχρός
[τε καὶ λαπτός ὁμα δή τραμμα εξαν
[🔗 [ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ] θερμὸν τε καὶ δριμῷ
[τηκόμενος] δὲ ύπο τοῦ καλλιρο
[ネタ ερωτος π'αντως αὐν ετελευτη
[Σεν εί μη τοια'γεδε τινος ετυχεν
[παραμύθιας] των εργατων τι

15 [νες των αμα] χαίρειν δεδεμε
[νους εξ και δεκα ησαν τουν αριθμον
[ἐν οικισκῳ σκοτενωι καθεργημε
[Νοι νυκτωρ διακοφαις τα
[δεσμα τον επιστατην απεσφαξαιν

20 [ειτα δρασμον] επεχειρουν αὖλ ου
[διεφογων οι γαρ κινεις φιλασσοι
[τες εμμυσαν αυτως φλαρα'θεν
[τες ονυ εκεινης της νυκτος
[εδεσαν ε]πιμελ[εστ]κρον

25 [ἐν ξυλω παρτης [,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,] [,]
[.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.]
[.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.,.
[��]

[λαζοῦτες ἐμὸς φοβοῦν παραδείγμα 
[τοῖς] ομοίως χαίρεσα μὲν ἐν [ὑπ' αὐτών] 
[ἀπαγορεύομεν εὐθὺς πολυχαρμος 
[δὲ] τοῦ ὅστατῳ βαστάσας δέι αὐτῷ ξα

15 [φησὶν] ὁ καλλιροφύς ταῦτα πασχό 
[μὲν] σὺ πάντων ἤμειν τῶν κα 
[καὶ αὐτία τοῦτον δὴ τοῦ λογον] 
[ο οἰκόφορος] ἀκουσάς εὐθὺς 
[ἐιναι τίμα γυναικα την συνήθινα

20 [τοῖς] τετελημεμενοις οἴοις οὐν 
[καὶ εἰς] ἐντέρια κολασθῆ ἤ 
[ή] γεγένηται της ἐπιβολῆς τα 
[χεῖς τον πολυχαρμήν ἀπορρήξας 
[ης κοινῆς ἀληθείας προς μιθρι

25 [δαπὴν ἁγαγέν] ὁ δὲ ἐν [παραδείσωι] 
[κατεκέντε μοῦ] αὔξα 
[καὶ καλλιροθῆν] ἀναπλατῶν εἰς το 
[τι αὐτῶν] ὁ σώ οἴοι 
[οὸς ὅ] ὕπι [ης] ἑπάνω 

30 [ης καὶ τοῦ] οἰκῆ[την αὐτὸς ἔβε] 
[οῖο τί γαρ] μοὶ φῆσιν παρενοχλεῖς 
[ἀναγκαίων] εἰπὼν ὁ δεσπότα 
[την γαρ η] γῆν [ἀνενήκα τού 
[μεγαλον] τολῆθματος καὶ οὐ

35 [τοῦ καταρατάς εἰσιστάται γυνα] 
[κα μικραν] συνήπαραν τοι φων 
[ο[κούσας]] ὁ μιθριδάθης συνή 
[γαγε τας] ὀφρως καὶ δείκνυν τ 
[δω][ν] λεγε] φῆσιν την συνηθίναν

[ε]ἰη

40 [καὶ κοινωνον των ἰδικήμα 
[τῶν ο] δὲ] πολυχαρχος εξαργὼν τη 
[εἰδε] ἅν μηδε γαρ ὁ λος της 
[παραδόθων κεκοινωνηκαί 
[μαστίγες] ἀτουτο καὶ πυρ ἐ
45 τέφερε[σί] καὶ βασανιστριώ[ν]ν
ην π[αρά]σκευη καὶ τις ἕ[δη καὶ τοῦ
σώματος] απτομένος αὐτοῦ λεγε
φη[σί]ν του[νομα της γυναίκος ην
αίτια]ν ομολογηγήσας ειναι σοι των
50 κα[κών] καλλιροη[ν εἰπεν ὁ πολυχαρ
μὸς ἐπιληθὲ του[νομα μιθριδατην καὶ]
[ατυχ]ὴ τίμια έδοξεν ομονυμιαν
[τω]ν γυναίκων οὐκέτ οὐν προθυμῶς
[ηθ]ελεν εξελεγχεν δεδοκοις μη [κα
55 τα[στη ποτε εἰς αναγκην υβρισαι το
[η]διάστον ονομα των [ηκεουν]
[δε] φελων και των οικτων [ ]

Col. III.

3 or 4 lines lost.

5 θεν [αξουσιν αυτην ο δε αθλιος εν
αμη[χαναι γενομενος καταφεν
2 lines lost.

[ου]ντες ου παρουσιν καλλιρο
την

10 ην εγ[ω] συρακουσιας εμνημονεν
σα θυγατρος ερμοκρατους του στρα
τηγου ταυτα ακουςα μιθριδατης ερμ
θηματος ενεπλησθη και ιδρου
[τα ενδον και του και δακρυων αν
15 του μη θελοντος προπεξεν ωστε
και του πολυχαρμον διασιωμησαι
και παντ[ας] [απορειν τους παροντας
οψε δε και μολις ο μιθριδατης
συναγαγων [εαυτον τι δε σοι φησιν

...[

20 προς καλλιροη[ν εκεινην και δια
τι μελλα[ν α]ποθυμησειν εμη
μονε[σις]α αυτης οδε απεκρι
FAYUM TOWNS

νατο μακρός α μυθός α δεσποτα
[και προσ ουσιν ετι Χρησιμος μοι ουν ε]
25 νοσάτων δε σε ηρων ακαίρως

About 12 lines lost.

[γησαὶ περὶ καλλιροης και τις ο
[φιλος η]ράτο ο[ιν ο πολυχαρμος λε

40 [γειν] ἡμεις οι διον δεσμηται συρα
[κουσιμ τιγενος εσμεν αλλ ο
[μεν ετέροις νεανισκος προ
[tos σικελιας δοξη τε και πλου
[tωι και ευμορφηται ποτε εγω δε

45 [ευρελης] μεν ων ωσφοιτης δε ε
εξισου και φιλος καταλιπον
[τες ους γονεις εξεπλεν
σαμν τις πατριδος εγω μεν
δι έξεινον [εκεινος δε δια γν

50 [νημικα καλλιροην τουνομα
[ην δοξασαν αποτεθηκεναι εθα
[ψε πολυ]νελαις τυμβορυχοι
δε] ξοσιμν ειροντες εις ιονιαν

σ

[επι]καλησε

1. 7. ορος: ολος F (lorentinus); cf. II. 28, τουσαντ όποιων.
2. χ of ορος seems to have been corrected from ρ.
10. δρομος: γλυκυ φ.
11. καλλιροης: the name is regularly spelled with one ρ in the papyrus; F gives two.
13. ετυχος: ετυχος F.
16. ησαν: η μαν F, but the asyndeton is in the manner of Chariton; cf. II. 37.
There is no room for more letters (e.g. 21) in the lacuna at the beginning of the line.
21. φιλοθησον]τες: the reading here is doubtful. The slight traces after τες though not inconsistent with φ, hardly suggest that letter, and the following six letters must have been somewhat cramped if they were got into the space between this and the supposed ν, of which only a single vertical stroke remains. But the papyrus does not support Hercher's conjecture of φιλόθησον.
25-6. F reads πνευμα. μεθ ημεραν δι ο οικωμος, which does not sufficiently fill the space in the papyrus. Probably something has dropped out in F. The traces at the end of 25 look rather like ρ.
27. μεθυμαντη: τω δεσμητη F.
II. 8. γαρ: δε F. The letters at the end of the line are very dubious. In place of αι, πι might be read, with μωραν την in the next line. There would then be a word of two or three letters (e.g. δε) between αγουκαντι and τημωραν. But the vestiges are too uncertain to justify an alteration of the reading of F.
9. ετοι: ετοι F.
10. πρωτεδυστι: πρωτεδυστι F.
11. Above the oβ of φοβον the letters πε appear to have been written (by a second hand?) Perhaps ει as a variant on εις was intended.
12. συναιτητα: συναιτητα F. The reading συναιτητα is not quite certain, but there is clearly something more than συν, and it is preferable to adopt συν, than to suppose that the scribe wrote σων twice by mistake. The loss of σων in F is easily accounted for by the σων preceding.
14. βασιστας: βασιστας F.
15. α in καλλιροφ seems to have been corrected.
16. ημεν: ημεν F.
17. δς: δς F.
19. συνεδρια: συνεδρια F.
21. εις και εις εις: και εις εις F: considerations of space make it probable that και εκεινη not και καινη was written.
25. α δε εν: α δε εν F.
26. There is not room in the lacuna for τωι which is read after παραθετηρι by F. It may very well be spared.
29-30. We follow F in filling up the lacuna between εις and εκεινη; but the papyrus may of course have had Hercher's reading [την επιφονει εκεινη των].
30-1. εθεσαντο τι γαρ μοι: οτ εθεσαντο τι μοι. F has τι γαρ, φοβοιν, omitting μοι.
34. τοιμητος: αμματος F, which has rightly been suspected, though defended by D'Orville. Reiske conjectured λιματος which Hercher adopts. The papyrus no doubt preserves the true reading.
35. It is clear that the papyrus, if it read επιστατας, which there is no reason to doubt, must have omitted παραθετηρι which F has after καινωραν.
36. συναιτητας: συναιτητας F.
37. There is not room for εν which F reads after εκεινη. [ανους δ] is possible, but it is more likely that there was no connecting particle; cf. I. 16.
38-9. The papyrus certainly differs here in some way from F, but it is not quite certain what the variant is. The letter at the beginning of 39 is more like a δ than anything else, but might be α or υ, or perhaps β. But βασιστας λεγε (so F) cannot possibly have been got into the space in this line before φοβοιν. We have therefore adopted εθεσαντο, which best suits the traces. ουβ is sometimes used like λεγεν with adjectives; and the commoner word may easily have been substituted. For the aorist cf. II. 14, βασιστας where F has βασιστας. Another possibility is λεγε μοι φοβοιν, with φοβοιν in 38; cf. II. 30-1, note. This would however make that line unusually long, though not much longer than 41.
39. φοβοιν: φοβοι F; cf. 48.
40. The α of αδικηματων was inadvertently omitted, but subsequently inserted. νυ (so F) also appears to have been written above των. Both additions are probably due to the original scribe.
41. πολυχαρμος is a slip for πολυμαρμος.
44. ενιφικρατειμον: so apparently the papyrus; εφικρατειμον F.
46. και is not found in F after εις. η ρ might be read instead of εις, in which case λεγε, κ.τ.λ. must be supposed to be spoken by Mithridates, not the attendant; but this seems less likely.

III.
FAYUM TOWNS

48. φθείρα: φθείρι F; cf. 39.

52-3. F reads ἄργυρος τινὶ ἔλθων ὑμωνίμων έχεις ἐκείνη γυνῖκα. Hercher makes the obvious insertion of τὴν, of which D'Orville regrets the absence, before γυνῖκα. The reading of the papyrus appears to be sound, and that of F to be due to an explanatory gloss.

53. ὀμητὶ: ὀμητὶ F.

54. ἐξελήγχει: ἐξελήγχει ἐδειλε F.

56. The superfluous α in ὑδατος has been cancelled by a dot placed above it. The cancelled letters at the end of the line have been crossed through, and a horizontal stroke is also drawn above them. ὑς of course was caused by the homoioteleuton of άνομα των and παραλλους; but why ᾨς αυτος and not ᾨς αυτος was written is obscure. ἡπτος is required by the context as it stands in F.

III. 9-10. The reading of what remains of these two lines is extremely doubtful, the traces remaining being very slight and blurred. Apparently the scribe originally omitted των before αυτος, and it has been subsequently inserted by another hand, immediately below the line instead of as usual above it.

15. The fibres on which the remnants of this line are contained had become detached, and were not quite correctly placed when the facsimile was taken, so that the v has the appearance of being the second letter in the line.

20. Here again one or two letters appear to have been inserted above the line just before the lacuna. The traces of the first (if there be more than one letter) are like μ; probably the addition was some alteration of the termination of καλλιροη.

24. The reading is uncertain. The vestiges after the supposed σ would suit α.

40. Some round letter, as τ or σ, has apparently been written above δ of δυς.

41-54. There is a very noticeable difference in the size of the letters in these lines as compared with the preceding part of this column and the two columns preceding. Possibly another scribe began at this point, but the formation of the letters is much the same as before.

51. δικαίως: δικαίως F.

54. ἐπωλησεως was originally written, but the ε has been crossed through and α inserted above. The correction is possibly by the original scribe.

II. LYRIC FRAGMENT.

Kom Ushim. 22.3 x 30 cm.

In this curious papyrus is preserved a new specimen of the obscurer forms of literary composition with which Egyptian papyri are for the first time making us acquainted. It is a lyrical poem of some length, descriptive in character, but including dialogue. Portions of three columns remain; but of the first of these only a few letters at the ends of lines are occasionally visible, and the second is very fragmentary, the surface of the papyrus being much damaged. The third column however contains a fair number of complete lines.

The metre used, which is the same throughout, is a logaedic form of a simple character. The scheme is ω-ο-ο-ο-ω. It may be most easily
described as an anapaestic dimeter with an iambus in the last foot. Spondees are admitted in the first and third feet, but not in the second. A similar form is found in Pindar, Pyth. ii. 4, Bacchylides xvi. 31, and in Sappho, Frags. 40 and 42 (Bergk); it also occurs, Prof. Crusius tells us, in some papyrus fragments at Heidelberg. The metre seems to be carefully used, which is rather remarkable considering the other qualities of the piece.

One of the strangest features of the papyrus is the manner in which it is written. The second column (the remains of the first are too scanty to show any peculiarities, if they existed) has two blank spaces, one at the top of the column large enough to accommodate five lines similar in size to the others in this column; the other, rather larger, about half-way down. The following column has no such empty spaces, but it is written in two hands, the good-sized hand of Col. II alternating with another much smaller and more compact. It seems however that these two hands are really identical; both are of an uncultivated type, and there is nothing beyond size in the formation of the letters which distinguishes the one from the other. What then is the meaning of the variation? It is natural at first sight to suppose that it has some connexion with the blank spaces in Col. II. But why should the blanks have been filled up in one column and not in another, and how came it about that the blanks occurred at all? Column III has every appearance of being continuous; it is all part of one poem. Changes of subject are indeed made rather abruptly; but they do not correspond with the variations in the handwriting. The numbers of lines in the several compartments are also quite irregular, so there can be no strophic arrangement.

The matter of the poem is hardly less remarkable than the manner in which it has been written down. The subject is the adventures of a man whose name does not occur (unless perhaps in III. 7). What this person is supposed to be doing in Col. II is obscure. He addresses a second character; there are several allusions to a πάλι, and κρατούμενος (?) are mentioned. In Col. III the hero proceeds to a place which is full of corpses being devoured by dogs. He then makes his way to the sea-coast and proceeds to sit down upon a rock and to fish with a rod and line. He did not however succeed in catching anything; and we then revert to the corpses, the gruesome picture of which is further elaborated. 'For a vast plain stretched round about, filled with corpses of dreadful fate, beheaded, crucified; and wretched bodies lay upon the earth with their throats lately cut, others impaled suspended the trophies of their cruel lot; while the Furies, chaplet-crowned, laughed over the miserable deaths of the corpses. And there was a fearful stench of gore' (III. 20–29). He 'dragged along a frightful body,' with what purpose we do
not know, and next holds a conversation with a woman—or her ghost—whom he accuses of deceit and treachery. Prof. Crusius, who has made some valuable suggestions for the reconstruction of the text, thinks that the scene is laid in the nether world, and regards the whole piece as a species of 'Inferno.'

The language and style of the composition, the literary qualities of which are poor enough, clearly show its late date. But it cannot be posterior to the second century, to the latter part of which we should attribute the papyrus. The two hands which appear in the third column have already been described. Both use irregular informal uncials; several mistakes in spelling occur, and occasionally more serious corruptions seem to have crept in. The scribe was evidently a person of small education. This consideration makes it improbable that the papyrus is a fragment of the composer's original MS., which might otherwise be a possible explanation of the abnormal manner in which the poem is written.

Col. II.
Blank space.

\[\text{\textit{λον}}\]
\[\text{\textit{τ}} \text{\textit{παν ιδων}}\]

\[\text{\textit{πρ}} \text{\textit{ιν τρεσα}}\]
\[\text{\textit{λελαληκου}}\]

\[\text{\textit{γελων χαρα}}\]
\[\text{\textit{εμολευν πυλη}}\]
\[\text{\textit{εκλεισμενη}}\]
\[\text{\textit{παθω}}\]

\[\text{\textit{προσεληνυθα σοι μακαρ}}\]

\[\text{\textit{εληνυθα}}\]
\[\text{\textit{καινεμεν ει θελες}}\]

\[\text{\textit{βοταχυθε, με την πυλη}}\]

Blank space.

\[\text{\textit{τουτον τε απο επευχομενων τοτε}}\]
\[\text{\textit{κατα [την] δυναμεν τη του θην}}\]

\[\text{\textit{ευθυς απο γενης}}\]
\[\text{\textit{κρατομεμενοι}}\]
\[\text{\textit{σαν την πυλην}}\]
\[\text{\textit{δουλα τεταγμενοι}}\]

Vestiges of seven more lines.
λαξην δ' ατραπον τριβον ερπυνας
tοπου ηλθε τον ουτθε αφικετο
εφοβετο φοβοσ γαν πες [κ]<δ>οβον

2nd hand. κατα πασαν ετυγχανε σωματα
5 πολλαν ἔκεις πρὶς τοὺς νεκρους
θοινης χαιριν ἦσαν αφειγμανιοι
ανετον επονεις κραδε,] φερουν
επλοειζε προπαντα δεος μεθεις
ως αυτον εχων εφοβετι πορον
10 κ[α][μ] δη χονα δυστραπε[ελ]φασε
α[σ][χ]ιμονας ηλθε παρ ηνας
ειθεν δαι πατρα[ν] καθισας οτε
καλαμω μεν εδησε[ν] νεκρα τριχι
δελεαρ δε λαβων και ψωμιο[αι]
15 αγγισατων ανηγε βαθει βυθω
την νεχομενην σε μη[. . .] [. . .] α
ος δ ουδεν ολως τοτ ελαμμενα
[[κατα τον βυθον]]
κατα θυμον ανες το [. . .]ερως

20 1st hand. αχανες γαρ εκειτο [. . .]μν περιξ
δαπεδου γεμιον αυμοροι νεκρων
πελεκιζων οους σταυρουμενον
λυγρα σωματα δ [. . .]θαυ υπερθε γης
τετραχηλοκοπη[ε]να προσφειτως
25 ετεριον παλιν ευκολοπισμενοι
eκρεμαντο τροπανα πικρας τυχης
ποιναι δ εγελων μελε[ε]νοι νεκρων
θανατου τροπου εστεφανωμεναι
μιρα δε λυθρου τις εκει πυθη
30 ο δε φρεικωλεν δεμας ελκησας
ἐλησε νεωτ
λευκης αιγι[η]ν
παλι δ ειαχε π [. . .]
2nd hand. ἔλεγεν δὲ [...]. [...]<br>
35 ὑπὲρ μὲν εὐπρεπὸς [...]<br>
οὐσαμαμία μὲν ὅμω[<br>
ἄλλῳ τινὶ προσπελάσασθα[<br>
40 τούτῳ ταῦτα εὐπρεποῦς τότε[<br>
ἡθ εἰςοθεὶς ἄ. μιμο[<br>
κατὰ γῆς σὲ βοὸς δὲ [...]<br>
1st hand. ἵπ τὸν βυθὸν ὀρθ[<br>
ἐπακοὺ μ[<br>
45 μὴ σου τὸ φ[α]ο[<br>
ἀπεκικ[<br>
τ[<br>
 [...]

II. 7. 1. [x]ελειομένη; σ is written for ε again in III 5 πρι. 14. 1. θλω. III. 1. λαοῖν : 1. λαοῖν. 5. πρι : 1. περί. 6. ἀφεγμαίνοι : i.e. ἀφεγμένοι. There are two more instances of αι for ε in 12. 7. This line is difficult. Probably κραδα was written for κραδίαν (cf. 10, where a final v is added above the line), to which αντων refers. After αντων (θ') may have dropped out. The second word, which is possibly a proper name, is apparently corrupt. The initial letter may be θ, in which case π must be wrong; ἢ is a just possible, but unlikely, alternative. 8. ἐπλοείζει can hardly be right. The π is quite doubtful, and in place of the second ε, η or possibly γ could be read; but the other letters are clear. 9. The word after ενων appears to be corrupt. The first letter might be θ or η, the second ν. 12. 1. δὲ πέτρων; cf. note on 6. 15. 1. ἀγκαστρον αὐχε. 16. At the end of the line [τ]α[]α[α]α could be read, which, if correct, was perhaps preceded by a participle. κελαμ would suit the sense, but not the surviving vestiges of the letters, though ε may be read in place of μ. The doubtful σ may be δ, but δ ἐπιμ[α] is also unsatisfactory. 17. ἐλαμμανεί: so apparently the papyrus for ἐλαμμανε. 18. κατὰ τὸν βυθὸν is crossed through, having been written by mistake. 20. κακε[θ]: or perhaps ἵπ τ[η]; cf. 29. 22. The present tenses are loosely used. The language here recalls the passage of Tacitus describing the tortures of the Christians by Nero (Ann. xv. 44): 'et pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contecti laniatu canum (cf. 5-6, above) interirent, multi crucibus adfixi aut flamma ust, alique, ubi defecisset dies, in usum nocturni luminis urerentur.'
23. Crusius suggests δ[ε][ε], which may be right, the only objection to it being that there is no other instance of the neglect of elision. δ ε[ε] would not fill the lacuna.
32. Π. λακόνερισ. αυξήτωρ is uncertain, η especially being doubtful. The vestiges rather suggest α.
34. Crusius restores the latter part of the line ι[λ]ε[γ]ερ των [μακεδον]αω, which makes very good sense. λ scarcely fills up the lacuna, but the scribe is rather irregular in his spacing. Perhaps ι[λ]ε[γ]ερ should be read, but cf. note on 23.
35. 1. χρήματα (f).
38. λαώ is apparently for λαώ.
40. This line is a repetition of Π. 13.

III. COMMENTARY ON ARISTOTLE, Topics II. 2.

Harit. 12×11-11 cm.

Parts of three columns of an early commentary on Aristotle’s Topics. The passages referred to in the fragment are from Book II. ch. 2, p. 109 a 34-5 (Col. I), p. 109 b 4-9 (Col. II), and p. 109 b 9-15 (Col. III). These are cited at length, and are followed by the commentary or paraphrase. The quotations are distinguished from the explanatory matter by the indentation of the lines, those which contain a quotation being made to project by the space of a couple of letters into the left-hand margin (cf. Ox. Pap. II. 226).

The remains of the commentary are too scanty to allow of a precise appreciation of its scope and quality; it is unfortunate that the second column, which is the best preserved, is mainly occupied with a long citation from Aristotle. But the treatise appears to be of a simple though systematic character. The commentator did not choose for elucidation particular passages, but went solidly through the text; and that he was not inclined to prolixity may be concluded from the fact that fifteen lines of Aristotle are disposed of in two columns, and that in Col. III, if our restoration of lines 5-10 is correct, text and commentary occupy an equal number of lines. The work then is probably to be regarded as an unadorned paraphrase, not as a commentary upon selected passages. Its early date is established by the manuscript, which itself can hardly be later than the middle of the second century. The two documents with which this papyrus was found are of the time of Domitian or Trajan; and the handwriting of the literary fragment, which is a neat slightly sloping uncial of medium size, has every appearance of being contemporary with them. The manuscript may therefore be assigned with some security to the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. The commentator accordingly must have written at least a hundred years before Alexander Aphrodisiensis; and was probably also considerably
anterior to Herminus and Sotion, who are known from Alexander’s allusions to have commented upon the *Topics* (see Alex. *Topics*, pp. 434-3, 569-3, 574-26, and cf. p. 154. το ὅτι τινι ἔδοξεν), and who, apart from the present fragment, are the earliest recorded interpreters of that book. The papyrus shows no punctuation or other lection signs, except the common angular mark used for filling up space at the end of a line. A second hand has made an addition in Col. II.

The citations from Aristotle offer a few slight variations of text, which are noticed below; but they are of small critical importance.

Col. I.

Col. III.
[γο]ρια φ[  
φαιναι ο γαρ ορι
[μος και] το ιδιον ουδειν αλλω υπαρ
[χει κεκριωται δε πολλα και των] 20
[αλλων] οιν [. . . ] ανθρασως ιππος
[δηλων] ουν [οτι ος συμβεβηκος
10 [αποδιδωσιν]
[. . . ]ηκ[  
[. . . ] . . [.  
το κας]

I. το, II. το (ε)τει.
II. τον, πινατι συνωμοσ τα γανη Bekker. The variant συνωμοσ has been inserted by a second hand. No trace is left of the μ, but the surface of the papyrus is rather damaged at this point.
12. α[ξανα]: the vestiges of the first letter suit o better than ο. τοβομα Bekker.
13. τον των: 30 B.C.; om. του Bekker.
III. 8. A difficulty arises concerning the length of this line, which with the ordinary reading, oλον ξυλων λιδων (λιδων ξυλων C) ανθρασως ιππος, would have contained thirty-two letters, or five more than any other line, and about eight more than the average. It appears likely therefore that one of the four substantives was omitted; and the MSS. variation in the order of ξυλων and λιδων creates a slight probability in favour of one of these two having been the omitted word. The question is not affected by the uncertainty which exists as to the exact point at which this and the preceding lines began. For if the first syllable of αλλων in line 8 were transferred to 7, the first syllable of δηλων in 9 would have to be transferred to 8, and the same total number of letters would result.

IV. HOMER, Iliad VIII.

Umm el 'Atl. 5.5 x 8 cm. Plate VI.

A small fragment containing in two consecutive columns the ends of lines 332-6 and the beginnings of lines 362-8 of the eighth book of the Iliad. Some interesting variations occur in ll. 366, 369; cf. note ad loc. The papyrus was found with several others belonging to the Ptolemaic period, and for the most part falling within the second century B.C. It may itself be assigned with some security to the second half of that century, or at latest to the beginning of the century following. A remarkable palaeographical feature is the occurrence of the square-shaped e at the beginning of ll. 365-6.
366. *وَ: sο apparently the papyrus. The second letter cannot be read as i; the first seems to be a square i like that at the beginning of the following line, though the heavy top stroke gives the letter rather the appearance of γ or π. *ι in the reading of all MSS. Mr. Allen suggests that the papyrus may here have had the line *وَ γαρ ἔγω τίθει οὔτε κατά φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν (Δ 163, Z 447), and that 369 differs from the ordinary version (οὐκ ἕν ἐπιζεύγης Σινιός ὅθε ρωσίμα τιθεσθήν) only by the addition of η before οὖν. The protasis would then begin at εὐτε, and the condition in the mind of Athene (‘if I could have foreseen events’) is left to be understood. But as a matter of fact the vestiges in the papyrus after η do not suit ο.

V. Homer, Iliad I.

Harlt. 28.2 x 16.8 cm.

A single column, written upon the verso of the papyrus, containing ll. 404-447 of the first book of the Iliad. On the recto are some accounts, which appear to have been written in the latter half of the second century A.D. The Homer on the verso may fall within the second century, or belong to the earlier part of the third. The handwriting is a good-sized upright uncial, well-formed and somewhat ornate in appearance. The marks of elision and diaereses on i and v, which are frequently inserted, are due to the original scribe. The papyrus shows no variants of importance. The common interchange of *ει and ι is not noticed in our collation.

[αιγαίοιν ο γ]ατρ άντε β[ι[η] ο[ν πατρός αμείνων


410 [κενομεν'ου]'υ να παντες επαν[ρ]ωνται βασιλη'ος
[γνω δε και ατρ'ειδης ευμε κρε[ι]ων αγαμεμνον
[ην ατην ο τ αριστον αχαιων ουδεν ετεισεν
[τον δ ημειμε]τ επιτα θετις κατα δακρυ χεουσα'
[αι μοι τεκ'ου εμον τι ν κε ετρεφον αε'ων τεκ[ου]'σα

415 [κενομεν'ου]'υ να παντες επαν[ρ]ωνται βασιλη'ος
[γνω δε και ατρ'ειδης ευμε κρε[ι]ων αγαμεμνον
[ην ατην ο τ αριστον αχαιων ουδεν ετεισεν
[τον δ ημειμε]τ επιτα θετις κατα δακρυ χεουσα'
[αι μοι τεκ'ου εμον τι ν κε ετρεφον αε'ων τεκ[ου]'σα

420 [εις αυτη πιρο σοι]μυ πολογισανον αι κε πιθηται
[αλλα αυ με']υ νυν νηυν παρημενοις ακινητους'
[μην αχ'αιοισιν πολεμο]υν εν αποσλευκεν πομπαι
[επειξα γαρ εις ακινητοι]ν γερ ομοιαν μετ αμιμοιαν αιθιοηαιτοι
[χωδος εβι]η μετα δαιμον θεον αι μαναντες επιντο

425 [δοκιματ]η δε τοι αυτης ελευσεται ουλιμπον δε
[και τοι επειτα τοι εις διο ησι χαλκοβατης δω
[και μιν γου']ιασιμαι και μιν πεισθαιρι οιω
[οι αρι φαιν]θασι απεβησατο τον δε λευ' αυτου
[χωρεμεν θπτων ημου ειλουνοι γυναικος

430 [την ρα βιον αεκοντος απηθω]ν αυτης ουσιαζεν
[εις χρυσων υμαν ογου δε]ρημεν εκατομβην
[οι δ' οτε δη] λιμενος πολυβεζβους εντο ικοντο
[ιοτα μεν στιλαντο θεσαν δ εν ηπι]η μελαιη
[ιστου δ εις]δοκιμη πελασαν προτουσαν υφεμενε'νες

435 [καρπαλμενος την δ εις ορμον προερυσαν ειρειτομες
[εκ δ επι]ου εβαλον κατα δ ειρειμη]σι εδησαν
[εκ δε και] αυτοι βαινον επι εις]μενοι θαλασση
[εκ δ εκ]ατομιμβην βησαν εκηβδολοι απολλοιμ
[εκ δε] χειρεσις εμπο θη ποντσπορο

440 [την με]ν ειςτι ειπτ [βα}μον ογουν πολυμητε ουσις'εν
[πατρε] φειλω εν χειρ]σει τιθει και μιν προσειπεν
VI. Homer, IIiad XXI.

Kāṣṭ el Banāt. 15.5 x 11.4 cm. Plate IV.

The upper part of a column, no doubt the second of the roll, containing lines 26-41 of Homer, IIiad xxii. The interest of the papyrus is mainly palaeographical. Both it and the following fragments of the Odyssey (vii) were found together with a number of early first century documents, of which six out of the seven that are dated belong to the reign of Augustus. The two literary papyri are no doubt of the same period, and we thus have a pair of practically contemporary specimens of the literary hand as practised in the opening decades of the first century. The handwriting of the present fragment is of a large bold type, and is considerably better formed and handsomer in appearance than that of the Odyssey fragments. The punctuation is a later addition; it is noticeable that all three kinds of stops occur (cf. viii). The text is the vulgate,
[πτωσον υπο κρίμμους. ο δ επει καμε χειρας εναιρων
[ζους εκ ποταμιαο δωδεκα λεγατο κουρυνα
[ποινη πατροκλου μενοτιαδαο βανανδος.
[τους εχηγε θυραξε τεθηπετας ηντε νεβρουν
30 [δησε δ οπισω] χειρας ευπρηθοιοιν ιμαιν.
[τους αυτοι φερεσακον επι στρεπτοιι χιτωσι.
[δωκε δ εταιροισιν καταγεν κουλας επι νης.
[αυταρ ο αψ επορουμεν δαιζεμεναι μενεαινων.
[ενθ ιει πραμαγοι] συνηντετο δαρανδιαν
35 [εκ ποταμου φενγοντι λυκαινι] τον ρα ποτ αυτος
[νγε λαβων εκ πατρος αλως ουκ εθελοντα
[εννυχοισ προμολ]ουν ο δ ερεινεν οζη εχει χαλκωι
[ταιμε νεων ορπηκας ιν αρματος αντι[γ]ες ειεν.
[τω δ αρ ανωτου] κακον ηλιθε διοσ] αχιλλεων
40 [και τοτε μεν μν λημοιν εμυκτεσθηνειν επερασθε
[νυσιν αγων αταρ νυοσ [ηνη]ονον ανον εδωκε

26. The last eight letters of the line have been written by a second hand over
an erasure,
30. ιμαιν: ιο D; ιμαι Λα R(oche).
37. ερεινεν: ερευνο Λα K.

VII. Homer, Odyssey VI.

Kašr el Banāt. 11.8 × 16.6 cm. Plate IV (fragment g).

Of the following seven fragments of the sixth book of the Odyssey, only one
(g), comprising ll. 286–300, is of any size; the rest are small pieces from at least
three different columns of the roll, containing parts of twenty lines between
201 and 328. As has been stated in the introduction to vi, these fragments
of the Odyssey are contemporary with the preceding papyrus, both MSS. belong-
ing to the early part of the first century A.D. Some corrections in the text have
been inserted by a second hand, which seems to be also responsible for the
punctuation. A variant not otherwise recorded occurs in l. 296.
(a) 201] διερος βι[ροτος
ανθρωπον εν γη[αιαν
μ[αλα γαρ φιλοι

(δ) 205] επιμισγεται α[λλος
ενθαδ ικανει;
διος εισιν απαντες

(ε) 255] οφρ[α] σε πε[μψω
δαιμονος ενθα αι

(f) ἐδωρ[σειας

(g') [κ]αι δ ἀλη[νεμεσω η τις τουσατα γε ρεζου
[η] τ' αεκητι φιλο[ιν] πατρος και μητρος εοντων
[α]νθρωσι μισηται πρων γ' αμφαδινων γαρον ελθειν
[ε]ιτεν συ δ' οι εμεθεν ευνιει επος οφρα ταχθητα
290 πορτης και νοστω τυχης παρα πατρος εμειο
δημον εγλαιον αλο[ι ο] αθη[ναιηηηη]γχη' κελευθ[ον
αιγιρων [εν δε κρηθηε] ταιει' αμφι δε λειμων.
[ε]ινθα δε π[ατρος] εμου τεμενοι τεβαλια τ' αλος
τοσον αιτο πτολοις οσον τε γεγονε βοηςας
295 [ε]ινθα κα[θεξομενος μειναι χρονον εις ο κεν ημ[εις
[ασ]τυ διεξ[λωσ]και ικομεθα δοματα πατρος
[αυτ]αρ επι[ην ημεας] ελπη ποτι δοματ αφιχθαι
[και τοτε φαιηκο]ν μεν εν πολιν ηδε ερεσθαι
[δοματα πατρος εμου μεγαλητορος αλκινουοι]
300 [ρεια δ' αριγνω] εστε] και αν [π]αις ηγησατο
Fr. (q) l. 288. αμφαδιανον is a slip for δεμφαδιανον.

290. εμεω: so Zenod.; ἕμω Aristarch., Lud(wich).

291. δημον: οἱ χειριστήρια δῆμος Did., and so Lud. δῆμον or δήμον (with minor variations of spelling and accentuation) is found in FGHTUYΩ. ἀθρωπίς has been corrected to ἀθροῖς; cf. G, which has ἅλος δεκτίς κελεύον ἀθροῖς.

292. The addition of ν after the second η of κρηπη is of course mistaken.

296. δελθωμεν is a variant peculiar to the papyrus; δεν δε or δενδε is the ordinary reading.

298. ηθα κρηπην: so G; ἅθα θρηπην Lud.

300. Since this line ends a column, and l. 301 began a column (cf. Fr. a), we may conclude that each column contained from 33 to 34 lines. The size of the hand makes this a much more likely number than 50.

Fr. (q). 328. The occurrence of this line is of interest, as the passage 328–331 has been condemned by various editors; it is printed in small type by Lud.

Fr. (f). This fragment contains part of the title, which was written at the end of the book.

VIII. DEMOSTHENES, THIRD PHILIPPIIC, pp. 121, 122.

Umm el 'Atl. 9 x 7.6 cm.

A fragment of the Third Philippic of Demosthenes, written in a rather small semi-cursive hand, apparently about the end of the second century. The scribe was rather careless, but usually corrects his own blunders. Some additions and corrections have also been made by a second hand. Three kinds of stops are used, as in the Demosthenes papyrus published in Ox. Pap. II. 231; and instances occur of the mark of elision and rough breathing. Some at least of these are later additions. The papyrus agrees with S.L in the omission of certain words, but does not support the excisions of Blass which are not based upon the MSS. We give a collation with the Dindorf-Blass edition (1892).

Col. I.                   Col. II.

προσαβ' παρα π'νον

[λεγοντων ουδε των στρα]
[τηγοντων ουδε την προσ]
αλληλους ομοιοιν ουδε

5 [την προς τους τυραννους]
[kαι τους βαρβαρους απιστιαν·]
[ουδ ολος τουτουν ουδεν·]
[νυν δ' απακ']ωνερ εξ αγο]
αιτων [αιναγαψαν και των συμ]
[ρασ εκπεπα [κ]ται ται [θη]ν]
[μαχου [αιτων και γενος]
FAYUM TOWNS

10 [ε]πεισηκται δ' αντι τουτω
[υ]φω αν απολαλευ[αι] καὶ νε
[ν]οση αν η ἐλλας. ταύτα
[δ]ὲ εστιν τι. γῆλος εἰ τις
[ε]ἰ ἡπειριν τι [.] γελοσ. ανὸν
'τα συγγωμη τοις ἐλεγχοις
15 [μο]λογη μειωον αν τουτοις
[τ]ις επ'τιμια' ταλλα πανθ' ὤ
[ς] εκ τ'ου [δ']οροδοκειν ηρτη' ται
[ε]πει τραγηρεις γε και σωμα
[τ]ουν πληθος και χρηματι' αν
20 [και τις] αλλης κατασκευης

I. 8. An illegible letter has been crossed out, presumably by the first hand, after the second o of οπλαὶ; cf. the next note.
9. εσερπαται: κ, which was wrongly written before τ, has a dot placed over it, and has also been crossed through. The same double process of deletion has also occurred in 11 and 14. In these cases the superimposed dots are probably due to the original scribe, and perhaps also the additional cross-strokes. The substitution of ταυτα for ταυθ, which was first written, may also be by the first hand. ταυτα B,lass).
10. οριζοντα is bracketed by B.
11. For the correction of απολαλευ to απολαλευ, cf. note on 9. The mistake was no doubt caused by the following και. απολαλε B.
12-13. ταυτα [δ]ὲ εστιν τι: ταυτα δ' εστιν τι; B.
15. The iota adscript of ο[μο]λογη (apparently) and συγγωμη τοις ἐλεγχυμενοι ε[ν] τουτωv have been added by a second hand, whose rather sprawling letters extend into the margin. B prints συγγωμη τοις ἐλεγχυμενοι, which is omitted by S and the first hand of L, in small type. The addition of εν τοιτω is peculiar to the papyrus.
16. επει τιμα' : the iota adscript, like that in the preceding line, seems to be a subsequent addition. τιμα C: τιμα ek may have been written.
20. The papyrus agrees with the first hands of S and L in omitting πρόσωπος or πρόσωποι after χρηματι' αν: so B.

II. 1. και των συμμετοχων is bracketed by B.

IX. EUCLID I.

Kası el Banát. 18.6 x 5.5 cm. (Fr. a).

The following fragments of Euclid (Book I, Props. 39 and 41), though unluckily much mutilated, are of considerable interest, since they show marked variations from the common text. The extent of these is however obscured by the uncertainty as to the length of the lines. No complete line is pre-
served, and we do not therefore know what the normal length was. But either the length of the lines was extraordinarily irregular, or the differences between the papyrus and the mediaeval MSS. of Euclid (which are unusually good) were quite remarkable. For instance, at the ends of ll. 1–10 of the papyrus the letters before the lacunae are nearly directly over one another. It would therefore be expected that the number of letters between them should be approximately equal. But, according to Heiberg's text (Teubner, 1883), which we have used for the collation given below, the numbers are these:—ll. 1–2 between ι and λ 32 letters, ll. 2–3 between λ and η 39 letters, ll. 3–4 between η and δ 76 letters, ll. 4–5 between δ and η 26 letters, ll. 5–6 between η and λ 28 letters, ll. 6–7 between λ and γ 38 letters, ll. 8–9 between β and η 39 letters, ll. 9–10 between η and ι 23 letters. It is true that by a judicious use of the recorded variants some of these inequalities might be reduced; but they cannot be got rid of in that manner; and seeing that in several cases the reading of the papyrus is certainly peculiar (cf. the collation), we have not attempted a conjectural restoration of the text. The general tendency of the fragment is towards compression; and some agreements with the MS. called π are noticeable. The irregularities of the text followed by the papyrus extended to the order of the propositions. Prop. 39 is immediately succeeded by Prop. 41. Prop. 40 was either omitted or else placed in some other position. It is noticeable that the diagram of Prop. 39 is drawn at the end of the demonstration, instead of, as is usual, at the beginning.

An easy explanation of the eccentricities of this fragment would be obtained if it could be supposed that it did not form part of a regular book, but was merely an imperfectly remembered exercise. But this is not a satisfactory view. The words are correctly spelled, and the handwriting, though not of the regular literary type, is by no means ill formed. Its date is apparently the latter half of the second century. The papyrus was found with a number of documents belonging to the reigns of Antoninus, Marcus, and Commodus. A small detached fragment (δ), which has every appearance of having come from this column, we have not succeeded in placing. On the verso are the ends of a few lines in a cursive hand of the latter part of the second or beginning of the third century.

This is the second fragment of Euclid on papyrus that has come from Egypt. The first was published in Ox. Pap. I (no. 29).

Fr. (a)  

οἴτα ἐπὶ [τα αυτα μερη]  

παραλληλοις

III.  

H
η επεξεργασία 

τῆς αὐτῆς βασιῶς 

ἐπεξευθενίστηκα τῇ 

ἐστὶν τῇ [ \(\beta\)γ 

τῇ \(\beta\)γ παράλληλος 

] τῷ \(\alphaβ\)γ [ 

tῆς αὐτῆς βασιῶς 

παράλληλοις 

ἐστὶν [σ]ον τῷ \(\beta\)[\(\delta\)γ 

μείζον τῷ εἰ[σ]ασθονι 

η α[ε] τῇ \(\beta\)γ εστὶν παράλληλος 

dεικόμεν οτι [ο[ν]δε αλλή [ 

η] ἀδ αρα τῇ \(\beta\)γ εστὶν παράλληλος 


15 εαν παράλληλογράμμον τριγώνω 

αὐτήν καὶ εν τί[ας] αὐτᾶς [ 

] ἐσται τῷ παράλληλο[γράμμον 

παράλληλογράμμο] 

βασιῶς τῇ [ 

] . [ 

dιπλασιάσθε 

ἐπεξευθενίστηκα [ 

] τῷ [\(\epsilon\)δ\)γ τριγώνω 

] τῆς \(\beta\)γ καὶ 

25 ταῖς \(\beta\)γ [α[ε] ἀλλα 

] παράλληλογράμμον 

] καὶ τοῦ \(\epsilonβ\)γ
CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1. o[nto ete: δὸντα καὶ ἐπὶ Η (ciberg) with most MSS. The whole phrase καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ αἵτα μήτη is omitted in BvVm. 1 p.

3. It is evident that the papyrus, whether or not it agreed with Theon (BFVbp) in omitting καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ αἵτα μήτη after βαστάω (δόντα), cannot have read λέγω δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄμοις παραλλάξεις ἐστίν, which in all MSS. precedes ἐπεζεύχω. On no theory of the length of the lines can 50 (or including δόντα—μήτη, 70) letters be supposed to have been lost in the lacuna between αὕτη and λέγω in the following line. λέγω κτλ. is quite unessential.

4. ἐπεζεύχων ἡ: ἐπεζεύχω γὰρ ἡ MSS., Η.

5. εἰστὶν τῇ: the order of the words is different from that found in other MSS., which read after ΛΔ λέγω δὴ παραλλάξεις ἐστὶν ἡ ΛΔ τῇ ΒΓ.

6. The papyrus agrees with p in omitting εἰδειγή after τῇ ΒΓ; σημείον was also no doubt left out after τοῦ Δ (so p).

9. It is probable that the papyrus read ταὐς Βγ ας after παράλληλα[λος] with pVpm. 2 b m. 2; om. H.

10. το β[δη]: καὶ τὸ ΔΒΓ MSS., Η.

12. The papyrus again varies the common order of the words (cf. 5 note), which is οὐκ ὃρα παραλλαγής ἐστίν ἡ ΔΕ τῇ ΒΓ.

13. [ο]νθέ: so FVbp; οὔτε Η.

14. ἐστι: so P; ἐστὶ Η.

The recapitulation of the theorem τα ὃρα Ἰσα τρίγωνα κτλ. is omitted. Perhaps the first words of it may have followed παραλλαγής, or the proposition may have been simply concluded by ἵνα ἐρί διείξαν.

17. The traces suit εστι (BFbp) much better than εστιν (P; ἐστὶ Proclus).

20-27. These lines are contained upon a detached fragment the precise position of which in relation to the upper part of the column is uncertain; but approximately it is to be placed as printed.

25. The reading of the vestiges at the beginning of this line is very doubtful; but κα at the end are clear.

25-27. The papyrus evidently differed considerably here from the ordinary text which (with minor variations) runs: ὀλλά τὸ ΑΒΓΔ παραλληλογράμματα διαφάσις ἐστὶ τοῦ ΑΒΓΓ τριγώνου γὰρ ΔΓ διάμετρος αὐτὸ δίκα τέματι ὅποι μὲ τὸ ΑΒΓΔ παραλληλογράμματα καὶ τὸν ΕΒΓΓ τριγώνον ἐστὶ διαφάσις (H). τοῦ ΑΒΓΓ τριγώνου must have been placed before τὸ ΑΒΓΔ παραλληλογράμματα, and the second τὸ ΑΒΓΔ παραλληλογράμματα either omitted or similarly placed after καὶ τοῦ ΕΒΓΓ τριγώνου. The sentence γὰρ ΔΓ διάμετρος κτλ., was apparently shortened, perhaps by the omission of the word διάμετρος.

X. LATIN FRAGMENT.

Harib. 6-4 x 5-5 cm. Plate VI.

This small fragment has little intrinsic value, but it possesses a palaeographical interest which renders its publication desirable. The handwriting is

H 2.
of an unusual type—a well-formed and regular semicursive, very clear and neat. On the verso of the papyrus is some Greek cursive of about the middle of the third century, which provides a terminus ad quem for the Latin writing on the recto. The latter probably falls within the first half of that century; it might however be as early as the end of the second.

Whether the papyrus should be classed as literary or no is uncertain. The excellence of the hand is rather suggestive of a literary composition, which is more likely than not to have been of a legal nature. But the fragment may equally well have come from some official document. Hardly enough remains to justify a decided opinion.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minutiti} & \\
\text{testamenta} & \\
\text{professi quaen} & \\
\text{duci si ad diligem} & \\
\text{5 observant} & \quad \uparrow \text{consue-}
\text{tudinem esse com-}
\text{militones} & \\
\text{existimant} & \\
\text{rata esse} & \\
\text{10 milites} & \\
\text{enj} &
\end{align*}
\]

1. There are some traces of ink before the \( m \), but these may be due to a long downstroke from the line above. If they represent a letter in this line, the line projected further into the left margin than those below it.

11. The doubtful \( i \) may be \( l \). The letter following must apparently be \( a \), not \( m \).

II. DOCUMENTS OF THE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD.

XI. Petition of Demetrius.

Harit. \( 26 \times 12 \text{ cm.} \) About B.C. 115.

Petition addressed to Cleopatra III and Ptolemy Soter II by Demetrius, an infantry soldier domiciled at Euhemeria, concerning the repayment of certain loans of wheat lent by him to Theotimus, son of Phileas (cf. xii. 3). This papyrus was found together with xii and cccxxiv-v in a house near the temple of Harit; cf. p. 52. There is no date, but the petition was probably
written very soon after the death of Euergetes II, since the contracts mentioned were made in his reign.

Βασιλίσσης Κλεοπάτρας καὶ βασιλείι Πτολεμαίων θεοῖς
Φιλομήτριας Σωτῆρος χαίρειν
Δημήτριος
κάτοικος τῶν πείζων τῶν κατοικοῦντων ἐν Εὐ-
5 νερίῳ τῆς Θερμίδους μερίδος. [ἐν] τῷ Χοιάχ
μηνὶ τοῦ γ[α] (ἐτος) ἑδάνεισα [Θεοτοκίμῳ Φιλέου
Πέργη τῆς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν κατοικοῦντων ἐν
Θεοδελφεῖ[ρ] τῆς αὐτῆς μερίδος τοῦ Ἄρσουντο
πυρῶν ἀρτάβας) [ξ] (ἡμισιν], καὶ ἐν τοῖς Μιχεῖρ μηνὶ τοῦ αὐ-
10 τοῦ ἑτεύς ἀλας ἀρτάβας) με, [όμοιοι δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ
Φαώφι [μηνὶ] τοῦ να (ἐτος) ἀλλας ἀρτάβας) κε, τάς δὲ
πάσας (πυρῶν) ἀρτάβας) οί (ἡμισιν), κατὰ συγγραφὰς τρὶς, διὰ
μὲν μᾶς [ξ] (ἡμισιν], δὲ ἔτερας με, δι' ὀφν ἐδη-
λώθη ἄλλα τε καὶ ποσασθαῖ μοι αὐτὸν
15 τὴν τῶν προκειμένων ἀρτάβων) οί (ἡμισιν] ἐν τοῖς διὰ τῶν
συμβολαίοις) ὀρισθείσοις χρόνοις ἢ ἐκτείνατ
μοι ἐκάστης ἀρτάβης) χαλκοὺς ἄραχμασ] 'Γ. τοῦτων δ' ὄντων
καὶ τῶν τῆς ἀποδόσεως χρόνων διεληπτι-
θῶτων καὶ ἄλλων ἐπιγεγονότων πλέον
20 ὁ ἐνκαλομένος πλεονάκις ἀπητημένος
[ο]ὐχ ὑπομένει ἐκουσίων ἀποδίδοναι, κατα-
νοικίζομεν τῆς [. . .] ως ἔχουν καὶ τὰς συναλ-
λέσεις [. . . .], ν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καταφύη γε πεπο-
ημένοις δὲ [ὁραῖοι ἀπος] τειλαὶ μοι τὴν ἐντευ-
25 ἐν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν [τ]ῶν χρηματισ-
τάς, δὲν [εἰς] θαυμάζων ἄνοιγθεός, ὅπως δια-
λέξατε αὐτὴν εἰς κατάστασιν καὶ ἀνα-
καλομένοι τῶν Θεών διὰ Αὐθη-
τρίων λο[γ]ευνοὶ κρινοιῴσιν πραξθήναι μοι
30 αὐτὸν τὴν όρισμενην τεινήν τῆς
ἀρτάβης] γῆς (')Γ (ἄραχμας), τὰ συναγόμενα χαλ-
άλλα καὶ ἡγαγόν μεθ' ὑβρεως καὶ πληγῶν καὶ συνκλείσαν-
tιές με εἰς τὴν Ἀμαντίαν τινῷ ὀικίαιν ἐξέδυσαν ὡ περὶ-
βεβλήματι ιμάτιον καὶ τούτῳ ἀπηλλάγησαν ἐξοντὶς ἐ-
20 ξένες γυμνῶν. εἰς οὖτως μετ' ἐνδύματος μ. . . .
ζ. . . θεντοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν γυναῖκων οὖτως ἐξελθὼν
καὶ καταβαλὼν διὰ Πτολεμαίου τραπαζίτην Μέλιτη
τῆς καπηλίδης ἡ τὸ ιμάτιον ἐδεκόκησαν ἐνέχυραν
πρὸς ἀσωτελαίς χαλκῷ (δραχμᾶς) Ἐβψ., ἐξεκομισάμενον ὁ[ὐτὸς]. περὶ
25 τῶν ἄλλως εἰς με σὺντετελεσθην[έων] προ[βρημένοισ]
ἐπεζηλθείν δέομαι ἀποστειλαί μου τὴν ἐντευξίν
ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων τῆς κατοικίας χρηματιστάς
ἀν ἐλαγγογείς Διοκκορίδης, ὡς χρηματίζοντες
αὐτὴν καὶ προσκαλεσάμενοι τῶν τε Διοκλῆν καὶ Ἀμμώνιον.
30 διὰ Τ[.] . . . . λογιστῶν συνκρίνωσι πραθήκαναι μοι
ἐκα. [. ]ρ[.] . . . . συνεκρομένοις τῆς ἄλλης ἀγώνης
ἀργυρίου[δραχμᾶς] β καὶ τῆς ὑβρεως χαλκοῦ νυ καὶ τὰς τοὺς χαλκοῦ[ν]
Ἐβψ., περὶ αὐτῶν γιεσομείνῃς [ἐργάγχης ἀγγελοῦνθης
διὰ δημοσίων. τούτων δὲ γενομένοις ἐσομαι ἀντειλήμ-
35 μένος.

ἐνυχείτε.
and by paying through Ptolemaeus the banker to Meli, the dealer to whom they had incontinitently pawned the garment, 2700 drachmae of copper, I recovered it. As I have decided to proceed against them for all the injuries they have inflicted upon me, I entreat you to send my petition to the assize-judges appointed for the settlement, whose cleris Dioscurides, in order that they may take cognizance of it, and having summoned both Dioeles and Ammonius through T. . . . the collector to appear, give judgement that they shall perfuse pay me for the illegal abduction 100 (?) drachmae of silver, and for insulting me 420 (?) drachmae of copper, besides the 2700 drachmae of copper, suitable pressure being applied on this account by public officials. If this is done, I shall have obtained redress. Farewell.'

3. Cf. note on xi. 6. 100 arourae was the usual grant to cavalry soldiers in the Fayûm.

12. ἐνεστῶτος (έτους): probably the 14th=11th year, i.e. B.C. 104–3; cf. line 5.
14. τοίς: the sentence from 9–20 is very loosely constructed, the subject changing more than once. τοίς, unless persons in the mind of the writer, but not mentioned, are meant, must refer to Dioeles and Ammonius, and καὶ ἔτορον συμπαράστατα, though apparently governed by εἰκασθεῖςκεῖται, is probably an accusative absolute.
15. εἰκασθεῖς: the subject is now Theotimus himself. 'The next clause is ambiguous and may perhaps mean 'as the result of their previous agreement between themselves;'
31. έν άυτον: ἐκάρτως would be expected, but the letter following α is not τ and is more like σ. ἐκάρτων causes difficulty owing to the tail of the supposed μ which follows shortly after. άθικόν τομήν: this refers to line 17, not to the δικηματικον mentioned in 7.

XIII. LETTER OF A TAX-FARMER.

Harit. 10.5 x 8.5 cm. B.C. 170 (?)

Letter from a farmer of the beer-tax at Theadelphia to a company of fish-salters (or mummifiers), directing them to 'support' (προστίμων) a certain Petesis, who had paid his tax for making beer. The precise meaning of this 'support' and the connexion between Petesis' payment of the beer-tax and his relations to the ταρχευταῖ are obscure.

The papyrus is written on the verso (the recto being blank) in a medium-sized cursive hand of the second century B.C. The 12th year mentioned is probably that of Philometer.

[.]ελθοῦν εἴσιν ἐν μὲν τὴν εἰς τὴν
[Θεάδελφες εἰς τὸ ιβ (έτος)]
Ψάιτι καὶ τοῖς μετόχοις
ταρχευταῖς χαίρειν.
5 καλῶς ποιήσετε προσ-
tάντες Πετήσιος

tῶν εἴς Ἀρχελαῖος.
άπτεσα τὸ γινόμενον
αὐτοῦ τέλος, οὐδὲν.
10 αὐτῶι έγκαλῶι.
ἐρρασθε.
(έτους) ιβ, Χολαχό ἡ.
elihous, farmer of the beer-tax at Theadelphia for the 12th year, to Psais and partners, fish-salters, greeting. Please support Petesis, an inhabitant of Archelais. I have received the tax due from him and have no claim against him. Farewell. The 12th year, Choiak 4.'

3. Ψήφισ: or Ψήφισ.
4. τοιχεύταις: cf. xv. 4, and Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 397, where the tax called τετάρατον τοῦ τοιχευτης is discussed. The words τοιχευτης and τοιχεύταις are ambiguous, and can refer either to the preparation of mummies, or to the salting of fish &c. The conjunction of τοιχεύταις with οτισσως in xv. 4 supports Wilcken's view that in the cases where a tax is concerned it is the salting of meat and fish that is meant; but here either meaning is equally possible.

XIV. NOTICE FROM TAX-COLLECTORS.

Harif. 16 x 17.5 cm. B.C. 124.

Notice addressed to Phileas, son of Tryphon, by two tax-collectors, one a Jew called Simon, requesting the extra payment of four silver drachmae for 'a crown' on behalf of Numenius. At the bottom is the receipt, signed by one of the collectors.

The papyrus is dated in the 46th year, which must refer to the reign of Euergetes II. Above the notice are three much obliterated lines in a different hand, referring to a payment of 1400 drachmae and mentioning the 32nd year.

Simon καὶ Πτολεμαῖος οἱ προκεχιμισμένοι πράκτορες τοῦ ἀναπεβομένου ἑαυτοῦ Νομονήφων στεφάνου Φιλέας Τρύφωνος χαίρειν. προσδιαγράφης ἑαυτὸς δραχμᾶς τίτουρας, /δ. (ἐτοις) μέ, Τύβι λ.

2nd hand Πτολεμαῖος Πασοκράτους συναπέκχω.

'Simon and Ptolemaeus, the appointed collectors of the crown-tax decreed for Numenius, to Phileas, son of Tryphon, greeting. You are required to pay in addition four drachmae, total 4. The 46th year, Tubi 30. I, Ptolemaeus, son of Pasocrates, jointly acknowledge the receipt.'

2. On the position of the πράκτορ in Ptolemaic times see Rev. Pap. p. 78 and Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 564. They were specially concerned with the exaction of fines or payments in arrear. In the present case there is a question of an extra payment (προσδιαγράφης). The πράκτορες στεφανεύον τοῦ Ρωμαίου period were ordinary collectors of taxes.

3. στεφάνω: on this tax see Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 295 sqq. It was generally a present made to the king on his accession or some other important occasion, like the aurum
coronarium of Roman times (cf. introd. to xx). Here, however, the 'crown' was for the benefit of a private individual, presumably a court favourite. Possibly this Numenius is identical with the ἀρχιμακροκαθαρίς and strategus of the Thebaid mentioned in Gr. Pap. I. xxxviii. 1.

XV. Tax-Receipt.

Úmm el 'Atl. 7·3 x 10 cm. B.C. 112(?).

Receipt for 500 copper drachmae paid as a monthly 'contribution' (σύνταξις) from the millers and fish-salters of Bacchias and Hephaestias. The purpose of this 'contribution' is not stated. On palaeographical grounds the papyrus can be assigned to the end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C. The 5th (or 9th) year mentioned in it therefore probably refers to the joint reign of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy Soter II.

Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ζωῖλ[ος] Ἡθεύτι Χαῖρεσιν.
ἐχομεν παρὰ σοῦ τὴν σύνταξιν.
τὴν τῶν σιτιοποιῶν καὶ [...]
ταρχηρῶν Βακχίαδος καὶ Ἡθεύτι.
δ̣ στιάδος τοῦ Παῦνι χαλκοῦ (δραχμάς) φι
(ἐτους) ε[Πα]υνι [...]

2. σύνταξιν: this word generally refers to contributions for religious purposes, but is sometimes used for certain kinds of payments to the government, e.g. the στεφανος tax (Wilcken, Oct. I. p. 296), almost as the equivalent of φόρος. There is nothing to show the status of Ptolemaeus and Zoilus here.

4. ταρχηρῶν: it is not easy to fill up the lacuna so as to make a satisfactory parallel to σιτιοποιῶν. ταρχηρῶν, if an adjective, ought to mean 'salted,' and to apply to objects such as fish or meat; but to balance σιτιοποιῶν we require a class of persons, i.e. ταρχηρῶν. If ταρχηρῶν were taken to be a substantive meaning the 'taxes on τάρχηρας' (cf. note on xiii. 4), the whole meaning of the receipt would be altered. But to this view the conjunction of ταρχηρῶν with σιτιοποιῶν presents insuperable difficulties. Even if σιτιοποιῶν be read, the plurals would remain inexplicable. We prefer therefore to suppose that either τῶν or a substantive meaning a class of persons is lost in line 3, in spite of the unusual meaning which on this hypothesis it is necessary to give to ταρχηρῶν.

Βακχίαδος καὶ Ἡθεύτι: from this passage and many others in which Bacchias and Hephaestias are mentioned independently both in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, we should infer that they were quite distinct villages. This however is not quite certain, for twice in the present volume (clxiii and cviii), and most probably in Brit. Mus. Pap. 315, 3-3 (cf. Class. Rev. xii. p. 434), the two names are coupled together as if they were one, 'Bacchias Hephaestias.' Owing to the occurrence of Hephaestias by itself as a village name, e.g. in xlii, it does not seem possible to suppose that the double title was given to distinguish our Bacchias from another Bacchias in the division of Heraclides,
Bacchias Ἀγγου (B. G. U. 66. 5). It appears then that Hephaestias was a distinct village from Bacchias, but was combined with it for some purposes. The site of Ümm el 'Atl, though it is divided into two halves (cf. p. 35), is, as a whole, too small to suit an amalgamation of two villages. The site of Hephaestias was therefore in the vicinity of Ümm el 'Atl, but not part of it.

XVI. ORDER FOR PAYMENT.

Harl. 17 x 10.5 cm. First century B.C.

Order from Ptolemaeus, a scribe, to the sitologus of the village of Autodike, to pay Posidonius from the account of Heraclides 55 artabae of wheat, being the rent of a κτίζως owned by Posidonius and cultivated by Heraclides. The handwriting of the papyrus strongly resembles that of Gr. Pap. II. xxxviii, written in B.C. 56, and unquestionably belongs to the first century B.C. The first year, therefore, which is mentioned in it cannot refer to a sovereign earlier than Ptolemy Neos Dionysus or later than Augustus.

Πτολεμαῖος γραμματεῖς Πτολεμαίωι 
σιτολόγῳ Αὐτοδίκης χαίρειν.
μέτρησον Ποσειδωνίωι Διδώρου
ὑπὲρ Ἑρακλείδου τοῦ Ζηνοβίου
5 ἐκφόριον οὗ γεγενήκηκεν αὐτῷ
κλῆρον περὶ (Κ)ερκείσιν τῆς Πολίσωνος
πυροῦ ἄρθρῳ(μῷ) τεσσαράκτων πέντε,
/(πυροῦ) ἄρθρῳ(μῷ) μ. 
(ἔτους) α., Παῦλι 18.

On the verso

10 2nd hand σιτῶν Ῥπαρ.οῖ."
XVII. Banker's Receipts.

Harl. 13 × 31.5 cm. B.C. 121.

Three receipts for sums paid into the royal bank at Crocodilopolis by Marres and two women, Tamarres and Hierobasis (?), respectively. The receipts are all written by the same two hands, and are dated on the same day, Phaophi 15, in the fiftieth year of a Ptolemy, who must be Euergetes II, since none of the others reigned so long. The formula is the same in all, and is remarkable for several resemblances to the earlier rather than to the later Ptolemaic style of bank-receipts (cf. notes on lines 1 and 2).

Owing to the extremely cursive writing, which often degenerates into a series of rounded flourishes, and the frequent use of abbreviations, the nature of the payment is uncertain. The sums paid are apparently copper drachmae. The first column has lost the beginnings of lines, the second and third are complete. We give the text of the second.

(Ἐτούς) ἅ, Φάωφι ἴθα, πεί(πτωκεν) ἑπὶ τὴν ἐν Κρο(κοδιλῶν) πόλει(τρόπεις)

Ἡρα... τρα(πεξίης) ὀστε βασιλεῖ παρὰ Ταμαρρέως

τῆς (Σ)ενδεός ἐπιγρ( ) ὤ Θεαδέλ(φελας) τοῦ ν. (Ετούς) τ. τ. / τ.

(Ετούς) ἅ, Φάωφι ἴθα, ὁ ἦπ... ῥτο( ) τ.

2nd hand (Ετούς) ἅ, Φάωφι ἴθα, ὁ παρατ... η( ) ὕρ( ) τ.

1. πε(πτωκεν): the use of this word has hitherto been characteristic of third and early second century B.C. papyri and ostraca (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 64). In the second century τεμενεῖα became the regular term. But both here and in xviii. 1 the abbreviation is much more like πε than τε.

2. The name of the τραπεζίης in the dative takes here and in xviii. 2 the place of the usual phrase ἵπτε ἦτα the τραπεζίης.

ὃστε βασιλεῖ: for the mention of the king in receipts for payments to the treasury cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 71. It generally occurs in connexion with πτωκεν. The use of ὀστε before it 'on account of the king' is novel. The reading of that word is not quite certain, the strokes being strictly speaking only enough for ὄστε; and in xviii. 3 ὀστε does not seem to be the word before ἔπο(σιλεί).

3. ἐπιγρ( ): this abbreviation occurs also in xviii. 4, where too it is followed by a symbol which we do not understand, but which is different from the one here. τ at the beginning and ρ at the end are quite certain, and the penultimate letter is either γ or τ. If it is τ, there is only room for one letter between it and the ε, where it occurs in this papyrus; but in xviii. 4 there are some extra flourishes between the ε and γ or τ. The only known name of a tax which is at all suitable is ἔπιγραφή, the land-tax, on which see Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 194 sqq. But in the ostraca where ἔπιγραφή is found the payments are in kind, and are therefore made to a βουνωρίωδ, not to a bank; and since the abbreviation which follows ἐπιγρ( ), both here and in xviii. 4, also probably
belongs to the name of the tax, ἐπιγραφή is not likely to be the right word. In the corresponding passage in Col. Iἐπιγρ is followed by τοῦ, Θεός τελεθίναι (φεῖναι).

1. In the first receipt, where the figure is ψ instead of τ, the word preceding begins with τ and goes off into a flourish, but does not, as here and in the third receipt, end with τ. In spite of the fact that the intervening strokes between τ and ψ bear no resemblance to ρ, τρι(στόρα) may well be the word intended here, and ἐπτ(στόρα δέκα) there.

4. Either this line or the next contains the signature of the banker, but we are unable to bring either line into correspondence with the ordinary signatures found on bankers' receipts. η may perhaps be an abbreviation of the name at the beginning of line 2.

5. The symbol before παρά is possibly the same as that found in xviii. 5.

XVIII. BANKER'S RECEIPT.

Ümm el 'Atl. 12-2 x 14-5 cm. B.C. 109 or 73.

This document, which was found in the temple of Sokanobkoneus at Bacchias, is a receipt for the payment of some tax by the priests to a bank, and like xvii is for the most part written in the very rapid cursive characteristic of late Ptolemaic documents, with frequent abbreviations. It is dated in the 'ninth year,' but is undoubtedly somewhat later than xvii; and though the ninth year may perhaps refer to Ptolemy Soter II (B.C. 109) it more probably belongs to the reign of Neos Dionysus, i.e. B.C. 73. Had the papyrus come from Gebelén or Thebes the question of its belonging to the reign of Soter II would hardly arise, but in the Fayum the transition from the Ptolemaic into the Roman style is noticeable earlier than in the more southern districts. Both the nature of the tax and the amount paid by the priests remain uncertain. The first is perhaps the same as that with which xvii is concerned; the second depends on the interpretation given to the symbol which occurs once in line 4 and twice in line 5, and perhaps signifies talents. On the verso is a short account.

"Ετός θυ, Θεός κ. πέρι στοιχείας ἔπει τη ηρά. ( ) κο( ) τρα(πεζι)ν
'Iσιεύσαν καὶ Ἀκοῦσα(λάω) τοῦ παρά Διονυσίου
τρα(πεζι)ν τῷ βασιλείπ. παρά Σοκανοβκονέως θεοῦ μεγάλου
ἱερίων Βασίλεα(πέρι) ἐπίγραφο( ) πείζε( ) ελ( ) εἰ(ρ) τοῦ η (ἐπούς)

5. η δέκα, / η 1.

2. ἔπει τηρ. 3. στοιχεύ is rewritten. 4. τοῦ of τοῦcorr. from τοῦ.
1. πέρι(τω)κ: written πεζ. The πεζ is not quite certain, and the curved stroke is found above the second χ of βασίλεα simply as an abbreviation mark; but the two letters here are more like πεζ than τοῦ (i.e. τετοπεζ), and πεζεύκ is confirmed by xvii. 1.

τηρ.: or perhaps τηρ. simply; the scribe is not at all careful about the number of strokes which he inserts. We should of course expect ἔπι τηρ ἔπι (place name) τρεῖς τω, but the
two words that follow are not reconcilable with an abbreviation of either Ἡρακλέως πόλεως or Κροκόδιλων πόλεως, and even the reading ῥα(πέων) is doubtful.

3. τῷ βασιλείῳ; cf. xvii. 2. Possibly ῥέ(στα) should be read.

Σωκαρσκεύασμα: for the explanation of this form of Sebek, the crocodile god, see p. 32.

4. ἐπιγραφ( ); the abbreviation is apparently the same as in xvii. 3; cf. note ad loc.

The symbol which follows is identical with that which occurs twice in the next line (cf. xvii. 5, note). Since the payment is to a bank, the name of some kind of coin is required, and the only known symbol for a coin to which this sign bears any resemblance is that for a talent, Ξ. But it is much more like the ordinary Ptolemaic sign for αἱροῦ. A very similar sign, of uncertain meaning, occurs in Brit. Mus. Pap. 195.17 and 19, written in the reign of Tiberius.

XVIII (a) and (b). Orders for Payment of Wheat.

Umm el Ṭāti. (a) 9.3 × 6.5, (b) 12.2 × 7.5 cm. First century B.C.

These two papyri were found together with a number of similar documents (cxliv–ccl) in the temple at Bacchias. They belong to the first century B.C., and are dated in the 19th, 20th and 21st years of an unnamed sovereign, who is more probably Ptolemy Neos Dionysus than Augustus, since μάχιμοι occur in cxliv. They consist of orders addressed to Acusilaus, sitologus, by the γραμματεὺς γεωργῶν or the γραμματεὺς κτηνοτρόφων of Bacchias to pay sums of wheat, generally two aratabae, to various persons. At the end come usually the signatures of the κωμογραμματεὺς and another official. The γραμματεὺς γεωργῶν was the scribe of the δημόσιοι or σύστατος γεωργοί (cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 256 (d) 3 and 258. 60), and the orders issued by him are apparently concerned, like Brit. Mus. Pap. 256 (d), with the advance of seed corn to the cultivators of βασιλική γῆ (cf. lxxv). But the reading of the crucial passage is unfortunately doubtful. The orders from the γραμματεὺς κτηνοτρόφων relate to freight charges, and are probably orders for payment of the owners of transport animals employed by the government for the carriage of corn to Arsinoē or Ptolemais Harbour, the port of the Fayūm; cf. p. 14, and B. G. U. 802, Brit. Mus. Pap. 256 (a) 6.

Another group of orders for payment, issued by the scribes of the γεωργοί or κτηνοτρόφων, is Ostr. 14–18, but the formula is somewhat different; cf. p. 318.

(a) Στράτων γραμματεύς γεωργῶν
Ἀκουσιδάου συνόλογος χαρέων. μέτρησον
[Πε]τρεσσούχων Πασίγυρον εἰς η. ( ) βασιλική
γῆν πυρῷ δύο, (πυρῷ) β.
5 (ἔτους) [κ]α, Θ(δῆ) 4ε.
FAYÚM TOWNS

2nd hand Πέταλος μέτρησεν τὰς προκειμένας
πυρού δύο, / (πυροῦ) β. (ἔτους) κα, θ(ῶθ) ἰε.

3rd hand Μαρρής κακομακατεῖς μέτρησεν τὰς προκειμένας
[πυροῦ δύο, / (πυροῦ) β. (ἔτους) κα, θ(ῶθ) ἰε.

"Straton, scribe of the cultivators, to Acusilaus, sithologus, greeting. Measure out to Petesuchus, son of Paësis, for... domain land two artabae of wheat, total wh. 2 art. The 21st year, Thoth 15." Countersignatures of Petalos and Marres, village scribe.

3. While βα(σλιοῦ) γὰρ is tolerably certain (cf. cxlix and cl), the word which precedes, both here and in cxlix, is illegible.

(δ) Ὅρνοφρεις γραμματεῖς
κτησιφόρος [βασιλεὺς] Βακχι- 
δος Ἀκουσίλαος σιτο- 
λόγω τῆς αὔξησις χα- 
5 ρειν. μέτρησαν να [...] 
[...]. φόρεσαν [...] 
[...]. στὸν Σιρμιακὸν πυροῦ 
[ἀρτάβας] τέσσαρας, / (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) δ. 
(ἔτους) κα, θ(ῶθ) 15.

10 ... σκλῆς μέτρησαν 
πυροῦ ἀρτάβας τέσσαρας, 
/ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) δ.

10. Final σ (?) of σκλῆσ above the line.


III. DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD.

XIX. LETTER OF THE EMPEROR HADRIAN.

Ūmm el 'Atl. 22 x 10-3 cm. Second century.

While several imperial rescripts are extant in papyri, there have been no instances of private letters of an emperor dealing with non-official topics. Yet, if we may believe the present document, we have here a copy of a letter, or rather part of a letter, written by the Emperor Hadrian to Antoninus, no doubt the future sovereign. By a curious coincidence, too, the letter is con-
cerned with the same subject as the one certainly genuine composition of Hadrian's that has come down to us, the famous poem beginning *animula vagula blandula*, namely the approach of death.

The letter is written on the verso of a taxing-list, and consists of fifteen lines, unfortunately incomplete, in a clear cursive hand, not later than the end of the second century. At the bottom is a repetition of the first five lines in a large irregular uncial. No doubt the writing by the first hand is an exercise set by a schoolmaster, that by the second is the copy by a pupil. Both beginnings and ends of lines are lost; but while the size of the lacunae at the beginnings can be determined with tolerable certainty from lines 1 and 16, where *Ἄντωνιπ* must be the first word, it is difficult to estimate the average amount lost at the ends. Comparing lines 3–4 with 18–19 we can, on the assumption that *ἀπροσδοκήτως* was the last word of lines 3 and 18, obtain a perfectly satisfactory connexion both as regards the sense and the known size of the lacunae at the beginnings of lines 4 and 19. Taking this supposed length of line 3 as the criterion for the ends of other lines, an obvious and satisfactory restoration for the lacunae between lines 5 and 6, 12 and 13, 13 and 14 is also attainable. But the hypothesis that line 3 ended with *ἀπροσδοκήτως* leads to difficulties in connexion with lines 1 and 2 which are repeated in 16 and 17. The second *ω* of *Ἄντωνιπ* is over *η* of *ἀπροσδοκήτως*, and after it is a space of about two letters blank before the lacuna. If *ἀπροσδοκήτως* is the end of line 3 there is probably nothing lost after *Ἄντωνιπ* at the end of line 1. But there is room for five letters before *τ* of line 2. Turning to lines 16–17, however, there is not space for both *Ἄντωνιπ* and five letters in the combined lacunae between *Σεβαστὸς* and *τ*. Secondly, the restoration [ρι οβτε] will make line 17 equal in length to line 3, but *μον* can only be made to fill up the lacunae at the end of line 2 and the beginning of line 3 by supposing that ρι was written in line 3 and that a blank space of a letter was left between it and οβτε ἀλαγως. The *ω* of *ἀωβ* is above *τ* of *ἀπροσδοκήτως*, so we should naturally expect the word to have been written out in line 2, not divided. On the other hand, if we renounce the view that *ἀπροσδοκήτως* was the end of the line, then we must supply another adverb preceded by οβτε, which would require a lacuna of ten letters or more at the end of line 3, and give up the proposed restorations, however tempting, of the lacunae between 5 and 6, 12 and 13, 13 and 14. But on the whole it seems more probable that *ἀπροσδοκήτως* was the end of line 3. The difficulties which arise in lines 1 and 2 are by no means insuperable. Granted the division *ἀωβ* in 2–3, we need only suppose that *ἀωβ* was written to obtain enough letters for the lacuna at the beginning of line 3;
and the inconsistency between lines 1–2 and 16–17 may be explained either by assuming that line 2 being part of the address began much further to the right than lines 1 and 3 (as frequently happens in the case of letters), and that we should read simply 'Ἀυτῶν' | τῷ, or else by supposing that the pupil omitted the word lost after 'Ἀυτῶν'. His copy is sufficiently inaccurate to justify the assumption of a mistake of this kind. We have, therefore, in our text of the letter filled up the lacunae on the hypothesis that ἀποστολήτως was the end of line 3 and that the other lines roughly corresponded to it in length. Owing to the first hand's practice of occasionally leaving gaps between letters, the lacunae may always be one or two letters less than what we have suggested.

The subject of Hadrian's letter is, as has been stated, his approaching end, which the Emperor declares his intention of meeting with fortitude and resignation, based upon a comparison of the length of his own life with that of his parents. No doubt we have only the commencement of an elaborate epistle. At line 15, where the first hand breaks off, it is not even certain that the sentence is complete. After the exordium (1–2), 'The Emperor Caesar Hadrianus to his esteemed Antoninus, greeting,' comes (2–4) the assertion that his death was neither unexpected nor lamentable nor unreasonable. From the vigour with which the points are reiterated (ἀπόθανε and ἀποστολήτως, ἀλόγως and ἀνοίγωσα) one may conjecture that the Emperor is repudiating the tone of a consolatory letter from Antoninus. The connexion of the two following lines, 5, 6, with the preceding is not clear owing to the loss of the verb. The person alluded to as tending and comforting the Emperor is no doubt Antoninus himself; perhaps the meaning is, 'I am fully prepared to meet death, though I miss your presence and loving care.' Line 7 is hopelessly obscure; lines 8–10 are introductory to what follows. 'I do not intend to give the conventional reasons of philosophy for this attitude, but to make a plain statement of facts.' Or else πραγμάτως refers to Hadrian's acta, and the letter is but the prologue to an account of the Emperor's life, like the Monumentum Ancyranum. The sense of the next four lines, 11–14, is clear: 'My father by birth died at the age of forty a private person, so that I have lived more than half as long again as my father, and have reached about the same age as that of my mother when she died.' Line 15 is obscure, and at the end of it the letter breaks off and the repetition of the first five lines by the schoolboy follows.

When we turn to the question how far this letter accords with the known facts about Hadrian, there is nothing which obviously need prevent our accepting it as part of a genuine, or of the translation of a genuine, letter. Hadrian died at the age of 62 after a long and painful illness, during which he was
assiduously tended by Antoninus. Shortly before the end Hadrian retired to Baiae, leaving his adopted successor in charge at Rome (Spart. vit. Hadr. 25). The background implied by the letter is therefore perfectly historical. Moreover Vopiscus (Saturninus 7) quotes Adriani epistolam ex libris Phlegontis liberti eius preditam; and though the genuineness of that letter is open to grave doubt, there is every reason to believe that private letters of Hadrian were published soon after his death. And if so, it is likely that they were widely read in Egypt. The references in the letter to the Emperor’s parents are quite consistent with our very scanty knowledge of those persons. Hadrian’s father, Aelius Hadrianus Afer, died when his son was ten years old (Spart. ibid. 1), which suits the statement in line 12 that he only lived to be forty. Of Hadrian’s mother we know no more than her name. There is nothing in the portion of the letter which is preserved that suggests a motive for a forgery, like the reference to the Christians which excites suspicions about the authenticity of the letter of Hadrian quoted by Vopiscus. Lastly, the great antiquity of the papyrus, which was written probably within thirty, certainly within sixty, years of Hadrian’s death, is a distinct argument in favour of its genuineness.

On the other hand has to be set the fact that the letter was employed as a school exercise, a circumstance which inevitably gives rise to doubt whether it was ever anything more. An epistle from the dying Hadrian to Antoninus would be a good subject for a composition; and though the use of the letter for school purposes is of course compatible with its authenticity, the evidence, mainly negative, in favour of genuineness barely outweighs the suspicion naturally evoked by the purpose to which it was turned.

[Ἀυτοκράτορ Καίσαρ Ἄδριανος Σε[βαστός Ἀγ[τ]ων]| 5[. . . . . .]δεναι εἰ καὶ παρατιχύνετα μοι νοσηλεύοντα| 10[. . . . . .]καὶ παραμυθομένου καὶ προτρέποντα δι|. . . . . .| [. . . . . .]δικείν ὧς εὑρον καὶ ἀπὸ τοιοῦτον| [. . . . . .]ψαί οὖ μᾶ Δεί[.] ὡς φιλορικὸν λόγον| [. . . . . .]καὶ, . . . .]αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπλῆν| [. . . . . .]καὶ οἱ μὲν φύσει πατήρ γενόμενος| [τεσσαράκοντα βιώσας ἐτη ἱδίωτης μετήλλαξε| 1. 2}
XX. IMPERIAL EDICT CONCERNING THE AURUM CORONARIUM.

This papyrus is a copy of an important edict concerning the remission of the aurum coronarium for the whole empire. The custom of offering golden crowns to victorious rulers, which was known both to the Hellenistic world and to the Romans of the Republic (Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 295 sqq., Kubitschek ap. Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encycl. s.v. aurum coronarium; cf. xiv. above), changed its character under the empire from a semi-voluntary contribution on special triumphal occasions to a regular tax exacted not only at the accession of a monarch, but in some reigns, as for instance that of Elagabalus, annually. Remissions of the aurum coronarium are recorded in connexion with Augustus (Mon. Ancyra. c. 21), Hadrian (Hist. Aug. vit. Hadr. 6. 5), and Severus Alexander (ibid. vit. Alex. Sev. 32. 5); and Antoninus Pius (ibid. vit. Ant. P. 4. 10) returned most of the aurum coronarium which had been offered at the time of his adoption. Several rescripts of fourth century emperors regulating the tax are preserved in Cod. Theod. xii. 13.

There are five fragments of the present papyrus, one (a) large and con-
taining the last column practically complete with the ends of lines of the column preceding, the rest small and worm-eaten. One of these, from the top of a column, obviously belongs to the beginning of the edict. The vestiges of the first two lines are too exiguous to afford any information; but in the third line Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβαστὸς, and in the fourth γαρ [παραδείγματι] are legible, showing that name and titles of the emperor occupied at least four lines. Though the ends of the first three lines in the penultimate column, which consist of ἴς, ἧμας, ἧμεῖς respectively, do not give any help, we think it probable that all the four small fragments belong to this mutilated column, and that when complete the papyrus had but two columns.

The edict is dated at the end in the first year of an emperor whose name is not given. On palaeographical grounds the papyrus can be ascribed with confidence to the period between 270 and 350, but as it may be a copy of a much older document this fact only provides us with a terminus ad quem for the date of the edict. The first and second century emperors are however excluded by the mention (Col. II. 3) of Trajan and Marcus as the emperor's πρώτον, and the occurrence of the formula Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβαστὸς in the list of titles in Col. I. Caracalla is out of the question, because in Egypt the years of his reign are calculated from his father's accession, so that the earliest emperor who can have been the author of the edict is Macrinus. Nor will the combination of the first year, which occurs in the date, with the implication of the speaker that he was sole monarch suit any emperor later than Diocletian, for after 283 there was no emperor before Julian who was sole monarch during his first year, and on palaeographical grounds Julian and his successors are unsuitable. We are therefore limited in our choice of the supposed author to some emperor not earlier than Macrinus, nor later than Diocletian.

The field is narrowed much further if we are right in our interpretation of lines 7–9 that the emperor in question had been Caesar before he became emperor (Ἀντώνιος). In fact, of the emperors between Macrinus and Diocletian only Severus Alexander and Carinus fulfil that condition; and considering the character of Carinus' reign and the fact that he was at first associated with his brother Numerianus, he may be safely left out of account.

The process of eliminating emperors who for various reasons are unsuitable brings us therefore to the conclusion that Severus Alexander was the author

---

1 Severus Alexander was not associated with Elagabalus on equal terms during the latter's lifetime; see Klebs, *Praeüigraphia*, i.e. pp. 215–216. The statement there made that he did not receive the title Augustus before Elagabalus' death requires modification in the light of B. G. U. 452 and 663 and Brit. Mus. Pap. 353; but Elagabalus alone bears the title Ἀντωνιώτης in those instances (Brit. Mus. Pap. 353 is imperfect).
of the edict, a view which seems to provide a satisfactory explanation. The remission of the *aurum coronarium* by that emperor would possess a peculiar appropriateness, since we know from papyri and ostraca that Elagabalus made the imposition annual, at any rate in Egypt, and the cessation of payments for ἀργαφωνία in papyri after the reign of Elagabalus has already been noted (Milne, *Hist. of Egypt under Roman Rule*, p. 228). The references in the papyrus itself to the exhaustion of the empire (lines 5, 14), the mention of Trajan and Marcus as πρὸσωποὶ of the emperor (line 3), a claim which is unintelligible if made by a later emperor than Severus Alexander, the efforts at reform which the emperor claims to be making (14 sqq.), all excellently accord with the hypothesis that Severus Alexander is the speaker. Lastly the day, Pauni 30, on which the edict was written suits that emperor, whose accession dates from March 11, A.D. 222. There are indeed two objections: first, that the Hist. Aug. (*vit. Alex. Sev.* 32. 5) states that Severus Alexander remitted the *aurum coronarium* for Rome; but is silent about a general remission such as is ordained by the edict; and secondly, that the papyrus itself must have been written fifty years or more after Severus Alexander’s accession. The first objection however is not very serious, for the edict, whether by Severus or another third century emperor, has in any case escaped the notice of the Hist. Aug.; and the second seems to us much less serious than the difficulties which arise in the interpretation of the papyrus, especially of lines 7–9, if it is supposed that Severus Alexander was not the author.

Though the edict is written in a neat and regular cursive, the Greek is extraordinarily corrupt—to such an extent that somewhat violent changes are in places necessary to obtain any satisfactory sense. Apart from the numerous mistakes in spelling the constructions are often so confused as to give rise to the suspicion that the errors lie deeper than in mere carelessness of scribes. Prof. Mitteis, to whom we are indebted for several good suggestions on this papyrus, thinks that the archetype may have been a private, not an official, translation from the Latin.

The object of the edict was to remit both in Italy and the provinces the *aurum coronarium* already either voted or ordered to be voted to the emperor upon his accession, but to insist on the payment of the arrears of *aurum coronarium* which were owing. For his inability to remit these too the emperor apologizes, the reasons having been given in the lost first column. He concludes with assurance of future good government and directions for the publication of the edict.

Owing to the peculiar obscurity of the decree we give first an exact transcription of it (omitting the slight remains of the first column). The scribe
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has a tendency to divide words, but as he is very inconsistent and erratic in his method of leaving spaces we have printed the Greek continuously. There follows a reconstruction of the text in modern form with a minimum of alterations necessary to obtain some kind of meaning.

Fr. (a).

Col. II.

[...]σημειάτον ησαχαραστή [...]αυτον ηθλωσισαποσπασθαι [...]ς, [...]νυνεπεμποπέλθουσιαπιππηράχνην εἰστὶν [...]. ἤμισυ καθένας ἑξανταίαδεμπαρεστήτη βουλισματούσουδεαποβραπταράξιμων τον υμειόμα ρατιονικακαρκονισματούντα σοματον προγονωσισματοκατοραθήσαμενεια ἡμισυνια 

γεγενεμονομέεινομενον ἀντιστοίχοιαπρωτοστηλλαγηνπροαιρησειτην ημευς γεγογονομονομίαν. [...]

5 ὁς, εγενεστοτις [...]ρατονκακοτουσθημίσουσανπερεισενεδωσητοπολιαροτεραντιπαρουν 

μεγαλοσυνηαντωτικι, [...]εμονουσιαμελησεσακαμεπικτουσουράλθουσεροχρονοκεντροιουτορο 

πλαστοντελειοχαριονιφελετοκαιπεμηπατροστηκατερασοτροπον γεγονειανετοντοι.[...]τεφανονομοι 

εψηφισμεθαπροτεροκαιτειςψηφισθησουμεθακατατηματηνηαιναινυπωτωνολησεικαιιαντα 

αιειιαλλαταναμενουκεομαδιεικροενπροθενεπιτυπνταπαγαφασιαπολιο

10 ὁσευκτωνταροτωναρωνυμεναναπαρειδονδιαπεριστωσαναπανταισερ [...]τασπολειομενασατοι 

ταστακειεταλιεικα [...]τασεταλειοσενθενεικαντηπροσατιεμενουραρχησητηςηματοκρατοσ 

εφημαυλουμενωυκαιεμουμεναπαινουπαρεθυναντως χρονουσετεφανως χρηματαν [...]ση 

ηευτευνεναναισταταταιδιαιπθεσιμαιοσιμαιιπλουτουποιονταυδητημεματαιουραρχησινθελη [saei...πικαισαρ...] μικαπερκεκρακυκλωναναλημψασθαιον χορονηχητησιειαλλασωφρον 

15 μενονουρμποτεσχενηγεμενουαναλωματωνουδεαργουτομοιουσθεται [...]μεπαταιντοι [...] 

χρηματωλη [...] νεμαλλουφιλαναυροπιετεκαευρεσιασωνανχητηναρχηνίου] 

καιτοιιιγεμεσιαντακαιεπεταπαιμενουπασταλμενουσεγειειασκριβεσταοτοδοκιμεσια[ 

καιπρελομεισ...]πεσστιλακιεκειουσουβουλεταισιμετρωτατουσπαραχειαντουσυμαλλον 

γερτηκαιμελον [...]τοςθνωνυγεμεσικατακεκαδημαιναιμεθοςανουστουρουρμαιςφειδεσαϊ 

20 ποτοσοφαθατωνουσιοισεππαισταροκεφαλειαντακαιτουκατραβοματαιεναυτοι 

μετατοικακκομετοτοκακαφροσωτοκακεικασκαθιαστησισβασιλιαθοικουκουταυτοτοεμα[ 

δοματοσαντηγραφατουσκετακατησκπαλιναρχουσιν γεμεσωπειμελεσιοτον ηματιαμιλισεσται[...] 

συνοπταοισασαγιουσκουσον 

Δαφνιδή.
�πως μὴ διὰ τὸ τῆς χαρᾶς τῆς ἐαυτῶν δήλωσιν ποιήσασθαι ε... νην ἐπ᾿ ἐμοὶ παρελθόντε ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν
ἐιστελεχεῖν βιασθεῖν μεῖζον ἢ δύνανται. οὗτοι μοι παρέστη τὸ βούλευμα
tοῦτο οὐδὲ ἀποδείουται παραδειγμάτων
ἐν αἰς Τραιανὸν τε καὶ Μάρκον τοὺς ἐμαυτοῖς προγόνοις Ἀυτοκράτορας δὲ
μάλιστα δὴ θαυμάσαι ἄξιον
γεγενημένους μιμείσθαι ἔμελλον, ὡς καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄλλαγὴν προαιρήσειν
τὴν γνώμην νῦν ἐμὴν ἐγὼ πιστεύομαι,
5 ὡς εἰ γε μὴ τὴν παρὰ τοὺς καὶ τοῖς δημοσίας ἀπορίας ἐμποδοῦν ἢν,
pολὺ ἄν φανερωτέραν τὴν ἐμαυτὸν
μεγαλοψυχίαν ἐπιδείκνυσιν οὔθ ἂν ἐμέλλησα ὅσα καὶ ἐτι ἐκ τοῦ
παρελθόντος χρόνου ἐκ τῆς τωνομητρο-
ποῦ αυτολείτα κατίστα ὁφείλετο, καὶ ὅποσα πρὸς τὴν Καῖσαρος
προσγοριαζομέν ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν [στεφάνων ὕψιστοι
ἐντιμήθηκε πρότερον καὶ ἐτι ψηφισθησόμεθα κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν
ὑπὸ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ ταῦτα
ἀνείναι. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν οὐκ ὀλοκληρώσει, δὲ ἀ μικρὸν ἐμπροσθεὶς ἐπιπο-
tαῦτα δὲ μόνα ἐ... , σειν τάς πόλεις,
10 ὡς ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ὅρῳ, δυναμένας οὐ παρείδευν. διόπερ ἴστωσαν
ἀπαντῆς ἐν ταῖς πόλεις ἀπάσαις
taῖς τε κατ᾽ Ἰταλιᾶν καὶ ταῖς ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθνεσιν τὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ
προφασίας τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ ἀρχῆς τῆς Ἀυτοκράτορος,
ἐφ᾽ ἂν καὶ βουλομένον καὶ εὐχομένων ἀπάντων παρήλθον, ἀντὶ τῶν
χρυσῶν στεφάνων χρήματα αὐθ... ἦ-
θεντα ἀνείναι αὐτοῖς, ταῦτα δὲ οὐ διὰ περιούσιαν πλοῦτον ποιοῦτα ἀλλὰ
διὰ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ προαίρεσιν δὲ ἦ-
5 ἀεὶ ἐπὶ Καῖσαρ εἰμί καὶ περικέκακα τὸ κλῖνον ἀναλήψεσθαι οὐχ
ὅμοι δρον ζητήσασιν ἀλλὰ σωφροσύνη,
15 μὸνον οὖ πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον γινομένων ἀναλωμάτων. οὔδὲ γὰρ τοῦτό μοι
σπουδαιότερον ἐξ ἀπάντων
χρηματίζομαι, πλὴν μᾶλλον φιλανθρωπία τε καὶ ἐνεργείαις συναξεῖν
tαττῆν τὴν ἀρχήν, ἴνα ἐμοὶ
καὶ τοῖς ἡγεμόνις τοῖς κατ᾽ ἐπιτροπεῖάς παρ᾽ ἐμοὶ ἀπεσταλμένοις, οὐς
ἐγὼ εἰς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον δοκιμᾶσα
καὶ προελθομενοι [ἀπέστειλα, κακέιναις συμβούλευμα εἶνα ὧς μετριωτάτους παρέχειν αὐτοῖς. μᾶλλον γὰρ δὴ καὶ μᾶλλον [ο] τῶν ἔθνων ἡγεμόνες καταμάθοιες ἀν μεθὺ δόσης αὐτοῦς προθυμίας φείδεσθαι καὶ προσφέρει τῶν ἔθνων οἷς ἐφηστήκασι προσήκει, εἰ ἀποτέλεσκα τὸν Ἀυτοκράτορα ὅραν πάσιν αὐτοῖς μετὰ τοσάττης κοσμόποιος καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας τὰ τῆς βασιλείας διωκόμα. τοῦτον τὸν ἐμοῦ δόγματος ἀντίγραφα τοῖς καθ’ ἐκάστην πόλιν ἀρχοῦσιν γενέσθω ἐπιμελεῖς εἰς τὸ δημόσιον μάλιστα ἐστάναι σύνοπτα τοῖς ἀναγγελώσκωσιν.
(ἔτους) α, Παῦλος Ἐπίτροπος αποκόμματος Ρωμαίων Ἐπίτροπος αποκόμματος Ρωμαίων

. . . lest for the sake of making a manifestation of their joy at my accession to empire they should be compelled to contribute a greater (sum) than they are able. Wherefore I have formed this intention, not wanting in precedents, amongst which Trajan and Marcus, my own ancestors and emperors proved beyond all others to be worthy of admiration, were objects of my imitation, emperors whose policy also, with respect to the adoption of reform, I now make my own, namely that if the fact of the public embarrassment existing in various parts had not stood in my way, I should have made a much more conspicuous display of my magnanimity, and should not have hesitated also to remit the sums which were owed as arrears from the past for contributions of this sort, as well as the sums which I have already been voted on account of the crowns when I received the title of Caesar, or which I may yet be voted on the same pretext by the cities. But while I do not propose to remit these for reasons which I have given shortly before, nevertheless it has not escaped my notice that this is all that the cities, so far as I see under present conditions, can pay. Therefore let all persons in all the cities throughout Italy and other countries know that I remit to them the sums due in place of golden crowns on the occasion of my accession to the empire, to which in accordance with the wishes and prayers of all I have attained, and that I do this not owing to a superfluity of wealth but to my deliberate policy, in pursuance of which, ever since I became Caesar, I have earnestly striven to restore vigour to what was in decline, not by acquisitions of territory (?) but by economy, limiting expenditure to public purposes. For it is not my aim to make money on all occasions, but rather by liberality and the conferring of benefits to increase the welfare of this empire, in order that the governors dispatched by me to posts of rule, officers whom I tested and selected with the utmost care for dispatch—that they also may follow my instructions to behave with the utmost moderation. For the governors of the different countries will learn more and more thoroughly how much zeal it is their duty to show in exercising thrift and in providing for the interests of the peoples over whom they are placed, if they have all been commanded to watch the emperor himself acting with so much propriety and discretion and moderation in the administration of his kingdom. Let the rulers of the several cities see that copies of this my edict are set up in the most public places in full view of those who wish to read. The first year, Παῦλος τὸ ἔτος τόπος.
1. The word after ποίησασθεῖται seems to be a substantive with which μείζω agrees; the doubtful ν might be read as η.

3. From this passage we should naturally, though perhaps not necessarily, infer that Trajan and Marcus had made a remission of aurum coronarium. Historians are silent on that point; but Hadrian, who is not mentioned here, is stated (Spart. vii. Hadr. 6. 5) to have remitted a large part of the present about to be made to him on his accession, and the omission of his name here would be less remarkable if it is supposed that Trajan and Marcus also made a remission of aurum coronarium.

προφέροντες: the claim is of course not strictly true; but Septimius Severus called himself the son of Marcus (Dio. Ixxv. 7), and if the emperor in question was Severus Alexander, who claimed descent from Caracalla, there would be nothing surprising in his speaking of Trajan and Marcus as his 'ancestors.'

4. ἔν...ποιήσας: in the interpretation of this very corrupt and obscure passage we have followed Prof. Mittels. ἄλλαγάς προφήτευσε must refer to the remission decreed further on, though the meaning given to ἄλλαγάς is rather strange. To obtain any construction several changes in the Greek are necessary. ἔν refers to Trajan and Marcus, and if it is retained oμε must be altered. Another way of emending the passage would be to omit ἔν, place a stop at προφήτευσεν, and read τοὺς τῶν οὖν ἐγώ γνώμην. This is nearer the Greek, but yields a less satisfactory meaning.

5. δημοσίως: perhaps δημοσίως should be emended to δημοσίως, in which case a word has probably been omitted after the first τοῦ.

6. καὶ ἔτι κ.τ.λ.: here again the papyrus is untranslatable as it stands, even if τοῦ is for ἔτι; the simplest remedy is to insert δέα (which may easily have dropped out after ομελλομεν), and alter ἔτι to ἔτι. The meaning of lines 7—9 depends on the question whether the aurum coronarium πρὸς τὴν Καίσαρος προφήτευσαν in 7 is identical with the aurum coronarium ἐν τῷ προφήτευτε τῆς ἡμετῆρος τῆς Ἀφανίστασας in 11. If it is, then τῶν in lines 8 and 9 must refer only to the κατάστα τὸ τοῦ παρελθόντος χρόνου and not to the sums πρὸς τὴν Καίσαρος προφήτευσαν; for from lines 10 to 13 it is clear that the emperor does remit the aurum coronarium for his own accession, as contrasted with certain sums which he refuses to remit. If that really is the meaning of the passage, the sentence in 7—9 is very clumsily constructed, for the sums due τὸ τοῦ παρελθόντος χρόνου are coupled with those paid τῷ τοῦ Καίσαρος προφήτευσαν, as if both sets of taxes, and not the first only, would have been remitted if circumstances had allowed, but as a matter of fact are retained. It is very difficult to take τῶν in line 8 as referring to only one of the two preceding clauses, and that the clause which is furthest from it. Moreover the point of the proclamation διὸ εἰς τῶν κ.τ.λ. seems to us to lose much of its force, if the emperor had a few lines previously stated by implication his intention of remitting the aurum coronarium for his own accession. We therefore prefer to take Καίσαρος in line 7 in the restricted sense as contrasted with Ἀπαφανίστασας in 11, and to suppose that the sums paid or to be paid for his becoming Caesar were, besides those due τὸ τοῦ παρελθόντος χρόνου, included under τῶν in lines 8 and 9, as the sums which are not remitted. A slight objection to this interpretation is that the sums due πρὸς τῷ τοῦ Καίσαρος προφήτευσαν had not yet all been voted by the cities; but if we suppose that the emperor in question became Λεοντόφαντος very soon after having been created Καίσαρ, the objection is avoided. The point is one of some importance because, if our explanation is correct, it affords an important clue for discovering the identity of the author of the edict (cf. introd.). On the presentation of aurum coronarium to a Caesar, cf. Hist. Aug. viii. Ant. P. 4. 10.

8. We have omitted τῇ before καὶ τῶν and connected ἀνείποι with ομελλομεν. Otherwise, to be grammatical, ἐν must be altered to ἡν ἦν. But then the participle
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ἐπιθετονίμενος is awkward, and the sentence is much improved by omitting ἔν altogether. ταῦτα, both here and in line 9, refers to lines 6–8; cf. note on line 6.

9. δὲ δὲ: the reasons were given in the first column which is lost. The corrupt word following μῶνα must be a verb meaning 'contribute' or the like. The doubtful π can be read as στ or σφ.

10. ζύλι: this is quite clearly written; probably the stroke drawn through the following ρ was intended for the μ.

12. ἀντί seems to have the sense of ἐπίρ, since, as Mitteis observes, it does not seem possible on the supposition that an actual conversion from χρυσοῦ στέφανος to χρῆματα is meant to obtain a satisfactory meaning for the passage, even though on this theory a more natural meaning for δαλαγὴ in line 4 might be obtained. Mitteis suggests that δειθώνα was the word meant at the end of the line, but it is not possible to read anything like it. The doubtful δ may be α.

13. αὐτάς: sc. τῶν πόλεων.

δι' ἡς: this division (if the reading, which is very doubtful, is correct) would not be employed by a good scribe, but cf. Ox. Pap. II. 270. 32 ὅπε ἱν.

14. The scribe does not seem to have written εἰποῦ after Κατὰ, for the top of an ε, if there had been one, ought to have been visible. Possibly he wrote ημῖν, but the vestiges are too slight to afford much positive evidence.

οὗχ ἄρον ζητήσεως: the phrase is difficult; perhaps οὗ χρῆμα should be read, a reference to the extravagances of Elagabalus; oὐχ ἄροφων gives no sense.

15. μῶνα οὕτω: this clause is very difficult. If μῶνα was the word intended after τά, some kind of sense is obtained, but it is not satisfactory. The doubtful а may be λ but not δ.

οὔτε γὰρ τούτο: the general sense of this sentence is plain, but a verb must be supplied before πλῆν. The simplest change is to alter χρημάτων to χρηματίζων.

20. Our emendation προσεξεις εἰ ἵπτετεκαταρκαί for the corrupt προσεκεκαταρκαί of the papyrus changes as little as possible, but ἵπτετεκαταρκά is hardly expected here.

XXI. PROCLAMATION OF MAMERTINUS.

Harlit. 29-4 X 23 cm. A.D. 134.

Proclamation of the praefect Marcus Petronius Mamertinus, ordering receipts to be given for payments made. After referring to a previous edict of his own on this subject, in which he had directed receipts to be given for payments made in accordance with a written document, Mamertinus extends this decree to all payments made for public purposes whether in kind or money or manual labour. He then notices, in a rather obscurely worded paragraph, an abuse which had arisen in connexion with the payment of debts. Apparently creditors were resorting to the device of refusing to accept payment when offered by the debtor, with the object of inducing the latter to pay more than was legally due in order to escape the penalties to which he would be
liable if the debt was not settled within the appointed term. This practice Mamertinus declares to be a penal offence.

Markos Petranios Mameertinos

eparchos Aiguptou λέγει:

πρότερον μὲν ἀποχάς ἀλλήλοις

παρέχειν ἑκέλευσα περὶ τῶν ἐν

γράφων διὰ τὰς ἀμφισβητήσεις

tās εἰ' ἐμοῦ περὶ τούτων γενομένας, νυνεὶ δὲ συνλῆβδην περὶ πάντων ὑποσοφον διδομένων [..]

ἡ λογισμένων εἰς τὸ δημόσιον εἰς

τ' ἐν γένεσιν εἰτ' ἐν ἀργυρίῳ εἰτ' ἐν σωματικάις ἔργασίαις ἡ ἄλλη ὑποδήτην τρόπη κελεύω παρέχειν ἀλλήλοις

ἀποχὰς τοὺς τε διδόντας καὶ τοὺς ἀδικημένους, ἐπεξελευσόμενος ἕαν

tis ἀλλα παρὰ ταύτα ποιήσας. εἰς(ε)ι

de καὶ τούτο τινες εμένψαντο

ὅς αὐτοὶ μὲν τὰ μεθία προσφέροντες ὦτ' ὃς ὕψωσαν, ἐκίνους δὲ μὴ

βουλομένους παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνω

βάνειν ἴνα τὴν παρολὴν ἐξωνήσωνται τῷ τοῦ προστίμου φόβῳ, δυνητώσωνται μαρτυρίαν ποιήσασθαι

περὶ τῶν μὴ προειμένων οἱ μὴ διδόν[τες] ὧτ' ὤποιος τῆς ἀποθείας ἐκίνου τὴν

προσήκουσαν δικη[ν] υπόσχοσι.

(ἔτους) ἐν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραίανον 'Αδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, Φαμενώθ κς.

14 After ξ of επεξελευσόμενος has apparently been added slightly above the line.
15 l. παύσθ, or supply φαίνεται. 16 l. ϕεύψατο. 22 l. διδόντων. Over αν of μαρτυρίαν some letters (?) δε) have been inserted above the line. 23 ει added above the line. 24 l. ἀποθαίνου ὀτ' ἀποθαίνας.

Proclamation of Marcus Petronius Mamertinus, praefect of Egypt. In a previous
edict I commanded that receipts should be mutually given with reference to debts secured by documents, on account of the disputes concerning them which had occurred during my office. I now give orders generally with regard to all payments to the government made in any manner either actual or by credit, whether in kind or in money or in bodily labour or any other way whatsoever, that payer and payee shall mutually give receipts; and I will punish any one who acts in any other manner than that hereby directed. Since moreover the complaint has been made by debtors that though they present their accounts to their creditors, the latter are unwilling to accept payment from them in order that they may be induced by the fear of incurring penalties to buy off the delay, those who are thus prevented from paying shall be allowed to give evidence concerning the refusal to give up the bond, so that the creditors may pay the fitting penalty for their disobedience.' Date.

1. Μάρκος Πετρών. Μαμέρτινος: the praenomen of this praefect is commonly given as Sextius, on the strength of CIL. III. 44, where however all that remains of the name is a (supposed) x. The papyrus is no doubt correct in calling him Marcus, which was also the praenomen of his father and his son.

3. ἀλλήλου: cf. note on 12, where ἀλλήλου is further emphasized.

4. τῶν ἀγρόφων: sc. διτελ penalty. The distinction between the previous decree of Mamertinus and the present one is that while the former referred only to debts which were the subject of written agreements, the latter applies to payments of taxes and similar government dues which did not depend on contract.

10–11. εν σεβασικώς ἁγγασίω: under this head would be included the work on the embankments; cf. lxxxvii–ix.

12–14. It is here explicitly stated that payer and payee were to give each other receipts. This ought certainly to mean, not merely that they were each to have a copy of a single receipt, but rather that distinct receipts should be written by both parties, and exchanged. A similar explanation is given by Wilcken, Ost. I. 638, of the terms σύμβολον and αὐτοσύμβολον. The character of the receipt given by the payee is obvious enough; the difficulty is to see what can have been the nature or purpose of that supposed to be written by the person making the payment, and to find a concrete example of such a document. Moreover if, as seems extremely probable, in the two receipts which are here ordered by Mamertinus to be written are to be recognized the σύμβολον and αὐτοσύμβολον, the extant examples of documents so entitled give no support to the view that one or other of them was issued by the person making the payment; cf. e.g. B. G. U. 293. 1 and lxxxiii–iv of this volume. It must, therefore, be supposed that Mamertinus did not mean more than that each party was to have a copy of the receipt written by the person receiving payment.

17. βιβλία: χρημα would rather be expected. Perhaps βιβλία is here used for the sum mentioned in the βαθμον, or the meaning may be that the debtor brought together with the money his copy of the contract of loan to be cancelled by the creditor.

17–25. This is an obscure passage, which will not construe as it stands. The simplest correction seems to be to read διηνότατα for διηνότατα in 22, which then begins the apodosis, and to ignore the ἄν which seems to have been written above the line after μορφήν (cf. critical note). The scribe may well have found the sentence puzzling, and attempted an emendation. of μὴ διδάσκετε in 23 ought to be the persons who do not pay, apparently a compressed phrase meaning 'those who are prevented from paying,' not 'those who do not give receipts,' the word for which in this document is παρέχειν. ἐκνο in 24 must be identical with the ἐκνο of 18, the creditors. The
only difficulty in our view of the passage is the unusual meaning given to ἐξαλάτησαν, 'buy off,' i.e. make an extra payment to prevent the delay caused by the creditors.

23. προσεκίνω may be either middle (sc. the creditors) or passive (the receipts, or the bonds of the debtors).

XXII. PTOLEMAIC MARRIAGE LAWS.

Harl. 24.8 x 12 cm. First century A.D.

This very interesting document is a copy of a series of regulations, apparently issued by one of the Ptolemies, concerning marriage. Unfortunately the papyrus is so mutilated that only a very general idea of its drift is attainable. But the bare fact of the existence of these elaborate ordinances, which bore both a civil and a religious aspect, is an important addition to our knowledge.

The first step prescribed is an announcement on the part of the bridegroom to some official of his name, age, &c., and the date of the proposed ceremony. A corresponding announcement was to be made by the bride, acting under the authority of her father (3–7). This regulation is followed by a provision concerning the sacrificial ceremonial, for which the λειοθύται were responsible (8, 9); the dowry, on the other hand, was in some way connected with officials called θεσμοφώλαικες (9, 10). Nothing is known of the functions of either the λειοθύται or θεσμοφώλαικες from other sources. After the announcement of the date of the marriage had been made certain payments became due (11–14).

The remaining regulations relate to divorce, in case of which the dowry of the wife was to be returned, the husband being liable to penalties if convicted of having failed to produce it. If the wife was divorced in a state of pregnancy the husband was responsible for her adequate maintenance, and also for that of her child (21–29).

It is noticeable that the rules here laid down for divorce are very similar to those actually found in marriage contracts of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The obligation to return the dowry is regularly inserted; and provisions resembling those contained in lines 21–29 also occur; cf. especially Pap. Gen. 21, Ox. Pap. II. 265. 24, 267. 20. No trace of anything corresponding to the formalities prescribed in the other part of the papyrus is found in extant marriage contracts, but it does not necessarily follow that they had entirely vanished. At least it is instructive to find that the memory of ordinances belonging to a bygone régime was carefully preserved.

On the verso of the papyrus is part of an account of legal proceedings (διαλογισμός) dated in the third and fourth years of Tiberius. This copy of
them, however, was made much later, being apparently not earlier than the second century. It is too fragmentary to be worth printing, and we only notice the mention of ἰεροῦς θεάς µεγίστης.

[Διέταξεν Πτολεµαῖος
[. . . ὧν καὶ ἀπολείπειν
[ἀπογραφέσθων πρὶν
[ἀυτοῦ τὸ δόµον καὶ τῇ
5 [τῇ] µῆνα καὶ τὴν ἡµέραν
ἀπογρα.
φῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν
ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ εἰ
ἱεροθεῖα καταβαλέσωσαν
βοτὸν ἡ ὦς ἐπίδοκιος ἐστὶν
ςαν]
10 τὴν φερνῆν ἕν ἔν [τοῖς θεσµοφύλαξι]
ἐπειδὴ δὲ
ἡ ἀπογραφὴ γένηται.
ὅφειλῃ κατὰ τὸν ὕµον
λιον καθάπερ ἐγώ δικής
15 φερνῆς κατὰ τὸν ὕµον
ἀποδείξως τῶν δο[]
φερνὰς µὴπο [eos]ονῆς α[]
δραχµᾶς ἡ ἐλασον διδα[]
δὲ τις µὴ ἀποδοῖ (τῇ) γυναικί
ean
ἀποτε-
20 σάτωι ἕνω δίκης νικᾶται κ[ι]
κυοῦσης ἀποσποµὴν ἔνω κ[ι]
ὁ ἄνηρ ἀποσπήµη περίμεν[]
κατὰ τὰ γενάµενα τρεφέτω
ναῖκα τὰ ἐπείσηδεια παρέχοιν
25 τῇ µητρὶ παρέχειν ἀναλισκέτω []
τὸ παι-
δίον ἐπειδὰν γένηται ὁπερ τ[ῃ]
ταιῳ παρέχειν τὰ ἐπὶτῆδε τῇ µητρί . []
δος ἔνω τὸ παιδίον κυµήσῃτα[ι]
ὅτε ἔνω βούληται, τῇ δὲ γυναικί

8. ἱεροθεῖα Ἡρ. 9. ἵππος. 27. παρέχειν added above the line. 28. ἱεροθεῖα, ὅτι κυµήσῃται.
1-2. These lines may have run πρὸ τοῦ γυναικα γα[μεν]βαί καὶ ἀπολεῖπεν τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ὀλίγαν.

3. Probably πρὸς (τὸν δὲ) ἔαν.

8. λεοβόταν is perhaps a mistake for λεοβόταμο; it seems more natural to make the bridal couple the subject of κατοβαλέται [μεν]. The papyrus contains several errors, perhaps due to having been copied from a Ptolemaic document.

25. The meaning appears to be that the husband was to provide for his late wife at a rate similar to that which she would have expected from her mother, i.e. in a manner befitting her rank:—οὐκ ὠλοσφοῖ ἡ δύο προσέχει αὐτῆς] τῇ μητρὶ παρέχειν. The passage might, however, also be taken to mean that the husband was to supply as much as he would to his own mother. In 27 τῇ μητρὶ is the wife.

27. τάξις is perhaps a mistake for παθηρ.

XXIII. List of Persons Qualified for Office.

Harl. 28 x 37.5 cm. Second century A.D.

Parts of two columns of an alphabetical list of persons of means with a note of the offices which they were or had been holding. The papyrus preserves only a small portion of the original list, since these columns are occupied with the letter Σ; the second column is numbered at the top χ. The statement of the (annual?) value of the property owned by each person is lost except in the first seven cases, in each of which it is 1000 drachmae or upwards. In the left-hand margin, opposite the several entries, the name of a place, usually that at which either the property or the office was held, is inserted in an abbreviated form, being intended to catch the eye glancing down the page. The list has been revised (by the original hand) some time after it was written, and the fact that some of the persons had retired from their office is recorded. The document should be compared with B. G. U. 6, 18, 91, &c., andBrit. Mus. Pap. 199, which is probably to be explained as a similar property-qualification list, though the editor prefers another interpretation. We print as a specimen the first half of Col. I, which is the best preserved part of the papyrus. Other village-names mentioned, besides those occurring below, are Ἀλεξ(άνδρεια) Ἡρ(ιλέα, Κερκεσοῦχ(α), Ἑρο(μακάς) Ὀρ(μοσ), Ταλεί, Τάμενιο(ς), Ἐρε(θις), Κέφαλ(ας), Ἐλευ(της), Ἐρ(ίκος). Several other offices also occur, but they are mostly difficult to make out. We note the following:—I. 25 ἔπιτ(ηπήτης) γῆ(α)φείου) μητροπ(όλεως), 31 ἐπίτ(ηπήτης) σταθμῳν Πολ(εμαῦθος) Ὀρ(μος), Π. 3 πληρωτής Σεβ(ενυτόν), 5 πληρωτής Κερ-κεσοῦχ(ως), 11 δοῦ(ες) ἕλς... ἐτοῦ τομοῦ φυλ(ακ...) 20. ερα(ς) οὐρ(αφην) Ἕρακ(λεας), 22 ὄρμοφαθ(ας) Κερής.

On the verso are parts of three columns of a register of land-proprietors.
Col. I.

[Σαραπίων 'Αλκίμου τοῦ 'Αρποκρατίωνος ἀπὸ Μακεδόνος ἔχω(ν) πέ(ρων) (δραχμᾶς) 'Γ]

dοθεῖς εἰς ἐπὶδρομ(η)ν τῆς μητροπ(όλεως).

tetel(ευθήκως).

Σαραπίων Σαραπίωνος τοῦ Πάπου ἀπὸ Φρε(μει) ἔχω(ν) πέ(ρων) (δραχμᾶς) 'Αφ

5 Σεβ(εκνύτου) γενό(μενος) [']νυνεὶ ἄνω' ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) οὐσ(ακῶν) Σεβ(εκνύτου).

Σαραπίων Ζωίου ἀπὸ μητροπ(όλεως) γεούχ(ῶν) ἐν Βουβάστω ἔχω(ν) πέ(ρων)

(δραχμᾶς) 'Α

Βουβάστου γενό(μενος) [']νυνεὶ ἄνω' ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) οὐσ(ακῶν) Βουβάστου.

Σαραπίων Θέανος ἀπὸ τῇ . . . . . . . π( λ) νυνεὶ ἄνω ἐν Νεδ(ου) πάλ(ει)

ἔχο(ν) πέρο(ν) (δραχμᾶς) 'Αφ.

Σισύς ὁ καὶ Αρποκρατίων ὁ Αρείου γεούχ(ῶν) ἐν Ψενυρ(δί) ἔχο(ν) πέ(ρων)

(δραχμᾶς) 'Α

10 Ψε(υρίδος) γενό(μενος) [']νυνεὶ ἄνω' ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) οὐσ(ακῶν) Βουβάστου.

Σωτᾶς Διογένους ἀπὸ μητροπ(όλεως) γεούχ(ῶν) ἐν Ιβίω(ν) (Εἰκοσιπενταρούς) ἔχο(ν) πέ(ρων) (δραχμᾶς) 'B

'Iβίω(ν) (Εἰκοσιπενταρούς) γενό(μενος) [']νυνεὶ ἄνω' ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς)

ἐρμηνείας, ἀλόπαλης).

Σαταβδῆς Σωκότου ἐπικαλ(ὁμενος) λαχανοπόλης ἔχο(ν) [πέ(ρων)]

(δραχμᾶς) 'Α

Καρ(ανίδος) νυνεὶ ἄνω ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) γε(ν)η(ματογραφουμένων) Καρ(ανίδος).

i–3. Lines 1–2 bracketed and τετελ inserted later. 5. νυνεὶ ἄνω bracketed and γεω
inserted later; so too in 7, 10, 12. 8. inserted later.

1. Μακεδόνως: i.e. the ἄμφοδων of that name at Arsinoë. Φρε(μει) in 4 is another
Arsinoite ἄμφοδον, as is Βεθ(ου) 'Ισίω(νος), which occurs in Col. II.

2. ἐπιδρομ(η)ν τῆς μητροπ(όλεως): nothing is known of this office from other sources,
but cf. c. viii. 7. We are equally uninformed respecting the ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) ἐρμηνείας in 12 and
the other titles mentioned in the introduction.

5. ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) οὐσ(ακῶν): that ἐπιτ is to be expanded ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) and not ἐπὶ τ(ας)
or τ(ῶν) is rendered practically certain by a comparison of l. 14 ἐπιτ(ηρητῆς) γε(ν)η(ματογραφουμένων) with B. G. U. 49. 5 where the same phrase occurs similarly abbreviated but followed
in lines 6–7 by τῆς προκειμένης ἐπιτηρῆς ἡμῶν. An ἐπιτηρήσις ἀνασκαφών is not found elsewhere,
though we have the phrase κατασκηνώσας εἰς ἐπιτήρησιν ἡμῶν in B. G. U.
619. 21. He was evidently a subordinate official connected with the royal domains,
214. 3.

III.
XXIII (a). LIST OF PERSONS QUALIFIED FOR OFFICE.

Harft. 198 x 33·3 cm. Second century.

This papyrus, of which parts of three columns are preserved, is like xxiii a list of persons with the offices which they had held or were holding and the value of their property. Only one entry is complete, which we give below. It is of special interest, because the individual in question had been employed in the government of the oasis of Ammon and the surrounding country, about which very little has hitherto been known. The home of both this person and three others mentioned in the papyrus was Eroathis, a town probably outside the Fayûm. One of the persons mentioned in the second column had been a πράκτορας and was now ἐπὶ τῆς καθάρσεως τοῦ δημοσίου πυροῦ τόπου περὶ Σάρων.

On the verso are parts of three much mutilated columns of a list of payments for taxes by different persons. ἐπιστατικὸν ἱερών (cf. li. 5) and γυνικῆς (so doubtless and not τυφῆς in B. G. U. 471. 15), the tax on the trade of a plasterer, occur.

3. τιμῶν τινων over the line. 6. βασιλικὸν over the line.

2. ἐδώρω 3. γράμματα: one of the persons mentioned in the next column is said to be ἄγραμματος.
3. The title εἰσαγωγεὺς has not, so far as we know, occurred before in the Roman period. In the Ptolemaic period the εἰσαγωγεὺς was a kind of magistrate’s clerk, accompanying the chromatistae on their circuits (cf. e.g. xi. 26). Probably Philadelphus performed similar functions for the strategus of the oasis.

6. βασιλικὸς: sc. γραμματέως. Or else we should read γρ(αμματέως), supplying εἰσαγωγεὺς.

XXIV. DECLARATION CONCERNING AN EDICT.

Κασρ el Banāt. 22·5 x 8·7 cm. A.D. 158.

Declaration on oath addressed to Diodorus, strategus of the divisions of Themistes and Polemo, by a village police officer that he had put up at a certain farmstead (ἐπολίκων) a copy of an edict of the praefect Sempronius Liberalis ordering persons who were staying away from their homes to return to them. A proclamation of Liberalis on this subject is preserved in B. G. U. 372, and this no doubt is the ἐπιστολὴ referred to. The proclamation was however issued in A.D. 154, four years earlier than the date of this declaration, and was to take effect after a period of three months (Col. II. 17, 18). Why the declaration should have been made after so long an interval is obscure; probably this official had been accused of neglecting to publish the edict of Liberalis by some person who had been prosecuted for disobeying it.

Incidentally the papyrus supplies the information that Sempronius Liberalis was still in office in Oct. 158. The latest date of this praefect previously attested was Jan. 1, 156 (B. G. U. 696); and P. Meyer (Heerwesen der Ptolemaier und Römer, p. 229) had wrongly placed the praefecture of Valerius Eudaemon in 157–8, in spite of our arguments in Pap. Oxy. II. pp. 173–4 for assigning that praefect to the end of Hadrian’s reign.

[D]ιόδωρος στρατηγὸς Ἀραξαντίου Θεμιστοὶ καὶ Πολέμων καὶ Ἑράλδος
Ποντοῦ Ὀρσεινοβέρεως τοῦ
Πετραπίου ἀρχέφθοδου ἐποι-
5 κλινὸς Δάμα. ὄμισυ τὴν
Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
[Δ]ιὸ διακοσμεῖ Ἀυτοκράτορος Χεβαστοῦ
[Ε]ὐσεβος τῆς ἡμέρας ἤποδειναι
[ἐν] τῷ ἐποικίῳ αὐτογραφον
10 ἐπιστολῆς γραφείσης δι' τοῦ τοῦ
K 2
[A]μπροτάτου ἵγεμόνος
Σεμπρούνιος Διβεράλι(ο)ς
περὶ τῶν ἐπιξένων κατα-
μενόντων ἐν τῷ ἐποίκῳ
15 ὡστε αὐτοῦ ἔτες τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνέρ-
χεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲν διεσφισθαι
ἡ ἐνοχὸς εἶναι τῷ ὅρκῳ.
Ποντείμις (ἐτών) λ ὀὐλ(ῃ) ποθὲν [ἀ]ρμήτερῳ.
ἐγρ(άφῳ) δ(ι)ὰ Σα... s νομογρ(άφου) ἐπακο-
20 λουθούντος Διοδώρου ὑπηρε-
τού, φαμένον μὴ εἶδον γρ(άμματα).
(ἐτοὺς) κβ Ἀπόσεινου Καίσαρος τοῦ
κυρίου, Φαώφι λ.

'To Diodorus, strategus of the divisions of Themistes and Polemo in the Arsinoite nome, from Pousimis, son of Orsenouphis, son of Peteraipis, police officer of the farmstead of Dama. I swear by the Fortune of the Emperor Caesar Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius that I have set up in the farmstead a copy of the letter written by his excellency the praefect Sempronius Liberalis, ordering strangers staying in the farmstead to return to their own home, and that I have told no falsehood, otherwise may I be liable to the consequences of the oath. Pousimis, aged thirty, having a scar on the left foot. Written by S... scribe of the nome, with the concurrence of Diodorus, clerk, Pousimis professing to be illiterate.' Date,

4—5. ἀρχέφωδον ἐποίκιον: an ἀρχέφωδος of an ἐποίκιον does not appear to be elsewhere recorded, ἀρχέφωδος κώμης being the regular title. But l. 9 implies that the ἐποίκιον in question had been previously mentioned, and if so, it must have been in l. 5. There is, however, no necessary inference that ἐποίκιον regularly had their own ἀρχέφωδος. This place may have been exceptional; or if the ἀρχέφωδος κώμης was responsible also for the ἐποίκιον his neighbourhood, Pousimis here might very well describe himself as the ἀρχέφωδος of the ἐποίκιον to which his oath referred.

8. προνήμου: προτείθεμα is the word used by Liberalis with regard to the publication of his edict (B. G. U. 372, II. 18).

12—16. An edict similar to that of Liberalis was issued at the beginning of the next century by Valerius Datus (B. G. U. 159), and early in the third century by Subatianus Aquila (Pap. Gen. I. 16. 19).

14. ἐν τῷ ἐποίκῳ: Pousimis applies the proclamation, which was of course quite general in its terms, to the particular case in which he was interested.

XXV. Work on the Embankments.

Καστ. el Banāt. 28.5 x 8.8 cm. A.D. 36.

A list drawn up by the village scribe of Euhemeria of persons then at work upon a certain embankment; cf. lxxxvii–ix.

\[\text{Παρ(ά) Ἡρακλείδ(ωι) καμογρ(αμματέως)}\]
\[\text{Εὐμερ(ειας) Θεμίστο(ν) μερίδ(ος).} \]
\[\text{εἰ σὲ υ ἐν ἔργων γεγονοῦσ(ες)} \]
\[\text{ἐν τῇ Μαγαείδῃ ἕπὶ τῷ {χά(ματι)} \]}
\[\text{χώματι τῆς Ἰωσίδ(ῶς)} \]
\[\text{ἀπὸ μη(νός) Μεσορῇ κὁ τοῦ ἐνεσ-} \]
\[\text{τῷ(ς) κβ (ἐτοῦς) Τιβερίου Καίσαρ(ος)} \]
\[\text{Σεβαστῷ(ν), ὅν τὸ κατ' ἀνή(ρα).} \]
\[\text{᾽Ορσενοῦφ(ῆς) Ποιάρ(εως) Ὁ(υρύγχων)} \]
\[\text{Στοτου(ῆς) Πεναιτ(ος)} \]
\[\text{Στοτου(ῆς) Σελεοῦ(τος).} \]
\[\text{(/ἀν&ep; σ) ἀ.} \]
\[\text{(ἐτοῦς) κβ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος} \]
\[\text{Σεβαστῷ(ν), Μεσ[ο]ρῆ Κβ.} \]

3. l. ci. 6. εInserted above line.

"From Heraclides, village scribe of Euhemeria in the division of Themistes. The following were at work at Magai's upon the dam of Iossis from the 24th of the month Mesore of the present 22nd year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, namely Orsenouphis, son of Pounaris, of Oxyrhyncha, Stotoetis, son of Penaus, Stotoetis, son of Selouas; total, three men." Date.


XXVI. Official Correspondence.

Harit. 20.8 x 18.2 cm. A.D. 150.

A reply from the scribes of the metropolis and the village scribes of the divisions of Themistes and Polemo to a letter sent to them by the strategus. The purport of the letter of the strategus, a copy of which is enclosed, is obscured by mutilation, but it evidently related to some diminution of the
revenues of the province, and directed the scribes to furnish a list of suitable persons who should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the matter. The answer of the scribes is a short statement that they have complied with this request.

Διογ(έ)νεις στρ(αγγίζω) Ἀρσ(νεῶτον) Θεμίστον καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων παρὰ Ἡραίσκου τοῦ καὶ Ἡρακλείδου καὶ Διοςκῆρου γρ(αμματέων) μητροπ(όλεως)
καὶ τῶν τῆς Θεμίστου καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων κωμογραμματέων.
πρὸ ἐπισταλὲν ἤμεῖν ὑπὸ σοῦ ἑπισταλμα, ὡς ἔστιν ἀντιγραφῶν.
5 Διογ(έ)νεις στρ(αγγίζω) Ἀρσ(νεῶτον) Θεμίστον καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων γραμματέων μη[τροπ(όλεως) καὶ κωμογραμματέων] χαρέων.
τῶν ἐπιστατῶν ἐπὶ ἐμ[η]ς Ἀρτωνίου Καλλαρος τοῦ κυρίου [...]
τῶν ἐν ταῖς μερίσ[t]ις [γενημ(ατογραφουμένων)] ὑπ[αρχόντων καὶ οἰκοπ(έων) [...]
τῆς διοικήσεως [χα]πιο σικαῖων καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἔτους [...]
10 ὑπὸ τῆς Ἡρακ[λείδου]) μερίδος βασιλικοῦ γρ(αμματέως)
καὶ τοῦ κακειροτού ἐμ[ν]ο[ῦ πρὸς τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ [...]
[...]. ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου Σεβενθίωνος τοῦ καὶ Σελε[τ].[ο]ν[ο] [...]
καὶ οἰκονύμων ἐν Ἡρακλεισσολογίᾳ, ἐν' ὑμῖν τοῦ συνοψινύντα τί [...]
[...]. κτήσιν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐπικαύσεως φανέρων [...]
15 [...]. λει καὶ τῶν διὰ τοῦτο μισθιμοῦ φόρων [...]
(ἔτους)[ι] γα Αὐτοκράτορος Καλλαρος Τίτου [Α]λ[λ]ου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνο[ν][ν]
20 Σαραπιὼν ὑπηρέτης μεταδέδωκα Φαμ[ε][ν]δῳ β.


2. The ἀγροματίες μητροπόλεως were to the capital what the κωμογραμματεῖς were to the villages. Thus to them, along with the strategus and royal scribe, are addressed returns from inhabitants of the metropolis, e.g. xxviii. 2, xxx. 2.

8. γενημ[ατογραφουμένων]: cf. xxiii. 14, cvi. 9. Brit. Mus. Pap. 164. 2 ἐπαρχόντων γενηματο[γραφουμένων] πρὸς τῆς διοικήσεως λόγου, and B. G. U. 282. 19. γενηματογραφοῦν is explained by Wilcken, Archív, I. p. 148, as meaning to confiscate by the government, a sense which suits the passages in which the word has so far been recognized.

9. τῆς διοικήσεως καὶ ὑπηρετῆς: i.e. either subject to the ordinary government administration or belonging to the special department of the imperial domain-lands. For this contrast between διοικήσεως and ὑπηρετῆς cf. B. G. U. 84. 5. At the end of the line [προσόδου is perhaps to be supplied.
11. ἐπὶ ταῦ... the name of some important official, probably either the praefect or epistrateagus, is to be supplied. The traces at the end of the line are very scanty, but so far as they go would suit λαμπρὸντον.

14. ἐπικροσις may mean either a raid (cf. Ox. Pap. I. 69, 15) or 'review,' 'examination.'
15-16. The sense may be, 'to report how much the diminished revenue differs from those of previous years,' τῶν... φόρων ἔτην τῶν ἐπεικροσίας φόρων διαφέρει.

16. ἀναδώξει, which governs τῶν συνοφρονών, apparently ends the letter of the strategus. ἀναδώξει (or ἀναδώξων) is the regular word used for presenting a list of well-to-do persons (ἐπικροσία) from whom a certain number were to be selected for a λειτουργία. Cf. Ox. Pap. I. 82. τῶν ἀναδώξει τῶν λειτουργῶν, and B. G. U. 194. 22.

17. Before καθότι, ἤμετρωπ may be supplied; or perhaps καθότι is part of a proper name, Ἀιανότης.

XXVII. SELECTION OF BOYS (ἐπικροσις).

Kafr el Banat. 22-2 x 16-4 cm. A.D. 151-2.

Application from Dionysammon for the ἐπικροσις of his son Nemesianus, i.e. his admission to the list of privileged persons who were exempt, wholly or partially, from the poll-tax. The application is addressed, as usual in the case of documents of this class from the Fayyum, to two ex-gymnasiarchs. A long statement of the evidence upon which the claim was based is appended, and is mainly supplied, as in other instances, by the census lists in which Dionysammon and his wife had been returned. A full discussion, in the light of new evidence from Oxyrhynchus, of the meaning of ἐπικροσις and of the problems connected with it will be found in the introduction to Ox. Pap. II. 257. The question has also been lately re-examined by P. Meyer, Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Agypten, pp. 115 sqq., who however had not the advantage of acquaintance with the fresh material from Oxyrhynchus, and could only refer to it in an appendix (pp. 229-230).

This document formed part of a series, being adjointed both on the right and left by other documents, of which however too little remains to enable us to tell whether they were similar in character, or had any other connecting link. The second line of the document on the right is ἀντίγραφ(α)ν, the sixteenth ἐκ διαστρισμάτων. On the verso are parts of three columns of a list of persons accompanied by amounts in money.

1st hand Μεσορὴ ἦ.
2nd hand Γαλὼ Πολύλαο Μαξίμω καὶ Ἡρακλῆς... ἡδίων
γεγομενισιαράχησι ἐπικραταί
παρὰ Διονυσώμανος Διονυσίου τοῦ... [οῦ Διονυ-
5 σάμμων(ς) μη(τρὸς) Ἀφροδοῦτος κατοίκων . . . . . . . . ἂναγρ(αφομένου) ἐπ᾽ ἀμφό(δου)
Μακεδώνων. τοῦ γεγονότος μοι ἐκ τῆς γενομένης καὶ ἀπο-
πεπλευγμένης μοι γυναικὸς (Σ)αραπάθιδος(ς) τῆς Ἀρποκρατίων(ς)
tοῦ Σαμβᾶ θυγ(ατρὸς) κατοίκων οὐδ' Ἀμεσιανοῦ τοῦ καὶ Ἀρποκρα-
τίωνος ἐπικεκλημένῳ(ν) Διοσκόρου προσβεβηκότος τῷ ἑνεστῶτi ἑν(τείρι)
10 Ἀδρηλίου Ἀντωνίου Καλ[εσαρος του κυρ[η ο[[ήντος] ὡς ἦμων
ἐπικριθη(πήναι) κατὰ τὰ κελευθ(έντα) ὑπέταξα τὰ τε ἐμῶν καὶ τὰ τῆς
μη(τρὸς)
αὐτοῦ δίκαια. ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ Διωνυσάμμων ἐπ[κριθεῖσις] τῷ κ (ἐτείρι)
θεοῦ Ἀλλίου Ἀντωνίου ἀπεγρ(αψάμην) καὶ ταῖς καὶ[τὰ] καὶ[τὰ]
οἰκ(ίαν)
ἀπογρ(αφαίς) τῇ τε τοῦ διελη(υθότος) ἐδ'(ἔτους) καὶ τῇ τοῦ κυν(ετους) καὶ
θ'(ἔτους) θεοῦ Ἀλλίου
15 Ἀντωνίου(ν) καὶ[τ᾽ 'ο[ικ[ίαν ἐπὶ τοῦ προκ(ειμένων) ἀμφό(δου)
Μακεδώνων(ν)
σκ[λ...] εἰ... εν[λ...]μ... τοῦ ἐδ'(ἔτους) τοῦ ἐπικρινων(μένων) μου[ν] τῶν
ω... ὁλο... τῆ(ς) καὶ καὶ[τὰ] δημοσίαν συν... σ(... τῷ δ(ἐτείρι)
[μου] Παχων, ἕ... Σαραπιας ἀπεγρ(αφή) ἐν μου[ν... τ[....].σι( ]
καὶ[τα] οἰκ(ίαν)
[ἀπογρ(αφαίς) ἐπὶ ἀμφό(δου) ... ὡς...] καὶ τοῖς ἐπικρινώμενοι μου νί-
20 [δ]ὲ Ν[εμεσίωνον ...] λο[γι[ν[.]
[...] το[τ...[ ]
[...] [ ]
[...] [ ] ὅρμ[...] τῶ...[
[...] ο[ν...] καὶ[τὰ] γρ(αφον) ἐπικρίσεως τοῦ [...] (ἔτους) σε[ρ]...[
25 [...] νο(...) Ἀθων(...) ἐπικρίθ(έντος) ἐν κατοίκ(οις...). [ ]
[...][ασκον δὲ... φησ(ε...) ἀνδρας... φομ [...] νο(...)
[...] Πεκυσίων ἀπὸ ἀμφό(δου) Θεσμ(οφορεύον) ... α [...].]
[...] τοῦ τοῦ Ἀγαθοδαιμόνα Ἀρτέ[μιδωρος]
[ἀπὸ] ἀμφό(δου) 'Ἀπολλωνίων(ν) 'Ιερακίου(ν) καὶ Μ[...] ὡν...
30 [...] τοῦ 'Πρωνο(ν) [ἀπὸ] ἀμφό(δου) ... Ἐφ[...] ὡν...
1st hand
]. Πεκυσίων ἀπὸ ἀμφό(δου) Θεσμοφορεύον
]. τερ[ιω] τοῦ ἐπικρίνομ(ένον
10. 1. ἤμων.
3. ἐπικρατεῖς: the title ἐπικρατεῖς does not appear to occur elsewhere, except perhaps in B. G. U. 562. 15, πρὶς τῇ ἐπικράτει being the usual periphrasis.

5. κατοικον ... must be a mistake for κατοίκοι ... or κατοικοῦσιον; cf. 8, where the mother of the boy who is to be 'selected' is described as δύνατη κατοίκου, and 25, where the phrase ἐπικρατεῖς ἐν κατοίκοις occurs. That in the Fayum the ultimate ground of applications for ἐπικρατεῖς was, in most cases at least, descent from κατοίκους, was already known; but this is the first actual application in which that fact is made apparent in the phraseology.


9. προσβεβήκε(το)ς: the writer omits to state the age which his son had reached, but the regular age of candidates for ἐπικρατεῖς was about fourteen, at which time they became liable to poll-tax, e.g. Gr. Pap. II. xlix. 5 προσβεβήκε(το)ς εἰς ἰδ. (ἔτος); cf. B. G. U. 324. 9-10. In papyri from Oxyrhynchus another set of phrases occurs, προσβεβθήκατος εἰς τοὺς ἀντί γνωματος (Ox. Pap. II. 257. 5), προσβεβθήκατος εἰς τοὺς ἀντίγραφον ἐπίκρατεας (258. 6).


24. Cf. B. G. U. 324. 18 συνπαρεθήκη δὲ καὶ αντίγραφον ἐπικρατείς. It is tempting to read συνπαρεθήκη at the beginning of this line, but the letter before ην appears to be κ not μ.

32. i in this line appears to be written in a very peculiar manner—an up-stroke with a dot at the top, rather resembling a mark of abbreviation.

XXVIII. Notice of Birth.

Harth. 12-6 x 11-7 cm. A.D. 150-1.

Notice addressed to the scribes of the metropolis by Ischyras and his wife Thaisarion of the birth of their son, who at the time of this announcement was one year old. Similar notices of birth are B. G. U. 28, 110, 111; Pap. Gen. II. 33. Wilcken (Ost. I. pp. 451-4) considers that their purpose was a military one, on the ground that the taxes were sufficiently secured by the fourteen-year census, and that only births of boys and not also of girls were thus announced. But the latter argument, as Kenyon has pointed out (Class. Rev. April, 1900, p. 172), loses its weight if, as is now most probable, women were not liable to the poll-tax. For the present, therefore, the exact object served by these notifications remains uncertain. We cannot agree with Wilcken in thinking that they were made from time to time in consequence of a general order issued by the government, for in that case the common formula κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα would hardly have been so consistently omitted.

Σωκράτη καὶ Διόμη τῷ καὶ Τυράννῳ
grammatēsou µητροπόλεως
To Socrates and Didymus also called Tyrannus, scribes of the metropolis, from Ischyras, son of Protas, son of Mysthes, his mother being Tasouchariou, daughter of Didas, of the quarter Hermouthiace, and from his wife Thaisarion, daughter of Ammonius, son of Mysthes, her mother being Thaisas, of the same quarter Hermouthiace. We give notice of the son who has been born to us, Ischyras, aged one year in the present fourteenth year of Antoninus Caesar the lord. I therefore hand in this announcement of the birth. (Signed) Ischyras, aged 44, having no distinguishing mark. Thaisarion, aged 24, having no distinguishing mark. Written for them by Ammonius, scribe of the nome.

2. γραμματεύς μητροπόλεως: cf. xxvi. 2.
11. (έτος) α: in the other examples the announcement was not made so soon after the birth as in this case. In the three Berlin papyri the boys are respectively aged two, four, and seven; in the Geneva papyrus the age is four.
15. ομογράφος: cf. xxiv. 19.

XXIX. Notice of Death.

Kaṣr el Banāt. 28.7 x 8.3 cm. A.D. 37.

This and the following papyrus (xxx) are announcements of death sent respectively to the village scribe and the scribes of the metropolis by relatives of the deceased person. The two declarations follow the same general formula as that of the similar documents already published, e.g. Ox. Pap. I. 79, B. G. U. 17, 79, 254.
"To Heracles, village-scribe of Euhemeria, from Mysthes, son of Peneouris, of Euhemeria in the division of Themistes. My brother Peneouris, registered as an inhabitant of the neighbourhood of the said village, has died in the month Mesore of the first year of Gaius Caesar Augustus Germanicus. I therefore present to you this notice in order that his name may be placed upon the list of deceased persons, according to custom. (Signed) Mysthes, son of Peneouris, aged about forty-two years, having a scar on the right fore-arm." Date and counter-signature.

23. The illegible beginning of the line is the signature of an official (cf. xxx. 16), but apparently not that of Heracles.

XXX. NOTICE OF DEATH.

Harlt. 23 x 7 cm. A.D. 173.

Announcement of the death of Aphrodisius, addressed to the scribes of the metropolis by his father Pantomynus. Cf. the preceding papyrus.

Kronor tō kal Ἡρα[κλειδῆ]
kal Ἀλεξάνδρῳ γρ(αμματεύσι) μητροπ(όλεως)
parā Παντωνῆμον
'Αφροδισίῳ τῶν ἄρσ
5 τῆς μητροπ(όλεως) ἀναγρ(αφομένου) ἐ-

π' ἀμφόδου Λυσανίων
FAYUM TOWNS

Τόπων. ὁ νόός μου
Αφροδίσιος μητρὸς Σαρα-πιάδος ἀναγραφόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ
10 προκειμένου ἀμφότερον Λυσίαν Τόπων
ἐτελευτήσε τῷ Παῦλῳ μη-
vι τοῦ ἔνειστος
ἵα (ἐτους). διδ ἄξιον ταχύνης
αὐτὸν τὸ δυνατόν ἐν τῇ τῶν
15 τετελευτηκότων τάξι.

2nd hand κατεχόμενη γραμματεύσι μητροπόλεως
περὶ τελευτήσεις Ἀφροδισίου.
(ἐτους) ὁ Ἀδρηγάπου Ἀντωνίου
Καλέσαμε τοῦ κυρίου, Ἐπελθεὶ τ.

'To Cronius, also called Heraclides, and Alexander, scribes of the metropolis, from Pantonymus, son of Aphrodisius, of the metropolis, registered in the quarter of Lysanias' District. My son Aphrodisius by Sarapias, registered in the said quarter of Lysanias' District, died in the month Paumi of the present eleventh year. I therefore request that his name be placed on the list of deceased persons. (Signed) Notification was made to the scribes of the metropolis concerning the death of Aphrodisius. The eleventh year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, Epeiph 10.'

13, 14. Cf. B. G. U. 254. 18, 19, where no doubt ἀντί τοῦ δῶρου应当 be read in place of ἀντί τῶν δόμων.

XXXI. TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.

Harf., 19 x 9.7 cm. About A.D. 129.

Notification to Dionysius and Theon, keepers of the archives at Arsinoë, from a woman named Apia (?), stating that she wished to sell some house property, and requesting that an authorization to complete the contract should be sent to the record office at Theadelphia, where she herself lived. We now know from Ox.Pap. II. 237 that these preliminary notices in the case of alienations of real property were made obligatory by a decree of Mettius Rufus in A.D. 89, and were intended on the one hand to secure that all changes of ownership might be duly recorded and the public registers of real property be kept up to date, and on the other to protect contracting parties from fraud.

The date of this papyrus is supplied by a comparison of Brit. Mus. Pap. 299, 300, which are similar notices addressed to the same pair of officials, with
the property returns of A.D. 131 (e.g. xxxii), by which year they had retired
from office.

The property which is registered in my name, namely
the half and the tenth part, being common and undivided, of a house and court
formerly owned by Theon, also called Socrates, son of Heron, and the whole tenement
in a lodging-house in the said village of Theadelphia, I wish to alienate the fifth
part of the whole house and court and of the whole tenement to Socrates, son of
Didas, son of Sambas, of (the quarter of) the Bithynians of Ison ... at the price
of 200 drachmae of silver. I therefore give notice, in order that instructions may
be sent to the director of the record office of Theadelphia, duly to join me in the transaction of the business.'


10-11. κοινόν καί διαίρετον: the meaning of this common phrase is a little obscure. That it is here to be connected with μέρος, rather than with οίκειον, is shown by other instances of its use. The designation of a μέρος as κοινόν καί διαίρετον implies that the property to which the μέρος belonged was not actually divided up into definite sections which were severally appropriated to the owners of the μέρος, but that each of these owners had a fixed share in the proceeds of the whole. κοινόν here could not mean that a second person had a claim to some part of Apia's three-fifths of the house since no such joint owner is mentioned, and she evidently possessed full rights over her own share. The only joint owners implied by κοινόν are therefore the holders of the remaining two-fifths. Neither can διαίρετον mean indivisible, 'unzertrennlich' as Wessely translates it (C. P. R. I. 4, 8), seeing that a part of the μέρος διαίρετον is here about to be sold.

11-13. οίκειον . . . καί . . . οίκειον ἐν συνωκίᾳ: the distinction between οίκος and οίκειον, which is repeated in ll. 16, 17, is noticeable. οίκειον is a 'house' in the ordinary sense of the term; οίκος is a separate dwelling or tenement in a large building or insula, corresponding to our 'flat.'

15, 16. σὺν τοῖς μέροις κ.τ.λ.: Apia wished to sell one-fifth of the οίκειον and court of which she owned \( \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} = \frac{2}{5} \), and one-fifth of the οίκος of which she owned the whole.

18. πρωτήριον(): the word is not found elsewhere, but a phrase that is its apparent antithesis occurs in the similar papyrus Brit. Mus. Pap. 300. 6 sqq., as ἄπογγελματικὰ . . . ἄριστας τεύχους βιαίμως παραμείνας Πρωτήριον . . . ἄπογγελματικὰ τοῖς πρωτήρειοι κ.τ.λ. Here it is possible, as with πρωτήριον() in our papyrus, to refer ἄπογγελματικὰ either to the object about to be transferred or to the person receiving it. In the Brit. Mus. papyrus the former alternative is the more natural, and makes good sense, 'returned on previous occasions as unencumbered' &c. But in our document, πρωτήριον(ἐγγραμμένον), referring to οίκειον κ.τ.λ., comes in very awkwardly between the purchaser and the price, and apparently has to bear the somewhat strained sense of 'returned for the first time by me,' since the meaning 'returned for the first time' simply is precluded by the statement (11-12) that the οίκειον had had a previous owner who would presumably have registered it. On the other hand to understand πρωτήριον(ἐγγραμμένον) as referring to the purchaser Socrates, and meaning that the last fourteen-year census was the first in which he had been included, as opposed to ἄπογγελματικὰ τοῖς πρωτήρειοι, 'entered on several previous census-lists,' is a still less satisfactory interpretation.

XXXII. PROPERTY RETURN.

Καστ Ελ Βανάτ: 12.5 x 8.9 cm. A.D. 131.

Return of house property, addressed to Dius and Herodes, keepers of the registers of the nome. cxxvi, which was found with this document and was written by the same hand, is a precisely similar return addressed to these same two officials, Dius and Herodes, as are also B. G. U. 420, 459, and Pap. Gen. II. 27.
Some lacunae in these last three can now be supplemented from the better preserved papyri from Kašr el Banát. On the general subject of property returns cf. Ox. Pap. II. 237. Col. viii. 31, note.

1st hand 'Ἀσκληπι(άδης) σεο(μείωμαι). ιε (ἐτος), Μεσο(ρη) ἦ.
2nd hand [Δέ]ὶ[ω τῷ καὶ 'Ἀπολλω(νῷ) καὶ
'Ηραδὴ τῷ καὶ Διογένει
γεγ(μεισαιρχηκόσι) βιβλ(ιοφόλαξι) ἐνκτ(ήσεω) Ἀρσ(νοί̇του)
5 παρὰ Σαμβοῦτος τῆς
Πνεφερῶτ(ός) τοῦ Διονυσίου
[τό]ῶν ἀπὸ κόμης Θεαδελ(φέας)
μετὰ κυρίου(ν) τοῦ διοπατρίου(ν)
καὶ διομητρίου ἄδελφον
10 'Αλλόδωνος. κατὰ τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ
κρατίστου ἡγεμόνος κελευσ(έντα)
ἀπογράφομαι τὸ ὑπάρχον μοι
ἥμισυ μέρος οἰκίας καὶ αὐλῆς
ὅν ἐν τῇ κόμη. ἔδω δὲ τι κατὰ τοῦτ(ον)
15 ἔξωκονομό ὑπότερον ἀποδίδο
ὑπάρχειν.

'To Dius, also called Apollonius, and Herodes, also called Diogenes, ex-gymnasiarchs, keepers of the property registers of the Arsinoite nome, from Sambous, daughter of Pnepheiros, son of Dionysius, of the village of Theadelphia, under the wardship of her full brother on both the father's and mother's side, Allothon (?) In accordance with the commands of his highness the prefect I return my property, which is the half share of a house and court situated in the village. If I alienate any of my rights over it, I will first establish my title to the ownership.'

1. Ἀσκληπι(άδης): Pap. Gen. II. 27 is signed by the same official. The last word of the signature in that papyrus is more probably Μεσο(ρη) than Ἀδμ(αυ). 3. Διογένει: M. Nicole (loc. cit.) reads the second name of Herodes as Diomedes, but this is no doubt an oversight.

11. ἡγεμόνος: the prefect was Titus Flavius Titianus; cf. B. G. U. 420. 8, 459. 9.

14-15. The same formula appears in ccxvi (with the addition of δι ἐπίθεσι(ων) τῆς ἀπογραφής), and is also to be restored in B. G. U. 420. 15-17 (ἐπὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτῶν ἐξωκονομώ ἂν ὑπάρχον αὐλῆς), and with slight variations in Pap. Gen. II. 27. 14-15 (ἐξωκονομῶ for a . . . . .), and B. G. U. 459. 10. Cf. also B. G. U. 112. 23-5. The sentence merely contains an undertaking to do what the edict of Mettius Rufus had rendered obligatory, namely to procure the authorization of the βιβλιοφόλαξ ἐκτήσεων before effecting any alienation of real property; cf. introd. to xxxi.
XXXIII. RETURN OF UNWATERED LAND.

Kafr el Banat. 22.5 x 11.6 cm. A.D. 163.

Return from Ptollarous of Theadelphia, declaring that some land belonging to her at Euhemeria was unwatered in the current third year of Marcus and Verus. Two of the four previously published documents of this class (Gr. Pap. II. lvi, B. G. U. 198) relate to the same year; and the discovery of this third example corroborates our view (Ox. Pap. II. 237, Col. viii. 31, note) that such returns concerning unwatered land were not annual, but only sent in in consequence of a special order of the praefect on occasions of a failure of the inundation.

[Φώκιων στρατηγῷ Ἀρσί(νοῦ) Θεμίστοι
καὶ Πολέμων] μερίδων καὶ
[Λεωνίδῃ βασιλ(ικῷ) γραμματεῖ Θεμίστοι
μερίδος καὶ κομογραμματεῖ]

5 Εὐημερείας

παρὰ Πτωλαράβτος τῆς Πτολ(εμαίου) τοῦ
Πτολ(εμαίου) ἀπὸ κῶμης Θεαδελφείας
diὰ φρωντιστοῦ Διοσκόρου

Ἡρων. ἀπογράφομεν κατὰ

10 τὰ κελευθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν

λαμπροτάτου ἥγεμόνος

τὰς ὑπαρχόντας μαίνειν κῶ-

μην Εὐημερείας ἡβροχηκα-

ίης πρὸς τὸ ἑνετὸς γ' (έτος)

15 Ἀρτανίνων καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν

κυρίων Σεβαστῶν Ἀρμεν[ι]ακῶν

Μηδικῶν Παρθικῶν Μεγίστων

(αροῦρας) Β' ὥ', αἱ ὀδοι. διὰ σωματισμοῦ
eἰς Ταρεώτων Ἀκονιλάδοιον.

2nd hand 20 Φωκίων στρ(ατηγῷ) διὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου Βονθ(ου) ἠσθ(νεοισάμην)

ʹΕπεὶρ 15. (3rd hand) Λεωνίδῃς βασιλ(ικός) γραμματεὺς διὰ

Βονθ(ου) σεσημ(είωμα).
XXXIV. DELEGATION OF TAX-COLLECTING.

Harit. 22.5 x 10.5 cm. A.D. 161.

Agreement between Heron, an inhabitant of Philagris, and two βοηθοὶ γεωργῶν (cf. note on 3), by which Heron undertakes to act as a substitute for them, and to collect certain taxes on domain (?) land at the village of Polydeucia,
cultivated by inhabitants of Philagris. Cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 255, an acknowledgment given to a person called Horion by the πρεσβύτεροι of a village, stating that he had collected certain taxes as their deputy in a satisfactory manner; and 306, which is a grant by a πράκτορα ἀργυρίων of his office to a deputy, to whom he promises a salary of 252 drachmae; and xxxiii, a receipt for the salary of two deputy πράκτορες. Here there is no question of a salary, but on the contrary the deputy promises to pay 560 drachmae. Probably therefore he expected to collect more than that sum, and the contract amounts to the sub-letting of a tax by the tax-collectors. If so the present document offers a curious mixture of the two modes of collecting taxes: (a) the direct method through official πράκτορες, and (b) the indirect, through tax-farmers. The 560 drachmae were to be paid in five monthly instalments during the last five months of the year. Whether that sum covered the whole amount due for the year or only the dues of the last five months is left obscure. An allowance was to be made to the deputy for the sum collected before the date of the contract (Paunl 9), but it is not stated whether the starting-point was the beginning of the official year or the month Pharnouthi, when the first instalment was to be paid. On general grounds and the analogy of Brit. Mus. Pap. 306 it is probable that the 560 drachmae represented the sum payable to the βοηθοί for the taxes of the whole year, especially as the deputy had apparently acted in a similar capacity for several years previously (9-10 κατὰ τὴν τῶν προτέρων ἐτῶν συνήθειαν).

"Ἡρων Ἡρωνος ἀπὸ κόμης Φιλαγρίδος
Πανεστὶ Ὡρων καὶ Μάρων Απολλωνίου
βοηθοῖς γεωργῶν κόμης Πολυδεκελαίας.
ὡρο
λογαριαστὴς τὸτε ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ᾖθος ὑμῶν
5 τὴν εἰσπραξίαν πούστοσθαι καὶ εκδώναι
σύμβολα μονοδεσμίας χόρτων καὶ ἄλλων
εἰδών νομαρχίας τῶν ἐπιμερισθείσων
ὑμεῖς Πολυδεκελαῖα διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Φιλαγρίδος
ἐν Πάλη (ἀρουράν) ἡ ἦλβης κατὰ τὴν τῶν προ-
10 τέρων ἐτῶν συνήθειαν ἐξεκινήσεν τοῦ "Ἡρω-
νος διεγράφην υμεῖς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Πα-
νεστὶς σύνταξις λόγῳ ἀργυρίων
δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας ἐξήκοντα,
/ (δραχμαί) φίξ, κατὰ μήνα τὸ αἰροῦν ἐξ ἱθοῦ
15 ἀπὸ μηνὸς Φαρμοθῆ ζῶς μηνὸς Μεσορῆ 
τοῦ ἑωσφόρου α (ἐτοῖς), ὑμῶν παραδεχόμενοι 
μοι τὰ διαγράφεντα ὑπὸ τῶν 
προκειμένων γεωργῶν μέχρι τῆς 
ἐνεστώτης ἡμέρας. Ἡρων ὁ προγε-
20 γραμμένος ἔγραψα τὸ σῶμα καὶ συνεθε-
μην πάσι τοῖς προκειμένοις καθός 
πρόκειται. ἔτους πρώτου Αὐτοκράτορος 
Καλλάραπς Μάρκου Αὐρήλ[ίου] Ἀντονίνου 
Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος [Καλ]ήρος 
25 Δαυκίου Αἰθρίου Οὐήρου Σεβαστοῦ, 
Παῦνι θ.

On the verso

συστατικῶν τοῦ μέρους τῆς Φιλαγρίδος
πρὸς Ἡρώνα.

4. 1. τάξις. 5. 1. ἐεδότων. 7. εἰ ὧν ἐδότων συγ. 8. ὧν ὧν συγ. 11.
1. διαγράφατοι. 16. ὧν ὧν συγ. 25. 1. Αὐρήλιαν.

‘Heron, son of Heron, of the village of Philagris, to Panesneus, son of Horus, and Maron, son of Apollonius, assistants in connexion with taxes upon cultivators at the village of Polydeucia. I agree in accordance with this note of hand as your deputy to make the collection of, and to issue receipts for, the μοναδιαρία of hay and other taxes of the nomarchy on the 411 1/2 3 1/2 αρούρεις assigned to you at Polydeucia, and cultivated by inhabitants of Philagris in Pale (?), on the terms that, following the custom of former years, I, Heron, shall pay to you, Panesneus and partners, on the whole account five hundred and sixty drachmæ of silver, total 560 dr., in equal monthly instalments from the month of Pharmouthi to the month of Mesore of the present first year, and that you shall make me an allowance for the sums paid by the aforesaid cultivators up to the present day. I, Heron, the above mentioned, have written the body of the contract and agreed to all the aforesaid terms as is aforesaid. The first year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus and the Emperor Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus, Pauni 9. (Endorsed) Contract for deputing the share of Philagris to Heron.’

3. βοθιοὶ γεωργῶν: βοθιοὶ are known as assistants of the πράκτορος (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 618), and very likely tax-farmers too had βοθιοὶ; but the γεωργῶν here are clearly the tax-payers (cf. 18), not the tax-collectors, and the βοθιοὶ are really assistants either of the nomarch, who was responsible for the μοναδιαρία γάρτου (Wilcken, ibid. p. 388), or of the πρωθιερεύον who appear in B. G. U. 334, 431, and 741 as actually collecting that tax. The genitive γεωργῶν, therefore, depends only loosely on βοθιοὶ, 'assistants in connexion
with γεωργοί, i.e. with taxes paid by γεωργοί; cf. B. G. U. 221, where a tax on the fishing industry is collected by a βασιλική άλλος on behalf of the nomarch.

The γεωργοί here, as often (e.g. xviii (a) 1), seem to be the δημόσιον γεωργοί; cf. 8 διὰ τῶν ἀντι Φαλαγρίδος with lxxxvi. 12, where the persons from Philagris who cultivate land at Polydeucia are δημόσιον γεωργοί, and see introd. to lxxxvi. This view is confirmed by a receipt for μονοδεμία χόρτον in Lord Amherst's collection, in which the tax-payer is a γεωργ(γοί) of the 17th κληρ(ονία), i.e. of βασιλικής δημοσίας γῆ.

6. μονοδεμία χόρτον: the meaning of this tax in connexion with bundles of hay is obscure. It was always paid in money, and perhaps fell only on δημόσιο γεωργοί. Possibly the ἀλα ἑδή which are regularly associated with it are not other taxes, but other kinds of produce on which the μονοδεμία was exacted.

7. ποιμείας: the nomarch was particularly concerned with the collection of certain taxes of which the μονοδεμία χόρτον was one; cf. note on 3.

9. ἐν Πάλη: the reading is clear, and none of the known meanings of πάλη suit here; but another proper name is not very satisfactory.

15. Φαρμοιδία: the contract is dated in Pauni, so nearly half the period had already expired, which is curious, especially if the contract is concerned with the μονοδεμία χόρτον for the whole year (cf. introd.). The reign of Marcus and Verus only began in Phamenoth (Antoninus died on March 11), but it is not likely that the change of emperors has anything to do with the fact that the payments only take place in the last five months of the year 160-1.

16. παραδεχωμένως: i.e. the sums already paid to the βασιλεῖα were to be subtracted from the 560 drachmae; cf. introd.

XXXV. RECEIPT FOR SALARY OF DEPUTY TAX-COLLECTORS.

Harit. 21.7 x 15.3 cm. A.D. 150-1.

Acknowledgement by two persons to a tax-collector of Theadelphia that they had received from him the sum of 200 drachmae as their ‘salary’ for acting as his deputy during one year. The receipt is to be compared with xxxiv and Brit. Mus. Pap. 306, by which a tax-collector of Heraclea appoints a deputy for a period of two years at a total salary of 252 drachmae.

A[. . . . . . .] καὶ Ἀρπαλος Ἡραξκλείδου
π[. . . . . . .] ὡς Χαίρημ(ονος π)ράκ-
tάμα[. . . . . . .] κ[ω]μῆς Θεadelphiaς.
ἀπέχουμεν παρά σοῦ [ἐκ παραθ . . . . . . .] τὰς συν-
5 εσταμένας [ἡ]μεῖν ὑπὲρ σαλαρείου . . . . [. . . . . . . .]
πρακτ[ορ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .] τὸν ἑντοτῶν ἑν (ἐτοὺς) Ἀντωνεί[νου]
Καὶσαρος [τοῦ] κυρίου ἄργυρου δραχμᾶς δια-
κοσίας, [([δραχμαί] Σ)], καὶ ἀναδόσομεν σοι τὰς ἀπο-
XXXVI. LEASE OF A MONOPOLY.

Hab. 15.5 x 9.5 cm. A.D. 111-2.

An undertaking on the part of a certain Sanesneus to pay 80 drachmae, with various extra sums, to the 'superintendents of brick-making in the nome,' in consideration of his having been granted for one year the right to make and sell bricks at the village of Kerkethociris, with power to hand on his rights to others.

The present papyrus is one of a small group of documents which so closely resemble each other in formula that it is difficult not to explain all of them in the same way. The first of these to be published was our Gr. Pap. II. xii., in which the concession requested was apparently the ἐτοισαμα (sic) of a village, and the φόρος 288 drachmae. We explained that papyrus as an undertaking by a tax-farmer to pay the sum mentioned for the right of collecting the tax upon ἐταίρας, and in this we were followed by Wilcken, who discusses the
document at length in his chapter on Die Steuerpacht in der Kaiserzeit (Ost. I. pp. 587 sqq.). The next papyrus with a similar formula to be published was Brit. Mus. Pap. 286, a proposal addressed to the priests of Socnopaei Nesus by two γναφεῖς to lease the γναφική of that village and of Nilopolis for a φόρος of 240 drachmae. This was interpreted by Kenyon (Cat. II. p. 183) as a lease of a monopoly of the γναφική or laundry work. Wilcken, however (Archiv, I. p. 156), comparing Gr. Pap. II. xlii and a Berlin papyrus (B. G. U. 337), which shows that the priests of Socnopaei Nesus were responsible for the raising of the tax called γναφέων or γναφική, explained the British Museum papyrus as a proposal for the farming of the tax upon the trade of a γναφεῖς, and this view has now been accepted by Kenyon (Class. Rev. xiv. p. 171).

The third instance is a papyrus in Lord Amherst's collection, which we hope to publish next year. It is addressed to the nomarch, and begins βούλομαι ἐπικωρηθῆναι . . . κοτυλίζεων πάν ἐλαιον ἐν ἐργαστηρίῳ ἐν ἐν κόμη Πραικλεία . . . καὶ τελέω(ε)μεν εἰς τὸν τής ὄνεις φόρον (or λάγον). . . . The fourth instance is the present document. xciii, a proposal for the lease of a perfumery business, perhaps belongs to the same group, but since the lessor there is not an official, the transaction may be a private one. The discovery of these new documents throws doubt upon the current explanation of Brit. Mus. Pap. 286, and even of Gr. Pap. II. xlii. ἐπικωρηθῆναι . . . τῆς πληθυσμοῦ cannot mean the concession of the tax upon brick-making, i.e. the farming of a tax, nor, so far as we can see, anything but the concession of the right to make bricks, i.e. the lease of a monopoly. In the Amherst papyrus, which is concerned with the right 'to retail all the oil in one factory at Heraclea,' it is even clearer that no question of farming a tax is admissible. Turning from these two instances, where the exercise of a trade is the subject of concession (cf. xciii), to the three ambiguous terms, πληθυσμική here, γναφική in Brit. Mus. Pap. 286, and ἐτα(ε)ρύσματα in Gr. Pap. II. xlii, it is very difficult, if not impossible, seeing that the πληθυσμική is granted together with the πληθυσμοῦ, to suppose that the subject of the concession here was a tax upon a trade and not the trade itself. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to draw what seems an arbitrary distinction between the πληθυσμική and the πληθυσμοῦ, we must explain the former as 'the selling of bricks,' not as 'the tax upon the selling of bricks.' Following the analogy of this papyrus we prefer to regard the γναφική conceded in Brit. Mus. Pap. 286 as the trade of a γναφεῖς, not the tax upon γναφεῖς. The fact too that the γναφική was conceded to persons who were themselves γναφεῖς is more intelligible on this view. Gr. Pap. II. xlii is more difficult to reconcile with the idea of a monopoly, though so far as the obscure word ἐτα(ε)ρύσματα goes, it might mean the trade of a leno as well as the tax on ἐτα(ε)ρύσμα.
(16–21 in that papyrus) concerning the καταχωρίσμος βιβλίων recalls the arrange-
ments in agreements for deputing the πρακτορεία of a tax (Brit. Mus. Pap.
306. 15 sqq., xxxv, 8–10), and is less suitable to the accounts of a monopolist.
Therefore, in spite of the difficulty of explaining Gr. Pap. II. xli and xxxvi
here on different hypotheses, we are not at present prepared to abandon the
current theory of the former document 1.

The conclusion that we should draw from xxxvi and Brit. Mus. Pap. 286 is
that in certain villages in the Fayûm the right of making and selling bricks,
and of exercising the profession of a γναφέβι, was a monopoly granted to the
highest bidder for the concession. That the price paid for the lease was the
subject not of a private agreement between the government and the lessee but
of an auction appears from xxxvi. 18, where the κυρικά are mentioned. In
this respect the terms of these undertakings resemble the leasing of a tax, and
it is also noticeable that the nomarch and ἐτιτημηταί are officials who were
largely concerned with the farming of taxes. It is not improbable that the
lessees of the monopolies were called μυθωται, but this does not alter the wide
division which separates their position from that of ordinary farmers of a tax.

While much is known about the system of government monopolies in
matters of trade during the Ptolemaic period from the third part of the Revenue
Papyrus which deals with the oil monopoly, for the Roman period we have no
corresponding information, and the subject is extremely obscure. Wilcken
(ibid. p. 190) is inclined to think that the government control of the oil manu-
facture continued into Byzantine times; but to this there are grave objections
(cf. introd. to xcvi), and no evidence has yet been produced for the existence
in the Roman period of monopolies in the form of the Ptolemaic oil monopoly.
The monopolies with which we are here concerned are in any case something
quite different, and seem to be more of the nature of a tax upon the exercise
of certain trades. Taken by themselves the monopolies implied in these two
papyri need not surprise us. But when we attempt to combine their evidence
with the rest of our information about the taxes on trades, we are confronted
by several difficulties. Are the sums paid for these monopolies an additional
tax over and above those paid for the χειρωνάξιων by the members of different
professions (cf. Wilcken, ibid. pp. 321 sqq.)? For the γναφεί, there is but
one instance of a recorded payment (Wilcken, ibid. II. no. 1487, provenance
unknown), which seems to be at the rate of 24 drachmae a year, and parallel to
other fixed taxes upon trades; and so far as it goes it is an argument for
taking γναφεί in Brit. Mus. Pap. 286 as a tax. But owing to the diversity

1 In line 27 read ἀπομεῖ γ (so Mr. Smyly), i.e. ἀπομεῖνα γ. The fact that the lessee is to have three
ἀπομεῖ is another argument for supposing that the concession is not a tax.
which undoubtedly prevailed between the systems of collecting taxes in different nomes, and the insufficient information afforded by a single ostraca, it is impossible to connect the ostraca with Brit. Mus. Pap. 286 with any certainty. As for taxes on brick-making, there are a few Theban ostraca (Wilcken, *ibid.* nos. 512, 572, 592, 1421) which mention payments ἐπὶ πλωθο-ποιία and πλωθοπωλική of xxxvi. The evidence of the ostraca is at present too scanty to form a basis of comparison, especially since none of them come from the Fayûm. But it is not in itself at all likely that the lessees of the monopoly of a trade should have to pay the tax on that particular trade as well. The monopoly is rather to be looked upon as a peculiar substitute for the χερσονάζων in certain places, probably for the most part villages, and affecting only a very limited number of trades. Its existence is not to be inferred except where direct evidence for it is forthcoming.

Κερκεδοήρεως (δραχμαί) π.
2nd hand Φλωνι καὶ Σαβείνοι ἐπιτηρηταῖς
πλῶθον νομοῦ
παρὰ Σανεσινέος τοῦ Ὀρσείτου τῶν ἀπὸ κό-
5 μῆς Ναρμοῦθεως Πολέμωνος μερίδος(σ).
ἐπιχωρηθεῖσα μοι πρὸς μόνον τὸ
ἐνστὸς πεντεκαίδεκα τῶν ἔτων
Ἄβδοκράτορος Κάλαρος Νεροῦ Τραίανοῦ
Σεβαστὸς Τερμαίνικος Δακικοῦ τῆς πλιν-
10 θοτοίας καὶ πλωθοπωλικῆς
καὶ ἐτέρων ἐπιχωρηθέντων διδόναι
κάμης Κερκεδοήρως τῆς
αὐτῆς μερίδος καὶ τῶν ταυτῆς ἐποι-
κίων καὶ πεδίων, ὄφιστάμαι τε-
15 λέσεων φόρων ἄργυρον δραχμὰς
ἀγοράκοντα καὶ τῶν τοῦτων προσ-
διαγραφομένων καὶ ἐκατοστῶν καὶ
κηρυκίων, ἵνα καὶ τὴν ἀπόδοσιν
ποιήσωμαι κατὰ μήνα ἀπὸ μηνὸς
20 Σεβαστὸς ἔως Καισαρείου ἐξ ίσου, ἵπτα
φαίνεται ἐπιχωρήσαι.
9. πλασθοποιαι Pap. 16. τα τοις προσιαγγαθαμενα και εκατοστας και κηρυκεια.

'To Philo and Sabinus, superintendents of bricks of the nome, from Sanesneus, son of Orseus, of the village of Narmouthis in the division of Polemo. If I receive the concession for the present year only, the 15th of the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus Dacicus, for the making and selling of bricks, with power to pass on the right to others, in the village of Kerkethoëris in the same division with its farmsteads and plains, I undertake to pay as rent eighty drachmae of silver and the extra payments, hundredths, and auction expenses, which sum I will pay in equal monthly instalments from Sebastus to Caesareus, if you consent to the concession. Sanesneus, aged 60, having a scar on the left knee. I, Castor, scribe of the nome, have drawn up this deed, since Sanesneus stated that he was unable to write.'

3. νομοι: τοι νομοι would have been expected, unless indeed νομοι here means not ‘nomes’ but ‘distribution,’ as in Rev. Pap. XLIII. 3.

17. On εκατοσται cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 364. In B. G. U. 156. 8 a soldier buying domain land pays, in addition to the τιμη, ιστερ εκατοστων τεσσάρων. Similar extra payments from the lessee are also found in Gr. Pap. II. xli. 13.


XXXVII. WARRANT FOR ARREST.

Kôm Ushim. Gizeh Inv. no. 10235. 5.9 × 22 cm. Third century.

Order addressed to the ἀρχέφωος of Psenuris (cf. p. 14), probably by a military officer, for the arrest of a person called Emes; cf. xxxviii, Ox. Pap. I. 64 &c. As usual in these notices to the ἀρχέφωος, the writing is on the vertical fibres.

Ἀρχέφωος κόμ[ης] Φενυρίους. ἀνάπεμψεν Ἐμην ἐνκαλούμενον ὑπὸ Ἀβραήλου Νειλου βουλευτοῦ ἐξαυτῆς.


On the verso

Φενυρίου.

2. ὑπὸ Pap.
XXXVIII. Notice from a Centurion.

Kãṣr el Banât. 12 x 10.2 cm. Late third or fourth century.

Order from a centurion to the elders of a village called Taurinus concerning the appointment of a watch. The centurion’s handwriting has strongly marked Latin characteristics, like Ox. Pap. I. 122. As in that papyrus the rough breathing occurs. At the end is a word or two in Latin, the meaning of which is obscure.

Παρ(ά) Δε(μ)πτῖτου Αννιανοῦ (ἐκατοντάρχου).
φροντίσατε ἐξαυτῆς
τὴν συνήθη παρα-
φιλακήν γείνεσθαι
5 ἀπὸ τοῦ μαγδώλου ὑμῶν
ἐως τῶν ὄρων ἐποι-
κίον λεγομένου Ἀμμίνου.

[τρη]
[πρεσβύτεροι] καὶ δημοσίους κόμης, Ταυρείου.

m kassiles

1. παρ Ραπ. 5. ἔμω Ραπ., so in 6 ἱµῶν.

‘From Domitianus Annianus, centurion. See that you at once provide the customary guard from your tower as far as the boundaries of the farmstead called that of Amminius. To the elders and officials of the village of Taurinus.’

5. μαγδώλου: ‘a tower,’ from the Hebrew ‘Migdol’ (Num. xxxiii. 7); cf. B. G. U. 282. 13 πυργομάγδωλ. Some of these places of refuge erected in Byzantine and Coptic times are still to be found. A tax for the maintenance of μαγδώλα is mentioned in liv. 13, and a μαγδαλοφίλαι in cviii. 13. Magdola or Magdolos was the name of a Fayûm village.

10. There is a short space between m and kassiles, which may also be read kamles.
XXXIX. REPORT TO A TAX-FARMER.

Harit. 25.9 x 7.3 cm. A.D. 183.

Reply from the elders of Theadelphia to the farmer of a tax connected with the temples at the village of Βουκόλωφ, stating, in answer to a question addressed to them by the tax-farmer, who was the person responsible for a certain payment in relation to the tax. The precise nature of this tax, which is called ἱερὸ(ῦ) Βουκόλωφ(ῶν), is obscure. Payments for ἱερὸ or ἱερᾶς (sc. πυρῶν and κριθᾶς) are noted in the margins of a number of receipts on ostraca of the second century B.C., but these sums appear to be a percentage subsequently assigned by government officials to the temples, and not a regular tax as such (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 223). Neither is it likely, from the phraseology of the papyrus, that a land tax payable to the ἔθνος ἱερῶν is meant. Probably ἱερὸ here is a special impost for the benefit of the local temple; cf. xlii (a) II. 10, where a tax called ἱερὰ παρὰ θείῳ is found, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 478, a receipt for payments by a priest to the μυσθωταῖοι ἱεροῖ(ῶν) χειρ(ομοῖον).

Νίκων Ἄρειον μαθητῇ
tέλους ἱερὸ(ῦ) Βουκόλωφ(ῶν)
παρὰ Καστορίος Κάστορος καὶ
'Ομηρίνος Χαίρημονος καὶ
"Ηρωνὸς ἀπὰ(όρος) μητρὸς Δι-
δόμης καὶ Νικάνδρου Ὄμι-
γένους δύο τοῦ πατρὸς
'Ομηρίγενος καὶ Ἡσάλλα
καὶ Διοκάρου Ἡρώνος καὶ Πε-
τασκόμου Διοκάρου καὶ
Μάλλας Πνεφερώτου τῶν
ἐκτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προσβ(υτέρων)
κόμης Θεαδελφίας.
ἐπιζητοῦσι σοι ἐκ τῶν
ἀπαιτεῖται τὸ προκείμενον
ἀπότακτον δηλοῦμεν
δῆλοιεν ἀπαιτεῖσθαι τὸ ἀπό-
τακτον τούτο ἐκ Χαίρῆ-
μονος ἱεροῦ.
20 2nd hand Κάστωρ ἐνθέδωκα.

3rd hand Ἡρων συνεπεδέδωκα.

4th hand Νικάνδρος διὰ το[ῦ] πατρὸς

1st hand Ἦκις Μελανᾶ ὡς ἐτῶν μ [οὐ]νῆκη] ἀντικημμίῳ ἀμιστεφρόφοι.

(ἐτος) κύ Αὐρηλίου Κομηδοῦ
Ἀντωνίνου Χεβαστοῦ, Φαρμοβίλης κη.

6. ó of νικάνδρου corr. from v. 18. ò of τοῦτο corr. from v. 23. οὐ inserted above the line.

'To Nicon, son of Arius, farmer of the temple tax of Boucolon, from Castor, son of Castor, and Horion, son of Chaeremon, and Heron, whose father is unknown, his mother being Didyme, and Nicander, son of Origenes, through his father Origenes, and Isas, son of Melanas, and Dioscorus, son of Heron, and Petuscheus, son of Dioscorus, and Mallais, son of Pnepheros, eight elders, and from the rest of the elders of the village of Theadelphia. In answer to your inquiry, from whom the aforesaid sum is demanded, we declare that this sum should be demanded from Chaeremon, son of Iemouthes.' There follow the signatures of Castor, Heron, and Origenes, and the ages and descriptions of Isas, Dioscorus, Petuscheus, and Mallais, and the date.

2. ἱερο[ῦ] Βουκάλου: the o of οὐρο is slightly raised above the line, but it would still be quite possible, so far as the method of writing goes, to read the expression as a single word οὐροβουκάλου. The initial i is also not quite certain. The village called Βουκάλου is known from P. P. II. 28. V. 16, and in Roman times from ccxi and B. G. U. 586. 8.


14–16. ἐκ τίνος...ἀπόκατειν seems to be a quotation from the letter of the tax-farmer. ἀπόκατειν apparently means the prescribed sum, while προκεῖμενον refers to a previous statement, not quoted here, in the letter of Nicon. This is less difficult than taking προκεῖμενον as a loose reference to line 2. It can hardly be supposed that Chaeremon was responsible for the whole of the τέλος.

15. ἀπαντήσαι: this word may imply that the payment was in arrear or have a quite general meaning; there is a similar ambiguity attaching to the ἀπαντήσαι (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 610). If ἀπαντήσαι has no reference to arrears, we may perhaps compare the present document with the ἀπαντήσαι sent to the ἐπίστατοι by government officials (Wilcken, ibid. I. p. 619); cf. introd. to xl.
XL. Taxing List.

Harit. 7.7 x 15.7 cm. A.D. 162-3.

In exacting payment of taxes, the collectors were guided by lists issued to them by the government officials, stating the names of the individual tax-payers, the objects taxed, and the sums to be exacted. Such lists were called ἀπαρθήσιμα καὶ ἁμωρά, and instances of them are B. G. U. 175 and 659 (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 619). Besides these, other ἀπαρθήσιμα were issued by the government officials giving the quotas due from different villages, e.g. ccviii. The present document is also called an ἀπαρθήσιμον, being written by the village scribe of Theoxeniss and Andromachis, and in the place generally occupied by the name of the tax to be collected we have the phrase τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια of the money taxes of the present third year of Marcus and Verus. At line 7 begins a list of properties, of which the first is said to have become subject to the tax in question during the nineteenth year of an emperor; but the papyrus breaks off before the sentence is complete.

The meaning of the text depends on the explanation of the obscure phrase τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια. In B. G. U. 199 verso 1 a payment ὑπὲρ θύσιων καὶ τελωνικῆς ἄτελειας is found amongst a number of other taxes (cf. Wilcken, Ost. II. no. 1257, where a payment for ἄτελεια seems to occur). From the context of that passage it would naturally be inferred that τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια was itself the name of a special impost, and this view, however strange it may appear, is confirmed by lxxxii. 14 where a payment in kind for τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια upon an ὀβοῖα, i.e. land which had become the private property of the emperor, is made, apparently by the μεσθωραί. In the present papyrus the property which was subject to the tax had once belonged to Antonia, the daughter of the Emperor Claudius, and it is probable that here too we are concerned with a tax upon ὀβσικοὶ μεσθωράι or γεωργία. Perhaps Antonia's property had as such been free from taxation, but when it was subsequently incorporated with the ὀβσικῆ γῆ belonging to the reigning emperor, the μεσθωραί or γεωργία who cultivated it had to pay the tax for τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια; though whether this impost was levied on all cultivators of ὀβσικῆ γῆ as a substitute for certain other taxes, or only upon those who cultivated land which had previously been ἄτελής, is obscure. But perhaps the explanation of this charge for τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια is to be looked for in the special circumstances of the year 162-3. In that year, as is shown by several returns of ἄβροχος γῆ (cf. introd. to xxxii), there was a failure of the Nile, and the τελωνικῆ ἄτελεια may have been a special charge exacted from cultivators of ὀβσικῆ γῆ in lieu of the taxes which were remitted. This view gains some support from B. G. U. 84,
a mutilated document which, so far as can be judged, has several points of connexion with the present papyrus (cf. especially B. G. U. 84 I. 3–4 with xl. 8). In the Berlin papyrus large amounts of ἄβροχος γῆ are mentioned, which are subtracted from the taxable area; and it is not improbable that in xl a similar statement was given of the number of aourae belonging to the οἰνία which were ἄβροχοι, and of which the cultivators were therefore subject to the charge for τελωνική ἀγέλεα. The chief objection to this interpretation is that in lines 7–8 of our papyrus a contrast seems to be drawn between the 19th year when the land in question was made subject to ἀπαίτησις (i.e. presumably the charge for τελωνικὴ ἀγέλεα) and the previous period when the land belonged to Antonia, as if it had then been exempt altogether. But perhaps, if the 19th year is that of Antoninus, the land had been ἄβροχοι ever since; or the charge for τελωνικὴ ἀγέλεα, made in the 19th year of the emperor, whoever he was, was being made the basis of the charge for the current year.

In the mutilated left-hand margin of the papyrus are some illegible additions in a different hand. On the verso is part of an account.

Παρὰ Μυσταρίωνοις κομογρ(αμματέωι) Θεοζενίδος [καί] Ἀνδρομαχίδος.

ἀπαίτησιον τελωνικῆς ἀγέλειας ἀργυρικῶν [τῶν ἐνεστῶτος γ (ἔτους) Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου 5 [Αὐρηλίου Ἀντωνίου Σεβαστοῦ καί Αὐτ[ο]κράτορος [Καίσαρος Δούκιον Αὐρηλίου Οὐήρου Σεβαστοῦ. ἔστι [δὲ] Θεοζενίδος πρότερον Ἀντωνίου θυγατρὸς θεοῦ Κλαυδίου ἡχθησαν εἰς ἀπαίτησιν τῶν ἑαυτ[έρ] [ ...]

7. Ἀντωνίου: the Ἀντωνίων οἰνία, which is mentioned e.g. in Ix. 6, not improbably belonged to this Antonia.
8. ἡχθησαν: the subject is nearly certainly ἄροι; cf. B. G. U. 84 I. 4, 11.

XLI. TAX-COLLECTORS' RETURN.

Ümm el 'Atl. 22.4 x 12.7 cm. A.D. 186.

Every month the tax-collectors had to send in to the strategus two accounts of their receipts, one giving a list of the individual payments, the other stating only the total receipts for each tax. Instances of both kinds of ὑπομνήματα are
extant, e.g. B. G. U. 41 and 42 and in the present volume xli, xlii, ccxxxix, and ccxiii (cf. xlii a). Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 622) thinks that in all these cases the collectors reported the amounts which they had themselves paid over to the δημοσία τράπεζα, apparently taking ἕμι in the commonly recurring phrase of these documents, τῶν διαγεγραμμένων ἕμι εἰς τὴν δημοσίαν τράπεζαν, as equivalent to ὑπ' ἕμι.

The present papyrus is an example of the second class of ὑπομηματα, those in which only the totals are given. Apart from the interesting questions concerning the taxes mentioned in it, which will be discussed later, the formula calls for some notice, since a contrast appears to be drawn between the sums διαγεγραμμένων ἕμι in I. 6 and II. 6 and those paid εἰς τὴν δημοσίαν τράπεζαν in I. 17 and II. 16, which are subsequently added together in I. 19 and II. 18. It is also noticeable that in several other ὑπομηματα from the πράκτορες to the strategus, e.g. ccxxxix, B. G. U. 199, 392, Gr. Pap. II. lxii (a), there is no mention of the δημοσία τράπεζα, but the sums are paid (διαγεγραμμένα) ἕμι simply. In those instances the dative after διαγεγραμμένα would more naturally mean 'to us' than 'by us.' Putting together these facts about the ὑπομηματα of the πράκτορες, a distinction, as it seems to us, is to be drawn between the payments εἰς τὴν δημοσίαν τράπεζαν and the payments where the bank is not mentioned. In the former case the taxpayer paid his money direct to the bank to the account of the tax-collector, in the latter he paid it to the πράκτωρ, who no doubt made it over to the δημοσία τράπεζα or other bank appointed (cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 255. 17–9), though the fact of his doing so is not stated. Under these circumstances we should expect to find that the receipts given to the tax-payers were issued in some cases by the bank, in others by the πράκτορες. Does this view harmonize with the actual receipts as found on Fayûm papyri? Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 69, note 1) thought that the ordinary tax-receipts with the formula διέγραψε διὰ . . . (e.g. xlviii, liv, lv) were issued by the bank. Now, however (Archiv, I. p. 141), on the evidence of Brit. Mus. Pap. 454, where the receipt is signed by a πράκτωρ, he thinks that they were issued by the tax-collectors. But the third alternative, that some were issued by the bank and others by the collectors, is equally possible. In some cases two receipts were actually issued to the tax-payer, one by the collectors, the other by the government bank (introd. to lxiv). What proportion the sums paid direct to the bank bore to those paid to the πράκτορες must remain uncertain. In the present document the amount paid to the πράκτορες is the larger, but out of the other published ὑπομηματα only four (υ. συρ.) fail to mention the bank.

The papyrus contains two returns, the first (Col. I.) giving the amounts received on account of the months Mecheir and Phamenoth, and dated in
Pharmouthi; the second (Col. II.) dated a month later, and written in the same hand, referring to payments on account of Pharmouthi. The formula is practically identical in both, except that in II. 12 a tax occurs which is not mentioned in I. Throughout both columns the names of the taxes are abbreviated thus:—ἀπομ and ἕ Ἰ. 13, II. 13; ἐ II. 14 and no doubt in I. 15; κολ. I. 16 and II. 14; ἅ I. 17 and II. 15; ἕ κοι in II. 12. Of these the first can hardly be anything else than ἀπομ(ορφα). On this tax upon vineyards and παραδεισων much information is provided by the second part of the Revenue Papyrus. Its continued existence in the Roman period is attested by Brit. Mus. Pap. 195, which also shows that it was no longer calculated upon the harvest but on the acreage of the land, and that payment in money had superseded the partial payment in kind permitted by the Ptolemies. ἔ, i.e. ἔπ(έπ), might be the name of one of several taxes, or even mean ἐπὶ τὸ ἀντί; but the latter signification is unsuitable here, for ἐπὶ τὸ ἀντί is used for adding up previously mentioned sums, not for introducing a fresh payment. The resolution ἐπ(αρωφείων) is almost certain for the following reasons:— (1) in cxx the αρωφ and κοι come in connexion with payments for ἔπαρο(φεινον); (2) in Gr. Pap. II. lxv. the ἔπαροφων (if we adopt Wilcken's correction of our ἔπαροφων) is also coupled with κόλλωσι (cf. cxxviii, cccxxii); (3) the ἔπαροφων was the land-tax upon those kinds of land which were subject to the ἀπόμωρα and was naturally often paid at the same time (e.g. Wilcken, Ost. II nos. 352 and 1234).

In ἕ κοι (cf. cxx, cccii–iv) is probably to be explained as ν(ανιθρο); see Brit. Mus. Pap. 193, where ἕ κοι interchanges with ναῦθ κοι, and Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 150. He there further conjectures that κοι is for κ(α)ρ(κωρ), comparing B. G. U. 342. 10 ἁρ(μηνείων) κοι with Brit. Mus. Pap. 451. 4 ἀρ(ιθ) κατ(κοὐν). This hypothesis gains much support from the present volume; cf. lv. 5 ναῦθ(ον) κατ(οίκων) and lvii. 4 with lxv. 6, cxx–ccxiv and xlii (a) I. 13; and it may now be regarded as certain. On the meaning of ναῦθων, an impost upon land-owners in connection with the maintenance of dykes and canals, see Ox. Pap. II. p. 297, and Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 259–63, and cf. lv–lvii.

In I. 13 and II. 13 also ἕ is best explained as ν(ανιθρο). The only alternative that is there at all likely is πεντηκοστή, but from its position between the sums paid for ἀπόμωρα and the προσβαλεμένα, ἕ must clearly be closely related to the ἀπόμωρα, and the sum is in neither case γο of that preceding. Though no other instance is known of the ναῦθων connected with ἀπόμωρα,

1 We should be quite ready to adopt ἔναφιεον if it were not for the certain occurrence in cxx (cf. cxxiv) of a tax called ναυ(κω) followed like the ἐναθριον by προσβαλεμέναι and κόλλωσι. Cf. also Brit. Mus. Pap. 193 I. 6.
there is nothing remarkable in the collocation, since the ἀπέμοιρα was in the Roman period a tax calculated upon the acreage of the property (v. sup.).

κολλάζων, as is shown by Gr. Pap. II. lxv. 3, and presumably has something to do with giving change. It follows προσδιαγραφόμενα several times in the present volume, often in connexion with ἐπαρχομένος as here and in lxvi. 7 and exc, but also with ὀνείρον κατοίκων in lvi. 7, lvi. 5 and exciii, and with αἰών in exciv, usually as a trifling payment. In Brit. Mus. Pap. 451. 8 (cf. Class. Rev. xii. p. 435) 10 (obols, see note on lvi. 7) are paid for κολλάζων; cf. also B. G. U. 9 IV. 2.

ὁ is for φυσικόν; cf. lvii. 5, B. G. U. 219. 13, Gr. Pap. II. lxv. 3, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 329. 8 and 9, where the symbol recurs, with lvi. 7, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 451. 8, where ἀριστοκρατ. and ἔμα are found in a similar position, and also Gr. Pap. II. xli. 10 προσδιαγραφόμενος καὶ συμβολικόν, B. G. U. 99. 8 προσδιαγραφόμενα συμβολικά, and 219. 8, where συμβολικά is probably to be read for ἡμι. . . When the amounts are given, they are, as here, very small. The συμβολίκα was a payment to the tax-collector for writing the συμβολόν or receipt (cf. Rev. Pap. XX. 14), and is to be distinguished in all cases from the προσδιαγραφόμενα, the precise nature of which is unknown. Those instances where no sum is mentioned after συμβολικά are to be explained as mere omissions (cf. the frequent omissions of the amounts paid for προσδιαγραφόμενα), not by the supposition that the συμβολικά were sometimes included in the προσδιαγραφόμενα.

Col. I.

[Πρακτικό[νε[ί]]δού[ν] με[ριδίο[ν]
παρὰ Διοσκί[ρ[ο]) ε[ν] κλή[ρο[ν] καλ]
μετόχα[ν] (π[ρ]ακτ[ι[ρ[ό])[ν] ἄργι[λ[ι[κ[ο]]
5 Ἡραμίστα(άδος). λόγος ε[ν] κεφ[αλαίο[ν]
τῶν διαγεγραμμένον ἦμιν
ἰς ἄριθμησιν Μεθείρ Φαιμείρωθ]]
τοῦ ἐνεστώτος κτ (ἐτοῦ)
Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου
10 Κομμόδου 'Αντωνείνου
Σεβαστοῦ. ἑστὶ δὲ διοικηθεῖσας κτ (ἐτοῦ)
ἀπορρ[αίρ] [δραχμαί] Σμ. ἐν (κυβίον)
(δραχμαί) 1, 5

Col. II.

[Ἀπολλωνία] στρ(ατηγ[φ] 'Αρσε[ν[νοίοτον]
[Ἡρακλ(είδον] μερίδιο
παρὰ Διοσκ[ίρ[ο)) ε[ν] κλή[ρο[ν] καλ]
μετίχα[ν] (π[ρ]ακτ[ι[ρ[ό])[ν] ἄργι[λ[ι[κ[ο]]
5 Ἡφαίστ[α(άδος]. λόγος ε[ν] κεφ[αλαίο[ν]
τῶν διαγεγραμμένον ἦμιν
ἰς ἄριθμησιν Μεθείρ Φαιμείρωθ]
τοῦ ἐνεστώτος κτ (ἐτοῦ)
Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου
10 Κομμόδου 'Αντωνείνου
Σεβαστοῦ. ἑστὶ δὲ διοικηθεῖσας κτ (ἐτοῦ)
ἐν (κυβίον) καλ[αί][και] (δραχμαί) ρμ,
προς(διαγραφόμενα) (δραχμαί)
I. 15. ι of ρεγε corr. from λ.

I. 3. ἐν κλ(ήν): cf. Wilcken, Ost. II no. 285, "Ἀπεκρούμενος Παπρεμίδον ἐν κλήρῳ καὶ Κορηῖς Ἐπαρκομένων γενόμενος πράκτορας ἄργους (μικροὺς), and ibid. no. 1588 ἐν κλήρῳ πράκτορας. The lists of persons suitable for the post of πράκτορα were made out in the first instance by the village officials and submitted by the κοινογνωματεύς to the εταιρεία who in his turn submitted them to the ἐνεπτυπωμένος for decision; cf. B. G. U. 194, 235, and Wilcken, ibid. I. pp. 602–3. Dioscorus had been nominated, but his appointment was not yet officially sanctioned.

5. Ἐπικατάστασις (κάθεια): cf. note on xxv. 4.

7. ἀλθ(ήρος): the accounts of taxes were made up monthly, and in many instances the payments of the taxpayers were made in monthly instalments. Hence tax-receipts frequently mention the ἀλθήρος to which the payment in question belonged, the month in nearly all cases being that preceding the date of the receipt. Where the ἀλθήρος was for the same month as that in which the receipt was dated, it was usually omitted; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 815. For an exception cf. I. 3 of the present volume.

12. δικαιοσύνη: the word appears to have its limited sense, designating either payments to the government for its own use as distinguished from payments to it on behalf of the temples (cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 656), or else being opposed to νόμος, i.e. the πατριμονίων Cæsaris (Wilcken, ibid. p. 644). Cf. lxxxvi. 1.

A corollary from the occurrence of the ἀπόδωσις under this heading is that the proceeds of that tax were not, in the Roman period at any rate, paid over to the temples; and this confirms the view of Philadelphus' ordinances concerning the ἀπόδωσις maintained by the editors of the Revenue Papyrus and formerly by Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 158) as against his later view (ibid. 615').

II. 15. The 669 dr. 3 obols do not include the sums in line 12, which are however added in to make the grand total in line 18. There is a slight inaccuracy in the total 113 drachmae in line 18, 3 + 3 + 5 = 11 obols being treated as one drachma.
XLII. Tax-Collectors' Return.

Kaşr el Banât. 21.9 x 6.3 cm. A.D. 196.

Return, similar to the preceding, addressed to a strategus by the tax-collectors of Archelais, and stating the amounts paid to the δημοσία τράπεζα on account of poll-tax and φόρος φυτῶν, a tax upon garden produce, for the month of Tubi; cf. introd. to xli. B. G. U. 199 is another return addressed to the same strategus, Philoxenus, but in his capacity of deputy for the strategus of the division of Heraclides.

Φιλοξένω φορέω
στρατηγῷ Ἀρσενοκράτει
καὶ Πολύμνῳ μερίδω
Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ μέτοχοι
πέρασον Ἀρχελαιδοῖς.

diēgrάφη ἵστο
μνήμα Τύβι ἐπὶ
τὴν δημοσίαν
τράπαιζαν τῶ

9. 1. τράπαιζαν.

To Philoxenus, strategus of the divisions of Themistes and Polemo of the Arsinoite nome, from Anoubas and partners, tax-collectors of Archelais. There has been paid for the month of Tubi into the official bank on account of the poll-tax of the fourth year 120 drachmai, for the plant-tax 80 drachmai, total 200 drachmai. The fourth year of Lucius Septimius Severus Augustus, Mecheir 4.

12. φόροι φυτῶν: cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 403, where a τέλεσμα φυτῶν is mentioned (the payment, as here, being in money), and cxe, where φόροι φυτῶν occurs with taxes on orchards and gardens, such as the ἐπαρχίαι and ἀνάγυρα. Whether it fell on the same land as these two taxes is not clear, but this is in itself not improbable: owners of ἀμπελῶνες had to pay three sorts of taxes; cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 270.

14. The scribe began the line with the sign for (τοις) and then wrote τους, as if he had begun with τ.

16. The scribe has omitted the usual Περίλεκτος.

XLII (a). Tax-Collectors’ Return.

Harit. 13.1 x 19.8 cm. Late second century A.D.

Return addressed to the strategus of the division of Heraclides by the tax-collectors of Pharbetha, giving a list of arrears of taxes in Phamenoth of M 2.
the 7th year of an emperor. The top halves of two columns are preserved and the beginnings of lines of a third, and on the verso is part of the column in a different hand but dealing with the same subject.

The writing on the recto is excessively cursive and abounds in abbreviations, and the surface of the papyrus is much damaged, so that the decipherment is often a matter of great difficulty. But despite its incomplete condition this document is of considerable importance, since it gives us the names of no less than twenty-five different taxes (of which several are new) levied on inhabitants of a single village.

Col. I.

[. . . . ]... φ στρατηγίων Ἀρσενοκράτους Ηρακλείου...
μερίδος
παρὰ Χαρῆμον καὶ μ(ετόχων) πρακτόρων
ἀργυρίων κόμης Φαρβείσηθεν.
5 ἑκάστης καὶ ἄνεμος καὶ εἰδος
[. . . . ]... μενοὶ εἰς μηνα Φαμενώθ ἄμμο-
μάτων ἵνα τοῦ ἱερεύτους
[. . . . ]... ἔστι δὲ
[. . . . ]... κ( )
10 τέλος θυών
ὑποκείμενον ἐπιστρατηγίας
ἵερων δημοσίων

(δραχμαί) ιερ,
(δραχμαί) ρκτ (τρισβολων),
(δραχμαί) νά (δομόδος),
(δραχμαί) Ἀνθ (δομόδος),
(δραχμαί) υς (πεντάβολων),
(δραχμαί) θ (τετράβολων),
(δραχμαί) δ,  

Col. II.

στιτίκων [ ]
ἀμπελώνων
δεω( )
μαγικάλων [ ]
5 αλκ(η)ς [ ]
χωματικων

(δραχμαί) Σμβ,
(δραχμαί) ρκς,
(δραχμαί) χκ,
(δραχμαί) ρς,
(δραχμαί) ες,

Col. III.

γερ(δ)ιακοῦ
διογ[ ]
δ[ ]
κ...[ ]
λου[ ]
DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

I ᾨατ[ικάν] ἔπτη 
ἔποιε[ν] ἡρέων 
φόρον προεβον 
10 ἐντο[υ] 
ἐντο[υ] 
ναυ[το] 
ἐνπε[το] 
15 καθ' ἀνοπο[ύ] 
στικ[

On the verso

καὶ τῶν [[ὁ]] παρ' ἐπιτηρητ' αἰ[σ]

ἔνθηρας δρυμῶν τιοθ 

η (ἔτους) 

διεγράφησαν) κ (ἔτους) Παῦ 

5

(δραχμα) 

νομῶν θερινῶν 

η (ἔτους) 

διεγράφη) κ (ἔτους) Παῦ 

I. 5. ᾨδιάοσι: this word is regularly employed for a list of arrears; cf. cccc xxx ᾨδιάοσι λοια[ω] and Pap. Ox. II. 291. 3.
8. Perhaps the line began η ἔτους; the vestiges are consistent with ἔτους. The eighth year is mentioned on the verso.
10. For the tax on thyia-wood see Wilcken, Ott, I. p. 374.
11. Cf. B. G. U. 199. 14 where a payment for ἐπικεφαλι[ων] ἐπιστρ(α[πηγία) by the priests of Socnopaei Nesus occurs. The control of the collection of various taxes was divided amongst different officials. On the taxes 'subject to the office of epistrategus' see Wilcken, ibid. p. 597.
12. This tax 'for public offerings,' or (reading ἱπρων) 'festivals,' is new for the Roman period; though ἱπρων occurs in P. P. II. p. 37 as a tax; cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 377.
13. On the naubion tax see intro. to xliii and cf. lvi and lvii.
14. The name of this tax is very uncertain. The first letter can equally well be read as ο, but if ον (i.e. ονταθεσω, cf. xlv. 3) is meant, the ν is practically omitted. There are only two known names of taxes beginning with ον, ἐνελεον and ὑνελεον, of which the latter occurs in II. 12. On the ἐνελεον, a tax on houses, cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 192.
15. This tax 'for the scribe of the guards,' i.e. for his salary, is new.
II. 1. Cf. 16 where another entry for ἀστειάω, 241 dr., is found, being one drachma less than the amount here. For the payment of ἀστειάω in money instead of kind cf. Brt. Mus. Pap. 367 (a), a receipt issued by a προπαρος ἀστειάω; but it is remarkable that the πραπαρος ἀστειάω should be concerned with the collection of ἀστειάω in any form. Perhaps it was owing to the fact that the payments were in arrear.

2. On the land-tax upon vineyards cf. ccxiii and Wilcken, ibid. pp. 147 sqq.

3. Only the tops of the letters are preserved. The second might be ο, the third π or γ. It is tempting to read διανεφολακίως, cf. liv. 17; but the beginning of the final letter above the line does not suit μ.


7. This tax is new; cf. liv. 7 where ἐμοὶ(τικῶ) alone is found. The uncertainty attaching to the second word used here renders the meaning obscure.

8. On the tax ‘for the ἐσπνάγης of the priests’ cf. lii. 5.

9. The name of this tax is very obscure. ζω suggests a compound of ζων- or ζωγ-, but the round stroke ought to represent a π, and φόμος has not been found in the Roman period in connexion with the taxes ζωνής, ζωνοσαία or ζωοσασίως, though cf. Gr. Pap. II. xxxix. Of the three ζω(γ)οσασίας is the most probable. The doubtful ι may be ν, and the doubtful λ, ῥ.

10. On the tax ‘for temples,’ which is new, cf. introd. to xxxix.

11. For the ιππ- tax cf. note on liv. 7.

12. On the payment for the use of public pastures cf. verso 6 and introd. to lxi.


14. The penalties are those which are often stipulated in contracts to be paid εἰς τὸ δημόσιον: cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 368.

15. Perhaps καθ. (ἐν). This tax was levied upon the income derived from building-


Verso 1. This list seems to be a continuation of Col. III, δημοσίας appearing at intervals as there; but apparently the taxes here are distinguished from the others in being collected by ἐποπτικοὶ of the πραπαρος, instead of directly by them.

2. ἵππος δημώω: cf. B. G. U. 485. 8. On the tax upon the fishing industry cf. Wilcken, ibid. pp. 137 sqq. Perhaps Δρύμο, i.e. a village name, should be read.

6. Apparently this payment ‘for the summer pastures’ is distinct from the ‘pasture-
tax’ mentioned in II. 12. It has not been found before.

XLIII. Tax-Receipt.

Κατό τῆς Βακτί. 16-3 x 8-4 cm. B.C. 28.

Receipt issued by two tax-collectors, Harpaesion and Nilus, to Acusilaus (?), stating that he had paid ‘the 12 drachmae (tax) of the 2nd year.’ On palaeographical grounds the papyrus must belong to the latter part of the
first century B.C. The '2nd year' therefore in all probability refers to Augustus. The nature of the tax is obscure. A century later we hear of μητροπολίται δωδεκάδραχμοι at Oxyrhynchus (Ox. Pap. II. 258. 8), who paid twelve drachmae for poll-tax, but we cannot postulate the existence of the poll-tax so early as B.C. 28 (cf. Ox. Pap. II, p. 209). The amount of the actual payment, which was made in copper, is also uncertain; see note on line 3.

\[ \text{'Arpaspòw} Νίλος 'Λεψωσιλάω) 'Λεψωσιλάω) \chi(\rhoειν). \]
\[ \text{διαγεγράφησις} \ ιβ (δραχμῶν) τοῦ β (έτους) \]
\[ \text{έξ. ιβ χαλκοῦ). (έτους) β, Μεσοπ(ή) κδ.} \]
\[ \text{2nd hand} \] Νίλος συνεπή(ο)χοου.
\[ \text{5 θηκα.} \]
\[ (έτους) β, Μεσοπή κδ.} \]

3. The meaning of the symbol before δ is obscure. We should expect the sign for δραχμαί, especially since δ< is the name of the tax. But the symbol cannot mean δραχμαί. Nor is it much like the sign for talent at this period, and even though the payment is made in copper, 12 talents would be an odd amount to be paid for a tax of 12 drachmae. Without the stroke through the middle the symbol would be rather like that for 1000. The ratio of silver to copper about this period was 1 : 350; cf. introd. to xlv.

**XLIV. Receipt for Mason’s Tax.**

Harit. 16.5 x 6.3 cm. B.C. 16 (?).

Receipt issued by Apollonius, agent of Archias who was probably a tax-farmer, to a mason (λάξος), stating that he had paid the tax on his trade (τὰ λαξίκα). What the amount of the tax was depends on the method of punctuation adopted in lines 9 sqq. If our explanation is correct, the total was 5 talents of copper, of which 2 talents 2000 drachmae had already been paid to Ammonarion, presumably another agent of Archias, in its equivalent in silver, 40 drachmae, while the receipt of the remaining 2 talents 4000 drachmae in copper, making up 5 talents in all, is acknowledged by the present document. On this supposition the ratio of silver to copper at the period when this papyrus was written was 1:350. The date of the document is the 14th year (or possibly the 24th) of a sovereign who, on palaeographical grounds, is most probably Augustus. A ratio of 1:450 between Ptolemaic copper and Roman silver is known to have existed about the end of the first century A.D. (Ox. Pap. II, p. 187). In the Ptolemaic period the ratio was 1:120, so far as is known, throughout the third and second centuries B.C.
That the ratio should be \(1 : 350\) in Augustus' time is not in itself improbable; and corroborative evidence is supplied by cccviii, an account written in the last half of the first century B.C., in which the same ratio between silver and copper is found. After adding up various minor sums which come to \(\delta \gamma\nu\nu(\varrho\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu)\) (\(\delta\varphi\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\iota\)) \(\xi\) \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\ '\Delta\Sigma\), the writer proceeds \(\textit{πε} \delta\nu\nu(\varrho\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu)\ \lambda\delta(\gamma\omicron\upsilon)\ \alpha\nu\) \(\textit{πε} \sigma\upsilon\nu\) \(\delta\varphi\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\iota\) \(\upsilon\beta\), \(\textit{το} \(\delta\nu\nu(\varrho\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu)\) \(\delta\varphi\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\iota\) \(\upsilon\beta\), \(\textit{i.e.} 4200\) copper drachmae at the rate of \(1400\) (for a stater, the normal unit of comparison, cf. Ox. Pap. II. 243. 42) are equivalent to \(12\) silver drachmae, or \(350 : 1\).

The papyrus is written on the vertical fibres of the \textit{recto}, in a rude hand.

\[\text{\'Απολλώνιος \ δ \ παρά} \]
\[\text{\'Αρχίου \ Οννόφρι Λά-} \]
\[\text{ξω \ τής \ Θεμίστου \ με-} \]
\[\text{ρίδος \ χαίρετι. \ \textit{έξω}} \]
\[\text{5 \ παρά \ σού \ \νβέρ \ Αρχίου} \]
\[\text{τών \ λαξικών \ σύν} \]
\[\text{τούς \ δεδομένους \ \textit{Αμμ-}} \]
\[\text{ωναρίων \ \τῶ \ Εἰρήνα-} \]
\[\text{ου \ \δραχμάις} \ \textit{τεσσαράκ-} \]
\[\text{κον-} \]
\[\text{10 \ τα \ \textit{χαλκοῦ} \ (τάλαντα)} \ \textit{β' \ \textit{Δ} \ εἰς \ συνπλ-} \]
\[\text{ήρσων \ \textit{χαλκοῦ} \ (τάλαντων)} \]
\[\text{πέντε, / \textit{χαλκοῦ}} \]
\[\text{\(\textit{τάλαντα} \) \ \varepsilon.} \]
\[\text{(\textit{έτους)} \ \textit{ιδ}}, \ \textit{Παύρι} \]

3. \(\varepsilon\) of the inserted over the line. 8. \(\nu(?)\) of \(-\omega\nu\) is written over the \(\nu\) of \(\upsilon\nu\).

corr. from \(\varepsilon\).

3. It is noticeable that only the \textit{μερίς} of Omphris and not his village is mentioned. Perhaps the masons of the \textit{μερίς} formed a single company of which he was one, or he may have received the sole concession for the \textit{μερίς}; cf. xciii, a contract for the lease of a share of the perfumery business of the \textit{μερίς}.

7 sqq. There are three possible ways of punctuating this passage, each of which produces a different meaning. If a stop is placed after \(\textit{Εἰρήναοι} \), the 40 drachmae of silver and 2 talents 4000 drachmae of copper are the object of \(\textit{έξω}\), and the five talents in line 12 must be the sum of \(\alpha\) the money paid to Ammonarion, \(\beta\) the 40 drachmae of silver, \(\gamma\) the 2 talents 4000 dr of copper. For it is impossible with this punctuation to suppose that the 5 talents were obtained either by adding \(\alpha\) and \(\gamma\) together, since the silver would then be left out of account in the total in lines 12-13, which is most unlikely, or by adding \(\beta\) and \(\gamma\) together, since \(\textit{εἰς συνπλήρωσιν}\) is not the right expression for a conversion of two sums simultaneously paid in different metals into one sum in a single metal. On this system of punctuation therefore the 5 talents are the total of \(\alpha\) one unknown, and \(\beta\), \(\gamma\) two known amounts; and all that could be inferred about the relation of silver to copper would be that the ratio was higher than \(1 : 350\).

Another alternative is to place a stop after \(\textit{τεσσαράκοντα}, \) in which case the meaning is 'I have received in addition to the 40 drachmae of silver given to Ammonarion 2 talents 4000 drachmae of copper making up a total of 5 talents of copper.' This is the punctuation which we have adopted, although it is open to the objection that \(\textit{τοῖς \ δεδομένοις} \) should strictly be \(\textit{τοῖς \ δεδομένων}.\) A third alternative is to place a stop after \(\textit{Α}, \) i.e. 'I have received, in addition to the 40 dr. of silver and the 2 talents 4000 dr. of copper given to
Ammonarion, 5 talents in order to make up the whole amount.' On this hypothesis the grand total was 40 dr. of silver + 7 talents 4000 dr. of copper. But this explanation is the least satisfactory of the three because, if the sums mentioned in ll. 9 and 10 are not reckoned in the sum paid εἰς συντάξιμον, we should expect χωρίς, not συν, in 6. Practically therefore the choice lies between the two other alternatives, and we prefer the second, since it seems more likely that in a formal receipt τοῖς δεδομένοις would be specified rather than left vague, and the ratio of silver to copper which results is supported by cccviii.

7-8. Ἀμφισυνθεσία: both here and in 10-11 συντάξιμον the writer offends against the canon of the correct division of words.

**XLV. Tax-Receipt.**

_Hatl. 17:7 x 10:5 cm. A.D. 10-11._

The following papyrus is a receipt for a tax called συντάξιμον, which occurs also in cccxv and (in the abbreviated form συν' or συντα) no doubt in liii. 4, liv. 6, &c., and probably in Brit. Mus. Pap. 181 (6) II. 18. The word συντάξιμον is new, but συντάξες occurs frequently in the sense of 'contributions' of various kinds, sometimes denoting the pension received by the temples, sometimes a tax, almost as equivalent to φόρος (Wilcken, Ost. I, p. 296). The particular meaning here is obscure.

The sums are paid in three instalments for the 39th year of Augustus and amount to 44 drachmai 6 chalchi; and it is noticeable that the same yearly total for συντάξιμον, but made up of a larger number of instalments, is found in liii and liv which belong to the second century. It seems, therefore, that this was the regular amount of the tax per annum.

At the top are the beginnings of three lines (not printed) in the same hand as the rest of the papyrus. The entry dated in the 40th year in ll. 6-8 was made later, but apparently is in the same hand.

*Έτους λθ Καίσαρος, Παχών λ, διέγραψε
Θέων Μύσθουν Ἡρακλᾶ των
παρά Τρόφωνος τυπ. ( ) συντάξιμον
τοῦ θ'τοῦ (έτους) Θεαδελφείας ἄργυριον (δραχμᾶς) εἰκοσι
5 ὀκτ'πώ, / (δραχμαί) κη, καὶ Π(αινι) δ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (έτους)
(δραχμᾶς) δέκα δύο, / (δραχμαί) είθ. (έτους) μ Καίσαρος [. . .
κ, ὑπ($) τοῦ ἐνάτου καὶ τριάκοστου (έτους)
(δραχμᾶς) τέσσαρα(ς) (ήμιώβολον) χ(αλκοῦ) β, / (δραχμαί) δ (ήμιώβολον)
χ(αλκοῦ) β.

3. The word after τρόφωνος is probably the title of the tax-collector.
XLVI. Receipt for Bath-tax.

Kašr el Banát. 8 x 8.3 cm. A.D. 36.

A receipt for 5 obols on account in payment of the bath-tax, which seems to have been levied for the maintenance of the public baths; cf. Wilckenn, Ost. I. pp. 165 sqq. Receipts for this tax also occur in the early Roman ostraca from Kašr el Banát (2-4), but since the payments are generally, as here, on account, they do not give much information about the annual amount of the tax. Four drachmae is the highest sum paid.

(Ετούς) κβ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ,
Παύνι δ, δι(έγραφεν) Ὀχχοῖ(φις) Κάστωρος
... γ( ) βαλαν(ειον) Εὐημερε(πελας) τιπ η(νγου)
δβολ(ον) πεντε, / (δβολοι) ε.

2nd hand 5 Ἡρᾶς σεσημίσωμαι.

5. l. σεσημίσωμαι.

2. The fact that the tax-collector, whose signature occurs in line 5, is called Heras precludes the resolution of the abbreviations as δι(ά) Ὀχχοί(φις) Κάστωρ followed by another proper name. The word at the beginning of line 3 is therefore probably part of the name of the tax; but it is not an abbreviation of νέλος.

XLVII. Receipt for Tax on Beer.

Kašr el Banát. 14.8 x 7.7 cm. A.D. 61.

The tax upon beer, which was a regular impost in both the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (cf. Wilckenn, Ost. I. p. 369), is the subject of the two following receipts, which acknowledge a number of payments on this account from a certain Petesuchus, amounting in the one case to 8 drachmae, in the other, probably referring to the following year, to 12 drachmae. Other instances of payments for beer-tax in this volume are xlvi (a), ccxxv, ccxxix, cclxii, cccxxvii, Ost. 9, 10. The phraseology of the majority of these receipts is quite in accordance with the accepted view of the tax, that it was a duty paid by the brewers. This is especially clear in ccxxv and Ost. 10. 4, where the word ὅποια occurs in place of ὄντρα. The present example however offers difficulties. In the first of the receipts the payments are stated to be ὕ(περ) παρα(ζυτ)( ) κατ' ἀν(ον) ὄν( ). παρα(ζυτ)( ) is a new form, which presumably implies something different from the ordinary ὄντρα; but its meaning for the present remains doubtful. In Brit. Mus. Pap. 254 verso 70 a word that may be read as ὄντικόν(ν) occurs (cf. Kenyon, Cat. II. p. 230, note), so perhaps παρα(ζυτικόν) may be the
right resolution here. In the second receipt the payments are described as ἀπὸ τιμῆς ζήτων; cf. ccxix (which has every appearance of being an ordinary tax-receipt) ἀπὸ; ζήτη μέχρι έλαιον; πλευράν ... Perhaps the phrase ἀπὸ τιμῆς may be regarded as an equivalent of φόρος, the word used in the first century B.C. receipts published in Gr. Pap. II. xxxix (cf. xlii (a), II. 9, note).

The two receipts are written upon the verso of the papyrus; there are vestiges of three lines of writing at the bottom of the recto.

"Ετοὺς ζ Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου
Καίσαρος Σεβαστός Γερμανικῶν
Αὐτοκράτορος, Μεξείρ(η) α, δ(έγραψε)
Παπασάκχες(ας) Ὠρσενούφεως
5 ἄ(περ) παρασύτη( ) κατ' ἄνδρα( ) ζύμη( )
Εὐθύμ(ερείας) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἐτοὺς)
ἐπὶ λόγου(υ) (δραχμᾶς) τέσσαρες, / (δραχμαί) δ,
καὶ τῇ εἰ δομοίοις ἐπὶ λόγου(υ) (δραχμᾶς) τέσσαρα(ς),
/ (δραχμαί) δ.
10 "Ετοὺς η [Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου]
Καίσαρος Σεβαστός Γερμανικῶν, 'Αβδρ [.
δ(έγραψε) Παπασάκχες Ὠρσενούφεως ἀπὸ τιμῆς(ας)
ζήτων ἐπὶ λόγου(υ) (δραχμᾶς) ὅκτω, / (δραχμαί) η,
'Ἐπίθ β, ἀλλα(σ) (δραχμᾶς) τέσσαρα(ς), / (δραχμαί) δ.

5. The abbreviated ζήτη in this line is in both cases written in the same way, with an incurved stroke after and slightly above the τ. There is no trace of an ο between the τ and the stroke.

12. ἀπὸ τιμῆς(ας): the word following ἀπὸ is very curiously written, only the τ being fairly clear. We read τιμῆς(ας) on the analogy of ccxix, which is approximately of the same date, and where a payment of 8 drachmae on account ἀπὸ τιμῆς ζήτων is recorded.

XLVII (a). Receipt for Tax on Beer.

Kašri el Banāt. 10-2 x 9-8 cm. A.D. 114-5.

A receipt for the payment by Onnophris of ten drachmae two and a half obols on account of beer-tax, and for another payment, probably the same amount, on behalf of another person, for the same tax. Cf. introd. to the preceding papyrus.

On the recto is a fragment of a taxing-list.
("Ετος") η Αὐτοκράτορος Κάισαρος Νερούα
Τραιανοῦ 'Αριστον Σεβσίας τοῦ Τετράκικου
Δικικοῦ, δι(έγραψε) δι(ἄ) 'Ασκεμπί(άδου) καὶ 'Αρχιβίον πρακτόρων,
'Ομνώφριος 'Ηρακλείδου ὑπ(έρ) ζυτη(ρᾶς) κατ' ἀν(δρα)
5 τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους) κατὰ μέρος ἀργυρίου (δραχμᾶς) δέκα
(διάβολον), / (δραχμὰ) i (διάβολον), πλῆκτρο, μὴ προσχρη-
σάμενος ἐτέρῳ συμβόλῳ.
ἐπὶρ Πισάστος Ἀπα. [... ]ς μητρὸς Τα. [...]
6. [... ]... κατὰ μέρος [δραχμάς] δέκα (διάβολον)?,
[ ] (δραχμὰ) i [διάβολον, μὴ προσχρησάμενος ἐτέρῳ]
φίλω(φ).

5. κατὰ μέρος here and in 9 perhaps implies that Onomphris and Pisaïs were
members of a company, and that the payment was their share of the total amount due
from their firm; cf. κατ' ἀνδρα which regularly occurs with ζυτη(ρᾶ) or συντελεῖα in receipts
for beer-tax.
6. After the second sign for διάβολον there is a short upward stroke which possibly
represents half an obol; but the amounts before and after the sign for 'total' do not
then correspond. There is another stroke in the reverse direction in the margin opposite
this line.
8. In the margin opposite this line are traces of two or three letters, the last of which
is apparently μ.

XLVIII. RECEIPTS FOR TAX ON WEAVING.

Kaṣr el Banāt. 7·3 x 17·3 cm. A.D. 98.

Two receipts, the first for five payments amounting to 31 drachmae, on
account of the γερβικὸν or tax on weavers, the second probably referring to
a sixth payment for the same tax. The γερβικὸν was one of the taxes on
trades, and at Oxyrhynchus in the early part of the first century seems to have
stood at 36 drachmae yearly (Ox. Pap. II. 288, introd.). If the sums acknowled-
ged in these two receipts are taken as representing the total amount of the
tax for the year, a very similar rate, 38 drachmae, is obtained. In a number of Theban ostraca of the first and second centuries monthly payments varying from two to eight drachmae are recorded (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 172). It is a question whether these monthly payments are to be regarded as regular instalments (i.e. are to be multiplied by twelve to give the total amount of the tax for the year), or are simply irregular payments on account. Wilcken prefers the latter view, notwithstanding the fact that, as he himself shows (ibid. p. 337), the monthly rate was usual at Thebes in the case of taxes upon trades; and he may now appeal to the analogy of the present papyrus according to which 14 drachmae were paid in one month, 7 drachmae in the next, and 5 drachmae in each of the two months following. On the other hand B. G. U. 9 proves that two centuries later taxes on trades in the Fayûm were paid at a regular monthly rate.

An incidental feature of interest in this document is the information which it conveys that the news of Nerva’s death, which occurred on Jan. 27, A.D. 98, was not generally known in the Fayûm by the following April 25; cf. l. 6, where Pharmouthi 30 is included in the second year of Nerva. The news, however, arrived shortly afterwards if, as is probable, the second receipt, which is dated in the first year of Trajan, was written in the next month. Statistics concerning the length of time which elapsed between the deaths of various emperors and the dates at which the facts became known in Egypt are collected by Wilcken, ibid. pp. 800 sqq. Periods of two, three, and, in the case of Commodus, even five months, are attested.

The receipts are written across the vertical fibres of the recto.

Col. I.

*Ετών δεύτερον Αὐτοκράτορος Νερών
Καίσαρος Ξεβαστὸν, Τίβις 3, δ(ξεγραψε) δ(ξεγραψε) Τρόφωνι(ς)
γραμμ(ματιῶσ) Ἡρων προγί(νοι) Πτολλᾶσ γερθ(εικών) Ἐνημερείαις
τῶν αὐτοῦ β (ἐτών) (δραχμᾶς) ἐπτά, / (δραχμαὶ) λ (δραχμὰς)
ἐπτά,
5 / (δραχμαὶ) λ, Μεξ(είρ) λ (δραχμᾶς) ἐπτά, / (δραχμαὶ) λ;
Φαμενωθ
λ (δραχμᾶς) πέντε, / (δραχμαὶ) ε, Φαμενωθ λ (δραχμᾶς) πέντε,
/ (δραχμαὶ) ε.
FAYUM TOWNS

Col. II.

2nd hand "Ετος πρώτου Διοικήτων Καίσαρος Νερόβα
Τραιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, . . . . . . δι(έγραψε)
διὰ Διόν γραμματέως." Ημῶν προχείνου Π(ολλάτος) τοῦ αὐτοῦ
τελέσματος δρ(υίου) (δραχμᾶς) επτά, / (δραχμαί) [£.

I. 3. 1. Πολλάτος.

Col. I. ‘The second year of the Emperor Nerva Caesar Augustus, Tubi 4. Paid through Tryphon, clerk, by Heron, grandson of Ptolias, for the weaver’s tax at Euhemeria in the same second year, seven drachmae, total 7 dr.; the 30th, seven drachmae, total 7 dr.; Mecheir 30, seven drachmae, total 7 dr.; Phamenoth 30, five drachmae, total 5 dr.;
Pharnouthi 30, five drachmae, total 5 dr.’

3. γραμματέως: γραμματεῖα were regularly attached to the πράτορος and not infrequently issued receipts on their behalf; cf. e.g. cecilii.
προχείνου: so too in II. 3. The grandfather’s name is perhaps given because the father’s name was unknown. Cf. B. G. U. 618, ii. 14, where in a list of names Πολλάτος Πλάτων is succeeded by Διόνος πράτορος αὐτοῦ.

II. 2. As the months mentioned in the first receipt are successive, there is some probability that Παῦλος stood in the lacuna at the end of this line. If this was so, the news of Trajan’s accession arrived in the Fayum some time between April 26 and May 25; cf. introd.

3-4. The supplement at the end of line 3 is based on the supposition that this receipt, like the preceding, refers to a payment for the γερμαίων. The reading ἀργ(υρίου) is not quite certain, and ἀργ(υρίου) does not occur in Col. I. But the name of no known tax is a suitable substitute; and the amount paid, 7 drachmae, is identical with that of three of the payments for γερμαίων in the first receipt.

XLIX. RECEIPT FOR POLL-TAX.

Wadifa. 10-2 × 8-7 cm. A.D. 138.

This and the three following papyri are receipts for payments of poll-tax (λαογραφία). The amount of this tax varied considerably at different districts and at different periods; and there were also distinct rates corresponding to distinctions of status. Thus the ostraca show (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 230 sqq.) that at Elephantine the amount of the tax was successively 16 drachmae, 17 drachmae, and 17 drachmae 1 obol. For various localities at Thebes the rates of 10 drachmae, 10 drachmae 4 obols, 16 drachmae, and 24 drachmae are attested. At Oxyrhynchus certain privileged persons paid at a rate of 12 drachmae (cf. Ox. Pap. II. 258, and introd. to 288). In the Fayum, with which we are here concerned, two rates only have so far been established (cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 257, 261), 40 and 20 drachmae, the latter being the more
frequently met with. Perhaps, as Kenyon conjectures (so too Wilcken, Archiv., I. p. 139), the larger amount was paid by Egyptians, the smaller by such Greeks or Graeco-Egyptians as were not κάτωκοι, who were exempt altogether (cf. introd. to xxvii).

Of the four examples here published, two (i, lli) record payments of the normal 20 drachmae, the other three (xlix, li, liia) are for payments of 16 drachmae; cf. also cclxxviii. In li these 16 drachmae are paid by two persons and include a payment for the ἐπιστατικῶν λεύκων, so the amount paid by each for λαογραφία must in this case have been less than 8 drachmae. In the present papyrus the 16 drachmae are apparently three years in arrear. The sums mentioned in all these receipts for 16 drachmae were presumably part payments, and not the full amounts due for the year. This is not indeed stated in the documents themselves, but such an omission is quite inconclusive. Otherwise we should have to infer the existence in the Fayūm, as at Oxyrhynchus, of certain privileged classes who paid poll-tax at reduced rates. In line 3 of the following text the occurrence of the word εἰκόν, which is a common abbreviation for ἐπικοίνων or ἐπικεκομίσθης, might at first sight give some support to this alternative. But εἰκόν also stands for ἐπικοιλομένος, which the order of the words here makes preferable. At present there is no evidence that there were in the Fayūm any stages of privilege between total exemption and taxation at the rate of 20 drachmae.

"Εὖν θεός ὁ Ἀβδοκράτορ Καῖσαρος Τείτου Αἰμίλου
Αμανοῦ 'Αντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Ἐυσεβίου.
Αμανοῦ Ἀρδέρ κε, ἀρίθ(μῆκεως) Φαώ(φε), δι(ἐγραψε) Πτολ(εμαίου) ἐπικ(αλομένου)
Μ., . . .
Πτολ(εμαίου) τοῦ Πτολ(εμαίου) μη(τρός) Τρυφ(αίνης) λαογ(ραφίας) εἰκ(οστοῦ)
(ἔτους)

5 θεοῦ Ἀμανοῦ Βιθ(υνῶν) (δραχμᾶς) δέκα ἕκ.; / 15, [προσ(διαγραφόμενα) χα(λκοῦ) δβο(ψωῦ) ὄκτῳ.

'The second year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Athur 25, for the account of Phaophi. Paid by Ptolemaeus, surnamed Μ. . . ., son of Ptolemaeus, son of Ptolemaeus, his mother being Tryphaena, as 'poll-tax for the 20th year of the deified Hadrian, in the Bithynian quarter, sixteen drachmae, total 16, and the extra payments, eight obols of copper.'

4. εἰκ(οστοῦ) (ἔτους): i.e. a.D. 134-5. It is strange that the payment should have been allowed to remain so long in arrear, but there does not seem to be room for anything more in the lacuna than ἔτους (ἔτους).
5. Βεθ(σως) is the name of the ἄμφοτηρ, probably at Arsinoë, in which the taxpayer lived; cf. lli. 5, lli (a). 2.
6. ἐκτὸς: the regular amount of the προσδιαγραφόμενα in payments of poll-tax is 1 copper obol for 2 drachmae; cf. cccxlix–cccxlvi, &c.

L. Receipt for Poll-tax.

Καστ. el Banát. 6-6 × 9-8 cm. A.D. 182.

Receipt for the payment by Chacras of 20 drachmae, being the poll-tax for the 22nd year of Commodus; cf. introd. to xlix.

"Ετών κβ Μάρκου Αὔγγλίου
Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ,
Ἐπίφ. λ, ἄριθμ. μίσχως Ἐπίφ. δι(ἐγγραφε)
Χαίρας Χαίρατος Ἀρτοκ(ράτωνος) μι(τρὸς) Σαμβα(τὸς)
5 ἐπ(έρ) λαογραφίας κβ (ετώς) Ἰσίου Δωμ(ατος ?)
(δραχμὰς) εἴκοσι, / κ, προςδιαγραφόμενα) χ(αλκοῦ) ζ(βολαδς) δέκα.

5. The symbol at the beginning of this line is made in the same way as that which we have interpreted as δω in Ox. Pap. II. 289. Col. II. 12, 19, II. 12; 290. 20, 23. That the symbol stands for δω in 289 seems tolerably certain; but in 290 ἐπίφ is not excluded.

Ἰσίου Δωμ(ατος) or Δωμ(ατος) is the name of the ἄμφοτηρ in which Chacras lived. No ἄμφοτηρ of this name is known at Arsinoë, and it may have been at Euhemeria, though the other ἄμφοτηρ mentioned in these poll-tax receipts appear to be at Arsinoë. In li, which records a payment by an inhabitant of Theadelphia, the name of the village alone is given.

LI. Receipt for Poll-tax, etc.

Hab. 6-6 × 17-3 cm. A.D. 186.

Receipt for the payment by two brothers of poll-tax and ἐπιστατικῶν λεπέων, the total sum paid amounting to 16 drachmae, no doubt a payment on account (cf. introd. to xlix). The latter of these taxes is also known from xxi (a) (where the full title ἐπιστατικῶν λεπέων occurs), B. G. U. 337. 2, 471. 6, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 352. 4. In the three last instances the payers of the tax were priests, and it is possible that the same was the case with the two brothers here. The fact that they were also paying poll-tax does not preclude this possibility, since only a certain number of the priests were exempt; cf. B. G. U. i. 15, Brit. Mus. Pap. 347. 5–6, Wilcken. Ost. I. p. 241. The papyrus is very cursively written.
"Ετος έβδομου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Μάρκου
Αὐρηλίου Κομμήδου Αντωνίου
Καλώρατο τοῦ κυρίου, Φανέρος κυ., διέγραψε δίϊ(α) Ἀντωνίου καὶ
μετά(το)ν πόλιακτόρων Φ. . . . ο(ι) . . . . ν καὶ Νέφρο(μις) ἀδελ(φός)
5 λαογ(ραφίας) καὶ ἐπιστ(ατικό) ἑρέα(ν) έβδομον καὶ εἰκοστοῦ (τοῦ)
Θεάδε(λφιας) (δραχμᾶς) δέκα ἥξιοι; / (δραχμαί) ἵπτῃ.

3. Instead of δί(α) Ἀντωνίου a name in the dative, perhaps Κάστρ(ος) or Φρα... might be read.

LII. RECEIPT FOR POLL-TAX.

Καστρὸν τοῦ Βασίλειος. 8 x 10 cm. A.D. 194.

Receipt for 20 drachmae paid for poll-tax by Souchammon, son of Castor.

"Ετός β Γονίου Σεπτιμίου
Σεβάστου Πολινακος Χριστιάνου,
Μεσορής η, ἀριστερῆσως Ἐπίφρ. διέγραψε Σου-
χάμμων Κάστωρος τοῦ Ηρα-
5 κλείδου λαογραφίας β (τοῦ) Θεσμοφορείου
(δραχμᾶς) ἑκατον, / (δραχμαῖς) κ. προσ(διαγραφοῦσα) χα(λκοῦ) ὀβ(ολοῦς)
δέκα.

5. Θεσμοφορείου: the name of an ἄμφοτερον at Arsinoë; cf. xlii. 5, 1. 5, note.

LII (α). RECEIPT FOR POLL-TAX.

Καστρὸν τοῦ Βασίλειος. 6.6 x 5.6 cm. A.D. 191–2.

Receipt for two payments of eight drachmae on account for poll-tax by a slave. It was already inferred from the fact that in certain circumstances slaves could claim ἐπίκρισις, by which they were exempted from poll-tax (cf. B. G. U. 113, 6, 324, Oxy. Pap. II. 257, introd.), that they were in ordinary cases subject to it. But the present is, so far as we are aware, the first actual example of payment of poll-tax by a slave.

Διέγραψε . . . [:μισίων δοῦλων
ὅπερ άλογραφίας λβ (τοῦ) Βιθ(νύων)
This papyrus and the next (liv) are receipts for payments of a variety of taxes, some of which are altogether new or are here attested by Roman papyri for the first time. The payments recorded in the present document fall under six heads: σωτ(άζιμων), φιλ(άκων), ἐπιμερισμός ἀπόρων, δεσμοφυλ(ακία), δαπ(άνη) διπλ(άνω?), and υκή. The last of these, the υκή or pig-tax, for which 1 drachma 1 obol is here paid (cf. also liv. 7, note), is known from other sources (e.g. Ox. Pap. II. 288); and the σωτάζιμων, the annual rate of which appears to have been, as in xlv, 44 drachmae 6 chalci (cf. note on 7), has already been discussed in the introduction to that document. Payments ὑπὲρ φιλ(ακίας) or φιλ(άκων) and ὑπὲρ ὄψανιν φιλ(άκων) occur in numerous Theban ostraca of the Roman period (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 320), and are clearly to be connected with the φιλ of our papyrus. The tax was raised for the maintenance of the φιλάκες, the local guards or police, and is the Roman equivalent of the φιλακτικόν of the third century B.C. (ibid. p. 402). The sum paid is here 1 drachma 2 obols; in the ostraca it ranges from 1 to 2 drachmae. Another tax of an analogous description is the δεσμοφυλ(ακία), of the existence of which this papyrus gives the first intimation. As the name sufficiently implies, this must have been a payment for the support of the public prisons. In the present instance and in cccxvii it amounts to 6 chalci, in liv. 17 to 1 obol. Most probably this is the same tax as that which is found coupled with the λαογραφία on a number of ostraca from Elephantine of the second century A.D., the payment on account of it being regularly half an obol. Wilcken (ibid. p. 177) gives the name of the tax as δεσμον, but offers no explanation of its character. As a matter of fact the name is never written out in these ostraca, the longest form in which it appears being δεσμον; and that this should be expanded as δεσμοφυλακία (or δεσμοφυλάκων) appears on the analogy of the present papyrus extremely probable, notwithstanding the fact that in the twenty-six examples published by Wilcken there is no instance of the longer form. It is especially noticeable that the abbreviation δεσ, which occurs in some of his ostraca (e.g. 121, 129), is also found in.
liv. 17, where no doubt it is identical with δεσμωτικόν here. In cccxvii a third
form, δεσμωτικόν, appears.

The διπλῶν is another impost hitherto only known from second century
ostraca from Upper Egypt, and its meaning is quite obscure. No fresh light
is thrown upon it by our papyrus, if indeed the same tax is to be recognized
in the δαπ( ) διπλ( ) of line 6. That δαπ is δαπάνη there can be little doubt;
but διπλ may stand equally well for διπλῶματος, which occurs as the name of
a tax (διπλῶμα ἄφων) in B. G. U. 213. 4.

Lastly we have the interesting tax μερισμός or ἐπιμερισμός (the two forms
are found side by side in liv) ἀπόρων. This has previously occurred on
a Theban ostracon of A.D. 143, where a payment of 2 drachmae 3 obols ὑπ(η)<p>
μερισμ(ῶν) ἀπόρων(ιν) is recorded. In the present instance the sum paid
is 2 drachmae ½ obol, presumably a payment on account, since in liv the
payments for this tax are much larger—12 drachmae and a fraction in one year,
and 12 drachmae in the next. Wilcken (ibid. p. 161) explains the tax as
a kind of poor-rate contributed for the maintenance of the destitute by their
more fortunate neighbours, comparing the system of poor-relief established at
Athens (Arist. Ath. Pol. 49. 4). Some critics may feel disposed to agree with
Mommsen that this interpretation 'sounds too good to be true.' But a priori
improbability, even if the improbability be granted, is a somewhat dangerous
argument; and at present we have no alternative theory to suggest.

[ἕτους τεσσ'αρεσκαίδεκατον Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Νερόβα
[Τρα]μανθ Ξεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Δακικοῦ, Φαώφι μετὰ
[λύγον κεῖ, διεγραφε] διὰ Φλανίων Ἡλιοδότου καὶ Ἀραβίωνος
[πρα]κτόρων Βελλής ἀλλος μητρὸς τῆς αὐτῆς συντ(αξίμου) τοῦ αὐτοῦ
[ἑτους]

5 [Θεά]δελφίας (δραχμάς) ὀκτώ, / (δραχμαί) η, φυλ(ακής) (δραχμή) μία
(δισβολῶν), ἐπιμερισμό(ῶν) ἀπόρων

[τρισ][καίδεκατον] (ἕτους) (δραχμάς) δύο (ἡμιβολῶν), δεσμωτικό(ακίας) (ἡμιβολῶν)
χ(αλκοῦ) β, δαπ(άνης) διπλ(ῶν) (ἡμιβολῶν), Ἀθηναῶν
[μετὰ λύγον κεῖ (δραχμάς) τέσσαρες (ἡμιβολῶν) χ(αλκοῦ) β, Ἰκέτης
(δραχμή) μία (δισβολῶν), / (δραχμαί) δ (ἡμιβολῶν) χ(αλκοῦ) β, Ἰκέτης]
(δραχμή) a (δισβολῶν), Μεκελοῦ κε (δραχμάς)
δέκα δύο, / (δραχμαί) β, Παχανων μετὰ λύγων
κε (δραχμάς) δέκα δύο, / (δραχμαί) β, 'Επείσ [κε] (δραχμάς)
ἀκτοί, / ((δραχμαί) η.

5. ί (δραχμή) μίαν. 7. τέσσαρες ... (δραχμάς) μίαν (δισβολῶν).
N. 2
2–3. Φαώφε μετὰ λόγον κτ.: the meaning of the insertion of μετὰ λόγον between the name of the month and the day, which is almost constant in the dates of this papyrus and liv, and also occurs in livi and ccxxvi, is not easy to understand. We have not succeeded in finding parallels elsewhere, or examples of the phrase μετὰ λόγον in any connexion which throw light upon its singular use in these few tax-receipts. It can hardly be an antithesis to εἰς λόγον owing to its position in front of the day of the month.

4. Βελλίς ἀλλιώ: this receipt must have been preceded in a previous column by another, issued to a brother of the person here concerned. The left margin of the papyrus is broken away.

5. ἐπιμεραῖον(ῶ): so liv. 16, but μεραῖον is the commoner form. Wilcken in the addenda to Ost. I (p. 821, ad p. 161) refers to an unpublished Berlin papyrus (Pap. 7079), in which he reads ἐπικεφαλίων ἀπὸ τῶν. The possibility suggests itself that there too ἐπικεφαλίων is the true reading.

6. δεσμοφυλακία (ἡμίβολον): the sign which we have taken to represent ½ obol here and in ll. 7 and 8, being simply the square sign (Ł) meaning ½, is not formed in the same way as the other symbol used twice in this line which certainly stand for ἡμίβολον. It is possible that we should here understand a half drachma; but if this was intended the sign for three obols would instead be expected. Moreover there are parallels for a square symbol representing ½ obol, e.g. xlv. 8, liv. 7, Ox. Pap. II. 288. 3; and two different ways of writing ½ obol occur side by side in liv; cf. note on liv. 13.

7. The 4 drachmae 6 chalcii mentioned at the beginning of this line, and the payments recorded for Mecheir, Pachon and Epiph in lines 8–9, the purpose of which is not directly specified, were apparently for the συντάξιμων. On the assumption that the payments for the year were complete, i.e. that nothing further was owing for Mesore, the annual rate of the συντάξιμων thus works out at 44 drachmae and a fraction, the same result as is given by xlv and liv.

LIV. Tax-Receipt.

Kašr el Banât. 22.5 x 8.7 cm. A.D. 117–18.

The following receipt, like its predecessor (liii), is of a miscellaneous character, acknowledging payments from a certain Onnophris on account of no less than seven different taxes. Several of these, the συντάξιμων, ἑκή, μεραῖον ἀπὸ τῶν, and δεσμοφυλακία, occurred also in liii and have already been discussed. The remaining three are taxes for ἱερα(τικά), μαγδάλα, and τοτ(αμι). Of the tax called ἱερα(τικά) the first instance has already been supplied by xlii (a). II. 7; but of its character no more is at present known than is implied by its name. The tax for μαγδάλα (or μαγδαλοφυλάκες), for which 2½ obols are here paid, has not been found previously; the same payment for this tax also occurs in ccxxvii of this volume. The μαγδάλα, as was explained in xxxviii. 5 note, were watch-towers or guard-houses, and the tax was of course raised for the purpose of their maintenance. The precise name of the tax here written τοτ is uncertain; in ccxxvii τοτ is preceded by a word which seems to
be ἐπιστήμων θεοῦ ἄντων κατὰ τοὺς ἐπιστάσεως. But whatever the full form may be, there is not much doubt that this is the Fayûm equivalent of the tax for the maintenance of τοσαμοφυλάκιας or government guard-boats stationed upon the Nile and canals, an impost which is known from a number of Upper Egyptian ostraca of the first and second centuries (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 282). The payments mentioned in the ostraca range from 4 obols to 6 drachmas 5 obols. In this papyrus only 1 obol is paid, in ccxxvii 1½ obols. Presumably these small sums are only payments on account; though it would not be surprising if the rate of the tax were lower in the Fayûm than on the banks of the Nile.

"Εν ουσίαν δευτέρου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καλάσαρος Τραίαινον Άδριανον, Φαώφι
μετὰ λῃσίονι ἕκας μὴ προσχρήσῃς ἐπέρι τοῦ συμβόλλος(φ).
διέγραφε διὰ Μάρκα(νος) καὶ Σάβεινου προσκύνησον.

5 "Οναφοῖς Ἑρῴδη(νοῦ) τοῦ(ν) Πισάρτους
μητρῖκας Χάριτος συν(εξεύρετο) τοῦ ἀντίτοιχος έτος Εὔλης(πεις)
ἀργυρίου (δραχμὰς) ὀκτώ, / (δραχμα) η (ἡμιωβολον) χ(αλκοῦ) β, [ὑπ[χήν]
α (δβόλων), λεπτικῶν (τετράβολον) (ἡμιωβολον),
Χολάκ κβ δίδακα Σάβεινον ἄλλας ἀργυρίου (δραχμὰς) ὀκτώ,
γ(ιονται) (δραχμα) η, Φαμενοῦ(θ) μετὰ λῃσίου καὶ διὰ

10 Πεκσιο(ν) ἀργυρίου (δραχμὰς) ὀκτώ, / (δραχμα) η, Παγα(νός)
μετὰ λῃσίου κ ἀργυρίου (δραχμὰς) ὀκτώ, / (δραχμα) η, Παλατινοῦ(ν)
μαχ(δολων) (διοβολον) (ἡμιωβολον), μερισμοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πισάρτου
ἔτους ἀργυρίου (δραχμὰς) ὀκτὼ, / (δραχμα) η (δβόλων) ... Επετέρα μετὰ

15 λῃσίου κ ἀργυρίου) δραχμὰς τέσσαρες, / (δραχμα) δ, ἐπιμελουμένου ἄρτα(ν) β (έτους) ἀργυρίων (δραχμὰς) ὀκτὼ,
/ (δραχμα) η, δεσμοφυλακίας (δβόλων), πολιτείων (? (δβόλων), Μεσορή
μετα λῃσίον κβ μερισμοῖς ἄρτα(ν) γ (τρισβολον) χ(αλκοῦ) β, / γ
(τρισβολον) χ(αλκοῦ) β.

3: μη προσχρήσῃς κατ. α. xlvii (a). 6, 10, B. G. U. 66 διέγραφε(ν) [Ἀ]πίου καὶ μέτοχ(ον)
παρακατε. ... καὶ μη χρησάμενος ἐπέρι τοῦ συμβόλ(ου), 214 διέγραφε(ν) ... Στενοπη(ν) ... καὶ
Παπετί ... μη προσχρήσασθαι ἐπέρι τοῦ συμβόλου διὰ τὸ φώνευν παραπολεμούσα
καὶ, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (a), where the words are the same as in B. G. U. 214 with the subj. προσχρήσῃ
instead of the participle. A similar formula is found on ostraca (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 79), usually running (with small variations) τοῦ πρότερον γραφ(έτο) μη χρησῆ. This is
clearly, as Wilcken explains, an injunction not to use a former receipt which was cancelled.
by the new one that had taken its place. The formula of the papyri, on the other hand, he wishes to interpret as a notice to the effect that a second receipt would not be issued. This seems hardly satisfactory; the two sets of phrases are so much alike that one explanation ought to cover them both. Moreover the sense given to the papyrus formula is not very apt. To tell a person not to use another (hypothetical) receipt is hardly equivalent to an intimation that no other would be given. The intention of the official no doubt was to protect himself against fraud; and his meaning in all cases appears to be 'This receipt only is valid.' ὅλα τὸ φάσκειν παραπτωμέναν on this view refers to a previous receipt, and explains why in the particular case the remark μὴ προσχώσῃ κ.τ.λ. was necessary. The former receipt was alleged by the recipient to be faulty; a new one was therefore issued, which cancelled its predecessor.

7. The half-obol and two chalci were for some reason omitted after ἔστω: cf. 14, note. On the rate of the συνίδζουν cf. note on liii. 7. Here too, one of the payments for the tax is 8 drachmae 6 chalci, and the total amount, assuming that the sums of 8 and 4 drachmae in lines 8–14, the purpose of which is not expressly stated, were for the συνίδζουν, is 44 drachmae 6 chalci.

[ὅχι ἔστω]: the sum paid for the tax is the same as in liii. 7, 100 and 107. Is this identity a coincidence, or was the ἔστω simply a licence for keeping pigs, so that the amount paid did not vary according to the number of animals kept? In support of the latter alternative it may be noticed that no returns of pigs, like those of sheep and goats, have as yet been discovered. On the other hand from the single Theban receipt for this tax published by Wilcken (Okt. II. no. 1931), which acknowledges payment of τὸν δήλου ἀλλήλου μᾶρ, the natural inference is that the amount was relative to the number of the pigs.

13. μαγδία(δὴ)λέων: there is no doubt about the name which is confirmed by cccxvii, where the same sum, 2½ obols, is paid for μαγδία(δ.). There is of course the possibility that we should write μαγδευλλακάς; a μαγδευλλακα occurs in civit. 13, and a payment for ἐσκιστοῦ μαγδευλλακάθεν is found in a tax-receipt from Tebtunis.

The sign for ἡμίσαλον is here 5; in 7 it was written ἕ: cf. liii. 6, note.

ἐπιστ. ἔστω: it would also be possible to read τὸν ἐπιστ. ἔστω, with a (ἐπιστ.) in 16; but the numeral there is more like β.

14. Here as in 7 the amounts before and after the sign for 'total' do not exactly correspond. After the symbol representing ὀσμής is another symbol or letter, above and to the right of which is something like a β or the sign for ½. Possibly the scribe first wrote 1½ obols and corrected this to 1¾ obols.

16. ἐπιστ. (ἐπιστ.): but μεσια in 13 and 18; cf. liii. 5, note.

LV. TAXES ON LAND.

Harit. 14·3 x 6·3 cm. a.d. 136.

A receipt for a number of different taxes on land, paid by a woman, Thermouthion. The papyrus is very cursively written, with many abbreviations, and the difficulties of interpretation are increased by the obliteration of the ink in parts.

The various taxes fall into two classes, those in lines 7–9, which are paid in copper obols (cf. lvi), and the γεωμετρία in line 11, which is paid in silver drachmae.
Of the taxes in the first class the names of three, παραδείσων, ἔλαιων, and ναβίων, are certain, those of the other four are doubtful. On the meaning of the ναβίων tax see introd. to xli. With which of the various taxes on land are we to connect the payments for παραδείσων and ἔλαιων? On the difficult question of the varying forms which the land-tax pure and simple assumed in Egypt see Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 195 sqq. He there combines the taxes (1) ἐπὶ ἄμπελων, φοινίκας (to which may be added ἐπὶ παραδείσων, ἔλαιων, &c.); (2) ἐπὶ γεωμετρία (with or without the addition ἄμπελων, παραδείσων, &c.); (3) ἐπὶ τόπον; (4) ἐπαράφων; (5) ἐπιγραφή, as all forms of one general tax upon land. Over and above this land-tax, which in some form was paid by all landowners, there were numerous other taxes upon land, such as the ἀράμοια upon ἄμπελων and παραδείσων, and in the Roman period perhaps upon ἔλαιων as well (Brit. Mus. Pap. 195 (a), cf. introd. to xli); the τέλος ἕλιον, which fell on owners of ἄμπελων (Wilcken, ibid. p. 270); the ναβίων tax which seems to have been general; besides the ἄμισθητος, φόρος φυτών (xlii. 12), and other obscure taxes which were apparently connected with the ownership of land.

The interpretation of the taxes mentioned in the present papyrus depends on the view taken of γεωμετρία in line 11. We proceed first on the hypothesis that Wilcken is right and that γεωμετρία means land-tax. Unfortunately since we know neither upon which kind of land it was levied, nor for which year, we are ignorant what relation this γεωμετρία bears to the preceding payments. The fact, however, that it was paid in silver, while the others are all in copper, raises the supposition that there is some marked difference. On the other hand, putting aside for a moment the question of the meaning of ἔλαιων in line 6, the payments for παραδείσων and ἔλαιων look like ordinary payments of land-tax on fruit-producing and oil-producing land. Moreover, if ἔλαιων in line 6 has the meaning which it undoubtedly often has elsewhere, e.g. in the common phrase in leases καθαρόν ἀπὸ παράδεισος ἔλαιος, and is a vague term for τέλος, applying in a general way to lines 7 seqq., its occurrence creates no objection to the view that the payments in line 7 are for land-tax. But the meaning of ἔλαιων in line 6 is unfortunately far from certain, for in connexion with taxes on land ἔλαιων is frequently found in a limited sense and carefully distinguished from the γεωμετρία. B. G. U. 572–4 are fragments of a taxing list concerning ἄμπελων, παράδεισοι, and ἔλαιων, and in several cases the same piece of land is subject to four taxes, (1) ἔλαιον, (2) γεωμετρία, (3) ναβίων (cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 1501), (4) η, the meaning of which is uncertain (cf. ccxiii). In Brit. Mus. Pap. 451 is a list of payments for various taxes connected with land, beginning with ἄρθρον (ηττικού) κατάλογον (cf. Wileken, Archiv, I. p. 147) followed by ἄλλον? ἔλαιον καὶ γεω-

μετρίας, and (after two unintelligible lines) concluding with payments for ναβίων,
In both these cases the payments for *eidow* are clearly distinguished from payments for *γεωμετρία* or land-tax, and in lxiv. 4 we have a payment for *eidow* ἐλαιών (written -κοῦ), perhaps coupled with another tax; but their actual nature is obscure. It is hardly likely that so vague a term as *eidow* expresses a peculiar tax, and therefore we might suppose that under *eidow* are perhaps included such payments as the ἀπόμεσα, which was much less than the *γεωμετρία* (cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 195(a), 7, 9, with B. G. U. 572. 7, where the *eidow* is 200 dr., the *γεωμετρία* 538 dr.).

It seems therefore on the whole most probable that, if by *γεωμετρία* in line 11 the ordinary land-tax is meant, the payments for ἀπαθεῖσσον and ἐλαιῶν, which come under the head of *eidow* and are contrasted with *γεωμετρία*, are different from ordinary land-tax; and this view is supported by a comparison of this papyrus with ccxxviii, in which *eidow*, &c., recur. Owing to the mutilated condition of that document no certain conclusion can be drawn from it, but apparently the sums which come under the heading *eidow* are paid, as here, in copper obols, and the *γεωμετρία* is again the subject of a separate entry at the end, and is paid in silver.

But, as Kenyon has remarked (Class. Rev. xiv. p. 171), payments for *γεωμετρία* simply (as here) may be for the re-survey of land, and in that case there would be no reason for explaining the payments for ἀπαθεῖσσον and ἐλαιῶν, which come under the head of *eidow*, as anything but ordinary land-tax.

5. Chaerax is the agent of Thermouthion; cf. line 10 and lvi. 3-4, where as here διὰ is used with a different meaning in two successive lines.
6. It is possible, though not at all likely, that a sum is lost at the end of this line. But \( \sigma\nu\nu \) (\( \tau\nu\nu\nu \)) is sufficient, and in cxxviii also \( \varepsilon\thinspace \delta\theta\varepsilon\omega \) appears to be a general description.

7. \( \chi\nu\nu\nu \) (\( \chi\beta\beta\beta\nu\nu \)) : written \( \chi \) in this papyrus and in liv. 7 after \( \sigma\nu\beta\theta\lambda\iota\kappa \nu \). Elsewhere in liv it is written \( \xi \).

8. \( \varepsilon\nu \); possibly \( \varepsilon\nu\nu\nu \) (cf. introd. to xii) should be read, or conceivably \( \varepsilon\nu\nu\nu \) is the tax in the next line. But in neither case does that word suit the vestiges very well. We should expect to find \( \delta\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) or \( \phi\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu \) somewhere in the list, but they do not occur.

9. The doubtful \( \gamma \) at the end of the line can equally well be read \( \tau \), in which case the resolution \( \sigma\nu\beta\theta\lambda\iota\kappa \nu \) (cf. introd. to xii) is probably wrong, for the amounts paid for giving the receipt are elsewhere quite trifling.

**LVI. Tax-Receipt.**

Harl. 11.2 x 8.8 cm. A.D. 106.

A receipt for \( \nu\beta\beta\iota\nu \) \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) and minor taxes connected with it all paid in copper obols, followed by an entry of a payment in silver for \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \).

On the meaning of \( \nu\beta\beta\iota\nu \) and the taxes associated with it see introd. to xli; cf. also lvii, where the payment being only 1 drachma and a fraction was, though formally silver, also probably paid in copper, and lv. 8, where the \( \nu\beta\beta\iota\nu \) was paid in copper obols. The conjunction of \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) with \( \nu\beta\beta\iota\nu \) means that the person who paid the tax was a \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \), but what relation such contributions for this tax had to those of persons who were not \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) is unknown.

For the tax \( \nu\varepsilon\rho \) \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) simply cf. lxiii. lxiv. 9 and introd. to lxxi. Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 379) supposes that this impost (which is elsewhere uniformly paid in kind), was the land-tax upon \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \), and with this view we agree. In the present instance, however, the payment \( \nu\varepsilon\rho \) \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) is made in money. Perhaps the land was of the nature of vineyards or gardens on which the land-tax was paid in money, not in kind (cf. Wilcken, ibid. p. 199), but in that case we should have expected a more precise designation of the tax. The reading \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) can hardly be evaded, since the abbreviation in line 8 is identical with that in line 5, where \( \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omega\nu \) is certain; cf. introd. to xli.

At the bottom of the papyrus is the beginning of another receipt in the same hand, from which we have supplied the number of the year lost in line 1. The writing is on the vertical fibres of the recto.
FAYUM TOWNS

5 παρακτόρων Ἐλέγγη Μ . . . ἴτος ναυβ(ίων) κατ(οίκων)
tοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἐτός) Θεα(δελφείας) χ(αλκοῦ) ὁ(βολοῦ) τριακόσιου, προοδ(ει-
γραφόμενα)
χ(αλκοῦ) ὁ(βολοῦ) λ, κολ(λύβου) χ(αλκοῦ) ὁ(βολοῦ) ι, σφυμβολ(ικά) χ(αλκοῦ)
[ὁ(βολοῦ) α (ἡμοῦ), καὶ ὑπὲρ
κατ(οίκων) Θεα(δελφείας) μνπ(αροῦ) ἄργυρίῳ) ὁ(δραχμαί) δέκα δύο, γ(υνοταί)
(ὀδραχμαί) ίβ.

6. 1. Ὄβολοι τριακόσιων, ίότοι in 7 and 8.

3. There is room for more than Τεκτοι after Ἱεραρχαῖοι, and the three letters visible
between the two lacunae do not suit any part of Τεκτοι.

4. μετ(α λόγων) ι, δ(είγραψε): cf. note on liii. 3. Perhaps ι should be read, δείγραψε
being omitted. There is no abbreviation mark after δ, but on the other hand ι has a stroke
over it, and δ has not. Φλωνοῦ ὁ Ἱεράρχας(άροι) καὶ Ἱεράρχ(ιοι): cf. liii. 3.

7. The numbers of the obols, 30 for προοδειγγραφόμενα and 10 for κολλύβων, are the same
as those in Brit. Mus. Pap. 451, where the sum paid for ναυβών is lost and it is not stated to
which denomination the numbers 30 and 10 belong. Probably therefore obols are meant
in that papyrus also; cf. lv. 8 and ccxxvi. The κολλύβων may have had something to do
with the payment being in copper. Here and in liii. 5 the κολλύβων is ίβ of the ναυβών,
but elsewhere different proportions are found; cf. xlii. 14 and ccxxiii.

The sign for half an obol here is like the ordinary sign for a half; cf. liii. 6, note.

LVII. TAX-RECEIPT.

 oltre el 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. no. 10225. 12.5 x 11.5 cm. A.D. 164.

A receipt for ναυβών κατ(οίκων) and minor taxes like lii. The sums paid
amount to less than 2 drachmae in all. At the end is inserted a payment of
100 obols as drachmata for some other tax, the name of which is uncertain.

(*) Τοῦ πέμπτου Αντωνείνου καὶ Ὀ(ὐδήρου
τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν, Ὀ(ὐδή θ, (δειγρ(αψε)
διὰ τῶν Λοϊωνίου καὶ μετόχων) παρακτόρων ἄργυρίων) Βαχ(χιάδος)
Ἀλέξανδρος
Ζωλού δ(ά) Χαιράτου ναυβ(ίων) κατ(οίκων) τετάρτου (ἐτος)
5 (δραχμῆ) μία (ὁβολὸς) (ἡμιῶβολον), / (δραχμῆ) α (ὁβολὸς) (ἡμιῶβολον),
προ(σδιάγραφομενα) Χ(αλκοὶ) β, κολ(λύβου) Χ(αλκοὶ) β, σφυμβολικά,
[ὁ(παίρ) τ(οι) ἐκατόν, χ(υνοταί) (δραχμαι) ρ, προ(σδιαγραφόμενα) δύο (ἡμιῶ-
βολον), / (δραχμαι) β (ἡμιῶβολον).

5. 1. (δραχμῆ) μία, &c.
4. δι(α) Χαράρως: Chaeras was the agent of the taxpayer; cf. lvi. 5.

κατ(οίκου): in our copy of the text we have κθ, but the parallel receipt, lvi, shows that this must be wrong, and probably the papyrus has κατ, rather than κθ (cf. introd. to xlii). In either case κατοίκος is no doubt meant.

5. Though the payment it not stated to be in copper (cf. lvi, where it is), in practice copper (or lead, cf. p. 73) must have been used, for there was hardly any Roman silver of a lower denomination than a tetradrachm, and certainly none for fractions of a drachma. On κάλλιβρος cf. note on lvi. 7 and introd. to xlii.

6. A comparison of this papyrus with lvi suggests that ς(ε) κατ(οίκου) should be read here, but the vestiges do not seem consistent with κατ.

LVIII. TAXES ON WEAVING.

Harlf. 13.1 x 5.3 cm. A.D. 155-6.

The two following receipts are concerned with the tax, which in the one case is described as the κοφη και θριξ και χειρωνάξιον, in the other as κοφης και χειρωνάξιον. Two other receipts similar to these are extant, Gr. Pap. II. lx and B. G. U. 617, in both of which the name of the tax is written κοφης τριχις και χειρωναξιον. The present text by the insertion of κατ after κοφης shows that the genitive τριχις does not depend upon the preceding substantive, but that the three names κοφης, θριξ, and χειρωναξιον are parallel. In Gr. Pap. II. lx and B. G. U. 617 the payers of the tax are in both cases weavers; and it is hence inferred by Wilcken that the names κοφης and θριξ belong to the terminology of the weaver’s trade. That the payers of the tax here and in lx were also weavers is not stated, though it is of course possible. But in any case the tax must apparently be distinguished from the ordinary γερδικοι (cf. introd. to xlviii). The rate seems to have been high; 20 drachmae on account are paid in Gr. Pap. II. lx, and 38 drachmae for a whole year according to the Berlin text. In the present instances the sums are smaller, 6 drachmae 5½ obols and 13 drachmae and a fraction, but these are probably only part payments.

ἲΕτους ἐννεακαὶ δεκατὸν
Ἄρτονείνοιον Κάισαρος
τῷ κυρίῳ . . . . . . .
διέγραφεν Ἀμαμο-
κάτῳ καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ
καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐγχίλιμπτοροις
κοφῆς καὶ τριχὶς καὶ χειρωναξίῳ δ . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Ἡρακλείδης Ἡρακλείδου ὑπὲρ
Χρο-

10 ναξίου τοῦ ἵθ (ἢτους)
ἀργυρίῳ δραχμᾶς
ἐξ πεντάβουλον ἡμίουβολον,
χινοται (δραχμαί) ἐ (πεντάβουλον)
(ἡμίουβολον).
The 19th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord... Paid to Ammonius and Ptolemaeus and the rest of the farmers of the tax on cutting and hair and trade... by Heraclides, son of Heraclides, on account of the tax on trade for the 19th year six drachmae five and a half obols of silver, total 6 dr. 5½ ob.'

6. ἐγκέμπτος: so in lxx. 3, Gr. Pap. ix. 3, where ἐγκέμπτορος is to be read (ἐγκέμπτορος) Kenyon, Class. Rev. xiv. p. 172, but the dative plural is required). In B. G. U. 617 they are called μωμηταί.

8. The mutilated word is perhaps a place name.

9. ἑπτὰ χρωμαξίου: so too in lxx. 5.

LIX. TAXES ON WEAVING.

Harit. 8·4×8·7 cm. A.D. 178.

A receipt for 13 drachmae and a fraction paid by Dionysius, son of Didymus, to the tax-farmer of the κοπὴ (ἡ) καὶ χρωμαξίου; see introd. to the preceding papyrus.

"Ετους ἑν [Ἀβραμίων Ἀβραμίων καὶ Κομίδου τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν, Ἐπελφ
5. διέγραψε Σαραπίων ἐγκέμπτορας κοπῆς καὶ χρωμαξίους Διονύσιος Διονύσιος ἀπὸ ἀμφόδους Διονύσιος
5 [. . .] [Ε] εἰς κάμμηθα Θεοδεσίας ὑπὲρ [χρωμαξίους] τὸ ἕτος αὐτοῦ
[[έτους] ἐπὶ λύκου ἀργυρίου (δραχμῶς) ὁκτώ, / (δραχμαί) ἑ. (2nd hand)
καὶ ιῳ (έτους), Ἀθαρίε, ἡ [διέγραψε] [ὑπὲρ] τοῦ διελ[η]κτότος ἐτους διὰ Ἰσιδοροῦ βοηθοῦ
[. . .] βολον ἡμιομβέλιον.

7. [ὑπὲρ . . . (έτους)] inserted above line.

'The 18th year of the Aurelius Antoninus and Commodus the lords Augusti, Epeiph 6. Paid to Sarapion, farmer of the tax on cutting and trade, by Dionysius, son of Didymus, of the Linen-factories' quarter, living at the village of Thesephalia, for the trade-tax of the same year, eight drachmae and silver on account, total 8 dr. Also in the 19th year, Athur 13, paid on account of the preceding 18th year, through Isidorus, assistant, five drachmae... obols and a half more.

5. The mutilated word at the beginning of the line may be either a participle having the sense of καταγωγίματος or part of the name of the ἄμφοδος. In the former case the ἄμφοδος would be at Arsinoe (where an ἄμφοδος Δειοδώρου is well known), in the latter at Thesephalia. There is not room for [διαμπηθαῦς], and the uncompounded [τρηθαῦς] is unlikely.

7. βοηθοῦ: cf. note on xxxiv. 3.
LX. Receipt.

Wadia. 9.5 x 13.3 cm. A.D. 149.

Receipt for a payment of 160 drachmai (?) for φόρος φωνικών (or φωνικόν) in connexion with the Ἀρτονιανὴ οἰσία, which was part of the imperial domain land (cf. note on xl. 7). The Ἀρτονιανὴ οἰσία is elsewhere coupled with Socnopaii Nesus (B. G. U. 212, &c.); here, however, the land in question was evidently situated in the neighbourhood of Philoteris. No doubt this οἰσία comprised estates which were widely separated. It is not quite clear whether the payment here recorded was on account of a tax or simply rent; the term φόρος includes both meanings. In two of Wilcken's ostraca (1446 and 1536, the latter of the second century B.C.) φόρος φωνικῶν occurs, perhaps in both cases in the sense of rent; but the formula of those two receipts is different from that of the present papyrus. There are however indications that this document also is not strictly to be described as a tax-receipt. The payment is connected with an imperial estate; and the payer is apparently called a μισθωτής. Probably he was a δημότης γεωργός.

Τίτου Α[λ]πίου Αδρ[ιανοῦ Αυτοκράτορος] Σεβ[αστοῦ]
Ευσεβ[οῦς,] μηνύος Αδριανοῦ α, εἰς ἀ[δριανοῦ] Ἀθόρ, διε[γόρασε]
 [...]

5 Φιλο[τερίδος μισθωτής?] Πτολεμαίου Κρονίου δώ[/δε-]

The 13th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus
Pius, the first of the month Hadrianus, for the account of Athor. Paid by... son of
Heron, lesee of Ptolemaeus, son of Cronius, for the rent of date palms... at Philoteris
on account of the Antonian estate for the 12th year one hundred and sixty (drachmai
of silver), total 160; for the receipt, 3 obols.

4. We suppose the name of the payer of the tax to have stood in the lacuna, and
μισθωτής in 5 to be in opposition to the lost nominative. An alternative method would be
to read δᾶ[δ] Ἡρωνος in 4 and Πτολεμαῖος in 5; but though not much remains of the final
letter of the latter name, it seems impossible to reconcile the vestiges with any other letter
than ν. Ptolemaeus was perhaps himself an οἰσίακος μισθωτής and sublet his land. In
the latter part of line 4 the land upon which the payment was made was defined. We
should perhaps read ὀ[φο]σίας (for ὀ[φο]σίας) μεγάλον(ν) ᾽Α[ρτονιανῆς] κ[ατὰ...]

7. σ[υμβολικά] (τριώ[δε]λον): the reading is doubtful. The supposed σ may be μ, and
the symbol which we take to represent 3 obols is not formed in quite the usual
manner.
LXI. Payment for Use of Pastures.

Kâṣr el Banât. 12.2 x 10.7 cm. A.D. 233.

The following papyrus acknowledges the receipt of 48 drachmae ὑπὲρ φόρον νομῶν. Similar payments are found in B. G. U. 199, 345, 810; and they are evidently to be explained as made for the use of public pastures, whether belonging to the government or part of the imperial private estates. In Ptolemaic ostraca payments for this purpose are described as ἐς τὰς νομᾶς or ἐν νόμων (cf. Wilckcn, Ost. I. pp. 191-2, 265-6), though the latter term also occurs in the Roman period (xlii (a). II. 12, B. G. U. 485. 1). The amount paid depended, as might be expected, upon the number of animals using the pasture.

This document, again, is not strictly speaking a tax-receipt, though the sum is paid to the regular collectors of taxes.

"Ετος ιβ Αιτωκράτωρος Καλόσαρος
Μάρκου Αὔρηλιον Σἰεουήρον
Ἀλέξάνδρου Εὔνετοβίς Εὐνιχών
Σεβαστοῦ, Φαρμούθι ζ, [διέγραψε] διὰ
5 Αὔρηλιον Διοκέτου καὶ μέτοχων προικτοροὺς ἀ[ργυρίκων]
κώμης Φιλοτερίδος Αὔρηλιος Σερήνυς
[[πομή]] ὑπὲρ φόρον νομῶν
δραχμ(άς) τεσσαράκοντα δεκτά,
/ (δραχμαί) μη.

"The twelfth year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, Pharmouthis. 7. Paid through Aurelius Dioscorus and partners, collectors of money taxes of the village of Philoteris, by Aurelius Serenus as rent for pastures forty-eight drachmae, total 48 dr.

5. καὶ μέτοχων προικτοροὺς have not previously appeared in connexion with the φόροι νομῶν. In B. G. U. 345 payment is made through προαιρέτητοι κώμης.

7. In B. G. U. 199 the νομῶν belonged to the imperial domains. This is not stated in the present text, but is probable enough, especially as lx shows that part of the Ἀντώνιανη oikia was situated at Philoteris. On the subject of the νομῶν of Philoteris B. G. U. 478-480 are of considerable interest. Those documents are returns from the ἐπιτηρηταί νομῶν at Philoteris to the ἱεροθείας θεοτόκου λόγων stating that there had been no income from the pastures between given dates, there being no animals in the village. In the light of what we now know concerning the size and position of Philoteris (see p. 62) this deficiency is hardly surprising.
LXII. Receipt for Tax on the Sale of a Cow.

Úmm el 'Au. 8.3 x 7.3 cm. A.D. 134.

A receipt for payment of the tax on a cow, which had lately been bought for 44 drachmae. It appears on the whole more probable that this payment, the amount of which is not given, was made on account of the ἐγκυκλιον, or tax upon sales and mortgages, than that it was for the regular tax levied upon bulls and cows, which is otherwise called φόρος βοῶν (B. G. U. 25. 8; cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 460, where βο(ῶν) is probably to be read in ll. 3 and 5). The addition of the details concerning the purchase and the price, which occupy the greater part of the receipt, are superfluous if the ordinary cattle-tax is intended; and the fact that the payment was made in the market-place also points to the ἐγκυκλιον. The ἐγκυκλιον, which in the Roman period as in the later Ptolemaic, was 10 per cent. of the price (Ox. Pap. II. p. 190), is sometimes described in bankers' docket simply as the τέλος of the object sold. But a more definite statement would be expected in a formal receipt.

"Ετους ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου Τραϊανοῦ
'Αδριανοῦ Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, Τεβής κε,
ἐν ἀγορᾷ Κερκεσοῦχων, διέγραψε τέλος
βοῖν Συμβείη Νεφερὰ ἡ ἱώνη-
5 ται παρὰ Πετεωῦτου τοῦ Ἂρα-
κῆου ἀπὸ Στρῖε'ων τιμῆς
ἀργυρίου (δραχμῶν) τεσσαράκοντα τεσσάρων,
γίνονται (δραχμαῖ) μ.θ.

The 18th year of Trajanus Hadrianus Caesar the lord, Tubi 25, in the market-place of Kerkesocha. Paid by Sabina, daughter of Nepheras, the tax upon a cow bought by her from Peteous, son of Heracleus, of Sotris, at the price of forty-four drachmae of silver, total 44 dr.

6. Στρῖε'ων must be a place-name: it does not appear to be known from other sources.

LXIII. Receipt for Payment on Wine.

Καστ ολ Βανάτ. 12.9 x 7.5 cm. A.D. 240.

Receipt for a payment of 400 drachmae by a wine-merchant. The character of the receipt is not quite certain. We should have supposed that it referred to a private transaction, and that the 400 drachmae were the price of
wine that had been purchased, were it not for the apparent necessity, on the analogy of Pap. Gen. II. 77, of reading ἀπὸ τελ(ἐσματος?) in the lacuna of line 9. The Geneva papyrus is a receipt following a formula precisely similar (with the omission of κατέβαλε) to that of the present document, and also acknowledges the payment of a large sum, nearly 300 drachmae. This payment according to M. Nicole's reading is described as ἀπὸ τελ(ἐσματος) οἰνον γενήματος ἐτη (ἔτους). ἀπὸ τελ(ἐσματος) here can hardly have the meaning of ἐπέρ τιμῆς. The fact that the payments are in both receipts made through a χειριστής (cf. note on l. 7), is also rather in favour of connecting them with the τέλος οἰνον, on which cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 270.

"Εη[ous] γ Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρι Μάρκου Αντωνίου
Γορδιανοῦ Εὔσεβους Εὐσυχοῦς
Σεβ[αστοί], Ἐπείφ ἰδ, κατέβαλ(εν)
5 εἰς τίδιν Ἀρτονίου Φιλοζένου
τοῦ [. . .] τιστοῦ λόγον διὰ Αὐρηλίου
Νεμεσίαν καὶ χειριστοῦ Χρυσάς
οἶνοπώλής κόμης Εὐμερείας
ὁ[πὸ τελ(ἐσματος?) οἰνον γενήματος] β (ἔτους) ἀργ(υρίου) (δραχμάς) τε-
10 τρακοσίας, / (δραχμάι) ν.

8. First ε of ἑυμερεία corr.

'The third year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Antonius Gordianus Pius Felix Augustus, Epeiph 14. Paid over to the account of Antonius Philoxenus through Aurelius Nemesianus, agent, by Chrysus, wine-merchant of the village of Euheremia, on account of the payment for wine of the produce of the second year, four hundred drachmae of silver, total 400 dr.'

4. κατέβαλ(εν): καταβάλλω, though found at all periods in the sense of διαγράφως, is especially characteristic of Byzantine papyri; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 89.

6. [. . .] τιστοῦ: the first τ may be γ. Φρο[τιστοῦ might be read, but it is uncertain whether the mutilated word is a title or the name of Philoxenus' father.

7. χειριστοῦ: judging by the order of the words, Nemesianus is more probably acting for the recipient than for the payer; cf. lvi. 5, lvii. 4. A χειριστής is also the intermediary in Pap. Gen. II. 77 (read 'Ἀπεὶ χειριστῷ' for 'Ἀπεὶ χειριστῷ in l. 2, and Τυποθέης (ο)ς οἰνοπωλῆς (ης) in the following line). χειριστής sometimes appear as assistants to collectors of taxes (cf. Pap. Gen. I. 17 χειριστής προκάτοραν ἀργυρίων), as well as to higher officials.
LXIV. Receipt for Taxes on Oil.

Harst. 23.4 x 11.2 cm. Second century A.D.

This receipt, which is written on the verso of lxxvii, is an acknowledgement by the collectors of money-taxes at Euhemericia of a payment of 56 drachmae on account of the taxes on oil (ἐλθῃ ἐλαικά), and perhaps some other tax (cf. note on line 4). Concerning the oil-taxes in Roman times little or nothing is known beyond the fact that taxes were imposed on oil-producing land (introd. to lv), and this papyrus is too indefinite to add much to our information on the subject. Perhaps the εἰθη here are identical with the εἰθη which are found in lv. 4 as taxes on ἐλαφων. The chief interest of the present document lies in the insight which it affords as to the manner in which receipts were issued to the tax-payers. Not only do the collectors here acknowledge the payment made to them, but they undertake to transfer it to the government account and to hand over to the payer the government receipt. In this case therefore the tax-payer was supplied with two receipts, (a) the temporary acknowledgement of the collector, (b) the final receipt of the government issued after the collector had paid over the money to the government bank. Cf. xli, where payments made to the tax-collector are distinguished from those ἐπὶ τὴν δημοσίαν τράπεζαν. Has this system of double receipts any connexion with the phrase μὴ προσχείορις ἔκτενοις συμμέλησιν? Cf. liv. 3, note.

Θ (ἐτος), Παχων κς, διὰ Διοσκόρου καὶ Τουτέως καὶ Μετέχουν πρακτικοῦν ἄργυρικων κάμπ(ς)
Εὐθυμείας. διεγράφασι ισχυον εἰς λόγον
διαγράφῃς εἰς ἐλαικοῖς ἐπὼ τὴν ἐτος . η (ἐτος)

5 δραχμας πεντήκοντα ἐκ / (δραχμαὶ) ντ, ἀσπερ
καὶ διαγράφομεν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ὑπὸ ὁ
νόματος σοῦ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, καὶ ἐπε-
νεγκουμένη σοι τὸ δημόσιον σύμ-
βολον.

3. l. διέγραψε. 4. l. ἐλακών. 7. κ of κου corr. from ε.

'The ninth year, Pachon 27, through Dioscorus and Toutinous (?) and partners, collectors of money-taxes at the village of Euhemericia. You have paid and I have received on account of the payment for the oil-taxes of the eighth year... fifty-six drachmae, total 56 dr., which sum we will pay to the treasury in the name of you, Apollonius, and will hand over to you the treasury receipt.'
1. At the end of the line τοῦ Τεώματος should perhaps be read, the article being wrongly inserted.


4. The name of another tax would be expected before the second η (ημέρας), but there is no known tax which suits. In view of the very illiterate character of the receipt it is perhaps not too much to suppose that its author was capable of a third ἡμέρας, this time written out in full. The third and fourth letters may be read as ωυ.

7. ἐπενεγκαίμενος(ν) is clearly intended for a future, corresponding to διαγράφομαι as τὸ δημόσιον σύμβαλεν does to τὸ δημόσιον.

LXV. RECEIPT.

Hart. 12.6 x 7.4 cm. Second century A.D.

The nature of the payments recorded in the following receipt, which is evidently of an official character, is very obscure. The payments, which are large, were made by some women through the agency of their guardian on account of catoecic land inherited by them from their father. The description of the first sum, 140 drachmas, is lost owing to the mutilation of the papyrus; that of the second is γνωστείας λοιπῶν κληρον κατ(α)οι(κικοῦ). γνωστεία should mean something like 'authorization,' 'supervision.' But its significance in this connexion is altogether doubtful. It is not known that catoecic land when inherited by females was under any kind of government tutelage or subject to special imposts.

-μερὸς αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ
πατρὸς τετελεσμένων τῆς (ἐτερί) (δραχμὰς) μιὸς.
Φαρμακία β, ἄρει(μήσεως) Μεχ(ερί) καὶ Φαμ(ενώθ),
διέγραφαν αἰ aὐταὶ δρομοὶ δι(ά) τοῦ
5 aὐτοῦ γνωστείας λοιπῶν
κλῆρον κατ(α)οι(κικοῦ) (ἀρουρῶν) ἑαυτὸς (ἡμέρας) περὶ Θεωδολ(φελαί)
καταλείπο(μένων) αὐτάς ὑπὸ τοῦ
πατρὸς τετελεσμένων τῆς (ἐτερί) (δραχμὰς) . δ.

1. -μερὸς is the termination of καταλείπο(μένων); cf. 7. αὐτοῖς is probably a mistake for αὐτάς which seems to be correctly written in 7.

6. κατ(α)οι(κικοῦ): for the form of the abbreviation cf. introduction to xli.
LXVI. List of Fines.

Ümm el 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. no. 10231. 5'9×12-3 cm. A.D. 185 or 217.

A list of payments by various persons for fines officially imposed apparently as the result of an inquiry (διαλογισµόν, if that be the correct resolution of the abbreviation διαλογ). The terminology of the papyrus introduces us into a new field, and in the absence of parallel documents we abstain from conjecture. The first line was clearly a heading. The 26th year mentioned must refer to either Commodus or Caracalla.

[...] ικος ἀμφοθήκης ὁδός ἡμερόντος κτ. (ἐτους) κατακριµάτων
Ἰερανούπις Ιερανούπις ἐπίκαλοβερόνος Γερμανὸς ὑπὲρ ἐπιτίµου διαλογισµόν (δραχµαί) η.

[...] ο οπάρ ενατι, [...] ἐκπ Ιασήπις ὑπὲρ ἐπιτίµου ἀναγορᾶς (δραχµαί) κτ.

| \[ \]

LXVII-LXXVI (a). Custom-house Receipts.

This group is a selection from a large number of similar receipts relating to taxes paid at the custom-houses of the outlying villages in the Fayûm by persons crossing the desert to Memphis or the oases. Many examples of this class of papyri have already been published, thirteen in Gr. Pap. II. 1 (a)-(m), eight in B. G. U. 763-8 and 803-4, and seven in Kenyon, Catal. II. pp. 83-7; the present volume contains thirty-eight, nearly all from Ümm el 'Atl (Bacchias), where the direct road from Memphis to the Fayûm entered (and still enters) the Arsinoite nome; and there are a few unpublished specimens in the collections of Lord Amherst and Lord Crawford. Despite the unusually large amount of evidence there are several points of difficulty in the interpretation of the taxes which require a detailed examination. For previous discussion see our Gr. Pap. II. pp. 78 sqq., Kenyon, ibid. p. 83, Wilcken, Ost. I. pp. 354-60. The formula of these receipts is with slight variations as follows: (1) τετελεσται, nearly always abbreviated τετελ, in the middle voice, meaning 'has paid'; (2) δια πόλεως, followed by a village name, e.g. Bacchias (lxvii), Karanis (B. G. U. 764), Dionysias (lxviii), Soco paei Nesus (lxix), Philadelphia (Gr. Pap. II. 1 e); (3) the name of the tax or taxes; (4) the name of the tax-payer; (5) ἐπίδωρον or, much less frequently, ἔσηδων, sometimes with
a statement of the object of the journey; (6) ἐπὶ, followed by a statement of the animal or animals; (7) the amount of the loads in the accusative (governed by ἔξάγων, not by τετελεσται, see Gr. Pap. II. p. 79); (8) the date; (9) seal of the πήλη or crosses to indicate a seal. The amount paid is almost invariably omitted; where it occurs, it is inserted after the loads (e.g. in lxxviii. 3). The taxes found are three: (1) the ἄρημοφυλακία, sometimes, as in Ixxxv. 2, called ἰχνεός ἄρημοφυλακία, (2) the tax λίμένος Μέρμφεως, (3) the tax called ρ’ καὶ ν’, i.e. η/0 and ϊ/0.

As to the meaning of ἄρημοφυλακία there is no difficulty; it was a tax for the maintenance of the ‘desert police’ who protected caravans. Payments of this tax are elsewhere said to be ὕπερ συμβόλων καμήλων; cf. Gr. Pap. II. lviii; Brit. Mus. Pap. 318, where six drachmae are paid to the farmer of the taxes for ἄρημοφυλακία and παρόδιον (‘permit to travel’) for one camel journeying from (Socinopaei?) Nesus to the Letopolite nome or vice versa; and ibid. Pap. 330, where 32 drachmae are paid to the farmer of the same two taxes for four camels coming from Dionysias to the Letopolite nome or vice versa. In these three instances of payments ὕπερ συμβόλων καμήλων it is not made clear whether the tax for ἄρημοφυλακία was paid at the beginning of the journey or at the end. But the more natural supposition is that it was paid at the beginning, for this was the case in twelve out of the thirteen Fayûm receipts for ἄρημοφυλακία, in which the payer is stated to be ἔξάγων. In one instance (Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (b); cf. Wilcken, Archiv. I. p. 143) the taxpayer was entering (ἔλαγων) the Fayûm, but here probably the circumstances were exceptional, for it is hardly conceivable that caravans should have to pay ἄρημοφυλακία twice over. In lxxviii, one of the very few tax-receipts issued by a πήλη which mention the sum paid, the rate of ἄρημοφυλακία for a person journeying from Dionysias to some place, the name of which is uncertain, was 8 drachmae on four camels. Whether the tax fell on the animals or on the produce or on both is a question which will be discussed later.

The nature of the tax for the ‘harbour of Memphis’ remains a puzzle. In none of the thirty-two extant receipts for it is the amount paid stated, and in only one case, lxxiv. 1, is the tax-payer entering the Fayûm. But there is not the same reason for thinking the conditions in that instance to be exceptional as there was in the case of the ἄρημοφυλακία, and probably the tax was paid by all caravans passing through the πήλη on their way either to or from Memphis. The caravan trade with the oases was no doubt exempt. It is difficult to say which part of the phrase λίμένος Μέρμφεως is the more remarkable—that persons going by land should pay a tax for a harbour, or that villages in the Fayûm should collect a tax concerning Memphis. From a comparison of the λίμένος
Méμφεως receipts with ostraca from Sycene (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 276), in which an export tax of 3/40 upon produce is collected by the τελώνας πεντηκοστῆς λιμένος Σωμῆς, it might be conjectured that the λιμένος Méμφεως payment was merely an export and import duty, and that λιμέν had a general signification, the land journey being treated on the analogy of the river journeys which in the Nile valley were of course more usual. But this does not explain why we have Méμφεως and not Αρσινόετοι: moreover the ρ' και ν' tax was an export and import duty, and since from Lxxiii and Lxxiv we know that caravans paid both taxes, there must have been some difference between them. If we are to hazard a conjecture where the evidence is so perplexing we would suggest that the explanation of the tax for the 'harbour of Memphis' is to be found in the early history of the Fayûm. When Lake Moeris filled the space between Arsinoë and Bacchias or beyond (cf. p. 7), there must have been somewhere in the north-east corner of the Fayûm an important harbour where persons travelling direct to Memphis disembarked. This place might have been called the 'harbour of Memphis' and tolls exacted there. When the lake contracted, the tolls may have continued to be exacted in addition to the ordinary export and import tax for produce represented by the ρ' και ν'. In any case the identity of the formula in the λιμένος Méμφεως and the ρ' και ν' series leads us to think that both taxes must have been levied in very much the same way.

That ρ' και ν' means 3/40 and 1/60 there is no doubt, nor has our explanation of the 3/40 as a tax levied on the produce been questioned. But the point whether the tax of the 1/60 was levied on the produce or on the animals is disputable. In Gr. Pap. II. p. 80 we maintained that it too was levied on the produce, making a tax of 3 per cent. in all; and this view was adopted by Kenyon (Catal. I. c.). Wilcken however (Ost. I. p. 357 sqq.) has recently argued with much force that the hundredth was a tax on the animals. His reasons are: (1) the πεντηκοστή is known in other parts of Egypt as the regular tax on produce exported and imported, and therefore the ἐκατοστή ought to be something different; (2) the numbers of the animals is stated with no less regularity than the amount of the produce; (3) in Gr. Pap. II 1(a) a full description of the animal is given, but there is no mention of the produce, and therefore the animal alone in that case was taxed. From the circumstance that in the receipts for ἐρμοφυλακία and λιμένος Méμφεως the number of animals as well as the amount of produce was given, he concludes that both factors were taken into consideration in assessing those taxes also.

In spite however of the attractiveness of this theory, especially because it accounts for the regular mention of the transport animals, the fuller evidence now available seems inconsistent with the view that the ἐκατοστή was a tax on
the animals; and the ἑρμοφυλακία probably stands on a somewhat different footing from that of the other two taxes. Gr. Pap. II. 1 (a) is very inconclusive, for it is wholly uncertain which of the three taxes is meant. The papyrus has in place of the name of the tax νομ(αρχίας or -άων) Ἀρσαύον, which means that the nomarch was the official responsible for its collection. In ibid. 1 (b) νομ(αρχίας) Ἀρσαύον follows ρ’ καὶ ν’, but since all the taxes collected by the πολή were presumably under the supervision of the nomarch 1 (a) cannot be referred to ρ’ καὶ ν’ rather than to ἑρμοφυλακία without further reasons. Not only, so, but even if 1 (a) does refer to the ρ’ καὶ ν’, unless a parallel instance in which the produce is omitted in a ρ’ καὶ ν’ receipt is forthcoming, 1 (a) is open to the suspicion that the produce, like the name of the tax, has been accidentally left out. A comparison of the statistics of the cases in which the formulae of the three series of tax-receipts vary in respect of the omission of the animals and produce leads to the conclusion that in 1 (a) the ἑρμοφυλακία is more probably meant. Out of twenty-five receipts for ρ’ καὶ ν’, twenty-three mention both animals and produce, one (Gr. Pap. II. 1 (f) 2) omits the animals, one (Gr. Pap. II. 1 (f) 1) mentions the number of animals and the nature of the produce but without stating its amount, which was calculated, as often (cf. note on lxvii. 2), in proportion to the animals. In the case of the λιμένος Μέμφεας series there is even less variation. Thirty out of thirty-one mention both animals and produce, one (Brit. Mus. Pap. 416 b) perhaps omits the animals, but the reading is uncertain. The inference which we should draw from these instances is that no importance is to be attached to the very small percentage of variations from the rule in the ρ’ καὶ ν’ and λιμένος Μέμφεας series; but it is worth while pointing out that since there is one case (Gr. Pap. II. 1 (f) 2) in which the animals are left out, none in which the produce is omitted, so far as the variations prove anything, they would show that the produce was a more necessary item than the animals in estimating the tax. With ἑρμοφυλακία, however, the case is different. Out of thirteen instances of receipts for this tax, where it is not coupled with ρ’ καὶ ν’, only four (ξlxxvi–ix) give full details concerning both animals and produce; four (Gr. Pap. II. 1 (c) and (m), lxxv of the present volume, and an unpublished one in Lord Amherst’s collection) give the number of the animals and the nature of the produce without stating its amount (cf. Gr. Pap. II. 1 (f) 1); two (Gr. Pap. II. 1 (l), and lxviiii below) omit the produce; and two (Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 b and 469 a) omit the animals. Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (c) gives the number of the animals but omits the nature of the load, though stating that there was one. Of the receipts ἐπίρ συμβόλων καμάρων, issued by the μισθωτὴς ἑρμοφυλακίας καὶ παροδίων of the Procopite and Leto-
polite nomes (v. sup.), one (Brit. Mus. Pap. 318) mentions camels but no produce; another (ibid. 330) mentions camels ἐνδικεῖσθαι. Out of fifteen receipts concerning ἅρματα, we thus have three which omit the produce, while out of twenty-five for τρικάλλη ἤτοι ἢ and thirty-one for λημένος μέμφεως there is no instance of the total omission of the produce. From this we infer (1) that ἄρματα was paid on an unloaded animal, e.g. in lxviii, though when it was loaded the tax, as is shown by Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (b), took account of the produce as well; (2) there is nothing to show that the tax of a hundredth, or the tax λημένος μέμφεως, was paid on an unloaded animal. Yet is, as Wilcken supposes, the tax of a hundredth was paid on animals whether loaded or not, it is very curious that there should be no instance of a receipt for the hundredth upon an unloaded animal. Gr. Pap. II 1 (a), as has been shown, is inconclusive.

There is, however, a much stronger argument against the view that the tax of ⅛ was upon the value of the transport animals. A receipt for τρικάλλη ἤτοι, obtained by us last winter and now in the collection of Lord Crawford, gives the amount of the tax. An individual leaving Socnopaei Neusis in A.D. 162 paid for one female camel carrying six aratabae of λαχανοσπέρμα, 5 drachmæ; and for one male camel and two donkeys carrying 12 aratabae of wheat, 3 drachmæ. An examination of the prices of donkeys and camels in the Fayûm will show that the amounts paid here are far too low, if the hundredth of the value of the animals was taken into account. Camels were sold at 800 dr. (Brit. Mus. Pap. 320, B. G. U. 88 and 153); 1200 dr. for two (Brit. Mus. Pap. 323); 450 dr. (Pap. Gen. 29); 500 dr. for two (B. G. U. 87); 780 dr. (ib. 100); 1340 dr. for two (ib. 446); 580 dr. (ib. 253); 680 dr. (ib. 459). Donkeys were sold at 106 dr. (Gr. Pap. II. xlii); 148 dr. (Brit. Mus. Pap. 303); 160 dr. (ib. 466); 64 dr. (ib. 313); 160 dr. for a female donkey and foal (ib. 339); 260 dr. (B. G. U. 228); 500 dr. and 300 dr. for male donkeys (ib. 413 and 527); and 56 dr. (xcii. 17 below). Taking even the lowest prices found here, 250 dr. for a camel and 56 dr. for a donkey, a tax of one per cent. on a camel and two donkeys will alone more than exhaust the three drachmae paid according to the Crawford papyrus for 1 camel, 2 donkeys, and 12 aratabae of wheat. Yet the tax of two per cent. on the wheat must have amounted to at least 2 dr., unless the value of the wheat was very much less than 8½ dr. an arataba, which is unlikely; and this leaves only 1 drachma for the supposed one per cent. tax on the camel and two donkeys, which is impossible. The Crawford papyrus seems to us to dispose conclusively of the view that the tax of the hundredth was upon the value of the transport animals; and in these circumstances there seems no alternative but to adhere to our original
explanation of the ρ' καί ν' as a tax of three per cent. on the produce. This would give $8\frac{1}{2}$ dr. an artaba as the value of the wheat in the Crawford papyrus, which is an average price. 10 dr. an artaba is the rate found in Brit. Mus. Pap. 131 recto 177–8, and 7 dr. 1 obol in B. G. U. 834. 22.

A corollary of this view is that an unloaded animal passing through the πόλη did not incur the tax ρ' καί ν' (nor, probably, the tax λιμένως Μέμψεως), though the owner would have to pay ἑρμωφυλακία (v. sup.). But this distinction is not unreasonable in itself; and, as we have already shown, the regularity with which in the receipts for ρ' καί ν' and λιμένως Μέμψεως the produce is mentioned points to the same conclusion.

The receipts range in date from the reign of Titus to the third century. The emperor’s name is usually omitted, especially in the later examples. The various classes of produce or other objects transported are wheat, barley, wine, pulse (ὅφος, very common), vegetables and vegetable seed, dates, garlic, olives, and sheep-skins (ἐφίου πόκου). Ixxv and lxxvi are written on the vertical fibres.

LXVII.

Ümm el’Atl. 3·5 x 6·3 cm. A.D. 80.

Παρέσι(χηκε) διὰ πόλης Βακχ(χιλάδος) ᾽Ιβία Πτ(ολεμαίου ?) (πυροῦ) ὄνου τρεῖς. (ἐτοὺς) Β Τίτου τοῦ κυ-ρίου, Μεσση(η) τρισκαίδεκα[κάτη].

2nd hand *'Ἡπιο[ψ] σεσημίω(μαι).*

1. For the variation παρέσο(χηκε) instead of τετελεσται cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (c) 1, where Wilcken reads παρασε, i.e. παροσ(χε). As in Gr. Pap. 1 (a) the particular tax is not named.

2. The ὄνοι are treated as a measure, ‘donkey loads’; cf. lxxv. 3, and B. G. U. 802, where a donkey load of wheat is $3\frac{1}{2}$ artabae, and Wilcken, Ost. L. p. 754.

LXVIII.

Harfl. 6·3 x 5·3 cm. A.D. 158.

Τετελ(εσται) διὰ(ά) πόλ(ής) Διονυ(σίαδος) ἑρ(μωφυλακίας)

'Αλβ(ες) ἐξ(ἀγων) εἰς Βυστί( ) καμ(ήλους) τέσ-

σαρές [15] (δραχμᾶς) ὀκτώ. (ἐτοὺς) πρώτου
καὶ εἰκοστὸν Ἀρτάβασιον
5 Καλόπαρος τοῦ κυρίου, Παχών
ἐκτὴ καὶ εἰκάδι, κ.ς.

3. [título] The camels were probably unloaded; cf. introduction.

LXIX.

Κόμ Ushlm. Gizeh Inv. no. 10239. 4.8 x 4.4 cm. Second or third century.

Τετέλεσται διὰ πύλης Σοκινοπάλου
Νῆσος χιλιάδος Μέμφεως
'Ωρος ἕξ'άγων ἐπὶ ὅνοις [,]
ὁρῶς ἄραθας ἕξ, ἄραθας 5 ἔτους [,].
5 Ἐπειφ ἐσθόμη καὶ εἰ-
κάδι, κ.ς.

4. Probably ἔτους ἕτερον; cf. the next papyrus, which was found with this one.

LXX.

Κόμ Ushlm. Gizeh Inv. no. 10240. 3.9 x 5.3 cm. Second or third century.

Τετέλεσται διὰ πύλης Σοκινοπάλου Νῆσος
ρ' καὶ ν'Eρημός ἕξ'άγων ἐπὶ κα-
μῆλην πάλωρ λαχάνου
(ἄρταβας) τέσσαρες. (ἔτους) ζ, Φορ-
5 μοῦθε δωδεκάτη, 1β.

4. [título] 5. δῶ τοῦτον ὀπισθονυμίαν ἐκ.

LXXI.

Umm el 'Ail. 6.7 x 5.6 cm. Second or third century.

Τετέλεσται διὰ πύλης Β[α]κχ(ιάδος)
ρ' καὶ ν' 'Αμμάνιος
ἕξ'άγων ἐπὶ ὅνοις ἐπτά, ζ,
ὁρῶς (ἄρταβας) εἴκοσι μίαν,
5 κα. (ἔτους) 15, Μεσορή
ἐνδεκάτη, 1α.
LXXII.

Ümm el 'Atl. 6.7 x 5.3 cm. Second or third century.

Τετέλεσται ἡ πόλις Βακχιάδος
λιμένιος Μέμφεως Ἡρώων
εἰς ἄγον ἐπὶ δυν ἐνὶ σκότῳ.
δών χαῖρε, μυθόν ἐν, ἀ.
5 (ἔτους) 7, Παῦλος
ἐννεακαίδεκάτης,
θ.

LXXIII.

Ümm et 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. no. 10236. 5.3 x 6.1 cm. Second or third century.

'Αντισυμβόλον. Παῦλος τετέλεσται
διὰ πόλις Βακχιάδος ῥό καὶ νήρι
ἰσάγων ἐπὶ δυοις πέντε
οἴνου κεφάλμα εἰκοσι δπ'
5 κτώ. (ἔτους) 7, Θωδώ τρίτη, ὑ.

1. In this papyrus and the next, which is written in the same hand and records the payment for λιμένιος Μέμφεως by Pausis on the same wine, we at length have concrete examples of ἀντισυμβόλα, an obscure term which has been occasionally found coupled with συμβόλα in Ptolemaic papyri concerning the royal bank; cf. Wilcken Aktenstücke vi. 11 and Gr. Pap. II. xxiii. 7. Wilcken suggests (Ost. L. p. 638) that the συμβόλον may be the receipt which the banker gives to the recipient of money, the ἀντισυμβόλον the receipt which the recipient gives to the banker, or vice versa. This may be true so far that one term (preferably the συμβόλον) means the receipt given by the person who receives the money to the person who pays it, and that the other term, i.e. the ἀντισυμβόλον, means a receipt kept by the person who receives the money. But the present instances of ἀντισυμβόλα show that there was no difference in the formula, for with the exception of a trifling variation in the order of words, lxxii and lxxiii are identical with the other receipts, which are simply συμβόλα like any ordinary tax-receipt; cf. B. G. U. 293. 1 ἀντιγράφων συμβόλων. Nor is it easy to see how or why the person who pays money should write a receipt for the person who receives it. ἀντισυμβόλον therefore is practically equivalent to ἀντιγράφων συμβόλων; cf. xxii. 12, note.

3. Instances of persons εἰσάγονες are very rare, the only others being Gr. Pap. II. 1 (a) and (f) 2 and Brit. Mus. Pap. 316 (b). In all other cases the persons are εἰσάγονες.
LXXIV.

Úmm el 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. no. 10237. 5.3 x 5.5 cm. Second or third century.

Ἀντεσύμβολον. Παῦσις ἵσαγ(ων) τετέλεσται
διὰ πύλης Βακχιάδος λύμένος Μέμφεως
ἐπὶ δύοις εἰς οἶνον κεράμια
εἰσκοι ὁκτὼ. (ἐτοὺς) ἵ, θῶθ
5 τρίτη, γ.
1. ἵσαγ PAP.

LXXV.

Úmm el 'Atl. 5.6 x 4.5 cm. Second or third century.

Τετέλεσται διὰ πύλης Βακχιάδος
ἐχυροτευχότες ἑρμοφυλακίας Παῦσις
ἐξάγοντες σκόρδων
δύος δύο, β.
5 γ (ἐτοὺς), Παρμοῦθι
τρίτη, γ.
3. σκόρδων δύος: cf. note on lxvii. 2. ἕκοκον σκόρδῳν corr. from ἔπει.
5. L. Φαρμοῦθι.

LXXVI.

Úmm el 'Atl. 5.7 x 4.3 cm. Second or third century.

Τετελεσταὶ διὰ πύλης Βακχιάδος
ῥ' καὶ ν' καὶ ἵσαγος ἐρ-
ημοφυλακίας Παῦσιῶν ἐξάγοντες
ἐπὶ δύοις τρεῖσι, γ, ὑδρά-
5 βου (ἀρτάβας) ἔννεα, θ. (ἐτοὺς) κ,
Ἀθίρ πεντεκαίδεκα-
τη, ιε.
The conclusion of a receipt, probably issued by the πῶλη, giving the amount of the tax like the Crawford papyrus mentioned above. 5 aritabae are more then the usual load of a donkey (cf. note on lxvii. 2), so perhaps κόμηθα should be supplied at the end of line 1. But the accusative εἰς in l. 2 is a difficulty, for where both the number of the animals and the amount of the produce is given, the animals are generally placed in the dative after εἰς.

LXXVII–LXXIX. Work on the Embankments.

Since the effectiveness of the system of irrigation is and always has been one of the prime conditions of the prosperity of Egypt, the maintenance of the canals and embankments was carefully supervised by the government. The papyri and ostraca (cf. Wilcken, Ostr. I. pp. 333 sqq.) show that contributions to this end were annually exacted in two ways, in labour and in money, the regular period of work being five days and the regular payment 6 drachmae 4 obols. What exactly was the relation between these two methods is not yet ascertained. It is in itself probable enough, as is assumed by Kenyon (Catal. II. p. 103), that the money payment was made in lieu of the five days’ work. But this has yet to be established by evidence, and until then the possibility remains that the tax ἐπὶ χωματικῶν was independent of the requisition of personal labour, and that the payment of the one did not involve immunity from the other. The fact that substitutes were allowed (B. G. U. 722. 7–9 Πτολεμαῖος Μαρκιζηστὼς ἐπὶ Παπεῖτος Φαρομγίως) does not at all prove that the money paid ἐπὶ χωματικῶν was expended in the employment of substitutes. From the occurrence of the name of the person for whom the substitute was acting we should rather draw the contrary conclusion, since the name would be quite immaterial if substitutes were employed on a large scale by the government.

Of the three following texts, which are certificates for labour of this kind,
two follow the same formula as the numerous other examples published in Gr. Pap. II. (liii a-g), the British Museum Catalogue (Nos. 139 b, 165, 166 b, 316 a, 321, 325), and the Berlin Urkunden (264, 593, 652, 722, 723). They briefly state that the recipient had worked during five successive days in a certain locality, as usual during one of the summer months Pauni, Epeiph, or Mesore, the period of the inundation. Labour was also sometimes required in the previous month, Pachon (Brit. Mus. Pap. 166 b), and not infrequently later on in the autumn, in Athur. The third papyrus (lxxviii) is peculiar in certifying a period of two days only (cf. ccclxxviii). No clue to the reason of this variation is afforded. The explanation certainly is not that the individual labour required by the government in some years or some localities amounted to less than five days, for it so happens that lxxvii is a certificate for work done in the previous month of the same year upon the same embankment, and in this instance the period is the regular five days. Possibly the two days were only an instalment, though there is no suggestion of this in the language of the document; possibly they were an extra period, necessitated by exceptional local conditions, and this may be the meaning of the unusual addition in line 5 ἀκολούθως τῶν κελευθείσων; or perhaps this person was for some reason privileged, and had not to work more than two days. But without further evidence a satisfactory conclusion is not attainable.

Other examples of these certificates are ccclxxvi-ccxc and ccclix-ccclxvi.

LXXVII.

Harl. 7.1 x 6.8 cm. A.D. 147.

Εὐτοὺς δεκάτῳ Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου
Αὐλίων Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀυτοκράτορος Σέβαστοῦ
Εὐσεβοῦς, εὐρυκοσται ὑπὲρ χαράκτακών ἐργαν
τῶν αὐτοῦ (τῶν) (2nd hand) Ἐπείφ ἐγὼ κ ἐν

5 τῆς Ψινάλειτρίας Θεάδελφείας

Ορὸς Πανευστερίος τοῦ

Νεφεράδτου μητρὸς Σωρείας.

3rd hand Μαρκίνας σεσημεύωμαι.

*The tenth year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius. Work has been done for the embankment works of the same tenth year from the 16th to the 20th Epeiph at the Psimaii . . . dyke at Theadelphia by Horus, son of Panesneus, son of Nepheros, his mother being Soéris. Signed by me, Marinos.*
5. The name of the embankment or canal may consist of two words Ψινωλι Τρυω( ) or τρυω( ); and it is therefore hardly certain that the name is exactly the same as that in lxviii. 6, where the letters after Ψινωλι are rather differently written. There τρ and ω are fairly certain, but the intervening vowels are more like αi than α. Here ι could take the place of τρ and ω be read as δ.

8. It is not quite clear where σεσημ(ειμαι) begins, and the name Μαρίνος may not have been abbreviated.

I. LXXVIII.

Harit. 7.1 x 10.2 cm. A.D. 147.

"Ετους δεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Κάσταρας Τίτου Αλίου Αδριανοῦ
'Αυτοκοτάνου Σεβαστού Ευσέβδους.
εἰργ(ασταί) εἰς χαίματικα ἐργ(α) τοῦ αὐτ(οῦ) i (ἐτους)
5 ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὑπὸ ἀκολ(ούθως) τοῖς κελευθερ(ίων)
2nd hand Μεσορή & καὶ η ἐν τῇ Ψιναλειτρείω( ) Θεα(θε)λ(φελει)
Δειος Ἡρακλείδου [τοβ] Δύκου μητρὸς Τασωνίκεως.
3rd hand Πρέσης σεσημ(ειμαι).

The tenth year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius. Work has been done for the embankment works of the same tenth year for two days in accordance with the command on Mesore 7 and 8 at the Painali...dyke at Theadelphia by Dios, son of Heraclides, son of Lycus, his mother being Tasoonikis, Signed by me, Pretis.'


6. On the name of the dyke cf. note on lxviii. 5.

8. The name of the person who signed the certificate was possibly Ἡρω; but if so, σεσημ(ειμαι), which is less cursively written than usual, has a ι or ε too much at the beginning.

I. LXXIX.

Umm el 'Atal. Gizeh Inv. No. 10241. 4.3 x 5 cm. A.D. 197.

"Ετους ε Ἀουείου Σεπτιμίου
Σεσουήρου Εὐσέβδους Περενακ[ος]
Σεβαστο(δ). εἰργ(ασταί) υπ(ἐρ) χα(ματικῶν) ε ἐτους (2nd hand?)
Παθ(νι) τι ἕως τοῦ

"The tenth year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius. Work has been done for the embankment works of the same tenth year for two days in accordance with the command on Mesore 7 and 8 at the Painali...dyke at Theadelphia by Dios, son of Heraclides, son of Lycus, his mother being Tasoonikis, Signed by me, Pretis.'
DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

ἐν τῇ ὄρειν Ἱππολέμαιον Βάκχεάδος

Πετσανίχας Βίωνος
Μέλλειτον.

4. Cf. Gr. Pap. II, liii (d) 5 ἐν ὀρεισὶν Ἱππολεμαῖον παραμένειν ἔνδος, and B. G. U. 722, where read ἐν ὀρείῳ Παρ(ί). That ὄρη stands for ὄρεις and not ὄργημα or ὄργη is proved by several examples from Tebtunis. ὁ ὄρη (sc. ὄργης) means 'the desert canal,' i.e. possibly the same as the 'canal of Cleon' (P. P. II. xxxvi (1) 4) which brought water to Bacchias and perhaps to Socnopaei Nesus; cf. p. 15.

LXXX. ADVANCE OF SEED CORN.

Umm el 'Atl. 4-i x 6 cm. A.D. 141-2.

This papyrus is one of a large class of Fayûm receipts, addressed to the sitologi or keepers of granaries by δημόσιος γεωργος, acknowledging the advance of seed corn; cf. Viereck, Hermes, xxx. pp. 107 sqq. The amount was usually one artaba for each aoura when the land was βασιλική γῆ (B. G. U. 171 and 512). In the case of ἱερὰ γῆ and προσόδου γῆ (confiscated land, cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. pp. 148-9) which were also cultivated by δημόσιος γεωργος (Brit. Mus. Pap. 256 (c) 1, 2) the advance was somewhat less; see B. G. U. 512 and Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 777. In contracts for the lease of private land, where the seed corn is sometimes advanced to the γεωργος by the lessor, the amount was also generally one artaba to the aoura, e.g. in B. G. U. 227. 15, and the repayment of this advance (without interest) was included in the rent. Since the δημόσιος γεωργος were in much the same position as other γεωργος and paid rent (ἐκφόροντο, C. P. R. I. 32. 13) for their holdings to a government official, it is probable that in their case too the repayment of the advance was included in their rent. Kenyon on the strength of Brit. Mus. Pap. 193, in which extra payments for διαχοι(νίκα) are connected with some kind of land-tax, has supposed that the advances of corn by the sitologi had to be repaid with γῆ interest after the harvest. But, as Wilcken (Archiv, I. p. 150) has pointed out, there is no evidence to show that Brit. Mus. Pap. 193 is concerned with δημόσιος γεωργος, and we should explain that papyrus differently; see note on lxxxi. 9.

Owing to the excessive brevity of the present document it is impossible to say what kind of land is in question. There is nothing to show that it was even government as opposed to private land except the comparison with other documents having the same formula, in which the land is either βασιλική, προσόδου, or (apparently) belonging to some ὀβῶν.
LXXXI. Receipt for Payment in Kind.

This and the four following papyri are receipts issued by the sitologi for payment of various taxes in kind. Numerous similar receipts from the Fayum in the collections of the Berlin and the British Museums have been published, but despite the large number of examples the interpretation of the series is open to doubt, especially in regard to the nature of the taxes and the position of the persons mentioned as making the payments, about whom it is not always clear whether they are the tax-collectors or the tax-payers.

The taxes found, which are written in the genitive, either with or without ὑπὲρ, and usually immediately preceded or followed by a village name, are four:

1. (ὑπὲρ) κατοίκων, lxxxi. 7, lxxxiii. 8, lxxxiv. 9, lxxxv. 10, cclxiv, Ost. 23. 4, B. G. U. 336. 8, 579. 7, 755. 5, 792. 11, 835. 11;
2. (ὑπὲρ) κληροῦχων, B. G. U. 61. 9, Brit. Mus. Pap. 217. 17;
3. (ὑπὲρ) κληροῦχων, lxxxi. 19, lxxxvi. 8 (a sitologus' account of his monthly receipts) lxxxvi (a) 7;
4. (ὑπὲρ) δημοτῶν, generally abbreviated δη, 180. 2, lxxxv. 7, lxxxvi. 7, and lxxxvi (a) 9, B. G. U. 67. 9, 716. 9, 835. 11, Brit. Mus. Pap. 315. 8, 372. 8, 346 (a) 8, (c) 5;
5. (ὑπὲρ) ἵδιοκτήτων (tou?), sc. γῆς, cccxliv.

The payments ὑπὲρ κατοίκων and κληροῦχων are explained, rightly as we think, by Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 380) as the land-tax (cf. p. 185) upon these two classes of landowners. That for ἵδιοκτήτων (tou?) is also probably a payment of
land-tax by a private owner. A difficulty arises concerning the interpretation of δημοσίων. Wilcken (Archiv, I. p. 144) explains this term as equivalent to δημοσίων γεωργῶν, and supposes that the payment is for the rent (ἐκφόριον) of the cultivators of imperial domain-land. This view that γεωργῶν is to be supplied is derived from Kenyon’s explanation of this class of papyri, viz. that they record repayments by the δημόσιοι γεωργοί of the seed corn advanced to them by the government; though Kenyon’s reading δη(μοσίων) (γεωργῶν) in Brit. Mus. Pap. 315. 8, &c. and the reference to the seed corn are shown by Wilcken to be unsatisfactory. It is clear from other instances, e.g. Brit. Mus. Pap. 180. 2, that δη(μοσίων), i.e. ὑπὲρ δημοσίων, must be read; and since the question of a repayment of seed corn does not arise in the case of the payments by private individuals ὑπὲρ κατοίκων and κληρονόμων, some other explanation is to be sought for in the case of payments ὑπὲρ δημοσίων. Wilcken’s own explanation of δημοσίων however is not free from difficulty. In the first place it is noticeable that although in sitologus receipts (ὑπὲρ) δημοσίων is common, (ὑπὲρ) δημοσίων γεωργῶν is never found. Secondly, though the ἐκφόριον of δη(μοσίων) γεωργοί apparently occurs in lxxxvi together with payments (ὑπὲρ) δημοσίων, the wording of the entries is different in the two cases, and the payments for ἐκφόριον are not stated to be (ὑπὲρ) δη(μοσίων). Moreover receipts for payment of ἐκφόριον by δη(μοσίων) γεωργοί are extant (e.g. a Tebtunis papyrus of the reign of Gaius, and probably lxxviii), which have nothing to do with sitologi at all. Thirdly in lxxxiii we find persons paying for both δημοσίων and κατοίκων simultaneously. If these individuals were really the tax-payers and not the tax-collectors (v. τελευταίοι), it is curious that a δημόσιος γεωργός should also be an owner of catoeic land.

An alternative explanation for the phrase ὑπὲρ δη(μοσίων) would be to take δη(μοσίων) (as Wilcken himself formerly did) to be neuter, sc. τελευταίοι, and to treat these payments ὑπὲρ δη(μοσίων) as payments of land-tax by ordinary land-owners, having no connexion with δημόσιοι γεωργοί. The phrase τὰ τῆς γῆς δημόσια in the general sense of taxes upon land frequently occurs in leases, But the difficulty then arises—what was the distinction between the persons who paid ὑπὲρ δημοσίων and those who paid ὑπὲρ κληρονόμους? Though κληρονόμος has a technical sense in Fayyum papyri of the third century B.C., it seems to be in the Roman period no more than a general term for land-owner as contrasted with a γεωργός or tenant (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 185); and it is not satisfactory to suppose that the land-tax was called ὑπὲρ κληρονόμου when paid by the landlord, and ὑπὲρ δημοσίων when paid by the tenant. Another objection to taking δημοσίων as neuter is that the analogy of payments ὑπὲρ κατοίκων and κληρονόμων leads us to expect a masculine. On the whole therefore the view
that Ἰμιοισόν is for Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν is preferable. There are in fact a few papyri where γεωργῶν is clearly omitted after Ἰμιοισόν (Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 144); and—what is more important—no other view provides a satisfactory explanation for the persons who are constantly found paying ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν and are called ὃι ἀπὸ followed by a village-name differing from that in which the payment is made. The substantive to be supplied with ὃι is undoubtedly Ἰμιοισόν; cf. lxxxvi (a). 10 with lxxxvi. 9, 10, and Brit. Mus. Pap. 315. 9 διὰ ὃς Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν 1 Σοκισι(παῖ)ον Νήσων with Gr. Pap. II. xlvi. 7 διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Σοκισι(παῖ)ον Νήσων. A further comparison of these Ἰμιοισόν domiciled in one village and cultivating land in another with C. P. R. I. 33 and Pap. Gen. 81 leads to the conclusion that all these persons called ὃι ἀπὸ . . . who pay ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν were Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν. Those two papyri are both lists of parcels of Ἰμιοισόν γῆ, in the one case coupled with personal names, in the other with names of villages, and the Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν are divided into (a) those ἀπὸ or ἐκ τῆς κάμης, who lived in the village where they cultivated Ἰμιοισόν γῆ, and (b) the ἄποικος (Pap. Gen. 81. 19, cf. C. P. R. I. 33. 24), who lived in a different village. This system of classification exactly corresponds with the distinctions in lxxxvi. 9–10 and lxxxvi (a). 8–10 between the persons who pay ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν, an advantage which seems to outweigh the objections to the view that ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν is equivalent to ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν. It remains however to account for the payment by the same person of sums ὑπὲρ κατοικῶν and ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν (v. sup.) and to show why in e.g. Brit. Mus. Pap. 315 the payments from Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν were accredited to a single individual.

This leads us to the other question in this series of receipts, the position of the persons making the payments. Wilcken (Ost. I. pp. 659–60 and Archiv, I. p. 143) holds that the tax-collectors are not mentioned, and that the individuals who are found in these receipts with a variety of constructions (nominative, ἐσ with acc., ἐσ ὄνομα, or ὄνοματος) are the tax-payers. His arguments are (1) the analogy of the ostraca of the same period with a similar (but by no means identical) formula, in which the tax-payers, not the tax-collectors, are mentioned; (2) the fact that in several cases more than one individual is found making payments, which is certainly more intelligible on the hypothesis that tax-payers are meant; (3) an ostraca at Gizeh with a heading ἄντι ὅν ἐν ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν ὑπὲρ Ἰμιοισόν (Πηθυματος), Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν, followed by persons whose names have not been deciphered but who are different from those found in

1 This reading (proposed by Kenyon) seems to be the best. Our previous suggestion κομπαρ(χῖ)υ is undoubtedly wrong; and we are unable to reconcile Wilcken’s reading [ř]ῶρ d(ῦ)φ with the facsimile.
2 The name of the tax which came at the end of line 6 of this papyrus is unfortunately obliterated but was probably Ἰμιοισόν. Our reading Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν is wrong. Read [φ]ῦρ(ῖ)ς Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν Βὑρ(ᾶ)ς Ἰμιοισόν γεωργῶν.
the heading. The first and third arguments are not very convincing, because
the ostraca themselves show that a large degree of variation in the formulae
of tax-receipts was simultaneously possible in different parts of Egypt, and in
the Ptolemaic period the receipts of sitologi generally mention the tax-collector
and omit the tax-payer. But the explanation of Wilcken is confirmed by
two receipts in the present volume (lxxxiii and cccxiii) and by one from
Tebtunis, in all of which the person in the nominative or with els is a woman;
and we should not have been disposed to doubt its correctness in all cases,
if it were not for the occurrence in a considerable number of these sitologi
receipts, especially in the present volume, of a second class of persons intro-
duced by διά, who are different from the persons in the nominative or with els ὄνομα, &c. These persons are found in Gr. Pap. II. xlvii. 7, Brit. Mus.
Pap. 315. 9, lxxxiv. 9 διὰ Πετροῦρεσ, and clxii διὰ Τετεπούφεσ. In lxxxii. 19
διὰ κληρονόμων no name of an individual, whether tax-payer or tax-collector, is
given; in lxxxvi and lxxxvi (a) the payments are regularly described as διά
certain persons. If the persons in the nominative or with els ὄνομα, &c., are the
tax-payers, who are these persons introduced by διά? They cannot be the tax-
collectors, in spite of the analogy of διὰ πρακτόρων in money-receipts, for it is
impossible that the κληρονόμοι in lxxxii. 19 and lxxxvi, or the δημόσιοι γεωργοί in
lxxxvi, were the tax-collectors. In the cases where the payment is ὑπὲρ κατοίκων
or κληρονόμων the persons introduced by διά are to be explained as the tenants
who actually make the payment, as distinct from the landlord to whom the land-
tax, whether paid by himself (e.g. lxxxiii) or his tenant (e.g. lxxxiv), was accredited;
cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 115, where γεωργοί appear in similar receipts making pay-
ments on behalf of their landlords. But in the case of payments ὑπὲρ δημοσίων,
e.g. Brit. Mus. Pap. 315, since there is no relationship of landlord and tenant,
a somewhat different explanation must be found. Either the persons in the
nominative are the heads or superintendents of an association of δημόσιοι γεωργοί
or else they are the tax-collectors. In favour of the first hypothesis is the
analogy of the receipts ὑπὲρ κατοίκων and κληρονόμων which, so far as we can judge,
omit the tax-collector. It is not very satisfactory to suppose that the persons
to whom these receipts were made out were in some cases the tax-payers, in
others the tax-collectors. Nevertheless several of the receipts ὑπὲρ δημοσίων
are in some ways more intelligible on the view that the tax-collector is the
person to whom the payments are credited, especially those in which the
sums paid are very large (e.g. Brit. Mus. Pap. 180), and those in which the
same person pays both ὑπὲρ δημοσίων and ὑπὲρ κατοίκων (e.g. lxxxv). It is
therefore not certain that in every case the persons in the nominative or with
els are the tax-payers.
The present papyrus is an acknowledgement by sitologi of the receipt of $26\frac{1}{2}$ artabae of wheat 'for the κάτοικοι of Theadelphia' from Athenarion. The amount consisted of land-tax upon κάτοικοι and some extra payments, but the loss of the beginnings of lines renders a few points obscure.

[('Ετους) ὀκτωκαὶδεκατόυ Ἀντοκράτορος Καίσαρος
[Nερώδα Τραιανῶν Ἀριστον Σεβαστό τῳ τῆς Θεadelphiaς καὶ ἀλλῶν
5 [καὶ ἐτὸς μεμετρήμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν γεννήματον
[τοῦ ἱερῆ(ἀτοσος) ὀκτωμακαίδεκατού ἐτους Αθηναρίδων]

2nd hand
[Δίδυμος μεμετρήμεθα πυρόδε ἄρταβας ἐκοσὶ δῦο ἡμείς,
[ἐπιβολῆς πυρ(ο)ῦ δῦο δύμηρον,
10 [. . . . . ] ἐς πυροδέ ἡμ[ε]ίς τρίτων,
[ἐκτὸν, / τοῦ πυροῦ ἄρταβαι κες φ', καὶ τα προ(σ)μετρούμενα]

3rd hand (?) [. . . . . . ] ἐς μεμετρήμεθαι πυροδέ ἐπιβολῆς ἄρταβας ἐκοσὶ ἡς [ἐκτὸς, / (πυροῦ ἄρταβαι) κες φ'.

2. τραιανῶν Παπ. 9. l. διμορροφ.

'The eighteenth year of the Emperor Caesar Nerva Traj anus Optimum Augustus Germanicus, the 12th of the month Caesar, We, Didymus and partners, sitologi of the toparchy of Theadelphia and other villages, have had measured to us from the produce of the present eighteenth year by Athenarion . . . . for the cateoci of Theadelphia twenty-two and a half artabae of wheat, of which smoothered by rice measure, for the extra charge two and two-thirds artabae of wheat, for . . . . five-sixths of an artaba of wheat, total 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ artabae of wheat and the additional payments.' Signatures of two sitologi.

7. The abbreviation κατοίκων(ων) is written very cursively, the letters between the κ and ὕ losing any distinctive shape; but there is more than κω, to which the abbreviation was generally reduced (cf. introd. to xli, lxxxiv. 9 and B. G. U. 716. 12, where κατοίκων preceding by a village name is perhaps to be read). The meaning of the abbreviated entry over the line is uncertain; most probably Σω( ) is the name of a village (cf. lxxxvi. 13), the home of Athenarion who paid land-tax at Theadelphia upon cateocic land leased to him there by Φιλ( ) Ἀρφοδ( ), to whom therefore, as the landowner, the payment was accredited; cf. introd.
8. [ἐνωρί]: cf. lxxxiv. 7, &c. The corn was not heaped up, but only allowed to fill the measure which was then 'smoothed' with a piece of wood; cf. Wilcken, Oit. I. 769.
9. On ἔσιδολη see Wilcken, *ibid.* p. 193, and cf. B. G. U. 515. 7 τὰ ἐπίφρον ἐποιότατα, and 519. 15 τῶν δημοσίων καὶ ἀνωτέρω καὶ παντοῦ ἔσιδολη. What the precise nature of the ἔσιδολη was and whether it was regular or an extraordinary contribution is uncertain. Possibly here it or the payment in the next line has some connexion with the δικουρία or extra charge of \( \frac{1}{4} \) in Brit. Mus. Pap. 193. The tax of \( \frac{1}{2} \) to 2 artabae on the aroura in that papyrus is, we conjecture, the land-tax upon catoecic land (the πέδων which occurs frequently there falls on κατοικεῖον; cf. introd. to xii). Cf. Wilcken, *ibid.* pp. 194 sqq.


11. The προσμετροῦμενα in receipts for taxes paid in kind are the equivalent of the προσδιαγραφόμενα in the case of those paid in money. In Brit. Mus. Pap. 193 the προσμετροῦμενα amount to about \( \frac{1}{3} \), in Ixxixi to about \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the main sum.

13. ἐπατια(ν): cf. lxxxi. 9 and B. G. U. 792. 12. The meaning is obscure.

**LXXXII. Receipt for Payment in Kind.**

Harlt. 20-5 x 8-5 cm. A.D. 145.

Acknowledgement by the sitologi of Berenici-on-shore of the payment of 74½ artabae of wheat and 38½ artabae of barley from the κληροῦχοι of Berenicia and others; cf. introd. to lxxxi.

'Ωνος Ἡρώνος καὶ οἱ
μέτοχοι τοῖς κατοικοῦντας
Βερνικίδας Ἀγγαλὸῦ [με-
μετρήθησα τῇ κα]
καὶ καὶ Καὶ τοῦ Μεσορῆ 
[τοῦ Μεσορῆ 
[τοῦ 
[τοῦ Εὐστάτως η (ἔτους) Ἀστανείνου 
Καλαροσ τοῦ κυρίου 
τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους πυροῦ μέ-

τριφό δημοσίῳ ἄρταις
ἐβδομήκοντα τριτον 
τετρακαιο[ν]τριακὸν, δὲν 
κληροῦχοι Βερνικίδας (πυροῦ ἄρταις) ἦν τῇ [κῶ, 
tελωνικῆς ἀτελείας Ἀδριανῆς 

οὐσίας μιαθ( ) (πρῶτον) Ἰουλίου 
Ἀσκληπιαδοῦ (πυροῦ ἄρταις) αὐτῆς, 
Ἀπολλονιάδος κληροῦχοι 
(πυροῦ ἄρταις) βεδ, / αἱ προκείμεναι.
καὶ τῇ καὶ διὰ κληροῦχ(ων)
20 (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) δ (ἡμισν) ἴβ', καὶ
κρηθήσ ἀρτάβας τριά-
κοντα ὀκτὼ δίμοιρον,
(πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) δ (ἡμισν) ἴβ', κρηθήσ (ἀρτάβαι) λη β'.
'Προς Ἡρωνος καὶ οἱ μέτοχοι
25 [σιτολόγου διὰ Χαίρημονος θῆ-
σ[. . .]]. φον μεμετρήμεθα
τὰς τοὺ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας) οἰ (ἡμισν) γη, κρηθής)
(ἀρτάβασ) λη β' [21. κριθ written over an obliterated word. 25. δ of δω cor. from χ.]

3. Berenicis Αἰγαλοῦ was on the shore of Lake Moeris, probably to the north of Κασρ el Banát; cf. p. 14.

14. τελωνεῖ(ς) ἄτελείας: cf. xl. 3 ἀποστήσαμεν τελωνεῖς ἄτελείας and B. G. U. 199 verso 1, where a payment ἐπὶ τῶν θυσίων is coupled with τελωνεῖς ἄτελείας. It is clear from the present passage that this curiously named charge fell upon the μοιχωταὶ οἰκίσκοι, i.e. the lessees of the oikiai belonging to the emperor; cf. introd. to xl.

15. πράξας is expressed by ο', as in lxxxvii. I. 6. The Julius Asclepiades here is probably identical with the 'philosopher' mentioned there.

25-6. Νulist ὑσανυφόλ(λακών).

LXXXIII. RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT IN KIND.

Κασρ el Banát. 28.5 x 8.2 cm. A.D. 163.

Acknowledgement by the sitologi of Euhemeria of a payment of 4½ artabae of wheat 'for the κάτοικοι of Euhemeria' to the account of Sarapis, daughter of Sarapion. On the importance of this papyrus see introd. to lxxxi.

["Ετους τρ[ι]του Αν[τ]ωνίνου
[καὶ O]δήρου τῶν κυρίων
Σ[εβαστών], Ἐπειφ ἑ. Σαβείνος
Εὐμερεῖάς
5 μέ[με]τρήμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν
γενη[μάτων] τῶν αὐτοῦ (ἐτοὺς) εἰς
Σαραπιάδα Σαραπίνων"]
DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

Εὐεῖ (μερείας) κατολίκων (πυροῦ) μέτρων δημοσίω
[ξυστῷ ἐπαιτον ἄρταβας] τέσσα-
10 ρᾶς τρίτου τετρακαιεἰκοστῶν,
(πυροῦ ἄρταβαι) δ ᾑκθ, καὶ τὰ προσήμερούμενα).

LXXXIV. RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT IN KIND.

Ub. el 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. No. 10224. 12-2 x 10-8 cm. A.D. 163.

Acknowledgement by the sitologi of Νέστου ἐπολίκου, a village near Bacchias, of the payment of 1½ artabae of wheat 'for the κάτωκοι of Hephaestias.' The payment is made by Petosiris, probably a γεωργός, to the account of Kopes (?); cf. introd. to lxxxvi.

"Ετός τρίτου Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Μαρκου Ἀντιπάτρου Αὐτοκράτορος
Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Ανωτέρων Ἀντιπάτρου Οὔζερον Σεβαστοῦ,
5 Μεσείρι Κρήνων Ζωίδου καὶ μέ-
τοχος Νέστου ἐπολίκου μετρή-
νεωματάς τοῦ διεγενεσθέντος β' ἐτῶν Κοπήν Ἀρ-
τάλων διὰ Πετόσιρου Ἡρακράτου κατοικίας
10 (πυροῦ ἄρταβην) μὲν ἐκτὸν, γῇς (ὑπερ) (πυροῦ ἄρταβην) α' ε',
καὶ τούτων τὰ προσήμερούμενα).

5. Zωίδου Ραπ.

LXXXV. RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT IN KIND.

Harit. 19-7 x 9-3 cm. A.D. 247.

Acknowledgement by the decemprini, who in the third century take the place of the ἁπειδότου in this class of receipts (cf. B. G. U. 579), of 60¾ artabae of wheat and 6¾ artabae of barley ἐπὶ δημοσίων, and 3 artabae ἐπὶ κατοικίων, paid by Patereus; cf. introd. to lxxxii. The papyrus incidentally shows that
the *decemprimi* were not all members of the *boulē* (cf. note on line 3). A remarkable extra charge occurs in lines 12–13.

The writing is on the verso, the recto being blank; the papyrus is a real exception to the rule that the recto is first used.

Aὐρήλιοι Ὄρειοι ἐξηγητεύσας πρι-

tανεύσας καὶ Ἡρᾶς γυμνασίαρχος καὶ Τούρβων

cοσμητὴς καὶ ἐξηγητεύσας βουλευταῖ

cαὶ Σερήνος γυμνασίαρχος πάντες τῆς Ἀρωνοῦ πῶλαν

5 ἰκάπρωτοι ταύτα τῆς τοπορχείας θεμ(ιστοῦ),

ἐμετήθησαν ἐν δηο(αυρῷ) κάμης θεαδελφίας

ἀπὸ γενημάτων γ' (ἐτούς ὑπὲρ δημος(ἐν) ἅπτης ὄνοματος Πατερεύτου

ἀπάτορος μέτρο δημοσίῳ ἄμποτο

πυροῦ ἀρτάβας ἐξήκοντα ἤμισον τέταρτον.

10 τοῦ γ'(μντο) (ἀρτάβαι) ε' (ἐμισον τέταρτον), κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) γ' (ἐμισον

τέταρτον), καὶ ὑπὲρ κατοικίων

τῆς αὐτῆς πυροῦ ἀρτάβας τρεῖς,

γ'(μντο) (ἀρτάβαι) γ' ἐσχομέν  ἐπὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πυροῦ

tου ὁμολογόω. (ἐτούς) δ' Ἀὐτοκράτορος

Καῖσαρος Μάρκου Ὑσαύλου Φιλίππου

15 Εὐσεβεῖς Εὐσυνείδης καὶ Μάρκου Ὑσαύλου

Φιλίππου γεναιοτάτου καὶ ἑπὶφανεστάτου

Καῖσαρος Σεβαστῶν, Τύβι κυ.

2nd hand Αὐρήλιος Σερήνου γυμνασίαρχος σεσημειώμαι. (3rd hand) Αὐρήλιος

Τούρβων κοσμητὴς καὶ ἐξηγητεύσας βουλευτής

20 σεσημειώμαι.

7. ἀπὸ γενηγ(ἐτοὺς) and ἱματος over the line. 9, 11. ταῦτα. 10. κριθ (ἀρτάβαι)

γ' (ἐμισον τέταρτον) over the line. 12. τοῦ over the line, πυροῦ corr. from τοῦτον.

3. βουλευταῖ: from the position which this word occupies it appears that Serenus who followed was not a βουλευτής; cf. line 18 where βουλευτής does not occur in his signature. The opinion of Menadier (Wilcken, *Ost.* 1. p. 626) that the ἰκάπρωτοι were not necessarily βουλευταῖ is therefore confirmed against the view of Waddington adopted by Wilcken.

12. The reading ἐπὶ(φ) is very doubtful, but there is some word between δὲ and πυροῦ. The nature of this extra charge is quite obscure. If it corresponds to the προσμετρητήματα found e.g. in lxxxii. 11, it is remarkable that it should be in money. The mention of obols suggests a comparison with the νόμβιοι and κόλλαζοι taxes (intro. to xii) which are associated with (probably) the land-tax in Brit. Mus. Pap. 193.
LXXXVI. Account of a Sitologus.

Harl. 23.4 x 11.2 cm. Second century.

An account of payments of wheat, barley, and lentils received during the month Phaophi from various classes of persons in several villages; cf. B. G. U. 835, lxxxvi (a), ccc, and cccxi. Three kinds of payments occur: (1) (ἀπὸ) δὴ(μοσίων), i.e. rent of holdings paid by δημόσιοι γεωργοί (cf. introd. to lxxxi); (2) δὴ( ) φο( ), a small charge more or less proportionate to that for δὴ(μοσίων). δὴ stands for δι(αφόρου) and φο for φα(μέτρου), as is shown by lxxxi (a). 11, and an Amherst papyrus in which δι(αφόρου) φο(μέτρου) occurs. The charges for freight are kept separate throughout the papyrus, and are added up separately in line 2, though included in the grand total in lines 1 and 27. Another payment is found in line 3 in connexion with the δημόσιοι γεωργοί and consists of two abbreviated words, διω(κήσεως) ἐκφο(ρίου), so that it is really identical with the first; see introd. to lxxxi. Payments of land-tax by κλημονήκοι also occur several times, but κάστικοι are not mentioned.

The villages from which the tax-payers came are Theadelphia, Euhemeria, Polydeucia, Dionysias, Philagris, Philoteris, Autodice and two others, all of which were in the division of Themistes, and Oxyrhynchus in the division of Polemo.

On the verso is a tax-receipt (lxiv).

1 [Συνήχθησαν] εἰσδοχῇ τῶν Φαϊ(φί) τοῦ γ (ἔτους) ἀπὸ λη(μμάτων) β (ἔτους) διο(κήσεως) ἑτορ(άρταβαι) υκ (τή(ταρτων), κρι(θῆς) ἐ(άρταβαι)
    ἑ(ὁμοιού) τέταρτων.
2 φακ(οῦ) ἐ(άρταβαι) ρκ ἵβ', δι(αφόρου) φο(μέτρου) (πυροῦ ἐ(άρταβαι) ἐ(ήμοιον) ἱ', φακ(οῦ) ἐ(άρταβης) ἠ(ὁμοίον) ἵβ', ἵν
3 Θεα(δελφείας) δι(α) δη(μοσίων) γεωρ(γίων) διο(κήσεως) ἐκφο(ρίου) (πυροῦ
    ἐ(άρταβαι) ἐ(ή'ν, κρι(θῆς) ἐ(άρταβαι) ἐ(γκ) ἵν, φακ(οῦ) ἐ(άρταβαι) ναι 
4 προ(μετρομένα) (πυροῦ ἐ(άρταβαι) θ(ὁμοιοῦ) ἵ'ν, κρι(θῆς) ἐ(άρταβης) ἠ(ὁμοίον)
    ἵ', φακ(οῦ) ἐ(άρταβαι) ἵβ' ἵβ', (πυροῦ ἐ(άρταβαι) ἵ(ὁμοιον), κρι(θῆς)
    ἐ(άρταβαι) ἐ(γκ) ἵν, φακ(οῦ) ἐ(άρταβαι) ἵ'ν 
5 [...]. κρι(θῆς) ἐ(άρταβης) (τή(ταρτων), φα(κοῦ) ἐ(άρταβης) ἵν', καὶ δι(α)
    [κ]λη(μονήκοι) (πυροῦ ἐ(άρταβαι) ἠ(ὁμοίον), κό(μης) (πυροῦ ἐ(άρταβαι)
    πη καὶ τά γ ὃ,)
6 [κριθης] (αρταβαι) ε (ημιου) η', φ(ακου) (αρταβης) . . .] κδ. Ευθη(μερειας)
δη(μοσιων) δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας) (πυρου αρταβαι) η(ημιου)
κδ, κριθης (αρταβαι) δ βκδ,

7 φακου (αρταβαι) κδ,

8 δι(α) κλη(ροχων) (πυρου αρταβαι) ιβ β", κριθης (αρταβαι) ιθ (ημιου)
[κδ", / καμης] (πυρου αρταβαι) η (ημιου) η', κριθης (αρταβαι) κδ
(τεταρτων), φ(ακου) (αρταβαι) κδ.

9 Πολυσεκειας δη(μοσιων) δι(α) των απο της καμης (πυρου αρταβαι)
α γιβη, δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) (πυρου αρταβης) κδ".

10 και δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας) (πυρου αρταβαι) λβ, κριθης (αρταβαι)
κη γιβη, (φ(ακου) (αρταβαι) δ. κδ, δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) (πυρου αρταβης)
(ημιου) β", κριθης (αρταβης) (ημιου),

11 φ(ακου) (αρταβης) β".

12 και δι(α) των απο Φιλαγ(ριδος) (πυρου αρταβαι) η, δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) γη,;

13 και δι(α) των απο Συντ( ) φ(ακου) (αρταβαι) κα, δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) φ(ακου)
(αρταβης) (ημιου),

14 και δι(α) κλη(ροχων) (πυρου αρταβαι) ε (ημιου), δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) ιη,
/ καμης (πυρου αρταβαι) με (ημιου) γιβη, κριθης (αρταβαι) κη γιβη.

15 [........................] φ(ακου) (αρταβαι) λα . κδ, δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) (πυρου
αρταβης) (ημιου) γιβη, κριθης (αρταβης) ([ημιου], φ(ακου) (αρταβης)
(ημιου) β".

16 [......] δη(μοσιων) δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας) (πυρου αρταβαι) δ γη,

17 [και δι(α) των απο Φιλαγ(κριδος ?) (πυρου αρταβαι) η, [ / καμης] (πυρου
αρταβαι) οδ γη,.

18 Διονυσιαδος δη(μοσιων) (πυρου αρταβαι) ιε. Φιλαγ(κριδος) [δι(α) κλη(ροχων)
(πυρου αρταβαι) η (ημιου) ιη', δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) γη,.

19 Φιλαγ(κριδος) δι(α) κλη(ροχων) (πυρου αρταβαι) ζ γκδ.

20 Αυτοκηθης δη(μοσιων) δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας) (πυρου αρταβαι) γη,
δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) (πυρου αρταβης) ε' κδ.

21 Α. ( ) δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας) (πυρου αρταβαι) β κδ", δι(αφορου)
φο(ρετρου) β".

22 και οπ(ερ) λη(μματων) Πολεμιονος οχρων δι(α) των απο Θε(αδελφειας)
(πυρου αρταβαι) με (ημιου) γη,.

23 δι(αφορου) φο(ρετρου) δ γιβ,
24 καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Συντ (κριθή) (ἀρτάβαι) ἵ(ἡμιον) ὑ', δι(αφόρου) φο(ρέτου) α' γ',
25 καὶ κόμησις (πυρὸς ἄρταβαι) μ' (ἡμιον) γη', κριθή (ἀρτάβαι) ἵ(ἡμιον) ὑ',
δι(αφόρου) φο(ρέτου) (πυρὸς ἄρταβαι) δ' γηβ', κριθή (ἀρτάβαι) α' γ'.
26 καὶ ὑπ(ερ) λημμάτων ἁ (ἔτους) Θεαδελφείας δι(ά) δη(μοσίων) γεω(ργῶν)
κριθή (ἀρτάβαι) λέη.
27 / αἱ προκείμεναι διο(κήσεως) (πυρὸς ἄρταβαι) υπ(κήρατον), κριθή (ἀρτάβαι)
(ἔτους) ρθ (ἡμιον ἑτάρατον), φι(ακοῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) ρκ ιβ'.

10. η γεία in the entry for κριθή is written above the line over an erasure.
1. διο(κήσεως): the word is here used apparently in its limited sense applying to payments on behalf of the government as opposed to payments on behalf of the temples; cf. xii. 1, 12.
The correctness of the totals in this line and the next can be verified in five out of the six items; owing to the lacunae in lines 5 and 10 in the fractions of two amounts of lentils we are not able to fill up the lacunae there.
4. Out of the three totals obtained by adding the προσμετρώμενα to the preceding sum, two, the 78½ aratae of wheat and the 59½ aratae of barley are not quite correct, 68½ + 9¼ aratae of wheat making a total of 77½, and 4½ + ¼ aratae of barley making 5. The addition of the lentils is right.
5. The lacuna at the beginning of the line no doubt contained a statement of the nature of the two small payments which follow. δι(αφόρου) φο(ρέτου) is out of the question, for these two payments are not included in the freight total in line 2. δη(μοσίων) followed by δι(ά) . . . is more likely.
καὶ ἡ γη( ) : the meaning of this phrase (cf. xxxviii) is obscure.
6. τῶν ἄτο Θε(αδελφίας): γεωργοί whose domicile was at Theadelphia but who cultivated land at Euhemeria; cf. line 9 and lxxxvi (a). 8–9, and introd. to lxxxi.
9. Πολ(εικείας): this village was near Theadelphia; cf. cviii. 11 and p. 14.

LXXXVI (a). ACCOUNT OF SITOLIOI.

Harit. 23.6 x 19.5 cm. A.D. 161–169.

An account of receipts during ten days by the sitolioi of Theadelphia. The payments are made partly by δημόσιοι γεωργοί, partly by κληροῦχοι, and there are small charges for freight; cf. introd. to lxxxi and lxxxvi. The first two lines are a later addition in a smaller, but probably not different, hand. On the verso is a short account.
FAYUM TOWNS

]. ἀπὸ α ἐνος τοῦ Ἐπείφ μηνὸς

5 [τοῦ ... ἐτοὺς] Ἀντωνείνου καὶ Ὀνήρου κυρίων
[ἀπὸ τῶν γενη[ματῶν]] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐτοὺς (πυροῦ ἄρταβας) Ἐν[ν]τ[τ] (ἡμίον]
[τρέτον) η', ὅν
[διὰ δημοσίωςς(ν) γεωργίω(ν) (πυροῦ ἄρταβας) 'Βροβ β', φορετ(ρου) κλ( ) (πυροῦ
ἀρτάβας) ἐ γκθ],
/ διὰ δημοσίωςς(ν) γεωργίω(ν) [(πυροῦ ἄρταβας)] Ἐν[ν]τ[τ] (ἡμίον) η', / κάμης) (πυροῦ ἄρταβας) Ἐν[ν]τ[τ] β', καὶ ὑπὲρ
ἀλλων καὶ αἱ

10 Πολυδευκ[είας] δημοσίωςς(ν) διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Θεαδελφ[είας] γεωργίω(ν) (πυροῦ
ἀρτάβας) Ἐν[ν]τ[τ] (ἡμίον) 1'β',

diaφορον (πυροῦ ἄρταβας) τ[ο(ν) ἡμίον) κ'β'.

2. γκθ is written above the line over an erasure.
7. θ(προέκυκτου) naturally suggests itself (cf. cccxxxviii); but the payment is by δημοσίωςς
γεωργίω.
10. Cf. lxxxvi. 9-10 and introd. to lxxxvi.

LXXXVII. Payment through a Bank.

Kašê el Banât. 22.8 x 30.9 cm. A.D. 155.

Receipt for various sums paid into a local bank, probably at Euheremia, by the overseers of some estates belonging to the corporation (ὁλος) of the city of Alexandria. These were situated at Euheremia, and had formerly belonged to a 'philosopher' named Julius Asclepiades (cf. lxxxii. 15), who had presumably bequeathed them to the city; and it is the rentals (φορος) of these estates, which were managed by ἐπιτηρηταί, that are the subject of the receipt. The document is of much interest, not only as affording an indication of some of the sources from which the wealth of Alexandria was derived and the manner of their acquisition, but also as an illustration of the development reached at this period by the banking system. The money paid into a local bank in the Fayûm was to be paid out to a person at Alexandria. This person would naturally not have to wait for the coin to be actually transported. The mutual relations and organization of the local bank and the bank at the capital were such that money paid into the one could be drawn at the other.

The papyrus is written in a remarkable hand, which presents at first
sight an almost Byzantine appearance, mainly due to the thickening of the extremities of the rather large and heavy semiuncial letters.

Col. I.

"Ετοὺς η' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου Αὐλί[ος]ν
'Αδριανοῦ Ἀντωνεῖνος Ζυμβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς,
Μεχ(ειρ) κ.ξ. ἐπολήσεν ἔπι ζῆν Τίτου Φλ.αουλοῦ Εὐτυχ(ξο)ν τράπεζαν εὐδαιμονίων Σαραπίων κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) ἐπιτηρηταί
5 ὑπαρχόντων οἰκῶν πόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείων
(πρόστερον) Ἰουλίου Ἀσκληπιάδου φιλοσοφοῦ(ν) ὄντων περὶ
kῶμῆς[ν] Εὐβοιρείαν εἰς φόρον(ν) ἵ(ς ἔτους) τάλαντο[ν]
ἐν καὶ δραχμ(ὰς) τετρακισεκατός ἐπὶ τῷ τὸ ἔτος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δοθήναι τῷ ἔτει τῶν
10 στεμμάτων προκεχ(ρισμένω) γιά τάλαντον α(δραχμαί) Α.
'Επειφεὶ ἦ, ὁ ἄυτ(ὸς) κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) ὄμοιοι εἰς φόρον(ν) ἵ(ς ἔτους)
tάλαντον ἐν κ(α)ὶ δραχμ(ὰς) χειλίας τετρα-
kοσίας, ἰ(σ) πρόκειται
(τάλαντον) τάλαντον α(δραχμαί) Αν.
15 φόρο(ν) ἐν (ἕτους) δραχμ(ὰς) χειλίας, ἵ(ς πρόκειται) (δραχμαί) Α.
'Αδριανοῦ ἦ ὁ ἄυτ(ὸς) κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) ὄμοιοι εἰς φόρον(ν)
[ε]ν (ἕτους) δραχμ(ὰς) χειλίας ὑπὲρ[κοσίας], ἰ(σ) πρόκειται [(δραχμαί) Αν.
[Φαμεκαδῆ] ζ., ὁ ἄυτ(ὸς) κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) εἰς φόρον(ν)
19 ἐν (ἕτους) δραχμ(ὰς) δια[χι]λαίος, ἵ(ς πρόκειται) (δραχμαί) Β.
20 'Επειφεὶ ἦ, ὁ ἄυτ(ὸς) κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) εἰς φόρον(ν) ἐν (ἕτους) δραχμ(ὰς)
δια[χι]λίαια, ἰ(σ) πρόκειται (δραχμαί) Β.

Col. II.

κ (ἕτους), Φαώφι ε, ὁ ἄυτ(ὸς) κ(α)ὶ μέτοχοι(οι) εἰς φόρον(ν)
25 ἐν (ἕτους) δραχμ(ὰς) χειλίας ..., ἰ(σ) πρόκειται (δραχμαί) Α[.]


' The 18th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Mecheir 27. Paid into the bank of Titus Flavius Eutychides by Eudaemon, son of Sarapion, and partners, overseers of the property belonging to the corporation
of the city of Alexandria and formerly to Julius Asclepiades the philosopher, situated at the village of Euhemeria, for the rent of the 17th year, one talent and four thousand drachmae, on condition that an equivalent amount should be paid at Alexandria to the official in charge of the stemmata, total 1 tal. 4000 dr. Epeiph 8, by the same person and his partners, as before for the rent of the 17th year, one talent one thousand four hundred drachmae, total as above written 1 tal. 1400 dr. &c.

I. 5. οἶκον πόλεως: cf. lxxxviii. 5, where the phrase recurs, πόλεως apparently there referring to Arsinoë. A similar use of the word οἶκος is found in Ox. Pap. I. 127. 1 ὁ Ἱλάβους οἰκεῖ σφενλυπηχοῖ φύσει.

9. τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων: the same title is known to have existed at Antinoë from an inscription dedicated to Severus Alexander in a.d. 232-3 (C. I. G. 4705) πρεσβύετος Ἀρμηλίου 'Πραγμάτων τῶν καὶ Ἀσκληπίων Βουλευτῶν γεμίστηρος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν στεμμάτων, στέμμα here has apparently the sense of ordo or familia, for which cf. C. I. G. 3995 b, 9897.

LXXXVIII. RECEIPT FOR RENT.

Hait. 22.4 x 10.2 cm. Third century A.D.

Receipt issued to a cultivator by the nomarch acknowledging payment of the year's rent for a plot of land which had belonged to the Queen of Ptolemy Neos Dionysus, and was now apparently part of the common property of the city of Arsinoë. That land was owned by cities and villages is shown both by the preceding papyrus and by Pap. Gen. I. 16, B. G. U. 659. II. (Socnopaei Nesus), C. P. R. 39 (Hermopolis), 41 (Obthis in the Hermopolite nome); and it is probable that such communal land is generally meant by the phrase δῆμους γῆ. A parallel for the survival of the distinguishing title of land which had in Ptolemaic times been included in the royal domains is found in B. G. U. 512, where the Φιλάδελφου οὐσία is coupled with the γῆ βασιλικῆ and γῆ προσόδου. In that instance, too, the land had not improbably been the property of a queen, Arsinoë Philadelphus, from whom it had passed to the temples; cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. 1502.

Ἀπίων νομάρχης διὰ “Ἡρωνος
Ἡρακλέαργον γεωργῷ καὶ μετόχις(οις) χαίρειν.
ἐσχον παρὰ σοῦ τὸ ἐκφόροιν
οὗ γεωργεῖς κλήρων περὶ κόμην.
5 Θεοδελφείαν οἶκον πόλεως βασίλεισις Πτολεμαίου Νέου Διονύσου ὑπὲρ γενήματος δο-
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On the verso

10 ἀποχή Ἡρακλῆσ(α) καὶ μετήχει(ν).

2. καὶ μετέχε inserted above the line.

'Apion, nomarch, through Heron, to Heracleus, cultivator, and his partners, greeting. I have received from you the rent of the plot cultivated by you near the village of Theadelphia belonging to the corporation of the city and formerly to the Queen of Ptolemy Neos Dionysus, on account of the produce of the twelfth year, in full. The twelfth year, Epeiph 22.'

2. γεωργὸς: Heracleus is not called a δημάρχος γεωργός, but that no doubt was his correct title; cf. xviii (a), 1.

5. ἰδὼν πόλεως: for ἰδὼν in this sense cf. lxxxvii. 5. note. πόλεως in the Fayûm more naturally refers to Arsinoë than to Alexandria, and that Arsinoë is meant may be concluded from the fact that the receipt is issued by the nomarch.

LXXXIX. Loan of Seed.

Κατ’ ελ Βανάτ. 26-8 x 9-5 cm. A.D. 9.

Acknowledgement of a loan of vegetable-seed and barley for a period of four months. No interest was required for the loan, as was sometimes the case with loans in kind (cf. xc and Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 674); but in case the borrower failed to return it at the specified date, he was pledged to pay ten times the amount of vegetable-seed, and no doubt the barley at a similarly high rate, though the exact proportion is lost. For the severity of the penalty cf. xi. 31.

The papyrus is dated at the top in the 38th year of the Κράτησις of Augustus, and below this after a large blank space follows the contract headed by another date, 'the 38th year of Caesar' simply, which also occurs in lines 14, 15. This double method of dating by the Κράτησις and by the ordinary regnal year is found in B. G. U. 174; and the identity of the numbers of the years of the Κράτησις and of the reign proves that both were reckoned from the same point of time. The method of dating by the Κράτησις of Augustus, of which this papyrus offers the fifth instance, originated, as is shown by Wilcken (cf. Ost. I. pp. 787, 788), in a decree of the senate establishing an era in Egypt reckoned from the date of the capture of Alexandria; cf. Dio li. 19, 6. The innovation had little success, and except on coins of the opening year of Tiberius' reign no traces of the era have been found later than Augustus' death.
The contract has been cancelled in the usual manner by cross-strokes of the pen, implying that the loan had been repaid.

"Ετοὺς ὀγδόου καὶ τριακοστοῦ τῆς
Καῖσαρος κρατήσεως θεοῦ νῦν,
μηνὸς Ἀρτεμισίου ἐκτη Φαμε-
νώθ ἐκτη, ἐν Πηλονίσῳ τῆς Θε-
5 μίστου μερίδος τοῦ νομίου.
ἐτοὺς λῃ Καῖσαρος, Φαμενώθ(θ) ἕ, ἀναγέγραπται
ἐν Πη(λονίσῳ) γρ(αφεῖο) . . . ἐν .
Πεθεῖς Πάτρωνος Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς
ἀθολόγοι ἔχειν παρὰ Ἀκουσηλάου τοῦ
10 Θέωνος παραχρῆμα [. . .]. ης λαχανω-
σπέρμου νῦν καθαρῷ ἀδύντων
ἀρταβῶν ἡμίσους καὶ κριθῆς ἀρταβῶν ἕξ
ἡμίσους, πάντα δὲ ἀποδόσω εν μηνὶ
Παῦνι τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ὀγδόου καὶ τριακοσ-
15 τοῦ ἐτοὺς Καῖσαρος ἐν Πηλονίσῳ μέτρῳ
τετάρτῳ. εἶν δὲ μῆ [ἀποδῷ ἐκτίσω
τοῦ μὲν λαχανωσπέρμου ἐκάστης ἀρταβῶν
ἀρτάβας ἀρταβῶν] ἡμίσια τῆς δὲ κριθῆς ἀρ-
[τάβας] . . . . . . .

16. ε of εκτίσω corr. from l.

The 38th year of the dominion of Caesar, son of the god, the sixth of the month Artemisius which is the sixth of Phamenoth, at Pelusium in the division of Themistes of the (Arsinote) nome.

The 38th year of Caesar, Phamenoth 6, registered in the record office of Pelusium. I, Petheus, son of Patron, a Persian of the Epigone, acknowledge the direct receipt from Acusilas, son of Theon, of two and a half artabae of vegetable-seed, new, pure, and unadulterated, and of six and a half artabae of barley, and I will repay the whole in the month of Pauni of the present 38th year of Caesar at Pelusium, measured with the quarter measure. And if I do not repay I will forfeit for each artaba of vegetable-seed ten artabae and, for the barley . . . .

5. Ἀρταβῶν is to be supplied before μήν, the omission being probably a mere inadvertence and caused by the homoiooteleton of τοῦ.

7. It would be just possible to read the letters after γρ(αφεῖο) as αφε and to suppose that the scribe after making the mark of abbreviation following γρ proceeded to add the three next letters of γραφεῖο. But this is not very satisfactory, apart from the fact that ῞ is palaeographically not probable.
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10. [...] eis: a substantive like χρήσις or δανείον is expected; either this word or ἀρταβάς κ.τ.λ. should have been in the accusative.

16. τετάρτως: sc. of an artaba; cf. Wilcken, Ost. L. p. 750. In xc, 14 the measure to be used is described as μέτρῳ ἑδεκαμέτρῳ which is difficult to account for. This might be equivalent to μέτρῳ ἑδεκατάφ, an eleventh part measure; or it might mean a measure containing eleven μέτρα. But an eleventh part of an artaba would be a very surprising fraction; and an artaba only contained ten μέτρα. It is not easy to say which alternative is the least objectionable.

XC. LOAN OF SEED.

Harit. 21 1 x 9 7 cm. A.D. 234.

Acknowledgement of a loan of vegetable-seed, to be repaid in the following month. In this case also, as in the preceding papyrus, no interest was required; but the lender was to have the choice of accepting either the seed or its value in money, estimated according to the highest current price.

"Ετοὺς τρισκαιδεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Μάρκου Αὐρήλιου Σεβοῦρων
'Αλεξάνδρου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐσυχοῦς
Σεβαστοῦ, μηνὸς Γερμανικ(ε)ίου Παχῦν θ,
5 εν Πτολεμαίδι Ευεργέτιδι τοῦ Ἀρσι(νοῦτου) νομοῦ. δι-
μολογεῖ Αὐρήλιος Πολιών Παμείων μη(τρός)
Ταβόεος ἀπὸ κα(μής) Σοκνοπ(αίου) Νήσου ὅσ
ἐτῶν λ οὐλ(ῆ) γαστροκην(μη) ποδὸς δεξιῶν Αὐρη(λῆς)
'Αγ(α)θεῖνῳ Ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀπὸ ἀμφόδον(υ)
10 Δινευέοιν ἔχιν παρ’ αὐτοῦ ὁ Αὐρήλ(λιος) Πολίω(ν)
χ[ρή]σιν ἐν γενὶ λαχανοπέρμου ἀρτάβας
τρ[ίς], καὶ ἐπάναγκον ἀποδώσιν αὐτὸν τῷ
Αὐρη(λῆς) ἑν μη(ν) Παῖνι τοῦ ἐνεσ(τῶτος) ἐν (ἔτος)
ἐν ἐποικίῳ Πισαιε μέτρα δεκαμέτρῳ
15 ἀνυπερβῆτος, ἐγιογῆς ὀδης τῷ Αὐρη(λῆς).
'Αγ(α)θεῖνῳ ἤτοι τὸ λ[α]ξανόπ(ερμον) λαμβάνων
ἐναρέστων ἐν τήν ἐπὶ τοῦ καιροῦ ἐσομένην) πλ(ἰστη
c(ερεί), γενομένην) αὐτῷ τῆς πράξεως ἐκ τοῦ
d[ο]λ(ογερετου) καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχοντων αὐτῷ πάντω(ν)
20 καὶθά(περ) ἐγί δικῆς, μένοντος τῷ Ἀγαθεῖνῳ

Q
On the verso

\[\text{γοδίανον} \, \text{περὶ \, ἀλλαξέοις \, ὀφείλει αὐτῷ \, ὁ \, \text{Πω-λίων} \, \text{καθ' \, ἡ \, γράμματα \, \{καὶ \, ἐπερατηθεῖς\} \, ὀμολογησεν.}\]

5. πτόλεμαιδε \text{Pap.} 6. ποίμεν \text{Pap.}

The 13th year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, the ninth of the month Germanicus or Pachon, at Ptolemais Euergetis in the Arsinoite nome. Aurelius Polion, son of Paimus and Tabous, of the village of Socnopaei Nesus, aged about 30 years, with a scar on the thigh of his right leg, acknowledges to Aurelius Agathinus, son of Agthus, son of Alexander, of the Linen-factories’ quarter, that he, Aurelius Polion, has received from him a loan in kind of three artabae of vegetable-seed, and that he is under the obligation of repaying them to Aurelius Agathinus in the month Pauni of the present 13th year at the farmstead of Pisa without delay, measured by the eleventh part measure, Aurelius Agathinus being allowed the choice of receiving either the vegetable-seed in good condition or the highest current price at the time being, and having the right of execution upon the borrower and all his property as if in accordance with a legal decision. Agathinus also retains his claim to the other debts owed to him, according to contracts in his possession, by Polion; and he (Polion) in answer to the formal question gave his consent.

4. \text{Γερμανίας\, \text{Παχών\, \text{Γερμανικοῦ\, here must be a slip for \text{Γερμανικός\, which is known from numerous instances to have been the same as Pachon, while the month \text{Γερμανικός\, corresponded to Thoth according to the statement of Suetonius (\text{Domit. 13,}\, which is confirmed by \text{Ox. Pap. II. 266. 2 (note \text{ad loc.}}.}}}

10. \text{Ἀνυφθεῖον\, an \text{Ἀμφολοῖον\, at Arsinŏė.}

14. \text{The \text{ἐπόδειον \text{Ποσαί\, was near the village of Heraclea (B. G. U. 446. 6).}}}

16. \text{μέτρῃ \text{ἐπεδείκτερῳ\, cf. note on LXXXIX. 16.}}

17. \text{τῷ \text{ἐπὶ τοῦ \text{καμπύ}} \text{κ.κ.λ.\, so also a similar loan of \text{A.D. 238 in \text{Mittheil. Pap. Rainer, II. 31, where however the lender has no \text{ἐκδοχή.}}}}

XCI. **CONTRACT FOR LABOUR IN AN OIL-PRESS.**

\text{Καστ ελ Βανάτ. \text{24.1 x 10 cm. \text{A.D. 99.}}}

This document relates to the affairs of Lucius Bellenus Gemellus, for an account of whom see introd. to cx. It is a contract for the engagement of a woman named Thenetkoueis to serve for the season in an oil-press belonging to Gemellus at a daily wage, the exact amount of which is not stated, but of which she receives an advance of 16 drachmæ.

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}

\text{Φασάζει \, \text{ὅτι\, ὀμολογοῦσα \, Θενετκούεις \, πράξαι \, Δούκιος(η).}}

*Etous τρίτου \text{[Αμφατραὶος \text{Καίσαρος \text{Νερόια}}}
Τραγανοῦ Σε[β]αστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, Φαώφι ὁκ-
τωκαί[δεκάτη, ἐν Εὐ]μερεῖᾳ τῆς Θεμίστου
5 μερίδος τοῦ Ἀρ[σιωνείου] νομοῦ. Ὡμολογεῖ
Θεντκουνεῖς "Ἡρ[ωνος] παρεμβάλλουσα Περ-
σείη ὡς ἐτῶν ἐκκοι ὡς ὀὐλὴ ἀντικνωμό-
θεῖα, μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ συγγενεῖς Δεοντᾶ τοῦ
Ιππάλου, ὡς ἐτῶν πεντήκοντα τεσσάρων
10 οὐλὴ μετόποι ἐγ[θεῖαν, Δουκίων Βελλήνῳ]
Γεμέλλου ἀπολογο[θ]μοῦ ἀπὸ στρατείας εὐλειον( )
ὡς ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα ἐπτὰ οὐλὴ ἀντὶθείρει ἀριστ[ηρ],
ἀργυρίῳ δραχ[μάς] δέκα ἐξ ἀραβαδων ἀναπόρει-
15 φων ἐπάναγ[κ]δου ὡς παρεμβαλεῖν τὴν Θεν-
τκουνεῖν ἐν [τ]οῖς ὑπάρχοντι τῷ Δουκίων Βελ-
λήνῳ Γεμέλλῳ [ἐν] Ἐδημερεῖᾳ ἑλαιοργίῳ
καρποῦ ἐκτεπ[π]τωκότας εἰς τὸ ἐνεστύς)
20 τρίτων ἐτῶν, ποιοῦσαν πάντα ὡς καθῆκει
παρεμβαλλόμενον μέχρει ἐγβάσεως πάσης
ἐλαιοργίας, λαμβάνουσαν παρὰ τοῦ Δουκίου
Βελλήνου τῆς ἡμέρησιν μισθῶν ὡς
ἐπὶ τῶν ὄροις παρεμβαλλούσων ἐν
25 τῇ κόμη, ὑπολογήσασιν δὲ τῶν Δουκίων
τᾶς τοῦ ἀργυρίῳ δραχμάς δέκα ἐξ κατὰ
μέρος ἐκ τῶν ἐσομένων μισθῶν. ἐν
δὲ μὴ ποιή ἡ Θεντκουνεῖς κατὰ τὰ προ-
γεγραμμένα ἀποδόσιν αὐτή[ν] τῷ Δουκίῳ
30 τῶν ἀραβαδων διπλοῦν, γεινομεθνῄς τῷ
Δουκίῳ Βελλήνῳ τῆς πράξεως ἐκ
τῆς ὑμελογοθῆς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὑπαρχοῦσιν αὐτῆ[ν] πάντω[ν]
καθάπερ ἐγι δικῆς. ὑπογραφεῖς τῆς Θεν-
τκουνεῖ[ς] Δεοντᾶς ὁ προγεγραμμένος.

2and hand 35 Θεντκουνεῖς "Ἡρωνος Περσίνη μετὰ κυ-
ρίῳ τοῦ συγγενεῖῳ Δεοντᾶ τοῦ Ιππάλου
ὅμολογοὶ ἐχειν παρὰ τοῦ Δουκίου τᾶς
Q.2
FAYUM TOWNS

tou ἀρήσμανον ἀγρυπνὸν ὑπακόα δέκα ἕξ, καὶ παρεμβαλὼν ἐν τῷ ἱπατοργῷ

40 ἀφ' ἑαυτὴ ἡμέρας [ἦν] μοι παραγίδης

λαμβάνουσα παρὰ σοῦ Δουκίου τοῦ μισθόν

ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων παραμβαλλοῦνταν καὶ ἐ-

καστα ποιήσω καθὼς πρόκειται. Λεοντᾶς

γέγραφα καὶ ὕπερ τῆς [Θενετκουΐτος]

45 μὴ ἱδότος γράμματα.

1st hand ἐντέταξαί γα (ἔτους), Φοίβη ἦ, διὰ "Ἡρώνος

tοῦ πρὸς τῷ γραφεῖῳ Εὔημερείας.

3rd hand Λουκιος Βελλήνος Γέμελλος διὰ(τ)

Ἐπαγαθῶν ἀπέχω τὰς προκιμένας

50 καὶ οὖθεν ἐνκαλοῦ

In the left-hand margin, at right angles

ἀγρυπνὸν ὑπακόα δέκα ἕξ. (ἔτους) πέμπ(τ)ον Αὐτοκράτορον Καῖσα-

ρος Νερώνα Τραϊανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, Τὐβ(ε) 1β.

On the verso two short nearly effaced lines.

1. l. Θενετκουΐτος. 8. συ of σύγγενους corr. 14. l. ἄρησμαν; so in 30. 32. η of

τῆς rewritten. 40. l. ἑ. 42. l. παρεμβαλλοῦσαν. 45. l. εἴδικον.

'Phaophi 18, agreement of Thenetkouei with Lucius. The third year of the

Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus, Phaophi 18, at Euhemeria in

the division of Themistes of the Arsimoite nome. Thenetkouei, daughter of Heron,

olive-carryer, a Persian, aged about 26 years, having a scar on the right shin, acting

with her guardian her kinsman Leontas, son of Hippalus, aged about 54 years, having

a scar on the forehead to the right, acknowledges to Lucius Bellenus Gemellus, discharged

from military service with the legion(?), aged about 67 years, having a scar on the left wrist,

that she has received from him directly from hand to hand from his house 16 drachmae of

silver as unexceptionable earnest money. Thenetkouei is accordingly obliged to carry

at the olive-press belonging to Lucius Bellenus Gemellus at Euhemeria from whatever day

he orders her the olive produce included in the present third year, performing all that a

carrier should until the completion of the entire oil-manufacture, and receiving from

Lucius Bellenus her daily wage at the same rate as the carriers in the village; and Lucius

shall reckon off the 16 drachmae of silver by instalments from her wages. If Thenetkouei

does not act in accordance with the conditions above written she shall pay back to Lucius

double the earnest money, and he shall have the right of execution upon her and upon

all her property as if in accordance with a legal decision. Attestor. on behalf of

Thenetkouei, Leontas the aforesaid.' There follow the signature of Thenetkouei written

by her guardian Leontas, the docket of the record office at Euhemerea, and the signature of

Epagathus on behalf of Gemellus acknowledging that he had received back the

16 drachmae.

6. παρεμβαλλοῦσα: παρεμβάλλειν is clearly a technical term for some process in
the manufacture of oil commonly performed by women (cf. 24 παραμβάλλωνων). The 
meaning seems to be to put the olives into the press, to feed the press with olives.

11. ἐγενομένοις( ) looks like a mistake for λεγόμενο(ν) or ἐν λεγόμενο(ν). For ἀπολύσιον ἐκ
cf. B. G. U. 326. II. 15 ἀπολύσιον ... ἐκ εἴλαρσης.

47. There are traces of ink after ἐκείνης, but these may be accidental; it is difficult 
to see what could have been added here, but cf. lxxix. 7.

48 sqq. This signature acknowledging the repayment of the 16 drachmae advanced 
to Thenetkoueis cannot mean that she failed to fulfil her agreement, for in that case 
she would have had to pay 32 drachmae (l. 30). The implication rather is that her 
part was duly performed, and these 16 drachmae were deducted from her wages. Why 
this acknowledgement that she had discharged all obligations should have been delayed 
until two years after the date of the contract we cannot tell.

XCI. Sale of a Donkey.

Harit. 19'3 x 7'2 cm. A.D. 126.

Agreement for the sale of a young female donkey at the price of 
56 drachmae. This is rather a low figure; cf. the statistics as to prices of 
donkeys and camels collected in the introd. to lxvii–lxxvi.

"Ετοὺς ἐνδε[κ]άτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Ταρανοῦ Α[δρίανο]ν[α] Σεβ[αλ]στ[ί]ον,
μηνὸς Σεβασ[το]ῦ Θαύθ ἵπτεν Θεα-
θελεία τῆς Θεοματίου μερίδος τοῦ

5 Ἀρακνοῦν νομοῦ. ὑμολογεῖ
Μυσταρίου Ἡρωνος ὅς ἐπὶ

τεσσαράκοντα ὑόλη δακτύλωι μικροῦ
χειρὸς ἀριστερᾶς Σαταβοῦτι
Πεκύσιος ὅς ἐπὶ ντρίκοντα ὑόλη

10 δακτύλωι μικροὶ χειρὸς ἀριστερᾶς
πεπράκεναι ἀντίῳ ὄνοι δήλιαν

πρωτοβδοῦν μι[δ]χρονον ταῦτην

τοιαύτην ἀναπύρηφον καὶ ἀπέχειν

τῶν Μυσταρίων παρὰ τοῦ Σαταβοῦτος

15 τὸν συνπεφωνημένην πρὸς

ἀλλήλους τειμήν ἀργυρῶν

δραχμάς πεντήκοντα ἐξ
παραχρήμα διὰ χρόνος ἐξ οἶκου καὶ βεβαιώσει πάντως βεβαιώσει.

2nd hand 25 Μυσθαρίων Ἡρώνος ὑμο- λογώ πεπρακέναι τῷ Σαταβοῦτι δὲ ὑψὶ θῆλειαν προσβολὸν ταύτην τοιαύ- την ἀν' ἀποθερμίου καὶ ἀπέ-
25 χ[ι]ν τὴν τιμὴν ἄργυρίου δραχμῶν πεντήκοντα ἥδε, καὶ βεβαιότατον καθὼς πρόκειται. ἐγένοντον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλείδης Ἡρακλείδης
30 [μή] εἰς δότος γράμματα.

1st hand (?) ἐντολ[εί] δίδ[α] ὑπὸ τὸν Ἡθεδελφῆς γραφεῖον.

On the verso

πρόσαγις Μυσθαρίων
πρόσα Σαταβοῦν

δένα λ λ.

2. τραίανον Παπ.

'The 11th year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, the 16th of the month Sebastus or Thoth, at Theadelphia in the division of Themistes of the Arsinoite nome. Mystharion, son of Heron, aged about 40 years, having a scar on the little finger of the left hand, agrees that he has sold to Satabous, son of Pekusis, aged about 30 years, having a scar on the little finger of the left hand, a female mouse-coloured donkey, shedding its first teeth, just as it is irrevocably, and that Mystharion has received from Satabous the price agreed upon between them, 56 drachmas of silver, directly from hand to hand out of his house, and that he will guarantee the sale with every guarantee.' Signature of Mystharion written for him by Heraclides, and docket of the record office at Theadelphia.

6. Μυσθαρίων: more correctly spelled in the signature Μυσθαρίων. Cf. xxxiii. 11 Μύστης.

23. Or perhaps πρωτεύθ(ων) μοίχ(ου)μών.}

XCIII. LEASE OF BUSINESS IN PERFUMERY.

Harl. 22-9 x 8-8 cm. A.D. 161.

A proposal for the lease of a share in a perfumery business. The lessor was himself the holder of a half share of this business in the division of
Themistes, and he now agreed, according to his signature at the foot of the document, to accept 45 drachmae for a quarter part of his share, markets and festivals being, however, excluded from the contract. It is not clear from the terms of this lease whether the perfume trade was a monopoly, granted by the government to certain individuals, which was now being sublet, or not. The lessor may be supposed merely to be parting with a share of a private business, just as a part-interest in a profession or trade can be bought or sold to-day. But the similarity of this contract to xxxvi, and—what is more important—the fact that the lessor apparently owned half the business in perfumes of the whole division of Themistes, gives much probability to the view that the perfume trade, like those of the brickmaker and fuller, was the subject of a monopoly. Cf. introd. to xxxvi.

Κάστορι Ἀντιφίλου Σωσικοσμίῳ τῷ
cαι Ἀλβαῖι
pαρὰ Σαραπάνων Αρτεμιδόρων
tοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἀπὸ ἀμφόδου
5 Χηνοβοσκίων Ἑτέρων. βούλομαι
μισθώσασθαι παρὰ σοῦ τὴν μυρο-
pωλικὴν καὶ ἀρωματικήν ἐργασίαν
θέλων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος σοι
ἡμίσους μέρους τέταρτον μέρος
10 Θεμίστου μερίδος (2nd hand) χαρίς ἅγιο-
ρῶν σοι πανηγύρεσιν
πρὸς μόνων τὸ ἐνεστὸς
β (ἐτος) φόρου τοῦ παντὸς ἄρ-
γυριου (δραχμών) τεσσεράκοντα πέν-
15 τε, ὅτι καὶ τὴν διαγρα-
φὴν ποιήσομαι κατὰ
μήνα τὸ αἴρον εξ ἵσου
ἐὰν φαίνηται μισθώ-
σαι. (3rd hand) Κάστορ Ἀντιφίλου μερί-
20 σωκα κατὰς πρόκειται.
ἐτος [β] Αντωνίνου καὶ (Οὐήρου
τῶν κυρίων Σεβαστῶν,
Θώβ e.
6. ἵπποςκεφάλη. 7. ἱπποκεφάλη. 8. ἀπο inserted above line. 20. ἱπποκεφαλή.

To Castor, son of Antiphilus, of the Sosicosian or Alkeian deme, from Sarapion, son of Artemidorus, son of Ptolemaeus, of the Second Goosefarm quarter. I wish to lease from you your business of perfume-selling and unguent-making, being desirous of the fourth part of the half-share falling to you in the division of Themistes, with the exception of markets and festivals, for the present second year only, at a total rent of 45 drachmae of silver, which I will pay monthly in equal instalments if you consent to the lease. (Signed) I, Castor, son of Antiphilus, have made the lease as is above written. The (second) year of Antoninus and Verus the lords Augusti, Thoth 5. 16-17. καρα μηνα το αλεον: so too in the similar contract Brit. Mus. Pap. 286. 18-19, where we prefer the editor’s καρα μηνα το to Wilcken’s καρα μηνα (Archiv, I. p. 157).

XCIV. TERMINATION OF GUARDIANSHIP.

Kašš el Banāt. 20-4 x 12-4 cm. A.D. 222-235.

This papyrus, the mutilation of which is very unfortunate, is a formal release given by an orphan girl to her late guardian, acknowledging that she had no further claims upon him, and that she was in possession of all her property. The document is signed by the ward and by both the guardian and his mother, who make a declaration that they had acted in good faith. Guardians for children under age could be appointed by will (cf. e.g. B. G. U. 86. 18); in cases of intestacy the duty of making the appointment devolved upon the praefect, as is shown by a papyrus found last winter at Tebtunis. A documentary release was probably the usual accompaniment of a severance of the relations between guardian and ward; but the present papyrus is, so far as we are aware, the first actual example.

"Ετος  Μάρικον Ἀδρηλίου Χερνήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἐσσεβδούς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
velopment Effect? τοῦ Ἀρσινοείτου
νομοῦ. ὑπολογεῖ
μητρὸς] Λουσίας ἀπὸ κόμης Θεγοῦ[ν]δος μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ
ἀντόρδος Ἀδρηλίου Ἐρμία Ἦρακλεοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς
κόμης
τῷ γενομένῳ τῆς ὀρφανείας αὐτῆς ἐπιτρόπῳ ἀπολ[...

Αδρηλίῳ Σαραπάμμωνι] Παλλίδωνος μητρὸς Τυραννίδος ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κόμης
ὡς ἐτῶν... οὕτῳ μετάκις μη ἐνκαθίν ἀγαθῶν ἔπελευσασθαί
αὐτὴν
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μηδὲ ἄλλον ] ἐπὶ τῶν Αὐρήλιου Σαραπάμμων περὶ μηδενὸς

τοῖς τῇ

ἐπιτροπείᾳ ] ἀνηκότων καὶ συμμετέχαν αὐτὴν [...] οις

ηθεῖοι καὶ τοῖς καταχωρισθεῖσι εἰς μνημονεύων

Αὐρήλιος

] μηδὲ ὀφιλήματος μηδὲ παντὸς τῷ καθόλου

ἐπὶ δικαίου [γαρίμματος ἢ [ὲ]τέρου τινὸς συμβόλου

μέχρι τῆς [ἐνεστώτης ἡμέρας τρόπῳ μηθείν καὶ

ἀπεσχηκέναι αὐτὴν [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῆς καὶ ἄπο τῶν]

γαῖα α. [............] 2nd hand? Αὐρήλιος

Τυρίαννης καὶ Αὐρήλιου Σαραπάμμων

] τῷ ὀμολογηθείσαν ἀπὸ τῶν [μέχρι τῆς] ἐνεστώτης ἡμέρας τρόπῳ μηθείν]

ἀπεσχηκέναι αὐτὴν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῆς καὶ ἄπο τῶν]

��이σιν σύμβολα ἀμφότεροι δὲ η. []

20

Αὐρήλιος Σαραπάμμων πίστειν [δέδωκα καὶ ἔγραψα

ὑπὲρ τῆς

μητρὸς ] Διηρήλιος Σαραπάμμων πίστειν δέδωκα ὡς πρόκειται.

3rd hand

ἀπὸ κιόμης Θεογράφιδος μετὰ κυρίον τοῦ δεδομένου τοῦ [ομολογοῦ] μηθέν μὴ ἐνκαλεῖν τῷ ἐπιτροπῷ Αὐρήλιῳ

Σαραπάμμων περὶ

τῶν τῇ ἐπιτροπείᾳ ] ἀνήκοτων ἄλλα καὶ ἐνδεδεχεῖν αὐτῶν []

ἀπέξειν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα μοι ὡς πρόκειται []

25

24. ἐνείσθη.

1. It is probable that Αὐρήλιος Καίσαρος as usual preceded Μαύρος, and that the lacunae at the beginnings of the lines amount to at least twenty-eight letters; if the numeral after ἐποὺς was written out the number of letters lost would be still larger.

5. ἄπολυμποι οὐ ἄπολυμποι ἢ?


12. The reference appears to be to documents and receipts written during the period of guardianship; cf. 19.

XCV. LEASE OF AN OIL-PRESS.

Harth. 13 x 8-7 cm. Second century.

Proposal addressed to Achilleus, through his guardian Sarapion, by Apollonius for the lease of an oil-press at Dionysias for four years at the
rent of one metretes six choes of both olive and raphanus oil with various extra payments. This papyrus, together with xci and xcvi, shows clearly that in the Roman period ἐλαιωρτεῖα were owned by private persons. The government monopoly of oil-manufacture, which existed in the Ptolemaic period, seems to have disappeared, though ἐλαιωρτεῖα belonging to the government occur, e.g. in Brit. Mus. Pap. 280; cf. introd. to xxxvi.

It is remarkable that while in the Ptolemaic period sesame and castor oil are the two most important varieties and olive and raphanus oil are not even mentioned in the Revenue Papyrus, in the Roman period the papyri quite support the statement of Pliny (N. H. xix. 5) about the extensive use of raphanus oil in Egypt, and the evidence of Strabo, who states (xvii. 35) that the Arsinoite nome ἐλαιωρτεῖον . . . μόνον ἐστὶ μεγάλοις καὶ τελείοις δένδρεσι καὶ καλλικάρπῳ. Sesame and castor oil occur but rarely in Fayûm papyri of the Roman period, but in many cases where ἐλαῖον simply is mentioned it is quite uncertain whether olive or sesame oil (which ἐλαῖον simply in the Ptolemaic period usually meant) is intended. In the present papyrus, however, as in xcvi, the phrase ἐλαῖον ἐλαῖον leaves no doubt that olive oil is meant.

The lacunae in the text have been largely supplied from a papyrus with a very similar formula in Lord Amherst’s collection.

[A]χιλὶ τῷ καὶ Χαραπάμουνι διὰ Σαραπίανος φροντιστοῦ [παρὰ Ἀπολλωνίου Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Σωτηρίου ἀπὸ ἀμφόδου λεγομένου Χηνο-

βοσκιῶν. βοσκομαί μισθώσασθαι πα-

ρὰ (σοῦ) ἐφ’ ἐτη δ’ ἀπὸ τριακάθος τοῦ ἐνεστὼτος) μνῆν Μεσορῆ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων

σοι ἐν κάμη Διονυσίας ἐλαιωργίαν ἐ-

π’ ἀμφόδου Ἀποκρησταίων ἐλαιωργίαν

έπεξηρτιεμένον ἐξ[ο]ὶ ἐν φ’ 

μηχαναὶ δύο καὶ χαλκίον . [ σὺν

tοῖς οὕτως ὑπερωτεῖ τύποις πᾶσιν, τελεσώ δὲ

καὶ[θ] ἐτος σύνπαντι λόγῳ [ἐλαίου ὑλιστοῦ

μετρητὴν ἕνα χοινές ἐξ καὶ ραφανίνων

δύο ὑμίοις μετρητὴν ἕνα [χοινὲς ἐξ, πα-

ρέχον καὶ θ’ ἐτος ἀμεσθεσίοις ἐλαίου

ραφανίνον κοστίλαι ἐξ καὶ [
χα[ω]ν δώδεκα καὶ κ[ε]
ελαίου κοτόλαι ε[ξ] [κ[ε]ι δέ] χο[ῶν]
20 δώδεκα, τ[ί]ν δέ προ[σ]κλησι[ν] φόρον ἀπο-
δώσω ἐν μη[ν] Φ[αμενοίθ] ε[ξ]
ελαίου ὀλιστὸν μετρητὴν ἐνα χοι[ς] ε[ξ], ἐν δὲ
μη[ν] Παυνί ὁμοίως μετρητὴν ἐνα
χο[ἰς] ε[ξ], ἀπαντά μέτρῳ θ[ε]
25 σύν [ἀ]ποχύματι ἐκάστῳ σ[ε]
os κ[ε]τυλῶν δύο ληψ[ψ]

elαίου Παρ. 24. χοί Παρ.

'To Achilles, also called Sarapammon, through his guardian Sarapion, from
Apollonius, son of Apollonius, son of Soterichus, from the Goose-farm quarter. I wish
to lease from you for four years from the thirtieth of the present month Mesore,
of the oil-presses owned by you at the village of Dionysias one oil-press in the Harpocrates
quarter, fitted with a wheel . . . and containing two machines and a caldron . . . with
all the appertaining upper rooms, and I will pay each year in all one metretes six
choes of strained olive oil, and likewise one metretes six choes of raphanus oil, providing
every year at the harvest six cotylæ of raphanus oil and . . . twelve choes, and . . . six
cotylæ of olive oil and . . . twelve choes, and I will deliver for the aforesaid rent in the month
of Phamenoth one metretes six choes of strained olive oil, and in the month of Pauni
likewise one metretes six choes (of raphanus oil?), all measured by the measure . . .'

10. διαστησουσι: in the Amherst papyrus, where the rent is 7 σεράμμα of raphanus
oil, a chous is to be paid at the διαστησουσι.
24. Probably θησαυρική or θεοῦ.

XCVI. RECEIPT FOR RENT OF AN OIL-PRESS.

Harl. 20-2 x 9-5 cm. A.D. 122.

A notice issued through the bank of Sarapion, probably at Arsinoë, by
Syrus to Nemesas, stating that he had paid Nemesas 5 metretae of oil, being the
year's rent of an oil-press belonging to Pompeius Ptolemaeus, a gymnasiararch,
of whose property Nemesas was acting as guardian. Cf. introd. to xcv. It
is remarkable that the payment, though in kind, is made through a bank,
a proceeding for which we have not been able to find a parallel. On the
nature of these διαγραφαί and the inversion of the formula found in ordinary
receipts see Mitteis, Trapezitica, pp. 30 sqq., Gradenwitz, Einführung in die
Papyrikunde, p. 139. The present document is not a complete receipt since the signature of the receiver of the money is wanting.

Ετοὺς ἐβδομοῦν Αὐτοκράτορος
Καΐσαρος Τίτων Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Αντωνέινον
Σεβαστοῦ Ἐυσεβοῦς, Ἀθὸρ κθ, διὰ τῆς Σαρα-
πίωνος τραπέζης Πτερούτ [.]κου.

5 Σύρος Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου
ἐλαιουργός Νεμεσάτη Ἡλιοδώρου τοῦ
Εὔδαμους ἁπὸ ἀμφότερος [.]κου ὡς
ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἀσήμιοι ἀπέχει
τὸν Νεμεσάτη παρὰ τοῦ Σύρουν φόρον.

10 τοῦ διειληθυῖτος ἔκτου ἔτους Αντωνέινον
Καΐσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ὦ ἔχει ὁ Σύρος
ἐν μυσθώεις ἐλαιουργίου τοῦ ὑπάρχον-
τος τῷ φροντιζομένῳ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ
Πομπηίου Πτολεμαίου ἐνάρχου γυμνα-

15 σιάρχου ἐλαίου μετρητᾶς πέντε,
ὡς ἑλαίου μὲν μετρητᾶς δύο ἡμῶν
καὶ βαμβακίου τῶν λοιπῶν μετρητᾶς
δύο ἡμῶν, καὶ μεθὲν αὐτῷ ἐνκαλεῖν
περὶ τούτων, μενοῦσθαι κυρίας τῆς

20 μυσθώσεως ἐφ’ οἷς περιέχει πάσης.

10. 7 of τοῦ κοιτ.

'The seventh year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus
Augustus Pius, Athur 29, through the bank of Sarapion in the quarter of . . . Syrus,
son of Alexander, son of Alexander, oil-maker, informs Nemesas, son of Heliodorus,
son of Eudaemon, from the quarter of . . . , about forty years old, with no distinguishing
mark, that Nemesas has received from Syrus the rent of the past sixth year of Antoninus
Caesar the lord for the oil-press leased by Syrus and owned by Ptolemaeus,
gymnasiarch in office, of whom Nemesas is guardian, namely five metretae of oil, consisting
of two and a half metretae of olive oil, and the remaining two and a half metretae
of rapanus oil, and that Nemesas has no claim against him on this matter, the lease in all
its provisions remaining valid.'

4. It is not clear whether the bank of Sarapion was at Arsinoe or in a village.
At the end of the line Πτερούτος [.]κου might be read. The name of an ἀμφότερον would
be expected, but none of this name is known.

7. Perhaps [Αξήμοι]: but this ἀμφότερον is not known in the Fayûm though ἀμφότερα
Αξήμοι and Λύκου occur at Arsinoe.
13. φρουτσισουσίνας: since Pompeius Ptolemaeus was a gymnasarch, the fact that Nemessas was acting as his curator is more probably to be explained by the absence of Pompeius (cf. B. G. U. 447. 21 ὅτι ἐν ἔτειμι τοῦ(φ), φρουτσισουσίνας ἐν ἔμαι) than by his being under age.
16. Ἰαίνων: cf. introd. to xciv.

XCVII. Receipt for a Share of an Inheritance.

Καστάρ Βανάτ. 27 x 7.8 cm. a.d. 78.

Receipt for 20 drachmae paid to Maron as his share of an inheritance from his deceased father, by his younger brother Onnophris. The acknowledgements of the two brothers are written for them by their ὑπογραφεῖς, though the elder also adds his own signature in rude uncials. The papyrus is in a bad state of preservation and the writing extremely cursive, especially the signatures at the end.

"Ετοις ένθεκτατον Αὐτοκρατόρος
Κάισαρος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, μηνὸς
Νέου Σεβαστοῦ ζ., ἐν[ε] Εὐθυμερεία τῆς Θεόμας-

3 ὡμολογεῖ Μάρων πρεσβύτερος
Οὐνόφρεως ὡς ἔτοιν τεσσαράκοντα ὑπὲ-
tα οὐλὴ μετάπτω τοῖς εαυτοῖς ὑμο-
πατριῶς ἀδελφῶν 'Οννόφρι ὡς ἔτοκεν
dίκαι ὕψωσιν ὑἄμοι, τῶν ὑμῶν.

10 γούνατα Μάρωνα ἄπειχεν παρὰ τοῦ
Οὐνόφρεως ἀργυρίου δραχμᾶς
ἐκόσι παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς
dιὰ ἔργος ἔργος ἐν[ε] τοῦ
cou aι εἰσὶν δ[ε]παγίσασθαι δ[ε]ποῖ τοῦ
tετελευτηκότος αὐτοῦ παρῆς.

15 'Ον[ν]όφρεως τοῦ 'Αφροδίσιον
κατὰ με[ε]ρίαν ἦν ἦν ἔνειμεν
ἡμεῖς περιών, καὶ κηθέν
τῶν Μάρωνα μηδὲ τινα παρῆ ἀυτοῦ
τῶν ἀδελφῶν 'Οννόφρι μηδὲ τὶν ἔδει παρῆ.

20 [αὐτοῦ] ἐνκαλεῖν μηδὲ ἐπικαλεῖν
FAYUM TOWNS

μηδὲ ἐπελεύσεσθαι τῶν περὶ τὴν ἀπο-
χὴν ταύτην καὶ μηδὲν ... τῇ ὁ-
μολογίᾳ επαμ ... [.] . . . . [.] . . . .
με Μάρωνος ὅποιοι γράφοντες Παππίων(ν)
25 Χάρητος ὁ(σ) (ἐτών) μ. ὁδή(γ) ἐκ(αί)κ(τύλω) μ.[(κρφ) χί(ρός) ἀριστ(εράς)
"Ηρων Παπ(πίων) ὁ(σ) (ἐτών) νῆ/ ὁ(λή) δακ(τύλω) μ[(κρφ) χι(ρός)
ἀριστεράς.

2nd hand Mάρων πρε(σβύτερος) ὁ[ν]νόφρεως
ὁμολογῶ ἀπέχειν π' ἀρά τοῦ
ὁμοπτηρίου μου [ἀ]δελφῶν Ὀννόφρεως
30 παραχρήμα διὰ χιρός ἐξ ὧν
ἀργυρόν δραχμὰς εἰ(κ)οσι αἱ εἰσ-
ν διαταγείσι[σ] αἱ μοι κατὰ μερίτ-
αν ἀπὸ τοῦ τετελευτη(κότος)
μου πατρὸς Ὀννόφρεως Αφροδισίο(ν).

35 καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνκαλῶ οὐδὲ ἐνκα-
λέσιν καθὼς πρόδικεται. ἐγρ-
ἀφέν ὑπὲρ [ἀ]δελφῶν Βραδέω(σ) γρά-
φοντος Παππίων Χαρῆτον.

3rd hand Mάρων πρεσβύτερος Ὁν-

40 ὁφρεως ἀπέχω καὶ οὐθὲν
ἐνκαλῶ κ[α]δ[α]β[ώ]ς πρόδικ-
αι. (4th hand) Ὀννόφρ(ψ) ὁ[ν]νόφρ(ψ) ὁ[ν]
[. . . .] . . . . . [.] . . . . [.] . . . . [.] 
45 [. . . . .] ἀποχὴν ἐν τοῦ ἀντικράτορος Καίσαρα(σ)

[τῷ Ἐὐδίῳ(μερείας) ἡρ[αφεῖρ.]

On the verso

ἀποχὴ [Μάρων(ν) πρὸς (Ὁ)νόφρ(ψ) [. . . .]ο[. . . .]

29. 1. ἀδελφῶν. 30. 1. ἀλον. 35. 1. ἕρκαλων for ἐνκαλεῖν. 38. 1. Χάρητος.

'The eleventh year of the Emperor Caesar Vespasianus Augustus, the 7th of the month Neos Sebastus, at Euhemeria in the division of Themistes in the Arsinoite nome.
Maron the elder, son of Onnphris, about forty years old, having a scar on his forehead, agrees with his brother on the father’s side, Onnphris, about eighteen years old with no distinguishing mark, that he, Maron, has received from Onnphris twenty drachmæ of silver directly from hand to hand from his house, being the sum bequeathed by his deceased father Onnphris, son of Aphrodisius, in accordance with the division which he made between us while he was alive, and that neither Maron nor any representative of Maron makes any claim or charge against his brother Onnphris or any representative of his, and will not proceed against him for anything concerning the present receipt...

Descriptions of the two ἐπιγραφεῖς, acknowledgement of Maron written by one ἐπιγραφεῖς, brief acknowledgement by Maron himself, signature of Onnphris written by the other ἐπιγραφεῖς, and docket of the registry office of Euhemeria.

44. The last four lines are written in a very minute scrawl; μὴ ἔδωκες γράμματα is of course meant, but we cannot reconcile this or the ordinary variations of it with the vestiges. Similarly at the end of 46 διὰ τῶν πρᾶξ... is required (cf. xcviii. 28), but does not seem to have been written.

XCVIII. RECEIPT FOR HOUSE-RENT.

Kaşr el Banât. 21-2 x 10-8 cm. A.D. 123.

Acknowledgement by Heraclides and Nilus of the receipt from Tauris of a year’s rent for a house at Euhemeria which was leased to her by them.

["Ε]τοὺς ὁγγίδου Αὐτοκράτορος Καῖσαρος

Τραματοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σέβαστοῦ, μηνὶς Περιτίου e
Χαλάς e, ἐν Εὐνήμεραι ἡς Θεμιστοῦ μερίδος
τὸ Ἀρ[β]σίου[νετάν νομόν. ὁμολογοῦσι Ἡρακλείδης

5 Φιλα[δῆ]λφον ἄναγγελον ἐπὶ ἀμφόδου Ἰηρᾶς
Πύλης] ὅς ἠτῶν τρικόντα ἐξ ὀμβρη [γ]όνατι ἀριστερῷ
καὶ Νελος Ἡρων ὁ ἀναγγελόμενον ἐπὶ ἀμφοδοῦν

Διονυσίου Τόπων [ὡς ἐτῶν εἴκοσι πέντε ἀσίμων
Ταῦρι Ἀτρείους ὡς ἠτῶν πεντάκοντα ἀσίμων

10 μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρίος] Πνεφερῶτος τοῦ Πνεφε-
ρῶτος ὁς ἠτῶν πεντάκοντα πέντε ὀλίθ πηχί
ἀριστερῷ, ἀπέχειν τοὺς ὁμ[ο]λογο[ὺ]νται παρὰ τῆς
Ταῦρων τὰ ἐνοικία τοῦ διηλειμμών ἐβδόμου
ἐποὺς Ἀδριανοῦ Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ὅς κατοκεί

15 αὐτῶν κοινωνικῆς ὁλίγας] ἐν κώμῃ Εὐνήμεραι,
καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς μηδὲ τοῖς παρ’ αὐτῶν τῇ Ταῦρι
μηδὲ τοῖς παρ’ αὐτίς ἐνκαὶ[χι]εῖν] μηδὲ ἐπελεύσεσθαι(αi)
περὶ ὧν ἀπέχουσιν ὅλες πρόκειται. ὑπὸ γραφείου τῶν ὁμολογοῦντων

Μύσθης

"Ἡρωνὸς ὁ(κ) ἐτῶν κ. ἀρν[ίων] (2nd hand) Ἡρακλείδης Φιλάδε-

20 λο[ή] καὶ Νεῖλος "Ἡρωνὸς ὀμολογοῦ-

25 μεν ἀπέχειν παρὰ τῆς Ταύρεως τα ἐνοι-

κα τοῦ διελθόντος ἐβδόμου ἐτῶν

Ἀδριανὸς Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ἡς κατοικί-

ἡρῶν κοινωνικῆς οἰκίας εἰς κώμῃ Εὐ-

εῖν [περαστεῖν], καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνκαλουμένοις κα-

θῶς [πρὸκειται]. ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Μύ-

σθῆς "Ἡρωνος μῆ[θ] ἑδόμον γράμματα.

1st hand [(ἐτῶν) ὁγ[εῖα], μνη Χ[ο]τ[α]χ ε, διὰ "Ἡρω[ῖς]


On the verso

30 ἀποχή ἑνοικίων(ν) ἄ(ἐτων) Τ[αύρεως]

8. τ. of τοιωτος corr. 9. ν of Ταύρι corr. fr. τ. 27. Above the second o of ἔθ[εως]

is o or w. l. εἰς[δί]των.

"The eighth year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, the
5th of the month Peritius=Choiach 5, at Euheremia in the division of Themistes
of the Arsite nome. Heracleides, son of Philadelphus, registered in the quarter of
the Sacred Gate, about thirty-six years old, having a scar on his left knee, and Nilus,
son of Heron, registered in the quarter of Dionysius' Region, about twenty-five years
old, with no distinguishing mark, acknowledge to Tauria, daughter of Hatterus, about fifty years
old, with no distinguishing mark, acting with her guardian who is her husband Pnepheiros,
son of Pnepheiros, about fifty-five years old, having a scar on his left fore-arm, that
they have received from Tauria the rent for the past seventh year of Hadrianus Caesar the
lord, of the house at Euheremia jointly owned by them at which she lives, and that neither
they nor their representatives have any claim against Tauria or her representatives,
and will not proceed against her or them for anything connected with the rent which
they here received as aforesaid. The attestor for the acknowledging parties is Myttæs,
son of Heron, about twenty years old, with no distinguishing mark." Acknowledgement of
Heracleides and Nilus written by Myttæs, and docket of the registry-office at Euheremia,

XCIX. RECEIPT FOR FARM-RENT.

Harl. 18-5 x 6-5 cm. A.D. 159.

Acknowledgement by Didyme of the receipt of 2½ artabae (of wheat?)
from her tenant Heron.
DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

Διδύμη ἡ καὶ Ματρώα Ἀσκληπιάδο(ν)υ μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ κυρίου (ἐνοῦ) φρει(ς) μοῖνον κλήρου [. .] ἀρτάβας δῶν τε [ταραθόν, τῆς ἀρταβείας καὶ τοῦ ναυβίου δι-
15 τος πρὸς σὲ τὸν πρὸς σὲ τὸν "Ηρώνα (ἐνοῦ) κβ." Ἀντωνίνου Καισα-
ρος τοῦ κυρίου, "Επίφης φη.

9. "παρὰ σοῦ over the line.

'Didyme, also called Matrona, daughter of Asclepiades, with her guardian, her cousin on the mother's side, Heron, son of Apollonius, to Heron, son of Satabous, cultivator, greeting. I have received from you the rent for the 22nd year of my plot which you cultivate, two and a quarter arabae, the tax of an arabæ and the naubion being payable by you, Heron. The 22nd year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Epeiph 28.'

11. If ἀρτάβας is right, the sign for πυρός is probably lost in the lacuna.

13. ἀρταβείας: cf. C.P.R.I. I. 16 καθαρὰ ἀπὸ μὲν δημοσίων τελεσμάτων πάντων καὶ ἐπίρων εἰδῶν καὶ ἀρταβείων καὶ ναυβίων καὶ ἀρματικῶν καὶ ἐπίθεσις κώμης. Probably the ordinary land-tax, which was sometimes about one arabae to the aroura on corn land (Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 207), is meant.

C. ORDER ON A BANK.

Harit. 25.5 x 11.3 cm. a.d. 99.

An order addressed to a banker by a woman called Aphrodous requesting him to pay two women both named Charition six hundred drachmae, being the price of half a house and appurtenances at Theadelphia, bought by her from them. At the end are acknowledgements of the receipt of the money by the two vendors, written by their respective husbands. The first part of the document is analogous to a modern cheque.

'Αφροδόου Σατ[ήρ]α(ο)ῦ μετὰ] κυρίου τοῦ συν-
γενοῦς Ἀμμανίου τοῦ Ἤρ(α)κλείδου Σαρβά
τῳ καὶ Διδύμῳ τραπεζ(α)ῆς ἐπὶ τῆς χα(ρί)ᾳ
μάτισον Χαρίτω τῇ καὶ Τασουχαρῳ
5 Χαρίδημου καὶ Χαρί(η)ῳ Διδύμου

III. R
μετὰ κυρίων ἐκάστης τοῦ ἀνδρός, τῇ
μὲν Χαρίτιφ τῆς καὶ Τασοκοστίφ Ἀπολλω-
νίου τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, [τῇ] δὲ ἄλλη ἡ-
ριτίφ Ἡρωνος τοῦ Διδύμου, τιμήν

10 ἡμέρους μέρους οἰκίας καὶ αὐλῆς καὶ τόπων
[καὶ τῶν συνυφόντων πάντων ἐν κώ-
[μή] Θεαδελφεία τῆς Θεμίστου μερίδος]
[ἀγιοὶ οἶκοι ταῖς γεγονόισι εἰς αἰχτάς
[. . .] ἵπτῳ καταγράφαις, ἂς ἐξίς μοι ἐν

15 δέματι ἄργυρίῳ δραχμᾶς ἐξακοσι-
[αγο], / (δραχμαὶ) Χ. (ήτως) Β. Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Νεαρόν Τρατιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, Τύβιν
κη. (2nd hand.) Χαρίτιον Διδύμου μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρός
"Ἡρωνος τοῦ Διδύμου καταχώρησον, καὶ ἀνίηραι

20 τὰς ἐπίβαλλονας μοι ἄργυριον (δραχμᾶς) τριακοσίων, / (δραχμαί) τ. "Ἥρων ἔγραψα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γυναικὸς μου μὴ εἰδυνής
γράμματα. (ήτως) δευτέρου Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Νεαρόν Τρατιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, Τύβιν κη.
3rd hand. Χαρίτιον ἡ καὶ Τασοῦ(δρ)ίου Χαριδήμου

25 μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἀνδρός Ἀπολλωνίου
τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἀνίηραι τὰς δραχμά-
ς τριακοσίας, / (δραχμαί) τ. Ἀπολλώνιος
ἔγραψα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γυναικὸς μου
μὴ ἱδείης γράμματα.

On the verso traces of four obliterated lines.

7. l. τῇ καὶ. 10. l. ἡμίσυνε. 16. l. ὅποσ με over the line. 19. l. ἀνίηραι, so in 26.
29. l. εἰδων.

Ἀφροδών, daughter of Satyros, with her guardian, her kinsman Ammonius, son of Heraclides, to Sambas also called Didymus, banker, greeting. Pay to Charition also called Tasiourchion, daughter of Charidemus, and Charition, daughter of Didymus, with their respective guardians their husbands, of Charition also called Tasiourchion Apollonius, son of Apollonius, and of the other Charition Heron, son of Didymus, the price of a half-share of a house and court and grounds and all the appurtenances at the village of Theadelphia in the division of Themistios in accordance with the legal contracts which I have made with them, the six hundred drachmae belonging to me which you have on deposit, total 600 dr. The second year of the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus, Tubi 28. Acknowledgements of the receipt of 300
drachmae each by Charition, daughter of Didymus, and the other Charition, written by their respective husbands.

8. τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου: Apollonius in his signature below (line 26) calls himself the son of Apion, so Ἀπολλωνίου here must be a clerical error.

14. Perhaps κύπελλος, but the vestiges of the letter preceding κύριος do not suit κύριος very well.

Cl. Account.

Kašr el-Banāt, 21.8 x 22.7 cm. About B.C. 18.

Both the recto and verso of this papyrus are occupied with accounts, those on the recto and in Col. II of the verso referring to payments in kind, those on the first column of the verso to payments in money. The payments in kind are made in wheat, cummin, lentils, and canecus, the last three of which are, in the main account, subsequently converted into wheat. One interest of the figures lies in the fact that among the fractions of the artaba mentioned are included fifths and tenths, which have not previously occurred in the papyri, the usual fractions being $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{6}$, and $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{12}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$ (cf. Wilcken, Ost. I. p. 749). How many choinices this artaba contained we do not know; in I. 3, however, it is described as δρομ(υ), which was the largest standard; and this, coupled with the occurrence of the fractions $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{12}$, makes it probable that the Ptolemaic artaba of 40 choinices is meant. This, as is shown by Ox. Pap. I. 9, verso 8, was divided into ten μέτρα, so that the fifths and tenths here would mean amounts of two μέτρα and one μέτρον. The artaba of 40 choinices is not known to have been employed in the Roman times; but that it survived at any rate among metrologists is proved by the Oxyrhynchus papyrus; and there is no improbability in its use at so early a date in the Roman period as that of these accounts. They were found with a number of other documents mostly belonging to the reign of Augustus; and this papyrus in particular was tied up with three others also containing accounts (ccxxxi–iv), of which ccxxxiii, written in a hand very similar to that here, is dated in the twelfth year.

The money account on the verso gives some information concerning the prices of oil, cummin, and canecus. One choinix of oil is valued at 5 drachmae, an artaba of cummin at 7 dr., an artaba of canecus at 4 dr. There is also a very surprising conversion of copper into silver, 1750 drachmae of copper being distinctly stated to be the equivalent of one drachma of silver. It is known from a number of Oxyrhynchus papyri (II. 242, 243, &c.) that in the
latter part of the first century A.D. the ratio between Ptolemaic copper and silver was 450 : 1; and a proportion of 350 : 1 for the close of the first century B.C. is given by xlv and ccviii of this volume; cf. introd. to xlv. Unless therefore copper temporarily underwent a most unaccountable depreciation at the time when this account was written, it must be supposed that the writer made a blunder in his figures. The latter alternative is not at all unlikely since the whole account is a badly spelled production, and other mistakes in arithmetic occur; cf. notes on recto I. 6–7, II. 3–4, verso I. 14.

The papyrus is composed of two selides or sheets which are wrongly joined together, so that the horizontal fibres of one selis and the vertical fibres of the other come together. Consequently the terms recto and verso cannot strictly be applied to the whole sheet. We call the recto the side which seems to have been first written upon and in which the larger selis has the fibres placed horizontally. The recto of this larger sheet had been previously used, but the earlier writing was carefully washed off.

Recto

(*Etoys) [· ·], Πάντει κυ.
βη. λευγών λογί
ἀνά] (πυρού) ἐ, / (πυροῦ) δράμῳ (ἀρτάβαι) γ (ήμιον) ε.
λευμπατη (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβη) α β.

Col. I.

5 βατωκοπαί γ.,
φωρέδρων πολήων νγ
ἀνά] (πυροῦ) ζ, / (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) ζ (ήμιον) γ.
καὶ ἐκφοραῖον (πυροῦ) ζ (ἀρτάβαι) ρνθ.
καὶ κυμίνου σῦν

10 τοῖς διαφόροις ζ (ἀρτάβαι) λγ,
καὶ Πτολάτι γραμματής (ήμιον),
/ κυμίνου (ἀρτάβαι) λγ (ήμιον),
καὶ φωρέδρων πολήων ε
ἀνα κυμίνου ζ, αἱ κυμίνου (ήμιον) γ.

15 / το( ) κυμίνου (ἀρτάβαι) λδ γ.,
καὶ φακοῦ ζ (ἀρτάβαι) ιε,
φωρέδρων δνου ε ανα ζ, / (ήμιον) γ.,
καὶ τοῖς μαχαίρωφοροῖς
καὶ Ἀγήνωρι καὶ ἦ,
καὶ κνήκος ἡ (ἄρτάβαι) ν.,
αἱ (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) ἡ, / το( ) ἐκφοριῶν.
(πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) σκό, καὶ κηπωρὸ (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβη) ο, / (ἄρτάβαι) σλ.

ἀνθ’ ἄν (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) σμὲ (ἡμιοῦ),
καταλίσται (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) ι(ὲ) (ἡμιοῦ),
καὶ ἀργυρίων (δραχμαι) ἡ.

ἀλ(λος) λόγος. κνῆκον: κῆ
Τασύτη ἐργάται θ,

κθ η, λ ε

Ἐσειφ α ζ, β δ,
/ ἐργάται λγ ἄνα (πυροῦ) ι, / (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) γ ε ι.
Ἐσειφ γ ρατωκωποὶ η,
θ θ, / ἐργάται ι(ὲ) ἄν(δ) (πυροῦ) ι,

/ (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) α (ἡμιοῦ) ἡ.
ἀλ(λος) λόγος. κλῆρος Πεταύτος,
β ἐργάται θ, γ η,
ὁμο(ός) ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κλῆρος

καὶ κνήκος (ἄρτάβη) α.

Col. III.

ρατωκωποὶ θ,
/ ἐργάται κς,
ἀνα (πυροῦ) ι, / (πυροῦ) (ἄρτάβαι) β (ἡμιοῦ) ι.
Λ κριτωπυρον (ἄρταβη) α,
καὶ φακοῦ (ἄρτάβαι) β,
καὶ κνήκος (ἄρτάβη) α.

Verso

λόγος ἀργυρίου.
καὶ ἐργάται (δραχμαι) ι,
ρατωκωποὶ κυμῖνο (δραχμαι) δ,
μαχαιροφόροις (δραχμαι) ι,
δαπάνης (δραχμαι) δ,
ὁμοίως χαρ(λκοῦ) Ἤφ, ὡμοίως χαρ(λκοῦ) τν,
Col. II.

λόγος. Μεδρήσιος (πυροί) (ἀρτάβαι) ῥω, κηπωρᾶ (ἀρτάβης) α', κηφήκου (πυροί) (ἀρτάβαι) ε', φακοῦ (ἀρτάβαι) ε', 5 κριθωπορού (ἀρτάβαι) δ', (ἀρτάβαι) ΣΛ.


Recto I, 5. ιπτωκοποιού; elsewhere (II. 13, III. 1, verso I. 3) spelled ιπτωκοποιού. The latter half of the word and the proximity of πολὺς (L. 6), which possibly stands for πολὺς, might suggest that 'rowers' of some kind are meant. But the great number of the 'πολὺς' is against the supposition that πολὺς was intended; and the ιπτωκοποιοί who are classed as ἱπτωτες and are connected with a κλήρος (recto II. 18—III. 2) look much more like farm-labourers of some kind than boatmen. πολὺς (cf. 17 φωρῇ δημῶν δου) is another possible though not very likely correction for πολὺς.

6. πολὺς: cf. 13, and the previous note.

6-7. There seems to be some mistake in the arithmetical here. The fraction after ἄρτα (πυροί) is almost certainly either ζ or γ, and the latter is manifestly impossible. ζ could hardly be read, apart from the improbability of the occurrence of this fraction of the artaba. But if the ζ is the right figure the amount at the end of line 7 ought to be $8\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$, in place of which we have 7 for 8, and a fraction after the $\frac{1}{2}$ which is not written in the way that $\frac{1}{2}$ is elsewhere in this papyrus, having three dashes above the γ instead of one. If it may be supposed that this γ with three dashes means the same fraction as the γ with one dash, then all that has happened is that ζ was written by mistake for γ. But this solution is not altogether satisfactory.

8. ζ: cf. 10 and 16 and II. 2, where ζ is similarly inserted before the sign for ἀρτάβαι.
The only explanation that offers itself is that χ here stands for έρφο, sc. μέτρον, 'by the sixth-part measure.' The account for έρφον extends from this point to II. 4.

15. ρό( ) : cf. II. 3, verso I. 7, 10—always in reckoning up totals. Here and in II. 3 the abbreviation might stand as usual for ρό( ), but this is inadmissible in verso I. 7, 10, where there is no substantive following, and some phrase like ρόν ἑλώ is required.

II. 1. The meaning of κα after ἄγραμα is doubtful. Perhaps the letters refer to the day of the month on which this particular payment was made, the other payments, as stated at the beginning of Col. I, having taken place on Pauni 23. κα might also be the number of the μαχαριοφάρμα including Aegenor, but 1/5 of an artaba would be a very small amount for twenty-one persons. Possibly an abbreviation, e.g. κα(μηλίτι), was intended.

3–4. The amounts of καμμίαν (34 1/2 artabae), ἐξαλος (15 1/2 artabae), and κυδος (50 artabae) stated in I. 9—II. 2 are converted into wheat (60 artabae), and the total amount of wheat for έρφον is said to be 229 artabae. This is 15 artabae in excess, since the only other amount of wheat under the head of έρφον is the 154 artabae in I. 8. Either therefore 15 artabae have got in by mistake (from I. 157), or the amounts of wheat mentioned in I. 1–7 are included. As a matter of fact the sum of those amounts, reckoning 8 1/5 in line 7 (cf. note, ad loc.) is 141 1/5 artabae, not 15, so in any case the arithmetic will be loose.

8–10. The numbers κη, κη, λ are those of the day of the month, θ, η, and ε those of the ἄγραμα. Cf. the following line and 14, 17.

III. 4. The sign at the beginning of this line means 'deduct.' It occurs again in verso I. 10.

κραδοπολα means a mixture of wheat and barley, which had been sown together; cf. Archiv I. p. 174, C. Wachsmuth in Jahrbücher für Nationalökonom. und Statistik III. xix. p. 779.

Verso I. 9. άλαυω χολ(πικος): it is very surprising to find oil measured by the χολ, which was a dry measure. Probably either άλαυω χολ(πικος) or άλαυω χολ(πις) was intended.

14. There is here another blunder in the figures; either ηθ should be κζ or γ should be ε. The first alternative is the more probable, the 27 drachmae being obtained by the subtraction of the 7 from the 34 dr. in line 10. Otherwise these 27 drachmae are not taken into account in the total.

15. The meaning of ἠνω here is that the following dates 'Pauni 4 to Epeiph 15' should have headed the account, like the date at the beginning of recto I. ἠνω and καρα often occur in this sense in literary papyri, standing at the beginning or end of an addition inserted in the upper or lower margin, e.g. Ox. Pap. II. 223. Col. V. 126.

II. 4. αὐτ (πυροι) is perhaps to be understood after φασο from the previous line, since the φρηγανα are all added up together in 6, and this is the only heterogeneous item.

CII. Farm-Accounts.

Kašr el Banāt. 26.1 x 33.6 cm. About A.D. 105.

Of this papyrus, which originally may have been a roll of some length, the last column and the ends of lines of the column preceding it are preserved, with two detached fragments from an earlier column. The two last columns, of which we print the greater part of the second, are occupied with accounts
of wages paid on different days for agricultural labour. Both men and boys were employed, and the operation in which they were commonly engaged is τυόςσευ, 'shaking,' a term of rather dubious signification; and after each total of wages for the day is recorded the number of baskets (σφυρίδες) produced, being always rather below the aggregate of men and boys. An alternative explanation of these σφυρίδες would be to suppose that they were served out to the labourers to work with. But a comparison of the detached fragments of the earlier column, in which the wages paid to workmen are coupled not with σφυρίδες but amounts of γόμου and ὄδραμα of wheat and barley, makes it more probable that the σφυρίδες represent the result of the work. Wages are also paid to boys διεξούσια πτώμα (gleaning?) and to παρθένου λύκηζουσιν, 'girls winnowing.' The rate of wages paid is for men, 6 obols; young men, 5 obols; and boys, 4, 3½, 3, 2½, 2 obols, and even 1 obol, the amount no doubt being proportionate to size and strength. In connexion with the γόμου and ὄδραμα a rather higher rate, 7 or 8 obols for a man, seem to have been paid. A still higher rate for the wages of ἐργάσια, 9 obols a man, is found in cccxxxi. These wages altogether show an increase in rate as compared with those in the long farm accounts on the recto of Brit. Mus. Pap. 131 (A.D. 78–9), where the daily wage of an ordinary labourer appears as 3 to 4 obols, and that of a boy as 2½ obols. The present document is not much later than that papyrus in date. It was found together with the correspondence of Gemellus (cf. cx introd.); and no doubt the accounts relate to his estates. The letters of Gemellus show that he owned land at Apias, Dionysias, and Senthis, the three place-names occurring in this column, and in the previous column there is mention of the νεόφυτ(α) Σαβίου, who may well be Gemellus' son Sabinus. The seventh year, which is also there mentioned, will therefore most probably be that of Trajan, i.e. A.D. 103–4.

ι άμολοις εἰς Ἀπιάδα τι ὁμοίως τοιασδεῦστων ἐργατών ἑτ (ὀβολοί) ῥη, ἀλ(λοι) ἑτ (τέρων) ἐργατών ἢ (ὀβολοί) ιε, 
καὶ παίδους ἣ [ὀβολοί] μι, ἀλ(λοι) παίδους ζ (ὀβολοί) δ (ὑμισυ), ἀλ(λοι) παίδους ἢ (ὀβολοί) καὶ ἀλ(λοι) παίδους ἢ (ὀβολοί) κε (ὑμισυ), ἀλ(λοι) παίδους β (ὀβολοί) δ, ἀλ(λοι) παίδους α (ὀβολοί) α, γενονταὶ (oppeloi) ἄριστοι, σφυρίδες νέπ, ἐγκλεκτοὶ ἀλ(λοι) ε. 
κα ἠμοίως ἐργατῶν ἄριστοι καὶ (ὀβολοί) πεκ, ἀλ(λοι) νεωτέρων ἐργατῶν ἵγ 
(ὀβολοί) ξε, καὶ παίδους εἰ (ὀβολοί) ξ, 
5 ἀλ(λοι) παίδους καὶ (ὀβολοί) π (ὑμισυ), ἀλ(λοι) παίδους γ (ὀβολοί) δ, ἀλ(λοι) παίδους θ (ὀβολοί) κβ (ὑμισυ), ἀλ(λοι) παίδους θ
(όβολοι) ἡ. γί(νονται) ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (όβολοι) τπα, σφυρίδε(ες) ὡτ., ἐγλεκ(τοί)

10 κυ ὀμιῶν(α) ἐργ(ατῶν) β (όβολοι) ἢ, καὶ παιδῶς α (όβολοι) δ, ἄλ(λων) παιδ(ων) ζ (όβολοι) κα, γίνονται (όβολοι) λ, σφυρίδε(ες) γ.

15 κε ὀμιῶν(α) ἐργ(ατῶν) ἢ (όβολοι) θ, ἄλ(λων) νεωτέρων ἐργ(ατῶν) ζ (όβολοι) δ', καὶ παιδῶς α (όβολοι) δ, ἄλ(λων) παιδ(ων) ια (όβολοι) κ ζ (ἡμισε), ἄλ(λων) παι(δων) θ (όβολοι) ιη. γί(νονται) ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (όβολοι) ρνε (ἡμισε), σφυρίδες λθ, ἐγλεκ(τοί) ἄλ(λαι) δ.

20 κθ ὀμιῶν(α) εἰς Διονυσίαδα διαλεγώντων πτώμα παιδ(ων) κ ὁβολοί ξ, ἄλ(λων) παιδ(ων) ἢ (όβολοι) λ. γί(νονται) (όβολοι) θ, σφυρίδε(ες) εθ.

There follow three other entries under the 30th and Mecheir the 1st and 2nd, and the column then ends

30 καὶ παρθένων λυκιζουσῶν σίτων (δραχμαὶ) i (όβολοι) ε.
I. τις σω(ν)τάν: the verb τισάνμεν does not seem to be used elsewhere as an agricultural term, and has no very obvious sense. It might mean 'sifting' earth, or perhaps 'threshing' corn of some kind. The other operations mentioned (διαλέγεις πτώμα, λεμένων) are apparently both connected with the harvest.

3. ἔγινεν(ν): 'selected,' i.e. of a better quality than the rest.

11. (δραχμαί) πλέκεις κ.τ.λ.: the obols are throughout reckoned as 7 to the drachma, i.e. the drachmae are on the silver standard.

III. FUNERAL EXPENSES.

Harlt. 5.5 x 11.4 cm. Third century A.D.

A short account of expenses incurred for a burial. The items are much the same as those in Gr. Pap. II. lxxvii, a letter in which the writer requests that various sums expended by himself in connexion with the illness and death of a friend should be refunded by the latter’s relatives.

The account, the writing of which is in places partially obliterated, is upon the verso of a fragment of another account.

Αἰγόνος ἀναλώματος τοῦ νεκροῦ.

βλάθη ἡ ἄρα τὴν ταφήν α.... τοιρία

ἀνά (δραχμᾶς) μή, μέσος τοῖς ἡρκύσι αὐτῶν

ε.... (δραχμαί ?) ἵπτ (δεμολοί) κ., στι(εφανίων (δεμολοί) ἵπτ, οἶνον

5....[.ον (δραχμαί) ]δ, (δεμολοί) κ.

3. ἡρκύσι.

'Account of expenses for the corpse. The expenses were for the burial, ... at 48 drachmae, wages of the bearers ... 16 drachmae 20 obols, wreaths 12 obols, a ... of wine []4 drachmae 20 obols.'

2. δάθη could be read in place of βλάθη. Between the final η and η is a short horizontal stroke at the top of the line which may represent a letter, e.g. η. At the end of the line ἀναλώματα could be read, but this is not suitable.

5. The traces at the beginning of the line do not suit either κερίμου οτ κερίων.

IV. ACCOUNT.

Harlt. 30 x 15.5 cm. Late third century.

Parts of two columns of an account, which is unfortunately broken in such a manner that only the figures of the first column and the names of the second remain. We print the latter which contains some interesting words.
The largeness of the sums in the first column (seven items of 100 drachmae and upwards, five of 1000 drachmae and upwards) indicates the late date of the papyrus, but they have otherwise no value. The payments in the second column are for a variety of purposes, but a number of them are connected with a boat or boats, and perhaps they may all have been made on the occasion of a journey by water. Nicopolis is mentioned in line 12.

On the verso of this papyrus is written "cxxxiii."

The text continues with a series of Greek words and numbers, which are partially legible.

2. πλευρών: neither πλευρά or πλευρώ seems to occur elsewhere meaning a vessel of any sort, which must be the sense here as they were made of glass.

11. τετραοτόλον probably means a small model shrine.

12. ζύτου κατά μέρος is inserted in the margin, apparently referring to τέλους. For the ζυτηδα cf. xlvii.

14. ἐραννητάς: cf. 18, 19. These ‘searchers’ seem to be customs officials, the ταξιλαρίῳ in 15 perhaps being their secretary.

16. εὐθεξ.: perhaps εὐθεξίας; cf. 18.

23. τυμολειτικοῖον: this strange word, which also occurred in the first column, is possibly derived from Τυμολογος which was a variant of Τυμόλος, κατά πυρηνικόν μεταχειρισμοῦ, according to Steph. Byz. τυμολειτικοῖον might be the name of some product of Tmolus.
CV. LATIN MILITARY ACCOUNTS.

Kom Ushim. 31 x 43 cm. About A.D. 180.

These accounts relate to sums of money on deposit belonging to a number of soldiers, who, it may be inferred from their names, were a body of auxiliaries. The locus classicus upon the subject of deposita is Vegetius, De Re Mil. II. 20, who tells us that half of any extra grants of money, donativa, made to the soldiers was 'sequestrated,' and that each cohort had a sack (follis) in which these sums were placed and which was under the charge of the signifer. The amounts thus accredited to the soldiers were also swelled by additions from their regular pay. This fact is not there stated by Vegetius, but comes out very clearly in a Latin papyrus recently published by MM. Nicole and Morel (Archives Militaires du 1er siècle, Genève, 1900; cf. Mommsen, Hermes, xxxv. pp. 443 sqq., H. Blümner, Neue Jahrbücher f. Klass. Alt. v. pp. 432 sqq.), which includes an account of the money affairs for a complete year of two soldiers. The expenses of each for food, clothing, &c., are deducted from their stipends and any surplus is added to their deposits. The general scheme is:—acceptit stip(endum) . . . , ex eis . . . , (total) expensas . . . , reliquas depositit . . . , et habuit ex priore . . . ; fit summa omnis . . . There was therefore for each cohort a kind of bank, in which every soldier had an account. This peculium was augmented in two ways, (1) by the occasional donativa, half of which according to Vegetius was necessarily paid over; (2) by additions out of the surpluses of ordinary pay.

Of the present account there remains the greater part of three continuous columns and some small fragments (one containing the same names in the same order as II. 11-17, with the insertion of one name before Apollinaris) of a previous column. The two first of the three continuous columns give a list of payments for various special purposes, the second column having the heading recessa depositorum. In one case (II. 2) the whole of the peculium amounting to 1459 denarii seems to have been withdrawn, perhaps on account of the discharge of the soldier; in another (II. 17) 103 denarii were expended for arms. Small payments are made to two soldiers for niatia (I. 14-16). But most frequently the persons drawing money are simply described as debitores. Apparently these men had incurred miscellaneous debts amounting to more than their periodic pay, and their liabilities were met out of their balances on deposit. The sums included under this heading range from 4 to upwards of 200 denarii.

The third column is of a different character, containing a list of soldiers and the total amount of the sums on deposit accredited to them. The first part of
the column is incomplete, but in the latter half of it between the names and the
sums, which as a rule are rather large, are the letters h( ) d( ), which on the
analogy of the Geneva papyrus, recto I a 31 &c. habet in deposito, we interpret
as h(abel) d(apositos). At the end of the list is a total which is divided into
three parts, the summa depositorum, summa sepositorum, and summa niatiorum,
together representing the balance in hand at the military 'bank.' What is the
distinction between the deposita and the seposita? An explanation is suggested
by the passage of Vegetius already alluded to, where the word sepositio occurs
with reference to the 'sequestration' of the half of the donatium. 'Illud vero
ab antiquis divinitus institutum est, ut ex donatino quod milites consequuntur,
dimidia pars sequestraretur ad signa . . . Sepositio autem ista pecuniae primum
ipsis contubernaliibus decetur accommoda . . .'. Further on these sums are
described as deposita. Now the Geneva papyrus shows that the technical term
for deposits consisting of surpluses of pay was deposita. It therefore appears
possible that the word first used by Vegetius, sepositio, was the more correct, and
that the seposita are the inaccessible sums derived from donatina, as opposed to
the deposita which, as we have supposed, could in certain circumstances be
drawn upon by their owners. If this is correct the soldier's peculium on
deposit was divided into two parts corresponding to the two sources from
which it was derived, irregular presents and regular pay, and separate accounts
were kept of each. The one remained in the charge of the signifer until
the discharge or death of the soldier; the other could be used as a kind of
current account. To what extent the expenditure of the individual soldier was
regulated by official control, and whether the depositio of all surpluses of pay was
obligatory (Mommsen, ibid. p. 452) or only customary, are further questions, upon
which additional evidence is required.

An alternative explanation of the seposita might be found in the same
passage of Vegetius in which it is stated that each legion had a burial fund to
which everybody contributed a small amount. It is possible that certain payments
of four drachmae in the Geneva papyrus represent such contributions (op. cit.
p. 18). But on the whole the former view seems more probable. By the niatica
may perhaps be understood a sum allowed by the government for necessary
travelling expenses. This may have been kept by the signiferi with the other
moneys belonging to their cohorts, and payments made out of it from time to
time, as recorded in I. 13-15. The niatica in this case will have nothing to do
with the deposita of the soldiers beyond the fact that the accounts concerning
them were kept by the same officers. The term niaticum is sometimes applied
to a soldier's savings (cf. Tac. Ann. i. 37; Suet. Jul. 68, &c.) but that meaning
does not seem appropriate here.
The accounts are kept in denarii, for which the ordinary symbol $\times$ is used, and in obols, mostly represented by the letter $b$; in two places (III. 27, 29) $ob$ seems to have been written. The Roman denarius being equated to the tetradrachm contained 28 copper obols. In the lists of payments the largest amount in the smaller coin is 27½; and the addition of the items in I. 17–24 works out correctly on the theory that the smaller coins are obols and that the denarius contained twenty-eight of them.

Concerning the date of the papyrus, the Latin cursive is of a similar type to that of the Berlin military roll of A.D. 156 (Pal. Soc. Series II. 165), and may be approximately assigned to the latter half of the second century. The date will be more accurately fixed if the Apollo[nius? strategus] of the division of Heraclides, whose name is written on the verso in Greek cursive, is identical with the Apollonius or the Apollotos who are known to have been strategi between A.D. 177 and 186 (xli, B. G. U. 194, 361. II). This date would very well suit both the Latin and Greek hands. But Apollonius is too common a name to allow us to regard this identification as being more than a probability.

In the left-hand margin of all three columns a large round dot has been placed opposite each of the names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. I.</th>
<th>(denarii)</th>
<th>(oboli)</th>
<th>(emis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[xviii]</td>
<td>[xxv]</td>
<td>[s(emis)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>[v]</td>
<td>[s(emis)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bq. [</td>
<td>[apollinarius]</td>
<td>[denarii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longinus</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dioscorus</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uaticorum</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pasion</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crispus</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>debitoris</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>cccxcvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>lvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>vlv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>neronius</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sisois</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermofilius</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasion</td>
<td>(denarii)</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maximus (denarii) CLXVI (oboli) XVII,
25 · [ ] ērtes (denarii) LXXVIII[?].
† sunt recessa (denarii) MLXXIII (oboli) XIII (quarta?).

Col. II.

recessa depositorum.
Dionysius (denarii) MCCCLVIII.
item debitores (denarii) DCLXVI.
Capiton (denarii) [ . . . ] (oboli) XXVIII s (emis),
5 Apollos (denarii) [ . . . ] (oboli) XIX,
Pasion (denarii) [ . . . ] (oboli) XVIII,
Ammonius (denarii) LXXII (oboli) XXVIII,
Protas (denarii) XXIII (oboli) XVIII s (emis),
Hermaicus (denarii) III (oboli) XXVIII s (emis),
10 Muntanus (denarii) LXXV (oboli) XIX s (emis),
Serenus (denarii) III (oboli) XXIV s (emis),
Gemellus (denarii) III (oboli) XXVII s (emis),
Serenus (denarii) LXXII (oboli) XX s (emis),
Nefotianus (denarii) III (oboli) XXVII s (emis),
15 Eponuchos (denarii) III (oboli) XXVII s (emis),
Fabianus (denarii) LXXI (oboli) XXVII s (emis),
Apollinaris (denarii) CLXXII (oboli) XXVII s (emis).

2nd hand item armorum Dionysi (denarii) III.
1st hand † sunt recessa (denarii) ICCCLVII.

Col. III.

3rd hand [ M LONGI NUS · [
Camarius
Baïbulas
Posidonius
5 Helius
Valerius
Horus
Paninutas
Chares

10 Publius
Ammonius
Galates
Antonius h(abet) d(epositos)
Argo[ius] h(abet) d(epositos)
15 Neferos h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) d[ex]p[ir]
Alexandr us h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) d,
Collutes h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) cc[cc]l.lxxxvii (obolos) II s(emis),
Claudius h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) ccxxviii,
Piolemeus h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) d,
20 Antonius h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) cc[c]xxvii,
Rufinus h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) d,
Longinus h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) cc[c]ccl (obolos) xxvi,
Saturninus h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) xxvii,
Longinus h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) cc[c]cxv,
0 Turbon h(abet) d(epositos) (denarios) cc[c]clxx (obolos) vi.
summa depositorum (denarii) xvi. xxviii oboli x s(emi)s,
separatorium (denarii) cc[c]cxxxv oboli x s(emi)s,
uiatiorum (denarii) mcccxxvi oboli x s(emi)s.
30 fit summa numero (denarii) mcccclxxi (oboli) vi s(emis).

On the verso
'Απόλλωνιος (? στρατηγός) Αρσανοντος Ηρακλειδος.

I. 14. The 27 denarii 12½ obols are the totals of the items in the two following lines. Similarly line 17 gives the total of the sums contained in 18-25; cf. II. 3.
17. The resolution of the symbol after s(emis) is doubtful. It is composed of a small half-circle open at the top, with a horizontal stroke above and below.
26. The symbol at the beginning of the line presumably means 'total'; it is repeated in II. 19. The sum is 2228; the scribe should have drawn a stroke above the two first figures to indicate thousands as is done in III. 27-30. The total is obtained by the addition of the items in 2, 3, and 18.
II. 3. An amount in obols was written after the sum in denarii but was subsequently erased.
18. armorum: cf. Tac. Ann. i. 17. In the Geneva papyrus there is no instance of a payment on account of arms.
III. 25. For the marginal note cf. the Berlin military roll, II. 22-3 (Mommsen, Ephem. Epigr. vii. pp. 456 sqq.) translatus ex coh(ortis) I Flaviae Ciliciae in (centurias) Candidi. Either alam primam or ala prima should have been written.
26. θ in the margin opposite the name of Turbon means that he had died. This letter, which is also found on Roman gravestones, occurs with the same signification in a Latin list of soldiers in the Rainer Collection (Wessely, Schrifftafeln zur alt. lateinischen Paläographie, 8 I. 6). There θ is placed opposite the name, as here, and the name itself is crossed through.
CVI. PETITION TO THE PRAEFECT.

Ümm el’Atil. 15.2 x 7.3 cm. About A.D. 140.

A petition addressed to Gaius Avidius Heliodorus, praefect in A.D. 140-143, by Marcus Valerius Gemellus, a physician, requesting to be relieved, partly on the ground of his profession, partly on account of ill-health, from the duty imposed upon him of acting as superintendent to certain estates confiscated by the government. Above the petition are five lines written in the same hand, containing the conclusion of a report of a case tried before the same praefect, which resulted in the release of some person. It is clear that it somehow concerns the petition of Gemellus, and from the fact that Heliodorus confirms the judgement of a strategus or epistrategus, while Gemellus makes no mention of any judgement in his own favour, the fragmentary ντομηματισμὸς is most probably a parallel adduced by Gemellus. Possibly it is referred to in the third line of his petition.

στρατηγοῦ κεχροπ[έ]μενον [εἰς . . (ἔτος)
'Αντωνίνου τοῦ κυρίου Φαρμοθῆ]. . .
'Ηλιοδωρος εἶπεν: "κέκρικεν . . .

διολύσας.

Γαῖων Ἀνιδίων Ἡλιοδόρου ἐπάρχ(ῶ) Ἁγ(ῶνος)
παρὰ Μάρ(κον) Οὐαλερίου Γεμέλλου [. .
παρὰ τὰ ἄγνορευμένα ἀλθεὶς εἰς ἐπι-
τήρησιν γε(ν)ηματῖγγαραφουμένων

υπαρχόντων περί κόμας Βακχ(ίδα)
καὶ Ἡφαιστιάδα τῆς Ἡρακλ[είδου]
μερίδος τοῦ Ἀραινοῦ τετρα-
τεὶ ήδη χρόνον ἐν τῇ χρείᾳ
ποιομένου ἐξησθένησα [. . .

κύριε, ὅθεν ἄξιον σαι τὸν σωτήρα
ἐλεησαί με καὶ κελεύσαι ἡδη με
ἀπολυθῆναι τῆς χρείας ὑπὸς δυ-
νηθοῦ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακτήσας ὑμᾶς ἀ-
πὸ τῶν καμάτων ὀδενθῷ . . .
FAYUM TOWNS

20 τον καὶ άμοιμω!, ...] ὑποτάξατι ὅπως
tέλεον ἀπολύονται τῶν [λειτουρ-
γίων οί τῆς ιατρικῆς ἑπιστήμην
μεταχειρίζομενοι μάλιστα [ἐκ οἱ δὲ-
δοκιμασμένοι ὁπερ κάγω, ἵν'  
25 ὁ εὐκρενητήμενος. διευθεῖει.

8. First τον of αὐτογραφοῦμεν corr. from η. ν over the line. 15 l. στ. 21. l. ἀπο-
λέωντι? 22. ἰατροκρατοῦν Pap.

6 sqq. 'To Gaius Avidius Heliodorus, praefect, from Marcus Valerius Gemellus. Con-
trary to the prohibition I was made a superintendent of confiscated estates near the villages
of Bacchias and Hephaestias in the division of Heraclides of the Arsinoite nome, and after
labouring for a period of four years at the post, I became very weak, my lord; wherefore
I entreat you my preserver to have pity on me, and order me to be released from my
duties so that I may be able to recover from the effects of my labours ..., and ... to add
instructions that complete exemption from compulsory services be granted to persons
practising the profession of physician, and especially to those who have passed the
examination like myself, that so I may experience your clemency. Farewell,'

1. ὑπομηματισμός] is the termination of ὑπομηματισμός. The applicant for relief had
produced a decision of a strategos (or epistrategos) whereupon the praefect's verdict
was 'He has decided the case by relieving him,' i.e. a confirmation of the previous
decision; cf. introd.
8. το αὐτογραφοῦμεν: the reference may be to the ὑπομηματισμός quoted above.
9. γελουσαίοισι γιγανταφροφυίζοντες: cf. xxvi. 8, note.
10. κώμας: here Bacchias and Hephaestias are (probably) treated as two distinct
villages; cf. note on xv. 4.

CVII. Petition of Papontos.

Harlt. 10-2 x 6-3 cm. A.D. 133.

A petition complaining of the theft of various skins and fleeces, and asking
for redress. Owing to the loss of the beginning it is uncertain to whom the
document was addressed. From the concluding formula it may be inferred
that the official in question was the centurion rather than the στρατηγὸς; cf.
Mittis, Hermes, xxx. pp. 567 sqq. A curious title for the ἄρχωφορος or another
minor police official, ὁ τῆς κώμης ἐπιτρέχων (cf. xxiii. I. 2 ἐπίδρομη τῆς μητροπόλεως),
occurs in lines 7–8.

... ταὶ... β... [...]
ὑφείλαντο δέρματα
καθήκουσαν ἀναζή-

io τησιν καὶ τοὺς φανέρως
... they carried off four goatskins and four fleeces. Wherefore I entreat you to give instructions to the village inspector to hold the due inquiry, and to keep the persons found guilty in a safe place that they may receive fitting punishment. Farewell. Papontos, about fifty-five years old, having a scar on his right eyebrow. 'The 18th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord, Athur 28.'

CVIII. Petition to the Strategus.

Κατ' ελ Βανάτ. 13.2 x 10.2 cm. (Fragm. a). About A.D. 171.

Petition addressed to Megalonymus, strategus of the divisions of Themistes and Polemo (who is known from B. G. U. 91.1 to have held office in A.D. 170-1), by Pasion and Onesimus, two 'pig-merchants' at Arsinoe, complaining of a robbery with violence committed upon them as they were journeying home from Theadelphia. The papyrus is in two fragments which do not join.

(a) Μεγαλονόμωφ οπρατηφ' Αρσι(νολτον) Θεμίστιφ' και Πο-
λέμωνος μερίδων

παρὰ Πασιωνον τοῦ Ἡρακλείου ἀπὸ
ἀμφότερον Ἑλληνίου καὶ Ὀρνήθιον τοῦ

5 Ἀμμανίου ἀπὸ ἀμφοτέρων ἰδίων ἰδιοκτησίαν

τῶν δύο χωρίων, ἰδιῶν μητροπολί-

τεως. ἐξῆς ἡτα τῷ τοῦ δόμτος μη-


νὸς Θαῦμαν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδίων ἰδο
κόμῃς Θεαδελφοῖς Θεμίστων

10 μερίδων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐπήλθαν ἦ-

μεῖν κακοῦργοι τινὲς ἄνα μὲν Πολυ-

θεουκᾶς καὶ τῆς Θεαδελφίας καὶ ἐθνῶν

ἡμῶν σὺν καὶ τῷ μαγνηθόφυλακι καὶ πλη-

S 2
γαίς ἡμᾶς πλίστας ἤκισαν κατ’ τραυ-
15 μαίαν ἐποίησαν τὸν [Πασίν'] καὶ
εἰσόνηραν ἡμᾶς χοιρίδιον α καὶ ἐβᾶσ.
[ταξαν τὸν τοῦ Πασίν'] ᾽κιώνα
] , εἰ καὶ ζω-
]ν Ὅνησίμου

(6)
κιτο[ν]
κα[σ]τρ[α]
κιτο[ν]
διὸ ἐπιδίδο-
μεν καὶ ἀριστοὶ μὲν τὸ καὶ βιβλίδιον ἐν
25 καταχωρισμ[ῷ] γενέσθαι
πρὸς τὸ φανέρων τῶν ἐπαιτῶν μένειν
ἀριστοὶ τὸν λόγον πρὸς αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ-
του καὶ τοµ[μ]
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Kašr el Banât. 11.5 x 15 cm. Early first century.

A letter from Pisaia to Heracleus asking him to pay 12 drachmae to Cleon. The writing is a clear semi-uncial, and the papyrus, which was found with

12. µεγαλοφέλεια: on µεγάλα cf. note on xxxviii. 5.
documents of Augustus' time, is certainly not later than A.D. 50 nor earlier than Augustus' reign.

Πισαίς Ὑρακλῆψ χαίρειν. ὅταν πρὸς ἀνάκαιν θέλης παρ' ἐμοὶ χρῆσασθαί τι, εἴθος σε οὐ κρατῶ, καὶ νῦν παρακληθένς τοῦς τρεῖς στατῆρες οὐς εἶρηκέ σοι Σέλευκος δώναλ μοι ἡδή ὄς Κλέωνι, νομί-
5 σας ὅτι κιχρᾶς μοι αὐτοῦς, ἔδω σε δ(ἄ)π τὸ εἰμάτιον σου θείναι ἐνέχυρον, ὅτι συνήμμαι λόγον τῷ πατρί καὶ λευκοποράφηκε με καὶ ἀποχῆν
θέλω λαβεῖν. Σέλευκος γὰρ μοι αὐτοῖς ὅδε ἐκκέκρουκε λέγων ὅτι συνεστακας ἐαυτῷ.
10 καὶ νῦν παρακληθένς νομίσας ὅτι κιχρᾶς μοι [αὐτοῖς] μὴ κατάσχῃς Κλέωνι καὶ συνπροσ-
[γενὸς Κ]λέωνι καὶ αἴτησον Σάραν τὰς τοῦ (δραχμὰς) 1β.
[μὴ οὐν ἄλλος ποιῆσες.]
(ἔτους) κ, Παύνι) κε.

On the verso
15 Ὑρακλῆψι, and parts of two red stamps.

1. l. ἀνάγκην. 3. l. στατῆρας. 4. l. δόναλ. 12. ἄγαρίον is omitted after τοῦ.

'Pisais to Heracleus greeting. Whenever you from necessity want to borrow anything from me, I at once give in to you; and now please give to Cleon the three staters which Seleucus told you to give me, and consider that you are lending them to me, even if you have to pawn your cloak; for I have settled accounts with his (?) father, and he has allowed me to remain in arrears (?), and now I want to get a receipt. Seleucus has evaded paying the money by saying that you have made an arrangement with him (to pay instead). Now, therefore, please consider that you are lending the money to me, and don't keep Cleon waiting, but go and meet him, and ask Saras for the twelve (silver) drachmas. On no account fail to do this. The 20th (?) year, Pauni 25.'

CX. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO EPEGATHUS.

Kaşr el Banát. 26-9 x 10-2 cm. A.D. 94. Plate VI.

The following fourteen letters (cx-cxiii) are part of a considerable find, not, unfortunately, in very good condition, from a house at Kaşr el Banát (cf. p. 44). The greater number of these papyri relate to a single family, and consist chiefly of letters exchanged by the different members. The head
of the family was Lucius Bellenus Gemellus, by whom the bulk of the letters were written, most frequently to his son Sabinus, or to Epagathus, who was perhaps a nephew. Other members of the family who are met with are Gemella, probably a married daughter of Gemellus (cxiii. 15); Marcus Antonius (?) Maximus, his brother (cf. cxvi. 18); Harpocratus and Lycus, sons (cxxxii); Geminus, perhaps a brother of Epagathus (cxxi); and some one who is familiarly styled ‘the little one,’ and was perhaps the son of Gemella (cxxxiii. 14). The house at Kasr el Banat was very likely owned by Gemellus, but not occupied by him, since the majority of the letters were addressed by him to other persons, and there are none to him from them. Probably the regular resident was Epagathus, to whom both Gemellus and Sabinus frequently write; and Sabinus seems to have passed some of his time there.

Concerning Gemellus himself, some interesting information is supplied by xcii, where it is stated that he was a discharged veteran (ἀπολύκτος ἀπὸ στρατόπεδος), and that in the year A.D. 110, when that contract was drawn up, he was sixty-seven years old. The latest letter by him that bears a date is cxviii, written in A.D. 110, when he was seventy-seven. His advanced age is reflected in his handwriting, which tends to become shaky and illegible. But it was perhaps never very good, any more than his spelling and grammar, which are peculiarly atrocious. His sons Sabinus and Harpocratus show a better acquaintance with the Greek language, though they too are not above reproach. Gemellus was a considerable landowner in the Fayum, most of his property being situated in the neighbourhood of Euhemeria. At that village he had an oil-press, which was concerned in the contract alluded to above (xcii); and there were also estates at Dionysias (cx. 16, &c.), Apias (cxi. 9, &c.), Senthis (cxi. 22, cxi. 19), Psennophris (cxviii. 19), and Psinachis (cxix. 33). If, as is most probable, the accounts in cii relate to these estates, a large number of workmen was employed upon them. Gemellus himself seems to have resided partly at Aphroditopolis, which was more probably the village of that name in the Fayum (cf. Gr. Papp. II. lxi. 12) than the capital of the Aphroditopolite nome (cf. cxv. 16, cxx. 6); but he took a keen interest in all his farms, and his letters are for the most part occupied with agricultural details. He kept himself informed of all that went on, exercising a general supervision over the management of affairs, and does not hesitate to express disapproval when dissatisfied with the proceedings of his lieutenants (cxi. 2 sqq., cxi. 9 sqq.). The more genial side of his character is exhibited in the frequent ordering of supplies for the celebration of some festival (cxvii. 11, cxviii. 16, cxix. 28), or the birthday of some member of the family (cxi. 14, cxiv. 20, cxxv. 8). He liked to keep up friendly relations with the officials, and was evidently fully alive to
the value of occasional ἥθισσε (cxvii. 6-8, cxviii. 13-15). The general impression of Gemellus left by these letters is that of a shrewd old man of business, somewhat wilful and exacting, but of a kind and generous disposition.

The first letter is not in the handwriting of Gemellus himself, but was written for him by a scribe in a well-formed uncial hand of a literary type, which being dated is of importance palaeographically. Only the date at the bottom is in cursive.
FAYUM TOWNS

οἱ τέκτονες: πέμπο δὲ σοι τὰ σχοινία. τὰς δὲ ἀλένας τοῦ ἐλαιουργίου

30 διηπλάσ ποιήσον, τὰς δὲ τῶν καταβολαὶδοὺ(ν) διπλάσ. ἔρρωσο.

(ἐτόοι) ἰδ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Δομιτιανοῦ
[Σ]εβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, μηνός Γερμανικοῦ
id.

μὴ ὑμῖν ἄλλως ποιήσης.

On the verso

35 ἀπόδος Ἑπαγαθὸ ἀπὸ Δουκίου Βελλήνου Γερμέλλου.

2. Θέμα Παπ.; so 6 and 9 ἴδια, 9 ἐπερχόταν, 17 ἤδαιον.

‘Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his own Epagathus, greeting. On receipt of my letter please have the manure there banked up in order to make the store-place that you speak of, and dig a deep trench round the oil-press outside so that it may not be easy to walk into the oil-press, and take away the manure to the manure heap, and make them let the water in over all our fields in order that the sheep may be folded there, and have the olive-yards washed over the second time, and go over to Dionysias and find out whether the olive-yard has been watered twice over and dug; if not let it be watered . . . Give to . . . and Psellus, the keepers of the public granaries . . . and Chaeras, scribe of the cultivators, and to Heraclas 90 drachmae and the interest, and to Chaeras the late tax-collector 24 drachmae, and to Didas . . . the price of the barley, 240 drachmae and interest, and to Heron, the former president, two years’ interest, 120 drachmae. Let the carpenters put up the doors; I send you the measurements. Make the hinges (?) of the oil-press double, and those of the stores single. Good-bye. The 14th year of the Emperor Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, the 14th of the month Germanicus. Do not neglect these instructions. (Addressed) Deliver to Epagathus from Lucius Bellenus Gemellus.’

13. The sheep would presumably not be put into these fields until the water had subsided again.

21. If [διον] is correct Φιλλον and the other persons in the accusative should have been in the dative. The participle [διον] is not unnatural, being a return to the construction of line 4.

22. γρ(αμματία) τῶν [γε]ροφίγιῶν: cf. xviii (a) introd.

26. ἐργα(μένος) is an ambiguous title which occurs in different senses. ἐργα(μένος) sometimes appear in the service of certain officials such as the strategus (Ox. Pap. II. 294. 19), or the comarch (B. G. U. 270. 6). On the other hand the ἐργα(μένος) συμβόλον in Gr. Pap. II. lxvii. 3 is clearly a president; so too ἐργα(μένος) γερμάνου, ibid. xliii. 9, ἐργα(μένος) λεψίων, Brit. Mus. Pap. 281. 2, &c., ἐργα(μένοι) πενταβαλλός Σακευαῖος, 335. 4. In the present passage there is nothing to indicate which signification is meant. The title is also used absolutely, as here, in Ox. Pap. I. 43 recto VI. 14, Brit. Mus. Pap. 266. 104.

CXI. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO EPIGATHUS.


Λούκιος Βελλῆνος Γέμελλος
Έπαγαγάθωι τῷ Ιδίωι χαίρων.
μέγαμοι σαι μεγάλως ἀπο-
λέσας χυριδία δῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ
5 σκυλιοῦ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἔχων
ἐν τῇ [κ]όμῃ ἐργατικὰ κτή-
νη δέκα. Ἡρμηλάθας ὡ [ὁνη]-
lάτης τῷ αἵτιομα περι-
επόθησε λέγον ὅτι αὐ ἐληχαῖς
10 πεζοὶ τὸν χυριδία ἔλασαί.
περίσοφον [ἐ]πιτιλάρην σὺ
εἰς Διονυσιάδα μίναι δύ-
οι ἡμέρας ἐως ἀγοράσῃς
λατίνου (ἄρταβας) κ. λέγουσι εἰ-
15 ναὶ τῷ λατίνου ἐν τῇ Διο-
νυσιάδι] ἐν (δραχμῶν) ιἱ. ὡς ἐὰν βλέ-
πης [τ]ὴν τιμήν πάν-
tος ἀγόρασον τὰς τοῦ λατίνου
(ἄρταβας) κ. [ἀ]πανκαῖν ἡγήσασις.
20 τῶν λῖμνασμῶν) δῆδον
τῶν [ἐ]λασιῶν τῶν πάν-
tων [καὶ] τάξον τῇ . . . . Σέν-
[θεω] ἐργάτην χρ. . . .
λιμνάζειν, καὶ τῶν στί-
25 χον τῶν φυτῶν τῶν
ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ πότισον,
μὴ οὖν ἄλλως πυήσῃς.
ἐρρωσο. (ἔτους) εἰ Λυτοκράτορος
Καῖσαρος Δομιτιανὸς Σεβαστότοι
30 Γερμανικοῦ, μηνὸς Γερμανικ( )
ιε.
On the verso

’Επαγαθών ταύτι εἰδοὶ
άπο Δουκίου Βελλήνης Χεμέλλου.

3. 1. μέμφομαι σε.
4. 1. χαίρειδα; σοι ἵοι.
5. 1. ἄδον. 6. 1. κύρος. 8. 1. περι-
εποίησε λέον ὅτι.
11. 1. περισσοῦ ..., σοι.
17. 1. πάντως. 19. 1. ἀναγκαῖον
οἰ ἀνάγκην ἡγησάμενος. 24-5. 1. τῶν στίχων τῶν φυτῶν. 27. 1. πειθώ.

‘Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his own Epagathus, greeting. I blame you greatly for the loss of two pigs owing to the fatigue of the journey, when you had in the village ten animals fit for work. Herachidas the donkey-driver shifted the blame from himself, saying that you had told him to drive the pigs on foot. I have already more than sufficiently enjoined you to stay at Dionysias a couple of days, till you have bought 20 artabae of lotus. They say it is to be had at Dionysias at 18 drachmae. However you find the price, be sure to buy the 20 artabae of lotus, believing it to be essential. Hasten with the flooding of all the olive-yards... and water the row of trees at “the prophet.” Do not neglect these instructions. Good-bye. The 15th year of the Emperor Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, the 15th of the month Germanic...’

3-5. ἀπόλεσαι and ἐκαντον both refer to Epagathus, and should therefore strictly be in the accusative, unless we put a stop after μεγάλως and read ἀπόλεσαι for ἀπόλεσαι.

ἐκαντον εἰς τῆ {κύρος κ.τ.λ.}: the meaning is that Epagathus, though he had sufficient animals (donkeys or horses) available to have had the pigs carried in a cart, instead of driven on foot, had nevertheless preferred to economize in labour and so caused the loss.

11. There are traces of ink above the v of περισσοῦ which perhaps represent the first letter of a word written over the line.

22. Σέκβεσ: cf. cli. 12, cxii. 19.
23. ἑργάτην: ορ ἑργά τιρ... 
26. τῷ πρωΐην: apparently a familiar name of a piece of land.
30. Γερμαν( ) may be Γερμαν(σ) (Thoth, cf. cx. 33), or Γερμαν(κ) (Pachon); cf. Ox. Pap. II. 300. II.

CXII. LETTER FROM GEMELLIUS TO EPA GATHUS.

Καστ τοῦ Βαεότα. 24 X 14 cm. A.D. 99.

Λουκιος Βελλήνος Γεμέλλος Επαγαθώ
tοι εἰδοὶ καὶ χαίρειν. εάν πυγής διώξει τῶν σκα-
থητών τῶν ἐλαιών καὶ τῶν ὑποχαίρημα καὶ διδολήτρων τῶν ἐλαιών καὶ τὰ ἀνα-
παίματα ὑπόσχεσαι καὶ διδόλησαι. ἐπιτι-
νας τὸν ζευγηλίτην εἶναι ἐκάστης ἡμὲ-
ρας τὸ ἐργόν ἀποδόν, καὶ μὴ τὸς κεῖς ἵσοι.
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6. τόν ἄγμαν τοῖς ἐπάθεις τοὺς
7. ἄριστον τουτοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων
8. Παχων 

On the verso are some traces of an address.

6. e of θευς. corr. from u. 7. ἀποδοι. 8. των τουν ἄγμαν. 14. 
1. μεμβραμα κτ. 16. των σκόφθρων. 23. ἐν ὀψε πάντων.

'Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his own Epagathus, greeting. Please carry forward the digging of the olive-yards and their ploughing up and hoeing, and plough up and hoe the fallows, and urge the driver to do his proper work every day, and do not unite a number of bulls... Up to to-day you have not harvested the field at Apia, but have neglected it, and so far have only harvested the half. Give heed to the measurer (i) Zoilus; don't look askance at him. Up to to-day you have left it unharvested, wherefore I blame you greatly. Find out whether the olive-yard at Dionysias was dug; if not, carry on the digging during two days, for it is an advantage that it should be dug... Do not let them be in a hurry with the... threshing-floor, nor that at Senthis until I write. Don't break up all the threshing-floors for the present. Do not neglect these instructions. Good-bye. Salute Heron and Orsenouphus and all those at home. The second year of the Emperor Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus, Pachon 26.'

2. σκόφθρος here and διδολητρος and δεσδελα in 4-5 are new words, but their meaning is clear.

7-8. The meaning of κόλλα depends upon that of the mutilated word at the end of line 7. κράσι might there be read, but hardly fills the space and does not produce a satisfactory sense, unless the sentence could be supposed to mean 'tie up the bulls by the horns,' i.e. keep them idle.
11. ἀκτιλιστής: the verb ἀκτιλιστῆς is known but only in the sense of ‘point at with the finger,’ which does not suit ἀκτιλιστῆς in this context.

20. οὖ: or possibly αὖ.

CXIII. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO SABINUS.

Καστρολ Βανάτ. 14.4 x 12.4 cm. A.D. 100.

This letter and the next are almost identical in subject and phraseology, and were written within a few days of each other. Both contain directions that a man should be sent to see an olive-yard belonging to a friend called Hermonax, which required thinning. Probably Sabinus did not immediately comply, and Gemellus became impatient and wrote again. At the end of each letter is a request for fish for certain festal occasions. The date of the present papyrus is supplied by cxiv, which was the later of the two, as is shown by a comparison of cxiii. 12 with cxiv. 19.

Ἀδώκιος Βελλήνος Γέμελλος
Σαβίνων τοῖς οἰεῖοι χαρεῖν.
πάντη πάντος πέμοις Πιν.
δαρον τὸν πεδιοφόλακα τῆς

5 Διονυσίαδος εἰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ,
ἐπὶ Ἑρμώναξ ἐρωτησέ με εἰνα
ἐφίδη τὸν [ἐ]παιδόν αὐτοῦ τὸν
ἐν Κερκεσούχις ἐπὶ πυκνός
ἐστὶν τὸν φυτόν, καὶ εἴς αὐτόν.

10 ἐκκόψαι θέλει φυτά. εὖ ὅν τὴν πυκ.
σε ἑαυτῆς πέμοις αὐτῶν
ἑαυτῆς καὶ τῇ ἐν εἰ τῷ τῇ
πᾶλι πέμοις εἰκόνας (δραχμῶν) 1β
ἐπὶ τὰ τετρακο[σ]τὰ τῶν μικρῶν.

15 [ ] . . . . . . . . . . οὗειόν Γεμέλλης

2. 1. νύμ. 3. 1. πάντη πάντων. 5. 1. ἤ. 6. Ἑρμώναξ. 8. 1. Κερκεσούχις.
9. 1. τοῖς φυτοῖς . . . αὐτῶν. 12. 1. ἤ ὃ. 13. 1. ἵδυον. 15. 1. νύμ.

†Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his son Sabinus, greeting. Be very sure to send Pindarus, the guard at Dionysias, or his father, since Hermonax has asked me to allow
him to look over his olive-yard at Kerkesucha, as it is overgrown with trees, and he wishes to cut down some of the trees. Please therefore to send him immediately. On the 18th or 19th send to the city 12 drachmas' worth of fish for the little one's four-hundredth-day festival.

4. πεδοφύλακα τῆς Διονυσίας: i.e. the guard of Gemellus' estate at Dionysias.
14. τοῦ μικρός; cf. cxvi. 11. He was probably identical with the son of Gemella mentioned in the next line. Μικρός is found as a proper name, but Gemellus does not as a rule use the article with personal names. The τετρακόσιος are obscure. τετρακόσιος for τετρακοσίωτος occurs in Tzetzes, Hist. 13. 99. A feast 400 days after the birth of the μικρός is perhaps meant.

CXIV. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO SABINUS.

Καστ ελ Μαντώ. 24.2 x 8.1 cm. A.D. 100.

This letter is almost a repetition of cxii; cf. introduction to that papyrus.

Δούκιος Βελλήνος Γέμμωλος
Σαβίνοι τῶν οἰκίων Χαρέων.
εὐ οὐν πυθέας κομμάδε-

νὸς μου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν
5 πέματι μοι Πινόραν
εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῶν πεπι-

ολυκακα τῆς Διονυσίαδος,
ἐπὶ ἐρώτησε με 'Ἐρμώ-
ναξ εἶναι αὐτὸν λα-
10 βη εἰς Κερκεσοῦχα
καταμαθίν τὸν
ἐκαίωνα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
πυγνὸν ἑστίν καὶ
θελε ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκκά-

15 ψαὶ φυτέ, εἶνα ἐνπλ-

ρος κοπὴ τὰ μέλλον-

τα ἐκκόπτεται καὶ

τὴν εἰκχεῖν πέμας
τῇ κῆ εἰς ἐς τὰ
20 γενέσια Γεμέλλης.
μῆ οὑν ληχῆς τὸν
ἐκτιναγμὸν σου.
ἐρρωσό. (ἔτους) δ Ἀὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Νερόβα
25 Τραίανοῦ Ζεβαστοῦ
Γερμανικοῦ, Χύκ

17.

3. 1. παίγνου. 5. 1. πέμπεις μοι. 15. 1. ἐρωτήσω. 18. 1. ἱδν. 19. 1. ὶ.

'Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his son Sabinus, greeting. On receipt of my letter you will oblige me by sending Pindar, the guard at Dionysias, to me at the city; for Hermonax has asked me to let him take him to Kerkesucha to look to his olive-yard, as it is overgrown and he wishes to cut down some trees, so that those which are to be cut down may be cut skilfully. Send the fish on the 24th or 25th for Gemella's birthday feast. Don't talk nonsense about your threshing. Good-bye. The fourth year of the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus, Choliak 18.'

22. ἐκτιναγμὸν: cf. cii. 29, and note on line 1.
CXV. Letter from Gemellus to Epagathus.

Kašr el Banāl. 15-1 x 8-2 cm. A.D. 101.


νοβθήν καὶ Ἑρωνα
καὶ τοῦς ἐν ὑκρ πάντες.
(ἐτοὺς) ὁ Τραιανὸς τῶν κυρίων,
μηνὸς Καίσαρίου κη.


15 πέμπεις μὲν οικί τῶν
ταυρικῶν εἰς Ἀφροδίτην
πύλαις στερῆς καὶ πλατῖν,
ἐπὶ κέκοπται ὡς ἐχὶ οὐρι
καὶ κολάζεται ὡς ζευγη-

20 λάτης, ἓιαντής.

On the verso

Χάρις ἑῳ Ἐπαγαθοῖ
Χάρις Ἐπαγαθῳ Βελλήνῳ
Γεμέλλου.

4. 1. συγγενὴς χυρίδα. 5. 1. οἶκος, so 12. οἶκος πάντες. 6. 1. μέλλοντος. 17.

1. στερῆς.

... Buy us two pigs of a litter to keep at the house, for we intend to sacrifice pigs on the birthday feast of Sabinus. Do not neglect these instructions. Good-bye. Salute Orsouphis and Heron and all those at home. The fourth year of Trajan the lord, the 28th of the month Caesareus. Send to me at Aphroditopolis a strap (?) for the oxen, strong and broad, as the one they have is cut and the driver is feeling the want of it, immediately.'

6. The letters at the end of the line might be read as ὁχρί, i.e. ἑίχαι ἑῖαν, but ἑίχαι is an unlikely word. The supposed χ may be two other letters cramped together, e.g. θι; the ο would then be eliminated.

15. οὐρί: in 18 spelled οὐρί; the word does not appear to be known. It probably means much the same as ἑπανθομοι; cf. cxxi. 3 sqq., where the language used is very similar to that here.

19. κολάζεται: cf. cxx. 5, ἡς κολάζεται αὐτῶν. The meaning of κολάζεται in these two passages must be 'to be badly in want of,' literally 'to be punished for (the lack of)'; but this sense does not appear to be found elsewhere.
CXVI. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO EPGA THUS.

Κασρ el Banāt.  22:3 x 6:7 cm.  A.D. 104.

[Δούκις Βελλήνος Γέμελλος]  
[Ἐπαγαθοί τῇ Ὑδίῳ χαίρεται]  
[εὖ ὅν] πυθήσας σκέψῃ φάρον] τριάκοντα ἦ κορα-  
5 [κ]ίνοις τριάκοντα καὶ  
[...] σπεύδας πέμοις μὲν  
[εἰς τῇ] πόλιν καὶ πύθσαν  
[...] ταῖς καλοῖς τεσσαρά-  
[kοντα, ἐπὶ βουλεύμοι]  
10 [εἰς πόλιν ἄπελθιν χάριν]  
[toῦ] μικρὸν καὶ χάριν ἐκ-  
[nou] τοῦ μεταφόρου ἐως  

πεντεκαίδεκάτης  
[τ]οῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς  
15 [Χύκα]κ, καὶ ἀν δὴν ἄρ-  
[τάβην ἐλάς πέμοις α-  
[...] πέμπτος εἶνα τῶι  
[ἀδελ]φοῖ τοῦ πέμοιον. μὴ  
20 [ἀπὸ] χαρὶ πέμοι πρὸς  
[οὖ] εἰςα σε ἀνασίωμαι.  


‘Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his own Epagathus, greeting. Please look out 30... or 30 perch and send them with all speed to me at the city, and make 40 good..., as I am intending to go to the city on account of the little one and on account of that incompletely deed until the 15th of the present month Choiak. If you are able to send as well an artaba of olives, do so, in order that we may send them to my brother. Do not neglect my instructions. If I leave I will send to you to greet you. Good-bye. The eighth year of Trajanus Caesar the lord, Choiak 6.’

3. φάρον: some kind of fish, if κορακέρον is right in the next line, but the reading there is doubtful. Possibly one letter is lost before ρ at the beginning of 4.
8. ἑως ῶρας? cf. cxvii. 10.
12. μεταφόρον: cf. Ox. Pap. II. 238, introd. Mitteis (Archiv I. pp. 193–4) is probably right in considering that μεταφόρος as applied to contracts means that the parties had announced the proposed contract at the δημοσία βιβλιοθήκη, and though leave had been granted (cf. Ox. Pap. II. 237 Col. VIII. 37 sqq.) had not yet proceeded with the transaction.
18. ἄδελφαι: probably Marcus Antonius Maximus, who is addressed as ‘brother’ by Gemellus in a fragmentary letter (cclii).
CXVII. Letter from Gemellus to Sabinus.

Καστρ ο· Βανάτ. 23 x 11.6 cm. A.D. 108.

An interesting feature in this letter, which is obscure in parts and includes several unknown words, is that it shows that if the strategus was unable through absence or other cause to perform his duties, the deputy (διαδεχόμενος τὴν στρατηγίαν) was appointed by the praefect. Probably the royal scribe, who as a rule appears as the διαδεχόμενος τὴν στρατηγίαν, had a kind of first claim. But with the praefect rested the confirmation of the appointment.

Δούκιος Βελλήνος Γέμελλος
Σαβίνου τών νεών χαίρειν καὶ διὰ παντὸς εὖ (ἑ)χειν. γείνοσκαι Ἕλλογρὰν τὸν βασιλευκὸν διαδέχεσθαι τὴν στρατηγίαν.

5 γείαν Ἕραςου ἐκ ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ κρατείστου ἡγεμόνος. αἰῶν συν δόξη πέμισαι αὐτῷ ἔλας (ἀρτάθην) ι καὶ εἰκόδιν ἐπὶ χρῆν αὐτοῦ ἐχωμον. πέμισις ἡμῖν εἰς ὑκον ατμανία καὶ ἔλαν, ἐπὶ οὗ

10 ἔχουσι ἐλαῖν νέαν εἰς ὑκον. τοὺς διώτας πέμισις ἐπὶ Ἕραςος τὰ Ἀραχράτια ἡδε τάχα ἑπτᾴςμι, καὶ τὰ βάκανα πέμισιον αὐτῷ. ἡπάντα τὰ κτύπην γεμίζει βάκανον καὶ πέμισμον

15 αὐτῷ βάκανον [...]. ἕπνετε καὶ εἰς ὑκον τῷ αὐτῷ. γείνοσκαι εἰς ἐληφαίναι [...]. σοιν τῷ πρισελλον Ἕραςου (ἄραχμὼν) τ., καὶ [...]. ἐν αὐτῷ πεπόνωσαι.

did γράφο συ εἰς [...]. [...]. τοὺς ἐποὺς

20 οὔσα λαβὼν ἄλλάσσου εἰν' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνῃ. ἐκτίμαζον τὸ διειρον εἴνα ἀμέριμνος ἡς. ὁ ἐγραφὼς μνὴ ἵνα χάζαι τῷ κτιστῷ περιτόν γέγραψαι, καὶ γράφος μν. λείαν

25 ὁτι εὐχαρεῖσι τῇ κόμῃ ὀς
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τέσσαρες στατηράς καθ’ ἕμων
γεγραφήκασι. Ἰρρώθησαν σαι εὐχομαι
εἰς τὸν ἐδρὶ χρόνον. (ἐπούς) τα Ῥωμανοῦ
Καὶ πρὸς τὸν θυσιάν, [Τ]έβιθι ἰθ.

On the verso

ἀπόδοσιν Ξαβίγοι [τῷ] οἰκίῳ π’(αρά) Δούκλιον

Βελλένοι Τεμέλλοι.

3. l. γείωντες; so 16. o in ελευραν corr. 5. l. ἐς εμπερηλί. 7. l. ἱπποδιον. 8. l. ιχνον. 9. l. εἰς ἐλακί. so 10, 16. 14. l. γείμεν. 20. l. λαβάνοι. 22. l. ἄροματε

'Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his son Sabinus, greeting and continual good health. You must know that Elouras the royal scribe is become deputy for the strategus Erasmus, in accordance with a letter of his highness the praefect. If you think it well, send him an aratba of olives and some fish, as we want to make use of him. Send us for the house some... and olives, for they have no fresh olives at the house. Send the... since Erasmus is going to celebrate the festival of Harpocrates so soon on the 14th, and send him the cabbages(?). Load all the animals with cabbage and we will send him five... of cabbage and as much to the house... What you write to me about not neglecting the building you have said more than enough, and you write too often "I am thanking the village," when they have charged you with four staters. I pray for your perpetual good health. The 11th year of Trajanus Caesar the lord, Tubi 19. (Addressed) Deliver to Sabinus my son from Lucius Bellenus Gemellus.'

6. ἔργον: probably C. Sulpicius Similis, who became praefect about this time.
10. διότας: some form of food, perhaps cakes or loaves, as they had to be made.
12. δόκασων is said to mean cabbage-seed; here however it apparently signifies the vegetable itself.
25. δὲ... γεγραφήκασι: perhaps this too is a quotation from Sabinus' letter, in which case δὲ is probably meant for ἵνα.
27. ἵνα... σαι εὐχομαι: this is an early example of the use of this formula, which is not often found before the third century; but its occasional occurrence at a much earlier period renders it an unsafe criterion of the date of letters.

CXVIII. LETTER OF GEMELLUS.

Kašr el Banāt. 22.4 X 13.5 cm. A.D. 110.

Letter from Gemellus probably to Epagathus, but the upper part is badly mutilated and the name is uncertain. Our text begins where the papyrus first becomes intelligible.

III.
πορεύον εἰς Διονυσίαδα πρὸς τὸν Ψιαθάν τὸν καταστρωμένον ἐώς τὸν ἐκεῖ ἐλαίωνα ποτίσματι, καὶ ἄγρασον ἤμιν εἰς ἀποστολὴν τοὺς Εἰσίοις οἰς ἔχομεν συνήθισιν πέμπτην, μᾶρα.

15 λιστά τὸς στρατηγοῖς. πρὸ δύο ἡμερῶν ἄγρασον τὰ ὑπερβάρια τῆς εἰορτῆς καὶ πέμπσις αὐτά καὶ τοὺς λυποὺς πέμπσις εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἔχοντο τοὺς σάκκους, ἐπὶ κοπρηγείν μέλλει τὰ κτήμα ἐν τῇ Ψευνώθι.

20 φρίν, ἔχοντος βελενκώδια καὶ σηστριδία ὡσί εἰς ἐξυλαμήν, βάλλοντος ἐξ ἀρόφρας εἰς τὴν Ψευνώφριν. ἓν αὐτοῦ αὐτὸ τὰ κτῆμα ἐξ ἔμερισεν αὐτὰ βάκαν καὶ ἑλον. μὴ ὢν ἄλλος πυήσας. ἐχ᾽ ἐκεῖ ἐκ τῆς ποτίσματι

25 τὸ ἐπτάορου τοῦ ἐλαίωνος. ἀπέστη τοὺς ψυλλωτές σε πάντες πρὸς ἀλήθειαν. ἔρρωσε. (ἐτοις) Ἰο τΡαῖζανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου,

'Αθηνία.

13. l. τοῖς. 15. l. τοῖς. οἱ ὀφ στρατηγοῖς corr. from v. 17. l. λοιποὺς. 18. l. ἔχονται; so 20. 26. l. ψυλλωτάς σε πάντας.

... Go to Dionysia to Psiathas the sower until you have watered the olive-yard there, and buy us some presents for the Isis festival for the persons we are accustomed to send them to, especially the strategi. Buy the birds for the feast two days beforehand and send them; send also the rest of the men to the city bringing the sacks, for the animals are to carry manure at Psennophris; let them bring the haskeis and sieves as they would for mowing. I am manuring six aorurae at Psennophris. If the animals come load them with cabbage and wood. Do not neglect these instructions. Stay there until you have watered the seven-acre at the olive-yard. Salute all who love you truly. Good-bye. The 14th year of Trajanus Caesar the lord, Athur τὸ.'

19. κοπρηγείν: cf. cxix. 33. note.
20. βελενκώδια is an unknown word.
24. ἐχ': the first letter may be σ. The supposed χ of ἐκ and ε of ἔως are very doubtful, being more like θ and α, but cf. 12.
CXIX. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO SABINUS.

Καίτε κοινάν τις ευκολότερα Κατάλεγα Αύλης.

Διάκοπος Βελλήνης Έμελλος
[Σαβίνων τῷ οἰκείῳ χαίρειν.

ηγόρασκε Αύλης ἐν ημηλάτης
χόρσον ἔδιψαμην σαπράν

5 ἐγὼ ἤραξών) ἢβ καὶ μικρὰν ἄδικην

καὶ χόρσον σαπράν καὶ ἄλων

λειψάμενον ὡς σκιβαλον.

Σαβίνων τὸν Ψέλλον τὸν

ἀπὸ Φενέχους τὸν μετέ σοι

10 εἰς τόλμην ἤνενκαι ἐπιστο-

λην τοῦ ἤγεμυνος πρὸς Διονύ-

σιν τὸν στρατηγὸν διακούσαι

αὐτῶν τῇ... μαςτὶς Βίαν 

μον αὐται πτ. ὑπώτις ἐως γρά-

15 ψε τῶν τῇ[...] εὑρον τοῦ χόρ-

του ἵπτε όσοράν. [τῇ]ν διαγραφὴν

τοῦ χόρτου ποῦ τέθηκα

καὶ ὧν ἰδέαν αὐτῶ τῇς

μνας ἢ ἱστη γραφή; πέμψις

20 τῷ ἐλιθιν καὶ σήμανων μον

ποῦ ἐξῆται εἰναι αὐτὰ προῦλων

ἐνε ὑδήν μέλλων πρὸς αὐτὸν

λογεῖν ἐχο αὐτὰ. μὴ ὁν ἄλλος

πυθήση. ἰσιμέλου σατοῦ.

25 ἀπετέλεοι Ἐπαγαθίν καὶ

τοῦτο ἡμεύνεις ἡμᾶς πρὸς

ἀλλήκων. ἤρωσο. Χοικὰς ἢβ.

εἰς τί Σατορνάλια πέμ-

σις ἀλεξορας δίκα ἄγορᾶς

30 καὶ τῷ τὰ γενέσει Γεμέλλης

πέμψει φησάρας καὶ . . . . .

καὶ ἔρτον (πυροῦ ἐρτάθην) α.

Τ. 2
In the left margin, at right angles

πέμας τὰ κτήνη κοπρηγεῖν εἰς τὸ λάχανον τῆς Ψινάχεως καὶ
tὰ κοπρηγά, ἐπὶ κράζει Πάσις

eἶνα μῆ εἰς ψωμίν γενήται διὰ τὸ ὄπωρ, καὶ χόρτον αὐτῶν
ἐνεκκάτωσαν. εὐθέως πέμας τὰ

35 (at right angles) κτήνη.

On the verso

ἀπόδοσιν Σαβίνου τῷ οἰκέω π(αρά) Δούκιον
Βελλήνου Γεμέλλον.

3. l. ἴγορας. 4. 5. l. διάμην. 6. ρ. ὁ χόρτον corr. from v. l. διών. 8. l. Σαβίνου
ὁ Ψιναίς κ.τ.λ. 10. l. ἴογεκ. 20. κλίδων: for κλειδῶν; cf. 34, ψωμίν. 26. l. φιλοψώματ.

Lucius Bellenus Gemellus to his son Sabinus, greeting. Aunes the donkey-driver
has bought a rotten bundle of hay at 12 drachmae, a little bundle and rotten hay, the whole
of it decayed—no better than dung. Sabinus, son of Psellus, of Psinachis, who is with
you brought to the city a letter of the praefect to Dionysius the strategus telling him
to hear... Where did you put the notice of payment for the hay, and the contract
for his loan of a mina? Send the key and let me know where they lie, so that I may
get them out in order to have them if I am about to settle accounts with him. Do
not neglect these instructions. Take care of yourself. Greet Epagathus and those
who love us truly. Good-bye. Choiak 12. Send ten cocks from the market for the
Saturnalia, and for Gemella's birthday feast send some delicacies and... and an
artaba of wheaten bread. Send the animals to carry manure at the vegetable-ground
at Psinachis and the manure-carts, for Pasis is crying out that we must not allow it
to be dissolved by the water, and let them fetch his hay. Send the animals at once.
(Addressed) Deliver to Sabinus my son from Lucius Bellenus Gemellus.'

4. The symbol after χόρτον resembles that usually signifying ἄρωμα, but this is hardly
in place here unless χόρτον (ἀρώματ) means 'field-hay.'

23. λόγεω is a verb peculiar to Gemellus, unless it is merely a mistake for λέγω.

33. κοπρηγαί: κοπρηγά occurs in Brit. Mus. Pap. 317. 8 (πλοίου κοπρηγαί); the verb
κοπρηγεῖν is apparently new.

CXX. LETTER FROM GEMELLUS TO EPAGATHUS.

Καστ el Banāt. 10-8 x 9-5 cm. About A.D. 100.

Λακίους Βελλήνος Γέμελλος
Ἐπαγαθοῦ [πα] (ἰδιῶ) ἔλατεῖν.
εὐ πυήνας πέλμησις ἐμ θρι-νάκες δῶν καὶ λικημπρή-
δές δῶν καὶ πτύκον ἐν, ἐπὶ κο-λάξωμαι αὐτῶν εἰς 'Αφρο-
Bellenus to his own Gemellus, greeting. Kindly give Vestinus for his yoke a new strong yoke-band, which you will carefully grease, from those in the box of skins which you have with you, so that he may bring it with him when he returns; for his own is cut. Ask the hunch-backed tanner for the hide of the calf that we sacrificed. Good-bye. Posted Paunia 6.
CXXII. Letter from Sabinus to Epagathus.

Kaşr el Banâh. 23.7 x 7.7 cm. About A.D. 100.

Belônôn Sabônôs 'Epagathû tōî iðîwv xârêîwv.

eîv poîîsîwv metâbalômènôwv tî pà-râ soi stîpîpî tî èv tîw ðhîsaurôwv Òô-

5 xârûw tîw koîîçîwv soi tî épî-

stôdîwv kai ëdîwv sîwv bâstâ-

êtî érûbàs êîkîwv ðkîwv, tâs ðê

loîpàs wîpî tîw ðmûotêîwv sfrâ-

gyêîdà ëdûs ëwîw ðpôlêwvîw tî lo-

10 pîn tîw tîmîwv pàlîw soi grâfîw,

lûsûs sîwv bâstàsîwv, mètrîw

dê tetrapô[înîkîw tî sînàpî mè-

tôtîswv ë[...]... ðpôgràfîwv ðê-

fûsîwv, k[â...] dhîlûsûn môi pûsàw

15 ëíîbêsw[an] ënà eîdîw. ðpêmîfà soi

ðpôdêîmûûa ðmèûlôw têssàpà-

kûswa ëîs [tî]w ðhîs Xûlôbêwos. ðpànàgûsîwv Òôsôv-

w tîw tê[kîswv] ðpôtîsàw

20 kai pêrmîsws ëîs Xûlôbîw wàn ti-

wà èûrrhês kàtâ pàrûîswas] ëxûsûa

pêîstîwv pðîllûw, pêrmîsws dê tâ pðs

tîw prûs

[...]ή.[......] ëg (ðrâêìwv) ë.

25 ërròsw.

ëîðûd h Fâmê[ôw] 5.

1. I. Belônôn. 18. õî Pâp. 22. I. ñîswv. 2. ësw Pâp. 8. ësw Pâp. ; so 13 ðpôgràfîwv, 16 ðpôdêîmûûa.

'Bellenus Sabinus to his own Epagathus,' greeting. Please transfer the mustard that is with you in the store of Sochothes to the bearer of this letter, allowing him to carry off 28 artabae and leaving the rest under the seals of you both, until I get the
remainder of the price and write to you again. Let him carry it off, and measure the mustard with the four-choenix measure . . . and inform me how many artabae came out so that I may know. I send you forty specimens of the large sort for the machine of Chalothis. Make Sisois the carpenter pay up, and send to Chalothis if you find any one quite trustworthy among those with you. Send also . . . three days beforehand . . . at the price of 8 drachmae. Good-bye. Posted Phamenoth 6.'

13-14. There is not room for σω[τας] in 14, even if the vestiges suited, which they do not. σωται however was perhaps intended; ἄφορ τὸ σω[τας] is a conceivable reading.

CXXIII. LETTER FROM HARPOCRATION TO SABINUS.

Kašr el Banāţ. 20.5 x 6.1 cm. About A.D. 100.

The following letter is addressed to Sabinus, the son of Gemellus, by a brother named Harpocrat, of whom we have not before heard. The most interesting point in it is a mention of a Jew called Teophilus (Theophilus), who had apparently been chosen as a cultivator of the domain-lands, and wished to be released from this service; cf. note on line 17.

10 ὅτε ἡμέρας ὄλγας ἠὰν δοκῇ σοι πέμψαι τὸ ἀποχρον Ἰσάτος καὶ παραλάβωμεν τὸ ἐλάδιον λυπὸν ἠὰν δόξῃ σοι.

On the verso ἀπ’ ὅδοις Σαβείνων

Harpocratization to his brother Bellenus Sabinus, greeting. I wrote to you yesterday too by your servant Mardon, desiring you to know that owing to having been molested I was unable to come down, and as I am staying here a few days, if you think fit send the receipt (?) of Isas, and let us get from him the rest of the oil, if you agree. Teophilus the Jew has come saying, “I have been pressed in as a cultivator, and I want to go to Sabinus.” He did not ask me to be released at the time that he was impressed, but has suddenly told me to-day. I will find out whether he is speaking the truth. Good-bye, Salute my brothers Lycus and . . . Mecheir 12. (Addressed) Deliver to Bellenus Sabinus.

12. ἀποχώον: perhaps ἀποχώον—ἀποχών is intended; or it may be the same as the ἀπόχωμα in xcv. 25.
17. ἥξθεν ἐστι γεωργία: this probably means that he had been obliged to become a δημόσιος γεωργός. Cp. Brit. Mus. Pap. 445. 4-5 γεωργοῦ τινος ἑκάστου . . . καὶ ἀπολογίσμου τῆς αὐτῆς ἀνάλυσις, from which Wilcken (Archiv, i. p. 154) infers that the leasing of the royal domains was not purely voluntary but a kind of ἀσφαλέσθε. The present passage (cf. also ἀπολογίη in 21 with ἀπολογίσμου in the Brit. Mus. papyrus) supports this conclusion, which is maintained by Mitteil in his lecture Aus den gr. Papyrusschriften, p. 32. We are however not quite convinced that the document on which chief stress is laid, Brit. Mus. Pap. 322, is so conclusive as is there supposed. That papyrus consists of a list, drawn up by the village-scribe of Socnopaei Nesus, of persons who each paid one artaba of wheat, and is headed κατ’ ἀνάρι πρὸς ἀσφαλέσθε φορέτρον ἀπολογίου τῶν μετατεθέμων ἐθείδε ἐκάθισμα κόμες (ἀσφάλεια). But there is no direct reference to γεωργοῦ of any kind, nor is there anything to show whether τῶν μετατεθέμων are persons or things. That the government should have insisted that cultivators of the domains should be forthcoming and made the districts in which they were situated responsible, is intelligible enough. But that these cultivators should have been reduced to a state of servitude and transported at the pleasure of the authorities from one place to another is a very different matter, and a point which we think not yet proven.
18. Teophilus seems to have thought that Sabinus could procure his release, though how this was possible does not appear.

CXXIV. Letter from Theogiton to Apollonius.

Kašr el Banāt. 16·2 x 9·4 cm. Second century A.D.

This letter was found with the Gemellus papyri, but the persons concerned were not so far as we know members of the family. The letter is a strong remonstrance addressed by a relative or friend to a man who was defrauding his mother of some allowance (χώρηλα), and threatens prosecution if this conduct was persisted in.
'Theogiton to Apollonius, greeting. (Again your deeds compel me to write to you) although I am unaccustomed to writing, and so now again I attempt to write to you before taking further steps—unless you are fair in your conduct towards your mother. Indeed you appear to me to be quite mad this month in not keeping your pledge, since even if there were no documents, still, thank heaven, there is no preconceived principle on our part that should make you suppose that we shall be illegally ousted. Therefore if you do not comply and pay your mother her allowance in a fair manner, the consequences of your behaviour will follow and your cupidity will again cause you regret. Do not suppose that your mother has any alarm about this course. Good-bye.'

CXXV. Letter of a Chief Priest.

Kaṣr el Banāt. 14.7 x 13.3 cm. Second century.

Letter from Ptolemaeus, ἀρχιερεὺς, to his brother Heron, urging him to use all his efforts to become successful in an election to some office, perhaps that of strategus. The last part of the letter, which has reference to some allowance that would be made by the writer to his brother in connexion with an ἔμβλημα, is obscure.
Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρώνι τῷ φιλτάτῳ
χαῖρεν.
καλὸς [ποιή]σεις, ἀδελφέ, μὴ ἀ-
μελήσας τῷ] κλήρῳ τοῦ στρατη-
5 γικοῦ, ἄλλα[δ] ὡς ἔδος ἔστι σοι ἀντι-
λαβὼν ἣν ἔξωσίαν ἔχεις.
καὶ δύνασαι[ι] τὸν μερισμὸν τῆς
Φιλ[ουπάτωρος ἔχειν. ἑὰν δὲ δὴ-
η [. . . .] τὸ ἐμβλημα τὸ δαπά-
10 νηθ[εν] παραδέχομαι, ἐδχο-
μαι [γαρ] μεῖζον ἀξίας γενέω-
θαι [ἂν ὁ] ἀπολαύσῃ τῶν
δῶρων].
[ἐρρώσθαι σε] ἐδχο[μαί] πτο[

On the verso

15 παρὰ Πτολεμαῖον ἀρχιερέως.

'Ptolemaeus to his dearest Heron, greeting. You will do well, brother, not to neglect the ballot for strategus, but, as is your custom, using all the influence you have and can get(?), take care to secure the share of Philopator. If it is necessary to ... the lading(?), I will make an allowance for the expense, for I hope to be better off now that we are enjoying presents(?) My best wishes for your health, dearest.'

4. κλήρῳ τοῦ στραταρχοῦ: this phrase would naturally mean the election by lot of a strategus, rather than an election by lot (for some other office) held by the strategus. About the method of choosing strategi we are ignorant, but as might be expected, the praefect was ultimately responsible; see C. I. G. 4957. 34-5, and cf. introd. to cxvii. If however Heron was standing for the office of strategus the reference to the μερισμὸν τῆς Φιλοπάτωρος is very obscure. Philopator must be the village of that name, while μερισμὸς would naturally mean the 'share' of the taxes, and the remark would be more intelligible if Heron was trying to become πράκτωρ or to get some such post. The strategi had to appoint to many of the λειτουργίαι (Ox. Pap. I. 81) but the choice of πράκτωρes rested ultimately with the epistrategus; cf. B. G. U. 194. 23.

6-8. An alternative construction to that proposed in our translation would be to place a comma after ἔχεις and connect ἔχει with δύνασαι.

9. The ἐπιθέμα would seem to have some relation to the ἐπιθηλή, or embarkation of grain, rather than to be a present of a work of art which Heron had to make in connexion with his candidature.

11-13. The restoration and meaning of these lines are extremely doubtful.
CXXVI. Letter to a Father.

Wadfa. 11.5 x 7.5 cm. Second or third century.

Letter of Dioxenus to his father Sarapion, asking him to return home in order to attend to the fixing of boundaries of a piece of land. The handwriting is a small uncial.

Διοξένου Σαραπίωνι τῷ πα-
τρὶ χαίρων, περὶ στατούντος μου
σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἥκουσα φίλου τοῦ
πατρὸς μου λαλοῦντος περὶ σοῦ ὅτι
5 ἔπεμψεν ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράδις σου χά-
ριν τοῦ κτήματος ἐπὶ μέλλων ὃ ὁρί-
ζεσθαι. Ἀνέλθη οὖν ταχέως ὅτι
ἐπίλιον ἀσπαζόμενον Θερμούθαν καὶ
Ἰσίδωρον καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ
10 Ἔλεγην καὶ Τεψίδιensem καὶ τὸ ἀβάςκαντον
αὐτῆς παιδίων καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἐνυ-
κους ἔρρωσεν. Πν[α]οίνι λ.

On the verso

ἀπὸ Διοξένου ἀτὸ- Χ -δος Σαραπίων.

9. Ἰσιδώρον Ρεπ. 11. ἐνίκους. 12. Ἱάβων.

‘Dioxenus to Sarapion his father greeting. As I was walking about with your father, I heard a friend of my father’s saying about you that he had sent a message to your mother-in-law about the farm, since the boundaries are to be fixed. Do you therefore come back, for it is pressing. I salute Thermouthas and Isidorus and his sister Helena and Tepsois and her child, whom the evil eye shall not harm, and all the household. Good-bye. Pauni 30.’ (Addressed) ‘Deliver to Sarapion from Dioxenus.’

1. τῷ πατρὶ: the relationship of the πατήρ in this line to the πατήρ in line 3 and the πατήρ μου in line 4 is very puzzling. Obviously the first two cannot be identical, and if the first is identical with the third, the second must be the writer’s grandfather. If τῷ πατρὶ in lines 1 and 3 have their natural meaning, there is no alternative to this. It is however very remarkable that the writer should refer to the recipient of the letter in this impersonal manner, and we are inclined to think that the πατήρ in line 3 is identical with the πατήρ μου in line 4, in which case τῷ πατρὶ in line 1 must be a mistake or else πατρὶ there means father-in-law or is used as a term of respect.
CXXVII. LETTER OF A DAUGHTER.

Úmm el 'Atl. Gizeh Inv. no. 10243. 11.3 x 8.8 cm. Second or third century.

A letter from Taorsenouphis to her mother, requesting the delivery of some grapes to the sister of the writer's mother and announcing the dispatch of various articles.

Ταορσενούφις Ἰσίῳ τῇ μητρί
πολλὰ χαρίειν.
πρὸ μὲν πάντων ἑσπεραί σε ἦλθη αι-
νεὶς καὶ τὸ προσκύνημα σου ποιῶ πα-
5 ρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ Σαραπίδι. καλῶς ποι-
ήσεις τὸ ἐπιβάλλου ὑμῖν τῷ καρ-
ποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελώνος δοῦναι αὐ-
τὸ τῇ ἀδελφῇ σου καὶ σταυφυλι-
ων. ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν γ [ἐπιγγέ] φια-
10 λῶν, σοὶ α καὶ Πετεσούχῳ α
καὶ τοῖς γαμ[β]ροῖς τῆς ἀδελφῆς
σου α, καὶ μικ[ρ]ῶν ποτήριν Θεο-
νατὶ τῷ μικ[ρ]ῷ καὶ ἄλλο τῇ θυγα-
15 τε φαγὸν πέμψαι ἐμοὶ διὰ Κατο-
τοῦ.

On the verso
ἀπὸ Ταορσενούφις μητρὸς.


'Taorsenouphis to Ision her mother many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health, and I supplicate the lord Sarapis on your behalf. Please give the share that falls to you of the fruit of the vineyard to your sister, and a bunch of grapes. I have sent you three pairs of bowls, one for yourself, one for Peteschus, one for the sons-in-law of your sister, and a little cup for little Theonas, and another for the daughter of your sister. If you get any lentils send them to me by Katoitus.'

1. 'Ἰσίων must be wrong, but to what it is to be corrected is not certain. 'Ἰσίων is excluded because Ision is a man’s name, 'Ἰσίωνος is not likely because in familiar letters patronymics are not given. A name in the dative is preferable, probably 'Ἰσίῳ from 'Ἰσίων.
CXXVIII. Letter of Midas.

Καὶ ὁ Μίδας. 10.7 × 9 cm. Third century.

A letter from Midas to Akous, perhaps the writer's son, asking him to tell Posidonius, who had referred Midas to a certain Ponticus in connexion with the sale or lease of a house, of Ponticus' refusal to negotiate. On the verso are three incomplete lines of an account.

Μίδας Ἀκοῦσιν τῷ [. . .] χαίρειν.
γενοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἀξιολογοῦταν Ποσι-
δόνιον καὶ ἐπικέον αὐτῷ ὅτι αὐκ ē-
πέστρεπται ὁ Ποντικός λαβεῖν τὴν
5 οἰκίαν παρ' ἡμῶν. προσήλθαμεν
δὲ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξ̣ωκέν
ἡμῖν σημεῖον πρὸς Ποντικάν.

1. [ὁμ. ?] 7. 6 of χειμιον corr. from ν.

'Midas to Akous his (son?), greeting. Go to the illustrious Posidonius and tell him that Ponticus has not shown any inclination to take the house from us. I went to Posidonius and he gave me a message to Ponticus.'

CXXIX. Letter to Serenus.

Καὶ ὁ Σερένιος. 12.5 × 8.5 cm. Third century.

A short letter to Serenus from some person informing him that his presence was wanted.

Χαίρε, κύριε πτερυγότατε.
'Ἀπολλάκτι συνίπαλον
καὶ ἑτάκτον πάντως
καταβῆναι τῇ ἐνθέ-
5 κάτη καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν
ποιήσασθαι. ἀξιοὶ δὲ
παράντοις σοβ γενέσθαι.
FAYUM TOWNS

ἵν’ οὖν ἱδής ἀναφέρω
σοι. ἐρρώσθαι εὖχομαι πανοικείον.

On the verso

10 Σερᾶμмо ἐπίθεος.

7. ο of γενεθλίων above the line. 8. σ of σων corr. from ι (?)

'Greeting, my most esteemed master. I arranged with Apollos and he appointed for certain the eleventh for his coming down and making the delivery. He wants it to be done in your presence, so I send this note to inform you. My best wishes for the health of all your household.' (Addressed) 'Present to Serenus.'

CXXX. LETTER OF MYSTHES.

Καστρ el Banât. 23 x 12 cm. Third century.

Letter from Mysthes to his brother Serapammon, saying that he was looking after some copper (money?) until he met Serapammon at a festival.

Μύσθης Σεραπάμμων τῷ
αδελφῷ πλείστα χαίρειν. πρὸ
μὲν πάντων εὐχομαι σε ύπναλ-
νων καὶ τῷ προσκυνήμα σου ποιῶν κα-

5 τ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τοῖς ἐνθάδεις θεοῖς.
γεινόσκειν σε θέλω, κύριε [μου, δὲ] προνοῶ τοῖς χαλκικοῖς πάντως καθὼς ἔταξάμην ἐως ἀν κα-
ταλαμβάνων σε πρὸς τὴν ἐορ-

10 τὴν ἀμερμικὴν ἐμοῦ,

ὁς [[μο]ὺ] προνοοῦν[ντ]ος τῶν χαλ-
κού. ἀντιγραψὸν μο[ῖσ]οι καὶ σὺ τὰ
περὶ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ εἰ τινὸς ἦν
χρίς σοι ἐστίν ἀντιγραψὸν μοι ἀνθ-

15 κινεῖ. κύμισαι παρὰ τοῦ ἀναδίδον-
τος σοι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν κεράμῳ ἐλεῶν,
ἀσπάζομαι Πτολεμαίον τῶν ἀδελ-
φῶν σου καὶ Εὐνύκην τὴν ἀδελφήν.
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σου καὶ [τὸν] πατέρα σου.
20 ἐρρῶσται σε εὐχομαι πανοικίου, κυρίε μου.

On the verso at right angles

ἀπὸδος ......... [ ... Τέρη]
ἀπάμμωντι ......... μη 
π(αρὰ) Μόσθου.

13. ἱάν. 16. ἱ. ἑλλών. 20. ἱ. ἑρρῶσθων.

’Mysthes to his brother Serapammon many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and every day supplicate the gods here on your behalf. I wish you to know, sir, that I am by all means looking after the copper, as I arranged, until I meet you at the festival, having in the mean time no anxiety for me, knowing that I am looking after the copper. Please tell me in your answer the news of the metropolis, and if you are in want of anything, write back to me without hesitation. Receive from the bearer of this letter a jar of olives. I salute your brother Ptolemaeus and your sister Eunice and your father. My best wishes for your health and that of all your household, dear brother.’

CXXXI. LETTER TO SARAPION.

Kafr el Banát. 25 x 8 cm. Third or early fourth century.

A letter addressed to Sarapion by a person whose name is lost, giving him directions about the sale of some barley and the irrigation of a farm.

παρ [ ......] ...
κρατοῦνος κριθῆς...
ἀργάθας τριάκοντα...
ἐξ οὗ ποιήσων αὐτὰς...
5 πραθήναι ἐκ (δραχμῶν) ἵδι,
ἐπὶ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐχεὶ...
αὐτὰς καὶ οὐκ ἡδεῖν...
σεν ἡμῶν τὸ ἐργον...
ποιῆσαι. ἔλαμπ τὸ ἐδωρ...
10 κατέλθῃ πάσῃ προθυμ...
μὴ χρῆσαι ἐστ’ ἄν τὸ...
ὑδροστάσιον γεμίσθη,

ἀλλὰ πάντως...
τὸ Δεκασίου τοῦ φίλου...
15 λάχανον πάντως...
πότισον, ἑλ(ν) μὴ ἤς...
ποτίσας, τὰ ταυρ(κ)ὰ...
μὴ ἄργετων, τιλήτων...
7 [ ... ][ ... ]... ν...

20 [ ... ] ... γραμ. καὶ ε...
[ ... ]... ἀρια διέπεμψα...
[ ... ]... ἐρρῶσθαι σε εὐχομαι...

On the verso

Σαραπὶ- Χ -ονι.

7. ὁ τε ἁμη ὑποτ. 9. ἐδωρ Pop., so in 12 ἕδροστάσιον.
FAYUM TOWNS

... thirty-six artabae of barley and get them sold at 14 drachmae an artaba, since it is a long time that he has kept them and he refused to do our work. If the water comes down, make every exertion until the basin is filled, but by all means water the vegetables of our friend Decasius. If you are not engaged in watering, don’t let the oxen be idle, ...'

CXXXII. INVITATION TO DINNER.

Kafr el Banat. 5 x 5.3 cm. Third century.

An invitation from Isidorus to some person unnamed to dine with him on the occasion of his daughter’s marriage; cf. Oxy. Pap. I. 110, 111, which have a similar formula.

'Ερωτά σαι Ἰσιδώρος δειπνήσαι παρ' αὐτῷ [eis τοῦς γάμος θυγατρῶς αὐτοῦ (?)
eis τὰ Τίτου τοῦ (ἐκατοντάρχου) [ἀπὸ ὥρας

5

θ.

1. 1. πρ.

'Isidorus invites you to dine with him on the occasion of his daughter’s wedding at the house of Titus the centurion at 9 o’clock.'

3. Perhaps αἰρὼν instead of αὐτοῦ; invitations were generally issued the day before; cf. Oxy. Pap. I. 110 and 111. Otherwise the day is not specified here.

4. 5. [ἀπὸ ὥρας] θ: about 3 in the afternoon, the regular time; cf. the two Oxyrhynchus invitations.

CXXXIII. LETTER OF ALYPIUS.

Harit. 30 x 15.5 cm. Fourth century.

This letter, which is written on the verso of civ, is from Alypius to Heron, giving some directions about making wine. The seventh year is most probably that of Constantine II (A.D. 343-4).

Π(αῦ) Ἀλυπίου [ἀπέστειλα τὸν οἰκονιμὸν Ἰρα-κλείδην πρὸς σὲ καθὰ ἡξίωσας

5

ἐνα τὴν διαταγῆν τῆς τρύγην
5 poivstai. [Δπερθαύ δε ἡμερῶν]
[διώ] καὶ τριῶν ἦν καὶ τὰ κοῦφα σοι
[σμυράμη ἂλλα καὶ ὁ οἶνος [[πτοῖοι]]
καλὸς γένηται, οἴδας γὰρ διὶ
ὁ καιρὸς νῦν ἔστιν ὅψιμότερος, κα-
10 ὅς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις κτηματίοις
ἐποίησα. καθ' αὐτὴν ὦν τὴν ὄψιν
μὴ πισθείς ὦν τοῖς καρπῶισι τὴν τρό-
γυν ποίησε καὶ αὕτως μοι ἐπιλεγίην.
ἐπεμψα δὲ σοι καὶ ἀπολυσίδιον οἶνον
15 εἰς τὴν τρόγυν πρὸς σὲ μόνον [ἐρρώθας σε εὐχεραὶ]
"Ἡρωκεῖ Ἡφαῖ Θρασώ.
(ἔτους) 5; Μεσορή 1η.

4. οἶνον Pap., so in 6. 12. θ of πισθεὶς corr. from τ. ow over a word erased.
13. 1. ποίησαι. 17. σ of θρασω corr.

'From Alypius. I have sent to you the steward Heraclides as you requested, to make arrangements about the vintage. Wait for two or three days in order that you may collect the vessels and also the wine become good, for you know that the season is now rather late, as I have done also in the case of the other properties. As soon therefore as you see this, don't listen to the fruit-buyers, but hold the vintage, and when you do, send me word. I have also sent you a sample (?) of wine for the vintage for you alone. My best wishes for your health. To Heron, son of Naph, of Thraso. The 7th year, Mesore 18.'

14. ἀπολυσίδιον: this word, which is new, apparently means a small vessel of some kind.
17. Νάφ: Νάφ could also be read, and the name is followed by two strokes. Possibly it is an abbreviation, but Νάφ occurs as a name without any appearance of being abbreviated in cxxxv. 1. Θρασω is a village name; cf. Ost. 23. 4, B. G. U. 634. 1.

CXXXIV. LETTER OF EUDAEMON.
Kafr el Banat. 10-2 x 10 cm. Early fourth century.

A letter from Eudaemon to Longinus asking him to come and bring the ἐκλος, apparently here a stone implement of some kind for clipping coins, in order that the writer might get some wine with the proceeds of this (nefarious) transaction.

III.
FAYÚM TOWNS

Εὐδαίμων Δογγείνῳ χαίρειν.
παρακληθεῖσι κύριε σκύλου σε-αυτόν πρὸς ἤμας φέρον εἰ δό-
ξαν σοι τὴν ὕαλον καὶ δυνηθῶ-
5 μὲν] τὸ λογάριν περικόψε, έλαν
... [. .].ς, καὶ καλὸν Μαρεωτικὸν δυ-
νῆσεμι μοι σειρῶσαι ἐρχόμενος
[τ]ῆς τιμῆς. ἔρωσον—

1. λογγείνῳ Pap. 5. 1. περικόψε. 7. The last six letters of the line are smudged.
8. 1. ἔφορος[ς] or perhaps ἔφρω[ς]θαυ[ς] σ(ε τ[ὸ]χ)ορ(ει), which is often written very cursively in these fourth century documents.

'Eudaemon to Longinus greeting. I entreat you, sir, to hasten to me and bring, if you please, the crystal (?) and we can clip the cash. If you ..., you will be able to strain me some good Mæreotic wine, when you come, with the value. Good-bye.'

4. ὕαλον: not glass here, but some hard transparent stone with which to clip the rims of the coins.

7. σειρῶσαι: why this rare word is used is obscure. Apparently the sense is that Longinus and Eudaemon would buy some wine with the metal taken from the coins.

CXXXV. LETTER OF AGATHUS.

Καστ οι Βανάτ. 20-2 x 12 cm. Fourth century.

Letter from Agathus to his father, urging him to pay a debt. On the verso
is a list of Roman with the corresponding Egyptian months, e.g. Ἰούλιος Ἐπελφ, Ἁγιοστσ Μεσορῆ. November and December are spelled Νωμήρη Νεκύμην.

'Αγαθός Νάφ πατρί χαίρειν.
tοῦ καιροῦ καλέσαντος τῆς
συνκομιδῆς οῇ. . . . . .
σεαυτῷ τῶν χρεί. [.]. φ. [.].
5 ἀποστὶλαι ἵνα μ[ὴ] ἔσῃ μ[ή]
στρατιῶτας ἀποστὶλαι ἐπὶ
σαλ καὶ συνκλίσθης ἄρις αὖ
πληρώσῃς. ἀλλὰ ἐπι-
σπούδασων πληρώσαι
10 ἵνα ἡ φίλη μιαίνῃ μετ’ ἀλ- ληλῶν, καὶ μεταδότω ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν Γεροντῖον διὰ τὰ ἀργύρια ἢ ἑλαβεῖς καὶ δὲ- δωκας αὐτῷ. χρεωτίς
15 γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πέρυσι λαχανοπερ- μον ἀρτάβην μίαν ἡμῶν.
ἐπροσθανε εὐχαρίστη.

2. ἣν συγκομίσῃ; 5. ἵνα Παπ., so in 10. 7. νῦ. 13. καὶ δὲ rewritten.
16. ἡμᾶς: οἱ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ.

'Agathus to his father Naph, greeting. As the season requires the gathering... please send the..., that I may not have to send soldiers after you, and you be put in prison until you pay. Make haste to pay, in order that we may remain on good terms with each other, and let my (your) brother communicate (?) with Gerontius about the money which you received and gave him. For you have been owing since last year one and a half artabae of vegetable-seed. I pray for your health.'

3. The doubtful ψ may equally well be ρ. In 4 τῶν χρῆσθαι is perhaps for τῶν χρῆσθαι.
12. ἡμᾶς is very likely for ἡμᾶς, the two forms being frequently confused at this period.
13. διὰ is difficult: if μεταδότω means 'communicate,' πρὸς is the natural preposition, if it means 'pay' then διὰ is superfluous.

CXXXVI. CHRISTIAN LETTER.

Kašr el Banát. 12 × 7.5 cm. Fourth century.

Concluding part of a letter in which the writer urges the addressees to return to their homes.

Χ. ἐλεο- δότες ὑμῖν ἔχετε με ὅσον ἄν
πάσχετε, θεοί βοηθοῦντες.
δέν εἰδῇ εἰς ἐβαποῦσιν.
5 νοι μᾶλλον ἀπαντήσατε
ἀπ’ ἐκατόν πρὸ τοῦ τις ὑπάσκει
ἐνέγκη, καὶ οὖν ἑστὶν οὐκέ-
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τι ἐν ὑμῖν χάρις. ἀμνον ὑ-
μᾶς ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ὅσε ἐδὼν
10 τοῖχοι εἶναι ἡ ἐπὶ ξένης.
ἐπρῶσθαι ὑ-
mᾶς ἐκκομαὶ πολλοῖς
χρονὶ αὐ [..].

On the verso

Ἀκιοκ [.]

15 ἕ [.]

2. ἵς Pap. 3. ἰ μάσχητε. 4. μθενά Pap. 7. ἐνεγχει Pap. 17. v corr.

from οἰ.

'... knowing that you have me to aid in whatever you may suffer, the Lord helping you. Therefore heed no one rather than me and return from where you are before some one fetches you, and there is no longer grace in you. It is better for you to be in your homes whatever they may be, than abroad. I offer many prayers for your health.'

13. χρόνος is wanted, but the traces do not suit, and there is in any case something at the end (not ἀδελφοί or κύριοι or ἀγαθοί). There may be two letters lost between Χ and the supposed ρ.

CXXXVII. QUESTION TO THE ORACLE.

Ümm el 'Atl. 4·5 x 8·2 cm. First century.

This papyrus and cxxxviii were found together in the central chamber of the temple of Bacchias, and both consist of short petitions addressed to the oracle in very illiterate Greek. Two very similar documents in equally corrupt Greek from Dimé have already been published in B. G. U. 229, 230, the reconstruction of which can now be improved in the light of the Bacchias papyri. In cxxxvii Sokanobkoneus, the local deity of Bacchias (cf. xviii. 3 and p. 22) is invoked to answer the question whether the petitioner should remain at Bacchias.

Σοκανοβκονεὺς θεῶι μεγάλῳ μεγά-
λων. χρημάτισον μοι, ἂ μείνω
ἐν Βακχιάδι: ἂ μέλλων ἐν τω χρ-
άνω; τούτω ἔμοι χρημάτισον.
DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

1. ὧ. Σοκανοβκονεύς (cf. xviii. 3) θεῷ μεγάλῳ. 2. η corr. from et. 4. τὸῦ. o of χρήσεως over the line.

'To Sokanobkoneus the great, great god. Answer me, shall I remain in Bacchias? Shall I meet (him?)? Answer me this.'

2. ἦ: so in cxxviii. 1 ἦ κρείνεται, B. G. U. 229. 3, 230. 3 ἦ μὴν συνθήκη; (for ἦ μὲν συνθήκην or συνθήκη). Whether ἦ in line 3 is also ἦ is doubtful; ἦ or ἦ are possible alternatives there.

CXXXVIII. QUESTION TO THE ORACLE.

Ümm el 'Atl. 3·3 x 7·3 cm. First or second century.

Another petition, addressed not to Sokanobkoneus but to the Dioscuri, praying for the departure of some one to the metropolis, presumably Arsinoë; cf. introd. to cxxviii.

Κύριοι Διόσκουροι, ἦ κρείνεται
αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἵνα πόλειν;
τοῦτο ἐκεῖνεν καὶ
συμφωνησάτο πρὸς
τὸν ἄδελφὸν σου.

3. 1. ἐκεῖνον. 4. 1. συμφωνησᾶτω or συμφωνησᾶτε?

'O lords Dioscuri, is it fated for him to depart to the city? Bring this to pass, and let him come to an agreement with thy brother.'

1. ἦ: cf. note on cxxvii. 2.
3. Similarly in B. G. U. 229. 4, 230. 4 τοῦτον μοι ἐκεῖνον, which is not understood by the editors, is equivalent to τοῦτο μοι ἐκεῖνον.
4. The subject of συμφωνησάτω (if that is what is meant) seems to be the person mentioned in line 2. But ἄδελφον σου (one of the Dioscuri or αὐτόν?) is quite obscure.

CXXXIX. HOROSCOPE.

Καστρ el Banāt. 26·2 x 18 cm. Late second century.

The recto of this papyrus contains parts of two columns of an account of legal proceedings (?) in a very mutilated condition. On the verso is the beginning of a horoscope, of which only the name of the person was written and the date, given as usual by the two calendars, the 'Greek' (i.e. the Julian)
and the 'ancient' (in which there was no leap year). The date in question is Mesore 5 = Thoth 16 in the first year of Marcus and Verus (July 29, A. D. 161). The divergence thus amounts to 44 days, which is consistent with the evidence of other horoscopes; see introd. to Ox. Pap. II. 235. The ἀρχαίοι χρόνοι began to diverge from the fixed year in B. C. 22, gaining one day in every four years.

The writing is not much later than the date of the horoscope.

'Ἀρποκρατίων [ 
α (ἐτος) Ἀντωνίου [καὶ 
Οὐήρου τῶν κυρίων 
Σεβαστῶν, καθὶ Ἑλλήνας 
5 Μεσορῆ ἐ ὄρα ὡ ἡμέρα(ς), 
κατὰ δὲ τῶν ἀρχέουσ Θώθ ἡτ.

6. l. ἀρχαίων.
IV. DESCRIPTIONS OF MISCELLANEOUS PAPYRI.

(a) Kôm Uskûm.

CXL. List of persons, forming a register or taxing list, in several columns. Much mutilated. Second century. Height 29.5 cm.

CXLI. Gizeh Inv. no. 10217. 14 fragments of two incomplete columns containing Homer, Iliad i. 273–362, written in a good-sized round uncial. The text is the vulgate. In 273 the papyrus has μυ for μευ, and in 298 μαχεσσωνι, in 304 μαχεσσωμενος. A subscript is generally written. First or second century. The largest fragment is 14.4 x 13.3 cm.

CXLII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10247. Letter of Pnepheros (?) to his mother Tamizas (?). Late third or early fourth century. Incomplete. 27 lines. 25.5 x 11.8 cm.

CXLIII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10242. Receipt for 1½ artabae of corn paid ‘for the corn of the tenth indiction at Karanis’ by ‘Αβρααμ. . . . λη συνεκ( ) εαύλ( )’ (cf. B. G. U. 548, 3). Written by Sambas ἐποδήτης. Cancelled. Sixth century. 6 lines. 4.3 x 4.7 cm.

(b) Úmm el 'Atl.

CXLV. Gizeh Inv. no. 10219. Letter from Isidorus, complete, but much obliterated. Dated in Thoth of the twenty-eighth year of a Ptolemy, who must be either Philometor or Euergetes II (B.C. 154 or 143). 19 lines. 31.6 x 10.9 cm. This and cxl-cli were found in the temple of Sokanobkoncus; cf. p. 38.

CXLV. Order from Ptolemaicus, scribe (of the γεωργοί or κηποτράφοι), to make some payment in kind for the μάχθυα συντακτικόλ. Cf. xviii (a) and (b), and cxlvi-cl. Dated in the nineteenth year. First century B.C. Incomplete. 7 lines. 10.6 x 7 cm.

The following collations of both the Iliad and Odyssey fragments are with the text of La Roche.
CXLVI. Order from Onnophris, scribe of the κτηνοτρόφου, to Acusilaus, sitologus, to pay [2?] artabae of wheat for φόρτηρων. Cf. xviii (b). Dated in the twentieth year. First century B.C. Incomplete. 7 lines. 10-8 x 7-7 cm.

CXLVII. Order from Straton, scribe of the γεωργοῦ, to pay 2 artabae of wheat εἰς β. κ( ) γῆς to ... and μέροχος. Cf. xviii (a). Dated in Choiak of the twentieth year. First century B.C. Incomplete. 6 lines. 11 x 7-4 cm.

CXLVIII. Order from Zoilus, γρ' (= γραμματεῖς γεωργῶν?), to Acusilaus, to pay 2 artabae of wheat for φόρτηρων. Cf. xviii (b). Dated in the twentieth year. First century B.C. Incomplete. 9 lines. 10-7 x 6 cm.

CXLIX. Order from Zoilus, γρ' (cf. cxlviii), to pay [2?] artabae εἰς κ ... ω( ) β(ασιλικήν?) γῆς. Cf. xviii (a). First century B.C. Incomplete. 3 lines. 2-5 x 8-2 cm.

CL. Order from Straton (cf. cxlviii) to pay various sums of wheat [εἰς] βα(σιλικήν?) γῆς. Cf. xviii (a). Dated in the twentieth year. First century B.C. Incomplete. 12 lines. 13-3 x 7 cm.

CLI. Signatures to a contract for loan, in which the borrowers, Petesuchus and Onnophilus, Persians of the Epigone, acknowledge the receipt of six artabae of wheat μέτρω τετελειμένου to be returned in Pauni of the πρώτου καὶ τρίτου έτους. The papyrus is not earlier than the first century B.C., nor later than Augustus' reign, and probably τρίτου is an error for τρι(ακος)το, i.e. A.D. 1-2. 15 lines. 12-7 x 11-5 cm.

CLII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10220. Acknowledgement by Heraclides of the receipt of 24½ artabae from Heraiz, being a year's rent. Dated in the fourteenth year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Emperor, Sebastus (A.D. 53). Complete. 8 lines. 9 x 13-1 cm.

CLIII. On the recto, two incomplete columns of a list of payments by various persons, arranged in alphabetical order. On the verso is one nearly complete column in a different hand, but dealing with the same subject. We give a specimen of the entries concerning one person for a year; [recto] II. 27–30, Πετεσώκτες Πετεσώκτεσιος Σερκ( ) μη(τρός) Θαυσάτος τρα( ) Νέον Σεβα(στός) κα(κο) ιδ(δραχμιαί) β(ρωμενείου) κε κο( ) άγ(δραχμιαί) η, Τίθε(να) κα(κο) ιδ(δραχμι) η, Φαμε(νθα) κα(κο) ) άγ(δραχμιαί) δ(ημιου) χ(αλκοί) β(ρωμενείου). From the position occupied by the month Neroneus between Neos Sebastus (Athur) and Tubi, it must clearly be identical with Choiak; cf. ccxxxi, where Neroneus Sebastus comes between the same two months. Unless, therefore, there is an error in one of these
two papyri, the months Neroneus and Neroneus Sebastus coincided with Chœiak. Neroneus Sebastus had previously been identified with Pharmouthi by Kenyon on the evidence of Tac., Ann. xvi. 12, and Suetonius, Nero 55, who states that Nero gave his name to the month of April. But both Neroneus and Neroneus Sebastus are found as early as the reign of Claudius (B. G. U. 713. 3, and Wilcken, Ost. II. no. 1555); and cccxxi, which was written in the reign of Nero, shows that in Egypt Neroneus Sebastus continued to be equivalent to Chœiak. First century A.D. 40 lines. 28-1 x 13-3 cm.

CLIV. Request addressed to the βιβλιοφύλακες ἐνκτήσεως Ἑρωινον (πολτοῦ) by a woman, with her son Sambas as κύριος, who wished to alienate διὰ τῶν ἑαυτῶν a vineyard. Cf. B. G. U. 184, and Ox. Pap. II, p. 180. First or early second century. Incomplete. 18 lines (the beginnings of which are lost). 10-3 x 6-2 cm.

CLV. Notice, sent through the bank of Maron (?) στοάς Ἀθηναίας, of a loan of 48 drachmae to be paid back in Phaophi of the following year. Formula similar to C. P. R. I. 15 and B. G. U. 70 (Mittheis, Tragopitica, pp. 27 sqq.). Dated in Pauni of the twentieth year of Imp. Caes. Trajanus HadrianusAug. (A.D. 136). Imperfect. 14 lines. 15-6 x 9-8 cm.

CLVI. On the recto 8 incomplete lines of an account. Second century. On the verso 18 nearly complete lines of a list of persons with number of donkeys (supplied?). The first four lines are—

'Ανωβίων ἀπολ( ) ἀγραφοῦ διὰ(ᾶ) Πανέιου δύναται.
Σμαραγδός διώκ(ος) 'Απολλωνῖον(ν) [...]
/ δύναται κ.
η δεκακάσ (followed by names as before).

Second century. 14-8 x 8-2 cm.

CLVII. Two small fragments in a large uncial hand, containing parts of Homer, Od. x. 366–380, and 399–402. The papyrus omits 368–372; 377 μισθαμεῖν. First or second century. On the verso, parts of 3 lines in a different hand. Fragment (a) 13-2 x 5-8 cm.


CLIX. Beginning of an official document of some kind, mentioning [Pa]クトυ-
menius Magnus, praefect. Dated in the sixteenth year of Imp. Caes.
Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Parth. Sarmat. Max. (A.D. 175–6). 7 lines. 5·2 × 16 cm.

CLX. Gizeh Inv. no. 10218. 10 fragments containing Homer, II. xx. 36–110, in two much mutilated columns. Collated with La Roche's text the variants are 41 εις, 42 τεως . . . μεγα κυδανον, 53 περ [Σιμωνεττ, 59 πο]λυπε- [δας, 61 εδ[ευεν], 77 μαλιστα γε, 78 παθοριμονυ,] 79 ειδυς, 81 εισαρο, 84 υπερεχε, 101 ουκε, 108 ειδυς. First or second century. Largest fragment 15·8 × 11·5 cm.

CLXI. Gizeh Inv. no. 10234. Order to the ἀρχέφωδος of Bacchias to send up various accused persons; cf. xxxvii. Third century. Written on the vertical fibres. Incomplete, the ends of lines being lost. 8 lines. 12·8 × 23·2 cm.


CLXIII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10233. Account, complete as far as it goes, of receipts and payments. Second or third century. 13 lines. 14·1 × 11·3 cm.

CLXIV, CLXV. Two receipts issued by the πώλη of Bacchias for the tax λυμένος Μέμφεως paid by Paësis on Arthur 5 and Pauni 10 of the seventeenth year, ἐξ (ἀγων) (in clxiv) ἐπὶ δύο ἐπὶ φοι (νίκων) ἀργάβας τρεῖς καὶ ἐφ' ἑτ' ἐρθ' (ῥω' σκ( ) φοι (νίκων) (ἀργάβας) δύο, (in clxv) ἐπὶ δύο ἐπὶ ὄροβο (νοῦ) (ἀργάβας) τρεῖς, καὶ ἐφ' ἑτ' ἐρθ' (ῥω' σκ( ) σιώνε [ως] (ἀργάβας) δύο. Cf. introd. to lxvii. Second century. Practically complete. 6·5 × 4·5 and 5·3 × 4·2 cm.

CLXVI–CLXXVI. Similar receipts for the tax λυμένος Μέμφεως paid by persons leaving the Fayum. Cf. introd. to lxvii. Second or third century.

CLXXVII–CLXXXV. Similar receipts for the tax ρ'καλ ν'. Cf. introd. to lxvii. Second or third century.

CLXXXV (a). Gizeh Inv. no. 10238. Receipt for the tax ρ'καλ ν' paid by Charemon exporting upon a donkey 10 ἔριοι πόκοι. Dated in the fifth year. Second or third century. Complete. 6 lines. 5·3 × 4·3 cm.

CLXXXVI–CLXXXIX. Similar receipts for ἵχνος ἔρμοφυλακίας. Cf. introd. to lxvii. Second or third century.

CXC. List of payments for various taxes, headed κατ' ἅμα Χαρήμιμοι (γ[]
followed by ἕκοστοῖς ἔτους. Amongst the payments are (line 3) ἐπάρον(ριον) 7 dr. 1 obol, προσ(διαγραφόμενα) 3¼ obols; (line 5) ἀπομο(λόσιος) 5 dr. . . .; (line 8) ἐπαρο(ριον) 7 dr. 1 obol, προσ(διαγραφόμενα) 3½ obols, καλ(λύβο) 1¼ obols 2 (?) chalci, σ(υμβολικά); (line 9) ν(αυξίον) κατ(ροικίων) δευτέρου ἔτους 3 dr. . . .; (line 11) ἐνα( ) ὁ ἀτρ(ός) 6 dr., προσ(διαγραφόμενα) 1 dr. 1 obol . . .; (line 12) φ(θρ)υ(ν) φυτ(ῶν) δευτέρου ἔτους. Cf. introd. to xli. Since the second year is probably the year immediately following the twentieth year, the papyrus may be placed in the second year of Hadrian (A.D. 117-8). Incomplete. 13 lines. 9.6 x 8.4 cm.

CXCI. Receipt for 9 (?) obols of copper paid for νομδί(ον) κ(ατ)οι(κων). Same formula as lvi. Dated in the tenth year of Imp. Caes. Vespasianus Aug., Germanicus (A.D. 78). Nearly complete. 4 lines. On the verso a similar receipt for 9 obols, the name of the tax being lost. Dated in the third year of Imp. Titus [Caes.] Vespasianus (A.D. 80-1). Incomplete. 11 lines. 9.7 x 8.8 cm.

CXCII. Receipt for various taxes. Line 4 ἄλος ἐνεκαῖο(ε)κάτου ἔτους, line 5 /11 dr. 1½ obols, ν(αυξίον) 3 obols 2 chalci, προσ(διαγραφόμενα). Cf. introd. to xlii. Dated in the twentieth year of Imp. [Caes.] Trajanus Hadrianus [Aug.] (A.D. 135-6). Incomplete. 6 lines, the ends of which are lost. 6.3 x 9 cm.

CXCIII. Part of taxing list. The entries consist of a name in the nominative followed by εἰς with one or two names and the same four taxes. Lines 18 sqq.: Λογγείνου μη( ) εἰς Ηρακλείδου Ισίωνος, καὶ εἰς Ισίωνα Ηρακλείδου, καὶ εἰς Μάρκου Αντώνιον Γέμελλον ν(αυξίον) κ(ατ)οι(κων) 3 dr. 2 chalci, προσ(διαγραφόμενα) 2 obols, καλ(λύβο) ½ obol, σ(υμβολικά). Cf. introd. to xlii. Second century. Incomplete. 22 lines. 24.2 x 8.4 cm.

CXCIV. Fragment of a similar taxing list with the same formula, perhaps part of the same document. Line 4 ν(αυξίον) ἐνα( ) 2 dr., προσ(διαγραφόμενα) 2¼ obols, καλ(λύβο) 2 chalci. Second century. 5 lines. 6 x 6.3 cm.

CXCV. On the verso a fragment of an account. On the verso a message from . . . ἡγούμενος (cf. note on cx. 25) πρὸς Ἀρτά(νου) κομιγρ(αμματία), ὅτε ἐλεύθεροι κατὰ τὰς στρ(ατηγάς) ὁ τὰς μεταφέρω τὰ καμψία τῆς Καρπαθίων] ἀπὸ Καρ(ανδού) καὶ κατάγοις εἰς [. . .] τὸν πειραίαν. Late second or third century. Nearly complete. 7 lines. 12.9 x 5.6 cm.

CXCVI. Receipt for 20 drachmae for poll-tax of the thirtieth year, and 10 obols of copper for προσδιαγραφόμενα] paid by Souchas. Same formula as xlix and I. Dated in the thirty-first year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Ant. Aug., Phaophi (A.D. 190) εἰς ἀριθμοῦς Ὀῳ. Practically complete. 7 lines. 7.1 x 8.5 cm.

CXCVIII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10230. Receipt for 20 drachmae paid by Heron for poll-tax of the fifteenth year, and [10] obols of copper for προσδιαγραφόμενα. Same formula as xlix. Dated in the sixteenth year of an emperor whose name is lost. Second century. Incomplete, the ends of lines being lost. 5 lines. 6-9 x 9-2 cm.


CCIII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10226. Two fragments containing parts of 26 lines of an account of legal proceedings, written in small uncial. A letter of the praefect Honoratus (probably M. Petronius Honoratus, praefect in A.D. 148) is mentioned, as well as κρίσεις of Calpurnianus, Maximianus and Neocyles (δικαιοδόται, cf. B. G. U. 378. 1, 17). Second century. 15 x 14 cm.

CCIV. Gizeh Inv. no. 10244. Beginnings of 12 lines of a collection of maxims (?). Line 1 ο δ διος βραχυς ... Written in rude uncial on the verso. Second or third century. 8-5 x 4-5 cm.

CCV. Gizeh Inv. no. 10222. Ends of 13 lines of a contract for a loan of corn to be returned in Pauni. Cancelled. Middle or end of the second century. 7 x 5 cm.
CCVI. Gizeh Inv. no. 10223. Conclusion of a return probably relating to the 
ἐπίκρυψις of a boy (cf. xxvii). Lines 1-5 . . . ἀπογραφὴν ἐμαυτῶν (ἐτῶν) λύ
και τῶν προγεγραμμένων οἰνοὺς Νεαμέναν Προσ(ά) (ἐτῶν) γ, καὶ διαφόροι, κ.τ.λ.
Pius (A.D. 138-161). 11 lines. 9.2 x 7.6 cm.

CCVII. Gizeh Inv. no. 10229. Acknowledgement by the sitologi of Bacchias
Hephaestias (cf. note on xv. 4) of a payment of wheat. Dated in the
twelfth year of Aurelius Antoninus Caes. the lord, Med. Parth. Germ.
Max., Pauni (A.D. 172). Incomplete, the end being lost. 13 lines.
9.3 x 6.1 cm.

CCVIII. Return from Aurelius . . . [κωμογραμματεύς?] of Bacchias, described
as ἀπαυσίσμοι καὶ [τὰ κάμμην] ἀποτάκτον καὶ ἄλλους λημ[μάτων] for a year in
(A.D. 222-235). There follows (lines 7 sqq.) a list of villages with
amounts (lost) in artabae of wheat. The first 3 are Bacchias, Tanis, and
Socnopaei Nesus. 5 lines lower down occurs Ἡφαίστειον?; cf. xv. 4,
15 lines. On the verso parts of 10 lines of an account. 12.8 x 9.3 cm.

(c) ḫaṣr el Bandât.

CCIX. Fragment containing ends of Homer, Il. iii. 214-224, in a good-sized
uncial. 220 [τοῦ (ἀθμός MSS.), 221 omitted. In the right-hand margin
are 3 incomplete lines in small cursive, Πράγμα occurring in the third;
and some distance above them πολυτῆς. First century A.D. 10.5 x 4.9 cm.

CCX. Four fragments (the largest being 7.2 x 11.4 cm.) containing parts of
Homer, Il. vii. 41-54, 86-104, 139-156, and 173-186 written in a medium-
sized uncial hand, on the verso of some second century accounts. 45
τοῦ ὕλακοι ἄκοιτη, 47 omitted, 92 ὀδύσσειμα, 154 πε[λ]θοὺς[τιμ], 182 κτίσμοι, 183
omitted, 186 [ο]ποιρεῦστω. About the second century.

CCXI. Three very broken columns containing parts of Homer, Il. xxii. 253-
298, 350-355, 358-365, written in good-sized uncials. 263 is omitted in
the text and added below in a cursive hand; 363 also is omitted; 364
τεθμένη ἔστι. First or early second century. Height 25 cm.

CCXII. Contract between Maron and Ninna, Ἀμοῦνις ὁ καὶ Ἑλθάνεια, for
the loan of 40 drachmae. Dated in the thirteenth year of Imp. Caes.
complete. 21 lines. 11.6 x 7.4 cm.

CCXIII. Acknowledgement by Apollonius of the receipt of rent for the twenty-
eighth year from Horus and another. Dated in the twenty-eighth year (of Augustus), Epeiph (B.C. 2). Complete. 7 lines. 16 x 9.5 cm.

CCXIV. Message to the καυματηρευόμενος of Euhemeria telling him to give the bearer a list of χωριοτέργαλόβοι. Dated in the first year of Gaius Caesar Aug. Germ., Pauni (A.D. 37). Complete. 4 lines. 7 x 13.4 cm.

CCXV. Receipt for 140 drachmae paid παρὰ . . . τοῦ ζυτοπ(οικών) ἄρχ(ολομένου) at Euhemeria in the thirteenth year of Aurelius Antoninus the lord. Mesore (A.D. 173). Nearly complete. 8 lines. 22.3 x 9 cm.

CCXVI. ἀειγραφή, addressed to Dius and Herodes, βιβλιοφόλακες, (cf. xxxii) by Alexion, of half a house and court. Signature of Dius γρ(αματεύς?) at the top in a different hand. Same formula as xxxii, which was written by the same scribe. Dated in Mesore of the fifteenth year (of Hadrian, i.e. A.D. 131). 15 lines. 21 x 10.3 cm.

CCXVII. Fragment containing on the recto a piece of an account, and on the verso ends of 9 lines of a document of uncertain character. Line 5 ἱδρευται Καύσαρ προσπατο-, 7 τοῦ βλοὺ τέρμα δι[ε]καίως, 8 καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι χρηστῷ. Second or third century. 9.7 x 8.5 cm.

CCXVIII. Part of a list of payments of various taxes. Line 5 καὶ Μεσορῆ Ἐθαλίων, 6 ἱλᾶν πεντεκαθέκατον (έτους), 7 πρὸ(σ)ειγραφώμενα ζεὶ, εὐ(ε) ἐπαρουρή(ν) cf. xlii. introd.) οἰκ., πρὸ(σ)ειγραφώμενα ιεπ., κολ(λόβου) ιε, 8 δι(α) τοῦ ἁ(τού) π(αραδείσαντι?) ἐλ., ζ(αλιών) ιε, 9 . . . γεμβ(αλικά) κα(κοῖ) (τριμβολοῦ), γεμβ(αλικά), 10 . . . (δεμβολοῦ), πρὸ(σ)ειγραφώμενα δεμβολοῦ, στραβ(αλικά) δεμβολοῦ (δεμβολοῦ). Cf. xlii and introd. to lv. Second century. Incomplete. 10 lines. 8.9 x 6.2 cm.

CCXIX. Receipt for payment of beer, dated in the reign of Claudius or Nero. Line 2 . . . διαγιγ(ραφη)κες Ὀρσέως Πρ., 3 ἀπὸ τιμῆς ζυτου οὖν ἐλ(γραφα) εἰς . . . [4 . . .] διπλ. ἀγ(γοῦ) δραχ(μα) δικτυω. . . . Cf. xlvii. 4 lines. Incomplete, the beginnings and ends of lines being lost. Written on the verso, the recto being blank. 14.2 x 5.9 cm.

CCXX. On the recto part of two columns of a list of landed property. Second century. On the verso an account, incomplete, mentioning μονόχωρα and ὄχωρα; cf. Wilcken, Ost. I, p. 763. 17.3 x 19.4 cm.


CCXXII. Beginning of a document addressed Φιλίππω αἰγιαλοφόλακε Ἄρτινδυντοῦ. Third century. 10 incomplete lines. 10-5 x 10.2 cm.

CCXXIII. Acknowledgement by six πρεσβύτεροι of Autodike of the receipt of
120 drachmae on account from the κηρυκτρόφοι. Dated in the tenth year of Aurelius Anton. Caes. the lord, Arm. Med. Parth. Max., Pachon (A.D. 170). Practically complete. 15 lines. 11-6 x 6-3 cm.

CCXXIV. Letter from [Νικέρας to his son Zosimus, announcing the dispatch of επιμήνια καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ χαλκόν, &c. Second or third century A.D. Imperfect. 11 lines. 8-6 x 8.

CCXXV. Beginning of a letter (?) from Dionysius to a θησαυροφόλαξ. Second or third century. 3 lines. 3-7 x 6-7 cm.

CCXXVI. Part of a taxing account beginning ε (ἐτους), Πτολεμαῖος Δραμοῦ, Πολυδέκατης Ε. . . ἔγονος ( ) παράδεισων ψε, ἐπαρουμένων Αφ, ναυβιῶν νω. Cf. xli and lvi. 7, note. First century A.D. 7 lines. 11 x 9-2 cm.

CCXXVII. Fragment of a list of payments (lost) from different villages. Those which occur are Ἀνδριάτων, Ἀττίων, Βοιβάστου, and [. Ἰωφένη, followed by γ(νωναι) Ἡρακλείου μερίδος (δραχμαί) . . . Third century. 6 lines. 7-7 x 8-7 cm.

CCXXVIII. Part of the conclusion of a document ending εὐρέχει (? a petition), dated in the second year of Valerianus and Gallienus Augusti, Pauni (A.D. 255). 10 lines. 15-9 x 6 cm.

CCXXIX. Receipt for the payment of 32 dr. 24 obols, mentioning the twentieth year of Lucius [Aureli.] Commodus Caesar the lord (A.D. 180–1). Incomplete. 11 lines. 26-5 x 6-8 cm.

CCXXX. Parts of two columns of a report (probably of πράκτορες to the strategus) of sums paid for taxes by different villages. The second column is / συνυ(αξιῶν) Βῆθ (ἡμισι?) . ἑκάτης ἵμβ (ἐτους) Θεοδελφε(ίας) νῆ, Σεβθαταί γ, Ἀνδρομαχ(ίδος) a (δβόλος), Φιλάχθεος a (δβόλος), Περιάρα α (δβόλος), Φιλογρίφος(v). Cf. xlii. and xlii. Dated in the twelfth year of Tiberius Caesar Aug., Pachon (A.D. 26). 22 lines. 17 x 16-2 cm.

CCXXXI. List of names with amounts of money in three columns. On the verso part of five columns of a similar list dated in the thirteenth year (of Augustus), Pachon (B.C. 17). 22-5 x 33 cm.

CCXXXII. Account in two columns divided into sections, each headed ἐποίκ(ιον;) followed by a proper name, e.g. Συσχάλεως. Below are names with amounts in drachmae. Complete, but effaced in parts. Late first century B.C. On the verso a short account also concerning ἐποίκ(ια). The papyrus was found tied up with ci, ccxxxiii and ccxxxiv. 21-6 x 13 cm.

CCXXXIII. Five columns of a list of persons with amounts in silver drachmae, dated in the twelfth year (of Augustus), Pachon (B.C. 18). 21-5 x 26 cm.

CCXXXIV. Short account of names and amounts in drachmae. Late first
century B.C. Complete. 3 lines. On the verso another account obliterated. 7·5 x 6·3 cm.

CCXXXV. Beginnings of lines of an order from Apollonius to pay (μέτρησον, cf. xviii a) a sum of wheat to a Ἑφορβοῦς and others. First century B.C. 11 lines. 16·1 x 6·2 cm.

CCXXXVI. Fragments of a lease of land dated in Dios of the 24th year of Ptolemy ‘the god Neos Dionysus Philop[ator Philadelphus]’ (B.C. 61–52). Parts of 23 lines. 9·5 x 7·4 cm.

CCXXXVII. Notice addressed to Didymus, [βα(σιλικός)] γρ(αμματεία) of the division of Themistes, by Sisois, announcing the death of his maternal uncle. Same formula as xxix. Second or third century. Nearly complete. 10 lines. 10·5 x 15·4 cm.

CCXXXVIII. Acknowledgement by Char[es?] of the return of a loan of 200 drachmae from Soterichus. Dated in the first year of Antoninus and Verus [the lords] Augusti (A.D. 161). Nearly complete. 12 lines. 23 x 10·3 cm.

CCXXXIX. Fragment of a return addressed to Flavius Apollo[nius], strategus of the division of Heraclides (cf. B. G. U. 194), by the πράκτορες ἀργυρίων of their receipts for a month in the seventeenth year of Marcus and Commodus (A.D. 176–7). The first two headings are λαογρ(αφίας) and μαγδιολ... Cf. xli and xlii (a). Beginnings of 15 lines. 12·5 x 7·3 cm.

CCXL. Contract for a loan of three artabae of ῥαφάνινων to Achilles. At the top are four lines giving an abstract of the loan, with numerous abbreviations, a blank space being left for the name of the lender. The middle of the papyrus is blank. At the bottom are the acknowledgement of the borrower and the docket of the γραφείων of Euhemeria. Dated in the seventh year. Late second or first century B.C. 15 lines. Imperfect. 29·2 x 11·8 cm. CCXL and ccxli were found in the temple.


CCXLII. Receipt for 144 λύτρον Ἰταλικαί of hay (?). Fourth century. Nearly complete. 8 lines. 10·3 x 10·3 cm.

CCXLIII. Beginnings of 15 lines of a list of names and payments. Early fourth century. On the verso beginnings of 20 lines of a list of villages and persons. Ptolemais Δομοῦ, Argias, Alexandri Nesus, Archelais, Theadelphia, Euhemeria, and Dionysias occur. 18·2 x 6 cm.

Written on the verso, the recto being blank. Nearly complete.

4.7 x 10.4 cm.

CCXLV. List of γεωργοὶ, with amounts of arourae, headed κατ’ ἄνθημα γεωργοὶ
άροιον Εὐθύμερειας [ὅπως] τῶν ἀπὸ Φιλωτερίδος τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος [(ἐτός)]
Much mutilated. 20 x 13.4 cm.

CCXLVI. Account of payments headed ἔξεσεις πωλημ(ῶν) ἐλ[α]νομ(ῶν) and
consisting of a list of persons with amounts in drachmae, generally 2 or 4.
Amongst the names occur four sittologi, a πράκτωρ, a ναύτης, a gymnasiarch,
an ἰδιωταλ(ιστής), and a γρ(αμματεύς) τοπαρχῶν. This and ccxlvii–
cecxvii were among the Gemellus find; cf. p. 262. About A.D. 100.
Incomplete, the end being lost. 18 lines. 12.1 x 7.2 cm.

CCXLVII. Another account, in the same hand as ccxlvi, headed ἔξεσεις
Εὐθύμερειας ὁμολογής. There follows a list of names and amounts of corn
and money, with interest sometimes added. About A.D. 100. 14 lines.
9.6 x 10.7 cm.

CCXLVIII. Letter from Gemellus to Epagathus, inquiring whether he had
recovered from a fever (πυρεσών), and giving directions about farms at
Dionysias and Psinachis. About A.D. 100. Nearly complete, but effaced
in parts. 28 lines. 21.5 x 9 cm.

CCXLIX. Letter from Gemellus to Epagathus asking for ἐργατικὰ κτῆμα to be
sent, and giving other directions. About A.D. 100. Nearly complete.
21 lines. 16.6 x 10.8 cm.

CCL. Letter from Sabinus to Epagathus. About A.D. 100. Incomplete, the
ends of lines being lost. 32 lines. 21.6 x 9.2 cm.

CCLI. Beginning of a petition to Gaius Minucius Italus, praefect, from Diodo-
rus, an ἄρχεφόδον of Dionysias and δημόσεως καὶ ὄβοσκος γεωργός. Early
second century. 7 lines. 8.4 x 11.1 cm.

CCLII. Letter from Gemellus to his brother M. Antonius (? Maximus, asking
him to send Epagathus. About A.D. 100. Much mutilated. 14 lines.
22.7 x 10.4 cm.

CCLIII. Parts of three columns of an account of expenditure on a farm,
chiefly in connexion with ταμακά and βοικά; cf. cii. About A.D. 100.
19.1 x 20.7 cm.

CCLIV. Letter from Gemellus to Epagathus, dated in the seventh year of
Trajanus Caesar the lord, Pharnouthi (A.D. 104). Much mutilated.
32 lines. 21.8 x 8.7 cm.

CCLV. Beginning of a letter from Gemellus to Sabinus. About A.D. 100.
12 lines. 9.5 x 10.7 cm.

III. x
CCLVI. Tax-receipt, much mutilated. Payments for οὐρά(άξιων, cf. xliv) and μεταμ(άς) ἀνάφων (1 dr. 2½ obols; cf. liv) occur. Dated in the seventeenth year [of Trajan or Hadrian], Φαύφι μέτ(ὰ λόγον, cf. liii. 2, note) 2. 9 lines. 11 x 7·7 cm.

CCLVII. Two fragments of an account of payments of wheat for different purposes. The villages Dionysias, Bouκάλων, and Psinaconomics occur. About A.D. 100. Fragment (a) 20 lines. 13·5 x 10 cm.

CCLVIII. Account in two columns of payments of metretae of oil to various persons, headed λόγος παρ’αδύνεω(ς) ἑλαία ... κ( ) ἐν κώμην [Εἴσημ]ερεία ἀπὸ καρπῶ(ς) τοῦ θ (έτους) Ἄθριανοῦ (A.D. 124–5). Incomplete. 34 lines. 18·1 x 6·1 cm.

CCLIX. Letter from Gemellus to Epagathus, dated in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81–96). Complete, but much obliterated. 28 lines. 27 x 12 cm.

CCLX. Contract for a loan of money from Gemellus through Epagathus. Written at the village of Αφροδίτης Ἐπανεκαθημερικὴ in the thirteenth year of Imper. [Caes. Nerō] Trajanus Aug. Germ. Duc. (A.D. 109–110). At the end is the docket of the γραφεῖον of Euhemeria (?). On the verso traces of a red stamp. Incomplete. 42 lines. 23·2 x 8·8 cm.

CCLXI. Beginning of a letter from Sabinus to his father Gemellus. About A.D. 100. 7 lines. 8·2 x 11·7 cm.


CCLXIII. On the recto ends of 13 lines of a century document. On the verso a list for payments for taxes:—Χαρίτινον Δελοῦ κάτ(οικος ?) (ἀρνουσά) βας (? (πυρού ἀρτάβαι) ... η προ(μετροῦμενα) γ' 1β', 'Ηρακλείδης Ῥ(απεπη) ἀμχ(ελώνων) (πυρού ἀρτάβης) α, η προ(μετροῦμενα) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβης) δ', ἐπιζολή(ας) (ἀρνουσά) γ' (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) β 1ς', προ(μετροῦμενα) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβης) γ'. On ἐπιζολή cf. Ixxxii. 9, note. Complete. 15·6 x 4·9 cm.

CCLXIV. Acknowledgement by the sitologi of Apia and other villages of the receipt of 4 (or 40?) artabae of wheat [els ? Β'ελλήνων Θεοπ(άργος) κατοίκικ(ων) Εἰκ(ημερέλαιας)? Same formula as lxxxii–lxxxiv; cf. introd. to lxxxii. Dated in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117–138). Imperfect, having lost the beginnings and ends of lines. 10 lines. 10·8 x 7 cm.
CCLXXVIII. Receipt for 16 drachmae of μεταρροθ ἀργυρίου εἰς Ἰ(δίῳ) λαοῦ(ραφίας) of the seventeenth year. The formula is the same as that of ccxiii, which is a receipt issued by the same person. Dated in the eighteenth year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Pachon (A.D. 153). Practically complete. 9 lines. 9·5 x 8·3 cm.
CCLXXIX. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφὸμενα paid for λαογραφία of the second year at the ἀμφοδόν Μοῆ(ρεω) by Polydeuces. Dated in the twenty-second year of M. Aurel. Commodus Ant. Aug., Mesore (A.D. 182). Cf. xxliii–lxi. Practically complete. 6 lines. 15·9 x 8·3 cm.
CCLXXX. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφὸμενα paid for λαογραφία of the fourteenth year at the ἀμφοδόν Διος(νιος) Τόπ(ω) by Castor. Dated in the fourteenth year of Aurelius Ant. Caes. the lord, Epeiph, ἄρεθ(μήσεως) Pauni (A.D. 174). Practically complete. 5 lines. 9·6 x 6·7 cm.
CCLXXXII. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφὸμενα, for λαογραφία. Dated in the reign of Marcus and Commodus (A.D. 176–180). Nearly complete, but much effaced. 7 lines. 8·3 x 9 cm.
CCLXXXIII. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφὸμενα, for λαογραφία of the seventh year at the ἀμφοδόν Διος(νιοιος) Τὸπ(ων). Dated in the seventh year of [Antoninus and Varus the lords] [Augusti] (A.D. 166–7). Much mutilated. 7 lines. 10·4 x 10·5 cm.
CCLXXXIV. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφὸμενα, for λαογραφία of the twenty-first (?) year. Dated in the twenty-second year of Imp. T. Ael. Hadr. Antoninus Aug. Pius, Thoth (A.D. 158). Nearly complete. 7 lines. 9·4 x 8·1 cm.
CCLXXXV. Short account headed ληρ(μ)α Εὐηθερ(εις) (πυροῦ) ... Below are names with amounts preceded by ὁμοι, i.e. artabae ὁμῆ(μης); cf. ci. The fraction ¼ occurs, as in ci. Late first century B.C. Complete. 6 lines. 10·6 x 10·2 cm.
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CCLXXXVIII. Certificate for two days’ work at the embankments (cf. lxxviii. 5). Dated in the tenth year of Imp. Caes. T. Ael. Hadr. Antoninus Aug. Pius (A.D. 147). Practically complete. 7 lines. 8.9 x 7 cm.

CCLXXXIX. Certificate for five days’ work at the embankments ἐν τῇ χώ(ματι?) Δρ( ). Dated in the thirty-second year of L. Aurelius Commodus Caesar the lord (A.D. 192). Incomplete, the ends of lines being lost. 6 lines. 4.2 x 6.5 cm.

CCXC. Certificate for five days’ work at the embankments ἐν τῷ τὴν Ἐνῆ(μερελα) by Sisios. Dated in the third year of L. Septimius Severus Pertinax Aug. (A.D. 195). Nearly complete. 6 lines. 5.5 x 5.5 cm.

CCXCI. Two incomplete columns of a taxing list. The entries consist of (a) personal name, (b) L. τῇ (cf. cccxxxv; τῇ probably means τράπεζα), (c) months and payments, generally 1 dr. 1 or 2 obols. Second century. 20.6 x 23.5 cm.

CCXCII. On the recto part of a taxing list, on the verso part of a register of land. Second or third century. 30 lines. 33.6 x 17 cm.

CCXCIII. Two fragments of a return, similar to xli, from τράπωρες to a strategus, concerning λαογραφία and other taxes. Dated in the reign of Antoninus (A.D. 138–161). 18 lines in fragment (a), which measures 14 x 8.2 cm.

CCXCIV. Two incomplete columns of a list of abstracts of contracts. Second century. 40 lines in Col. I. 21 x 17 cm.

CCXCV. Fragment of an official letter from the strategus (? of the division of Heraclides concerning the transport of corn. Third century. 23 lines. 17.5 x 9 cm.

CCXCVI. Beginning and concluding part of a petition to Apollonius, strategus of the division of Thebais, relating to the recovery of a loan. The document ends διῷ ἐπὶ σὲ τῆς κατατηματικῆς πωμήμενοι ἄξιοι ἐὰν σοι φαίνηται ἀντιλημψας τυχόν πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι μὲ ἐπιμένειν ἐν τῇ ἱλα διευθύνων τὰ δημόσια. Dated in the sixteenth year of Trajanus Optimus Caesar the lord, Epeiph (A.D. 113). 30 lines. 17.8 x 8.9 cm.

CCXCVII. Fragment of a copy of official correspondence. Second century. 23 lines. 24 x 10.5 cm.

CCXCVIII. On the recto parts of 13 lines of a taxing list. First century.
On the verso an account of payments in χό(ες;?), headed προσγρ(αφ.) τοῦ πε(μ)πομένου δι(α) Ψευμάτο(νίος) ἦ... στε βουκολο( ) τῶν ἀπὸ Τύβι. Dated in the fourth year of Imp. Caes. Domitianus Aug. Germ. (A.D. 84–5). Complete. 11 lines. 15·1 x 13 cm.

CCXCIX. Return of persons εἰς ξένης in the seventeenth year of Tiberius Caesar Aug. (A.D. 30–1). Incomplete. 28·9 x 12·7 cm.

CCC. Part of an account of corn, beginning εἰςιν αἱ εἰσαχθέοια... The entries are made under the names of various persons, e.g. Φαρίκων ὁμολος, (ἀρτάβαι) λό, ἐγλύγον (ἀρτάβαι) τό, / (ἀρτάβαι) ρ[η], τοῦτων ἐκβολ( ) (ἀρτάβαι) ξε, λωσ(αλ) εἰς ταμίων (ἀρτάβαι) νβ. Late first century A.D. 34 lines. 25 x 10·4 cm.


(d) Wadfa.

CCCII. Application from certain μακαιροφόροι asking ἐὰν φαίνηται σύνταξιν δοθήναι ἤμιν τὸ μέτρημα καὶ τὸ ὅψιν τοῦ Θώδη καὶ Φαώφα ἄνδρων τέντε. Second century B.C. Practically complete. 5 lines. 17 x 12 cm.

CCCIII. Receipt for λαογραφία similar to ccclxxviii, headed ἀντίγραφον χειρογρ(άφου) συμβόλων. Ερμίας γραμματεύς πρακ(τόρους) κ. τ. λ. About A.D. 153 (cf. ccclxxviii). Incomplete, the end being lost. 5 lines. 4·6 x 8 cm.

CCCIV. List, headed Φιλαπτερίδος, of πρεβύτεροι in the eleventh year. Lines 6–9 Ἰσχυρὸς Σωτηρίχον γεω(χῶν) εἰς τῇ κόμῃ γενάμε(ίος) ἐπιτηρητ(ῆς) γενημασωρ(αφουμένων) ἐπαρχ(οίντων). Cf. xxvi and cvi. 9. Second century. Imperfect. 11 lines. 9·9 x 8 cm.

CCCV. Receipt for rent of land near Philoteris paid by Hermes, γεωργός. Third century. Incomplete, the end being lost. 11 lines. 9·5 x 6·1 cm.

CCCVI. Receipt for payments, generally 20 drachmæ, in various months from Pachon onwards, for some tax at Philoteris upon the γενή(ματα). Dated in the eighth year of Imp. Caes. [T. Ael.] Hadr. Antoninus Aug. Pius (A.D. 145). Incomplete. 8 lines. 10·3 x 6·5 cm.

CCCVII. Conclusion of a lease of land at Philoteris, dated in the sixteenth year of Imp. [Caes.] Traj. Hadrianus [Aug.], Epeiph (A.D. 132). Parts of 31 lines. 17·5 x 6·6 cm.

CCCVIII. On the recto an account of payments in copper and silver, the former being converted into silver at the ratio of 350:1; see introd. to
CCCIX. Parts of two columns containing the ends of Homer, II. ii. 611-646, and beginnings of 647-683, in a semi-uncial hand. 637 meltoπαρεων, 645 ηγεμονε, 647 Μελητιον, 666 νεσ, 671 ιγ'εν, 678 Φιδιππονε, 680 των δε, 681 ναων, 682 Τρητιυν ενεμουντο, 683 Φθειρην. Occasional stops, accents, and breathings occur. Second century. On the verso traces of some second or third century cursive writing. Height 27 cm.

CCCX. Fragment containing a few letters from the ends of Homer, Od. xi. 557-573, and the first halves of 588-610, written in medium-sized uncials. Late first or second century. 588 δευρεα θ, 591 ιην, 596 ανωθενε, 600 εκ μελεων, 603 δαλιμος, 604 omitted. On the verso a few letters in second century cursive. 12·3 x 7·6 cm.

CCCXI. (a) On the recto ends of 9 lines from some philosophical treatise. Line 1] αισχυντα αι ανδρωται, 2] ιλ κακαι δευαν φανερα δευη. Written in a large uncial hand. On the verso parts of two columns of a similar work in the same (?) hand. (b) On the recto beginnings of 5 lines in a different hand; on the verso parts of 7 lines in the same hand as the verso of (a). About the second century.

CCCXII. Fragment of a commentary on Homer, Od. xxi. Quotations from lines 218-234 occur. The name Δημητριος is mentioned in connexion with line 231. Written in small uncial hand. Late first or second century. Parts of 33 lines. 20 x 5 cm.


CCCXIV. Receipt for 16 drachmae paid by Maron ἐπερ...δωρεᾶς καλ... and 12 more ἐπερ ἀποστατου, and two other payments of 8 drachmae and one of 16. Dated in the fourteenth year. Second century. Nearly complete. 12 lines. 10·5 x 7 cm.

CCCXV. Part of a receipt for various payments of taxes, including σωρτάζιγον (cf. xlv). Dated in the sixteenth year of Antoninus (A.D. 152-3). 9 lines, of which the beginnings are lost. 8 x 5·4 cm.

CCCXVI. Receipt for various taxes paid by two persons in the eighth year (of Trajan or Hadrian probably). Payments for σωτ(αξιμον), ψεκ(ης)
1 dr. 1 obol, μαγδώλ(ων), and μερισμ(ο)ί δ(ος)ων occur. μετ(α) λόγον is inserted in each case between the month and the day; cf. xlv and liv. Incomplete. 8 lines. The ends of lines of a similar tax-receipt preceding it are preserved. On the verso parts of two more much effaced receipts.

CCCXVII. Receipt, similar to cccxvi, for various taxes. Payments occur for νεκρ(η) 1 dr. 1 obol, μαγδώλ(ων) 2 1/2 obols, δεν(μο)φολ(ακίας) 1/2 obol 2 chalci, ἔπειτ(ατικο)ν τοῦ(αμών) 1/3 obols. Cf. liv. Dated in the seventh year of Imp. Caes. Traj. Hadrianus Aug. (A.D. 122–3). Incomplete. 9 lines. On the verso another tax-receipt (?) much effaced.

CCCXVIII. Receipt for a payment in wheat (?) to the πράσινος στρατηγός of Theadelphia. Dated in the twenty-fourth year of M. Aurel. Commodus Antoninus Aug., Epeiph (A.D. 184). Nearly complete. 8 lines. 13 x 7.3 cm.

CCCXIX. Copies of various documents; the first, which is headed ἀντιγρ(αφον) [δ]ικαιοματων ἐπικρ(εισων) is an application from Thouriaion, the descendant of a κάτωκον, for the ἐπίκρειωσ of her son, whose birth was returned in the eighteenth year of Trajan; the second is a copy of a κατ᾽ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή addressed to Hierax, strategus, and Τ[ιμαγενες, βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς], in A.D. 161–2; the third is a copy of a κατʼ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή made fourteen years earlier. In the margin at the top is ἀντιγρ(αφον) Σούχμαμμος, so probably the documents all concerned him. Late second century A.D. 26 lines, of which the ends are lost. 13.1 x 6.2 cm.

CCCXX. Beginning of an account headed ἔξθεσις λούτ(ῶν) ἔλει Παιχῶν κτ., followed by names and amounts in obols. Second or third century. 4 lines. 4.5 x 9 cm.

CCCXXI. Part of a receipt for payments of taxes in different months of the ninth year of Nero Claudius Caes. Aug. Germ. Imp. (A.D. 62–3). The month Neroneus Sebastus is placed between Neos Sebastus (Athur) and Tubi; cf. cliii. 9 incomplete lines. 11.1 x 15.5 cm.

CCCXXII. Fragments containing parts of two columns of an edict or important official document, including the phrase οἱ θεοι πράγανοι τῶν κυρίων ήμῶν Λυτρικατάκοφων ἐφ. [ Τοὺς παιδίους τούς ἑπτάριους. Reference is made to an ἀποδήκισις of Lupus, the ex-prefect, i.e. M. Rutilius Lupus, prefect in A.D. 114–7. Second century. On the verso some late second century writing. 19 x 23.8 cm.

CCCXXIII. Letter from Chaer[emon?] to his mother, requesting her to let part of a house, and announcing the dispatch of a key, &c. Second or third century A.D. Incomplete. 26 lines. 22.5 x 9.1 cm.
CCCXXIV. Letter from Philoxenion to Theotimus (cf. xi and xii). Late second century B.C. Incomplete. 33 lines. 33 × 9.5 cm.

CCCXXV. Part of a petition probably to the king and queen (cf. xi and xii). Late second century B.C. 27 lines, of which the beginnings are lost. 23.7 × 19.3 cm.

CCCXXVI. On the recto account in three columns, two of which are nearly complete, mainly concerning χόρτος and ἀράκων. On the verso parts of four columns of a money-account mentioning the thirtieth year (of Augustus, B.C. 1–A.D. 1). 29.4 × 28 cm.

CCCXXVII. Receipt for a series of payments, generally 180 drachmai, in different months, into the bank of Demetrius for ζυηδα. Late first century A.D. Incomplete. 9 lines. Above these are beginnings of 4 lines in the same hand, and remains of a preceding column. On the verso an account. 21.4 × 25.5 cm.

CCCXXVIII. List of persons, each line beginning with κλήρος (?) and ending with καὶ Ἀλεξ(ανθρείας ?) ὄμολος, e.g. line 3 κλήρος 'Ἰσχυρῶν τοῦ Θεόντας καὶ Ἀλεξ( ) ὄμολος, 9 κλήρος Νεφεράτος τοῦ Φασάτος καὶ Ἀλεξ( ) ὄμολος. Cf. cccxxviii. One column of 41 lines, nearly complete, and traces of a preceding column. Second century. On the verso part of a list of persons. 30.5 × 12.8 cm.

CCCXXIX. On the recto parts of two columns, the first a list of persons with amounts of wheat and barley, the second (beginnings of lines only) being a list of villages—Μουκέως, Κυνών, Θεσσαλίας, Βουκόλων, Φεσωτ( ). Ἱβιωνος, Ταλει, Καλλωπι, . . ., Βερουκιδος, Ιερας, Πολεμαδος, Κέρκησθιθεος, Βουκόλων, Κέρκησθιθεος. Second century. On the verso part of a list of persons with their ages, written in red ink. 15.9 × 13.8 cm.

CCCXXX. Receipt for ἄρθ(μηκοπ) εἰς(οικον) of the fifteenth year. Dated in the fifteenth year of Trajan (A.D. 104–5). Imperfect, the ends of lines being lost. 8 lines. 15.9 × 7 cm.

CCCXXXI. List of payments to ἑργ(αται) at the rate of 9 obols per man; cf. cii. Dated in the tenth year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord (A.D. 125–6). Imperfect. On the verso an account of payments for various articles, e.g. ἄγρα χειμα, ξηρας 16 obols, ἄλυσεναδος, σιδέλια, ἀποσφειμα, βίβλους 2 obols, ἱρα, ἕρομφρον, μύρον, Κοπρήσ, ὀστομικα. 20 × 12.7 cm.

CCCXXXII. Beginning of a return from the sitologi of Magais, headed καὶ ἀνδρα τῶν μενεριμένων ἦν ἕν ἀπὸ μηνὸς Παχών ἔως Μεσορή of the fifteenth year of Marcus ἀπὸ γενημίατος τοῦ ηὔτου ἔτους; cf. lxxvi (a). A.D. 174–5. 8 lines. 9.5 × 13.8 cm.

CCCXXXIII. Conclusion of a document ending . . . ἐξ δὲ ἀνηλιώδης τιμῆς κρηθης (ής)
at 5 dr. the artaba, 7 dr. 3 obols, a . . . . 4 obols, ἀγῷρων 3 obols, τιμῆς ἀθλάσ(τ)ον 2 obols, ζυμωργοῦ 4 dr., ψήφῳ καὶ κεράμου 3 obols, / ἄγρυ(ν)τον 13 dr. 3 obols, λοιπ(α)ί 9 dr., ἅ καὶ διαγράφω?] ἐπὶ τίν δημοσίαν τρ(ά)πεζαν. Σαραπίων ἐπὶθέσισα καθὼς παρέκειται. Dated in the reign of Antoninus (A.D. 138–161). 12 lines. On the verso part of an account. 10.5 x 8.8 cm.

CCCXXXIV. Account headed λόγος ἐνοικίων Κερκεστήριο(υ)ς ἀφελώτων ές χρον (//=Θωθ?) τοῦ ἰδ. (έτους) (δραχμάς) πδ. Second or third century A.D. Practically complete. 18 lines. 16.4 x 10.6 cm.

CCCXXXV. Six fragments, containing on the recto a list in several columns of names in alphabetical order, with similar entries after each, e.g. Ἀρποκρατίων Ὑμεγένους τοῦ Ἀρτεμίδωρον μητ(ρος) Ἰσιδώρας (ἔτων) μη, τρ( ) ιε(έτους) Ἑπειφ σ (δραχμαί) κ. Ἀγαθὸς Δαυίδων Σιο(χιώνος τοῦ Σμύρνα μητρ(ος) Κλαυδίας τῆς κ(α)λ. Γαλάτειας ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης (ἔτων) τα, τρ( ) ιε(έτους) Μεσορή β (δραχμαί) στ., κη (δραχμαί) δ. Probably a list of payments for poll-tax to the τράπεζα (?); cf. cccxc. Second century. On the verso a list of persons in alphabetical order and payments in corn, and accounts of a sitoalogus similar to lxxxvi.

CCCXXXVI. On the recto fragment of an official letter in two columns. Second century. On the verso four columns of a list of persons and payments in artabae of wheat or σάκκω, no doubt an account of a sitoalogus (cf. lxxxvi). ἐπικριτὴς δημοσίων occurs several times. 15.5 x 17 cm.

CCCXXXVII. Parts of two incomplete columns of a philosophical work concerning the gods. The first column has lost from three to six letters at the beginnings of most lines; of the second, only two or three letters of the beginnings of lines are preserved. Col. I 3–5 τοῦ θεοῦ εἰλαστριήςθεν χουίας ἄξωιθερῆτες ἐπιελεύθερα, 16–22 δε τῶν [ἀ]θρώτων ἄρχων [τῶν] πράξεων ἐκείνης δὲ εἰς οὗ ἐφάπτεσθα, οἷς ἀτάκτως μεντού ἀλλ' ἐμαυνήθερωσ' τοῦ γὰρ ἄστοχος . . . Written in a small uncial hand. Second century. 29 lines in Col. I. 17 x 8.4 cm.

CCCXXXVIII. Fragment of an account concerning corn. After a list of six persons and amounts paid by them on one day (the twenty-fourth) comes τῆς ἡμ(ερ)ας art. 552, δὲ γεν(ήματα) art. 115, Σενέκ( ) art. 140, Ἀλεξ(ιοπερίες ? cf. cccxxviii) art. 160, Γαλ(λιάν?, cf. Brit. Mus. Pap. 265) art. 68, Μαρκ( ) . . . On the twenty-fifth the entries are [κ]ληρος Ἡρακλῆν Μαρκ( ) art. 126, φορέταρων κληρο(χων) art. 4, &c. Second century. 12 lines. On the verso parts of two columns of another account. 9 x 16 cm.

CCCXXXIX. Fragment of a list of payments in kind upon σφραγίδες of land, e.g. ιβ σφραγίς νότ(ου) καὶ ἀπ(αλλακτων) ἀδ(άμα) μέτον ου καὶ διῄρησθαι ([κ]αὶ τά γ (cf. lxxxvi. 5) ἄρουρα 14, (παρθ θραβαὶ)
CCCXL. Two fragments, containing on the recto part of a list of κλήροι (roei) numbered in order, with much abbreviated entries under each, apparently a list of the holders of parts of each κλήρος with the amounts of their farms. Second century. On the verso part of a sitologus' account in several columns similar to lxxxvi, giving a list of payments on different days; e.g. Θεαδελ(βίαι) δημοσίων art. of wheat 4
2, δι(α) η
θυμωτ(ερίδοι) αι π(οικείμεναι) art. 6
2, δι(α) η
θυμωτ(ερίδοι) art. 4
2, δι(α) η
θυμωτ(ερίδοι) αι π(οικείμεναι) art. 11
2, Διονυσίαδος art. 4
2. γ' Ἀγγαρίμοβος (τις) Ἀγγαρίμοβος art. 106
2, / η(μέρος) art. 106
2, δημοσίων art. 11
2 (?). Fragment (a) 20.3 x 23 cm.

CCCXLII. Receipt for various taxes, including ἀλώς, ἐπαρα(τίνος) 750 (?) obols, προσδ(αγραφόμενα) 60, κολ(αβίων) 30, [... ]τ(α) παρ(μα)[θ.] (elosow) ..., προσδ(αγραφόμενα) 50, κολ(αβίων) 30, συμβ(οικίων) ..., vaviu ... Cf. xlii. Dated in the eleventh year of an emperor. Second century. Incomplete. 21 lines. 10.5 x 5.5 cm.

CCCXLIII. List of villages (Theadelphia, Polydeucia, and Argias occur) with amounts in kind, headed ἐπιστάμαντις [...]. Second century. Incomplete, the ends of lines being lost. 12 lines. 11.5 x 5.7.

CCCXLIV. On the recto a list of abstracts of contracts headed γραφείον Πολιτείας (τις) Θεμελίων (της) Θεμελίων μερίδοις. Late first or second century. Incomplete. 47 lines. On the verso a letter from Ptolemais to Papirians. Second century. Nearly complete. 24 lines. 25 x 20.8 cm.

CCCXLV. Lease of a κλήρος at Theadelphia, nearly complete, but much obliterated in parts. The land was to be returned καθαρῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ δημοσίου καλάμου ἀγρώστες δήλης πάσης (cf. C. P. R. 38. 21, B. G. U. 39. 21, &c., where these phrases occur without καθαρῶς). Written in the third year of Antoninus Caesar the lord (A.D. 139-140). 27 lines. 14 x 11.1 cm.

CCCXLVII. List of payments (lost) for various articles, e.g. τετραπατία, δισάκκον, σκληρύνων, κερκικαρί, δεμάτων, ἔθρυκελ( ), κελλαρέων, σάκκων, ξυστρείας, σφερίας, καψαλίον, φέλονων, χορτί, στιτολίων, ναρθείων, περιστρη. Second century. 23 lines, of which only the beginnings are preserved. 20.4 x 4.3 cm.

CCCXLVIII. Parts of two columns of a similar list of articles with prices (lost), e.g. σκεφή κλίνης, τιμής στοικέτρων χαλκίων, λεπάδων(α), κηροῦ εἰς πλησίας, ἡπτύμης ὀλίγης, λαμπρον ἰμνοῦ, πιστήνων, χάρακος εἰς . . . ἀνθρακο(ς). On the verso part of an account. Second or third century. 21 lines in Col. II. 19.6 x 13.2 cm.

CCCXLIX. Two receipts for poll-tax of the twelfth year (?) in the ἀμφοδον Ἰερᾶς Πολῆς paid apparently by the same person through Diodorus, the first payment being 8 drachmae with [4] obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα, the second for 12 drachmae with 6 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα. The second receipt is dated in the thirteenth (?) year of Hadrian (A.D. 128-9); the date of the first is lost, but was probably the same. Incomplete. 10 lines altogether. 8.7 x 21.7 cm.


CCCLIII. Receipt for 20 drachmai and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα paid by Papontos (?) for poll-tax of the tenth (?) year. Late second century. Incomplete. 6 lines. 10.4 x 6.1 cm.

CCCLIV. Receipt for 20 drachmai and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα paid by Zoistimus for poll-tax of the [th] year in the ἀμφοδον Μοὺ(ρως). Second century. Incomplete. 6 lines. 7.5 x 7 cm.

CCCLV. Receipt for 20 drachmai and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα paid by Philoxenus for poll-tax of the sixth year in the ἀμφοδον Ἦερᾶς Πολῆς. Dated in the sixth year of Imp. Caes. Trajanus Hadrianus Aug., Epeiph (A.D. 122). On the verso Ἰερ(άς) Πολ(ῆς). Nearly complete. 6 lines. 10.4 x 12 cm.
CCCLVI. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα, for poll-tax of the seventeenth year. Dated in the seventeenth year of Imp. Caes. Trajanus Hadrianus Aug., Athur (?) (A.D. 132). Nearly complete. 5 lines. 10 × 8 cm.

CCCLVII. Receipt for 20 drachmae and 10 obols for προσδιαγραφόμενα, for poll-tax in the reign of Antoninus (A.D. 138-161). Imperfect. 7 lines. 7.7 × 9.4 cm.


CCCLX. Certificate for five days' work, Pauni 23-27, at the embankments of Theadelphia by Heron. Dated in the seventeenth year of L. Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax and M. Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augusti and P. Septimius Geta Caesar Aug. (A.D. 209). Nearly complete. 9 lines. 6.5 × 7.6 cm.

CCCLXI. Certificate for five days' work at the Ψυκαλετ( ) of Theadelphia (cf. lxxvii. 5). Dated in the reign of Imp. Caes. T. Ael. Hadr. Antoninus Aug. Pius (A.D. 138-161). Nearly complete. 8 lines. 7.1 × 8.6 cm.

CCCLXII. Certificate for five days' work at the embankments of Theadelphia by Sisoi. Dated in the seventh year of Imp. Caes. Trajanus Hadrianus Aug. (A.D. 123). Nearly complete. 6 lines. 11 × 8.5 cm.

CCCLXIII. Two certificates, stuck together, for five days' work done at the embankments by various persons. Dated in the twenty-fifth year of M. Aurel. Commodus Anton. Aug. Pius (A.D. 185). Incomplete. 20 lines in Col. II. On the verso part of an account. 22 × 8.5 cm.


CCCLXV. Certificate for five days' work on the embankments at the ξηθ(υος) of Theadelphia. Dated in the eighteenth year of Imp. [Caes.] Trajanus Hadrianus Aug. (A.D. 134). Nearly complete. 8 lines. 6 × 6.2 cm.

CCCLXVI. Certificate for five days' work in Mesore at the embankments of Theadelphia. Dated in the third year of Imp. [Caes.] Trajanus Hadrianus Aug. (A.D. 119). Imperfect. 8 lines. 11.5 × 6.5 cm.
V. OSTRACA.

The 50 selected ostraca which we publish here possess a peculiar interest in being the first collection found in the Fayûm. Out of the 1600 texts in Prof. Wilcken's recently issued Corpus not one comes from that province, and the existence of only two or three Fayûm ostraca was known to him. That hitherto the comparative rarity of these objects in the Fayûm is largely due to the carelessness of native diggers has been already pointed out (p. 46). Our excavations at Kašr el Banât and Harit (and more recently at Tebtunis) showed that plenty of ostraca were forthcoming if only a systematic search for them was made.

The use of fragments of pottery as a writing material was necessarily restricted to short documents, principally receipts, the custom of giving which was observed with the utmost strictness (cf. xxi). The excessive brevity of these documents, in which the formula is frequently reduced to the barest minimum consistent with its legal validity, and their numerous abbreviations, combined with the usually very cursive character of the writing and the unsatisfactory nature of the material, on which ink was especially liable to run or to fade, often make their decipherment and interpretation a matter of extreme difficulty. The monumental work of Wilcken, however, marks a new era in this branch of study, and by the aid of the mass of material so carefully and accurately classified by him, it should henceforth be comparatively easy in most cases to interpret fresh examples from well-known sources of ostraca such as Thebes and Syene. But ostraca from a new district inevitably possess peculiar formulae, the difficulties of which do not readily yield to a comparison with examples from other parts of Egypt. Fortunately the interpretation of Fayûm ostraca can often be supplemented by papyri from the same locality with similar formulae.
The ostraca from Kaṣr el Banāt, Harit and Wadīfa fall into five classes. The first of these consists of receipts for taxes in money, amongst which are found the tax for the maintenance of baths (2-4, 6, cf. xlvi; 5 is somewhat different), and that on making beer (8-10, cf. 11 and 48). A tax connected with wine occurs in 7, and some new and obscure payments in 49. Orders for payment constitute the second class of ostraca (11, 12, 14-19). One group (14-18), which belongs to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, presents considerable resemblance to xviii (a) and (b). As in those two papyri, the γραμματέως of the (θησαυροῦ) γεωργοὶ or of the κτηνοτρόφος issues the orders (μέρισιν is the verb in the ostraca instead of μέρισιν in xviii (a) and (b)), and though it is not stated in the ostraca to which official they were addressed, the analogy of the papyri is in favour of supposing that they were sent to the sitologus. The nature of the instructions seems, however, to be different in the papyri and in the ostraca. In the former the payments were apparently to be made from the granary by the sitologus, while in the latter the payments are made into the granary, as is shown by 17. 3, where (εἰς θησαυρόν) is found. What kind of payments are meant is, however, uncertain, owing to the obscurity attaching to the proper names which follow (εἰς θησαυρόν or θησαυρὸν . . . ) in each case. From 14 it is clear that these are personal not village names, yet from 14 and 17 it appears that these persons are neither the owners of the produce brought to the θησαυρός nor the persons in charge of the transport.

The third class of ostraca (20-23), consisting of receipts for payments of hay or chaff (20, 21; cf. 19), or barley (22 and 23), offers no special difficulty; but the case is otherwise with the fourth class (24-40), a large and closely connected group, of which 24, 36, and 39 are the best illustrations, though even there the absence of any verb renders the interpretation extremely doubtful. The formula in this group with some variations, generally due to omissions or mere differences of the order, is this: (1) θησ (i.e. θησαυροῦ, cf. 30) followed by a village name; (2) γενν(μάτως) of a year (in all cases that preceding the year in the date); (3) διὰ κτηνῶν followed by a place name which may be another Fayûm village (e.g. 36. 3), or a place outside the Fayûm (e.g. 37. 2); (4) a personal name in the nominative; (5) διὰ followed by the name of an ἀναλάτης or κτηνοτρόφος; (6) ὀνος, or more rarely σάκκος, followed by a number; (7) date. This scheme is obviously very like that of the ostraca found at Sedment near Heracleopolis and only a few miles from Ilahûn. In these (Wilcken, Ost. i. p. 507) the formula runs:—(1) date; (2) σιγολ(ου ... ) (sometimes omitted) followed by a Fayûm village name; (3) γενν(ματος) followed by a year; (4) διὰ ὀνος followed by a place name, either in the Fayûm or in another nome; (5) a number of ὀνος or σάκκος and the number of artabae carried. With the
substitution of ῆσα(αυρων) for ουτολ(αυ . .) the Sedment ostraca are nothing but shorter examples of the formula given at length in 24 and 36, the characteristic difference between the two groups lying in the fact that personal names occur in no case among the ostraca from Sedment, but in nearly every case among those from the Fayum. The Sedment ostraca are explained by Wilcken not as tax-receipts, but as notes of the officials at the Controlestation of Sedment recording the grain exported from the Fayum for Alexandria upon donkeys partly requisitioned from the neighbouring nomes. The abrupt character of the formula is, he supposes, due to the fact that these ostraca were not given to the persons in charge of the animals, but were merely private notes of the officials at Sedment which were subsequently entered in the official books.

This explanation does not, however, suit the Fayum series. There is no reason for thinking that a document found e.g. at Theadelphia with the heading ῆσα(αυρων) Theadelphia was written outside the Fayum. It is, on the contrary, extremely probable that it was written at Theadelphia; and comparing the Fayum with the Sedment ostraca, it seems to us much more likely that the latter were written at the villages of which the names occur in the first line after ουτολ(αυ . .), than at Sedment itself which is never named in them. If the theory that they are concerned with the exportation of grain from the Fayum is correct, we should in any case prefer to regard the Sedment ostraca as tickets issued to the transporters at the starting-point, to be given up on leaving the Arsinoite nome. But are the grounds sufficient for supposing that in either of the two series the grain mentioned was being exported? In the case of the Sedment ostraca the principal reason lies in the fact that they were found outside the Fayum, an argument which does not apply to those from the Fayum. The employment of donkeys from other nomes than the Fayum, which is frequent in the Sedment ostraca and occurs at least once in those from the Fayum (37. 2, cf. 34), is perhaps more intelligible on the view that the grain was about to pass, or had passed, the boundaries of the Fayum; but it is curious that camels, which are much more suited for long journeys than donkeys, never occur. If the Fayum ostraca are considered by themselves it is not at all a natural inference that the grain was to be exported. The general scheme of the most detailed ostraca, e.g. 24 and 36, bears considerable resemblance both in the order of the phrases and in their construction to the ordinary sitologus receipts with the formula μεμετρήθη ἀπὸ γενημάτων κ.τ.λ. (e.g. lxxxi–lxxxv); and there are some other indications, such as the occurrence of (ἔ)ς τῶν δημόσιων ῆσανωτόν in 32, the later addition made in 24. 7–9, and the issue of two ostraca concerning the same person within two days (27 and 28), which suit the view that these ostraca are receipts issued for grain received by the
sitologi of the villages mentioned in the headings. The fact that the transport animals generally come from other villages has its parallel in the ἄτοκοι found in sitologus accounts, e.g. lxxxvi (cf. p. 210); and the distinction frequently found in the ostraca between the ὄνομάτης (δω) with the genitive) and the person in the nominative corresponds to the distinction, e.g. in lxxxiv. 9, between the person credited with the payment (the land-owner), and the agent who actually makes the payment (the tenant). On the other hand this view of the Fayûm ostraca does not explain wherein these supposed payments differ from the payments for land-tax, nor why, if the Sedment ostraca are also sitologus receipts, they came to be found together outside the Fayûm. The resemblance between the Fayûm ostraca and the sitologus receipts, though a strong argument for regarding the former as receipts of some kind issued by sitologi, hardly warrants our treating them as receipts for land-tax, although it is difficult to see what other kinds of payment would be likely to be meant. The occurrence at Sedment of sitologus receipts from various parts of the Fayûm may be due to accident, but it is more satisfactory to account for their presence by supposing that they were brought there with a definite object. If so, Wilcken’s hypothesis with the modifications we have suggested (p. 319) remains the most probable explanation of the Sedment series. But it does not seem possible to obtain a consistent explanation of both groups until more evidence is forthcoming to show what verb has to be supplied.

The fifth class of ostraca (41–50) is of a miscellaneous character, including three receipts (41–43) for payments of corn, which are perhaps analogous to those in 24–40.

A notable feature of these Fayûm ostraca is the large proportion of them which belongs to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. After A.D. 50 there are but very few examples before about A.D. 250, at which point they again become common.


("Ετους) ε Καλορος, δι' ἔγγραψεν

Ἡρακλ( , ) Τοβι( , ) ις (δραχμας) δ.

A specimen of a tax-receipt reduced to the barest elements. The name of the tax is not given here, but in another ostraca found with this one, dated in Athur of the 5th year, "Ἡρακλ( , )" is followed by an abbreviation, probably the name of a tax, which, owing to the faintness of the ink, we have been unable to decipher. It consists of four letters, the first being like δ or ε, the third like the sign for drachmae, and the fourth being above the line, perhaps λ. The sum paid is, as in 1, 4 drachmae.

("Ετους ξ, Πάχαν ει, δι(ἐγραφεν)
Ἡρᾶς χήρα μήτηρ Ἡρωνος
τέλ(ουσ) βαλας(ειῶν) Ἑυθηρε(ειας) δι(ά) Ἡρωνος ἐπὶ λόγου
δβολ(ουσ) δέκα τέ(σ)σαρες, / (δβολοι) ιδ. (2nd hand) Ἡρων σεση.

The 7th year, Pachon 18. Heras, a widow (?), mother of Heron, has paid for the bath-tax at Euhemeria through Heron. On account, fourteen obols, total 14 ob. Signed, Heron.

2. Perhaps Χηρα( ). On the bath-tax cf. introd. to xlv. 3. Heron in this line and the next is the tax-collector.


("Ετους κ' Καίσαρος, Ἐπειφ κθ,
δι(ἐγραφαν) Σαμβαθἐων καὶ Δανιδὲων
τέλ(ουσ) βαλ(ανείων) Ἑυ(ημερείας) χα(λκοῦ) δβ(ολοῦ) δέκα
οκτω. / ει.

A receipt for bath-tax paid by two persons, the first, Sambatheon, being of Semitic origin.


("Ετους 1 Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ,
Παχάν] ia, διαγ(γράφηκε) Μενχῆς] Πατρα(νος)
τελ(ους) βαλ(ανείων) Ἑυ(ημερείας) ἐπὶ λόγου (δραχμάς) τέσσαρες, / (δραχ- 
μαί) δ.

Another receipt for bath-tax.

5. Wadfa. A.D. 34.

Χαρέας βαλαν(ει)τ(ης) Φίλωτ(ερίδος) Ἐρμία [Χα(ρείν).
ἐχω εἰς λόγου βαλανετ(οδ) ταῦ
ικοστου (ετους) Τιβερίου Καίσαρος
Σεβαστοῦ δβολοῦ [.....

5 Μεσορή κς φ'.

This payment is different from the ordinary τίλος βαλανίων, being received by a βαλανετείς not by a πράκτωρ. A payment for the χρωμάζων βαλανετῶν occurs in Wilcken, Ost. II. no. 527, but that too is something different. The present document seems rather to refer to a payment to the superintendent of the bath for the use of the bath, or else for part of his salary.

III. V

Δόσις βαλ(ανευτικών) τοῦ καὶ (ἐτούς)
διὰ Μάρωνος ἰΔρ(ου)
καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν
"Ηρων ἵγ
5 ἀργυρίων (δραχμαί) τέσσαρες,
/ (δραχμαί) δ.

1. Perhaps Δόσ (ἐτούς) βαλ(ανευτικών), but the first line seems rather to be a heading, like μέτρημα θησαυροῦ found on Theban sitologus receipts. 3. λο Οστ. 4. The distance between "Ηρων and ἵγ makes the division "Ηρων γ improvable. The γ has a stroke over it, so probably γ means the 13th of a month; cf. Θ. 3.


Ἀφροδίτιος Μυσθάτι Ὀρσενούφιος
χαίρειν. ἐχώ παρὰ σοῦ τῆ(ν) τιμήν τῶν
δῶν κελ(αμίων) τοῦ οἶνου γενημάτων δευτέρον
καὶ τριακοστὸν (ἐτοῦς) Καῖσαρος
5 ἀλγυρίον (δραχμή) μίαν, / (δραχμή) αἱ. (ἐτοῦς) λδ
Καῖσαρος, Φαῶφι λε, πλῆνσ.

3. λε πλῆνσ., and so in 5 ἀργυρίων and 7 πλῆνσ. It is probable but not certain that this refers to payment of a tax, rather than to a payment for wine purchased (cf. Wilcken, Οστ. I. p. 271); but which of the taxes upon wine is meant is obscure. In Wilcken, Οστ. II. no. 1264, a payment ἱππ ἀπίστης ὁδὸν is stated to be εἰς ἄργυρον(α), on which tax see ibid. I. p. 155. Since the money payment here is an alternative for payment in kind, the land-tax upon vineyards which was necessarily paid in money is out of the question. But the ἰπποῦρα (cf. introd. to xli) may be meant.


Σαραπίων ζυτοποίδις (?) Πετεσσόχ(ας)
Σιπιτος κομάρχ(ας) χαίρειν.
ἐχω παρὰ σοῦ ε... ( ) ζυτ( )
tοῦ κάθ(ἐτοῦς) Καῖσαρος ἀργυρίῳ
5 (δραχμάς) τέσσαρες, / (δραχμαί) δ.
(ἐτοῦς) κάθ Καῖσαρος,
* Φαμε(νὶ) το ᾂ.

Perhaps a receipt for beer supplied, if ζυτοποίδις is right in line 1; but owing to the obliteration of the word before ζυτ( ) in line 3, which is unlike εἰς λ(όγου) or εἰς λ(όγος), it is uncertain whether a tax is not meant.
9. Harit. Late first century B.C. or early first century A.D.

Φαρμοβί

"Προς Ἀμφάυτος
λ ξυτ( ) ὅβαλ(ο) η.

Probably a receipt for beer-tax; cf. 10. λ in line 3 appears to be the day of the month; cf. 6. 4.

10. Каšr el Banāt. A.D. 54–68.

[("Ετους) . . Νερωνος Κλαυδιου Καύσαρος
[Σεβαστο] Αὐτοκράτορος,
[Φαμετολοθ] δ, Καπίλων καὶ Σάτυ-
[ης] ζυτοπ(οίας) καὶ ἀνδράς Εὐθην(ελάς).

5 [ἀργυρίου] (δραχμῶν) τέσσαρες, / (δραχμαι) δ.

4. On the nature of the tax ζυτοποιας κατ' ἀνδρα see introd. to xlii.


Δίδυμος Πέτεσον(ος)
χαίρειν. δος Διδύμοφω

5 ζετον κεράμιον εν, / ζετον κεράμιον α.

(ζετος) σ, Χα(λ)κ). a.

An order for the payment of a jar of beer, for what purpose is obscure owing to the abbreviation in line 3.


Πέτεσον(ος) λογευ(της) 'Ομνω(φρεί)
Πέτεσον(ος) χαίρειν. δος
Πολλων ἀργυρίου (δραχμάς) δ,

5 (ζετους) κδ, Τβζβ(λ) ε.

An order from a tax-collector (λογευτης is the Ptolemaic term for the πράκτωρ of the Roman period) to pay 4 drachmae to some person (? his agent).

13. Harit. First or second century A.D.

Φόρου φυ-
τών.

On this tax see introd. to xlii.

Μάρω(ν) γρ(αμματεύς) κτη(νοτρόφων), μέρισον Πετεσαύχ(φ)
Σισώτος ὑπ(δ) κριθ(ν) ὑνον ἐνα θη(σαυρ)
Πετώτος Ζενίου. (ἐτος) ᾽Αὐτάρας, Παί(νι) i.e.

2nd hand. Ἀπολ(λόνιοι) σεση(μείωμαί) Παί(νι) i.e.

1. Perhaps Μάρω(ν) γρ(αμματεύς); cf. 17. But if these documents are parallel to xviii (α) and (θ), they are addressed to the sitologus, and begin with a nominative; cf. 18. 1.

2. For this construction with ἐνό cf. 15. 2, 16. 2, 17. 2, and B. G. U. 362. VII. i. 3 διν[ν] β ἐνὸ δέδωκα καὶ βαίς. Sometimes the genitive is found with ἐνό; cf. Erman, Hermes xxviii. p. 479, who thinks the construction is due to the influence of the Egyptian language.

θη(σαυρ) : cf. 17. 3 (ε)ἰς θησαυρῶν.


Μάρω(ν) γρ(αμματεύς) κτη(νοτρόφων), μέρισον
Ἡρακλῆ(φ) ὑπ(δ) μαφάνιν(ν) ὑνό(ν)
β θη(σαυρ) ᾽Αντιγόνω.

Same formula as 14.


Ἀλιονος μέρισον Ναυτι-
τό. ἦ — ὑπ(δ) κτη(κον) [δινό(ν)] β
καὶ ὑπ(δ) δροβον δνο(ν) β
θη(σαυρ) ἃ.

Cf. 14 and 15. The name at the beginning is apparently in the dative (? the sitologus) as in 17. 1. The abbreviation at the end occurs again in 17. 4. This ostraka was found with 3 and 7.

17. Ka'ār el Banāt. A.D. 35:

Ἀπόλλωνον γρ(αμματεῖ) δνον, μέρισον Ἠάσι[τ]μ
Ἡλιοδώρου ὑπὸ λαχανοπέρμον ὑνοὺς δόο
ἰς θησαυρῶν Διββάλλης διὰ Πεθώς
Πάτρωνος ἃ. (ἐτος) καὶ Τιβέριου Καίσαρος,
Παχο(ν) i.e.

Cf. 14–16 and p. 318. ῦνη(δισω) cannot be read in line 1.

'Hlíaðoçro(s) γρ(αμματεύς) γεωργ(όν)
'Aπαζ. ίμας καὶ Α'γχαλαφ( ) ἀμφοτερ( ) Πάσειτος
θη(παρ ) Ίσιου φακ(οῦ) (ἀρτάβας) ἵβ. Ἰσχυρᾶς
σειστ(μείωμα) μ. μακ( ) φακ(οῦ) (ἀρτάβας) ἵβ.

1. On the γραμματεύς (δημοσίων) γεωργῶν cf. xviii (a). A verb is wanted at the beginning of line 2, but neither μέρους nor μέγερον will suit. 4. Possibly the letters following σέιστ are meant for the termination of σειστ(μείωμα), i.e. σειστ(μείωμα), but they are not much like it. The signature of Ischyras is probably by a different hand.


Π(αρὰ) Ἀγαθίνου
ὅπτιόνου ἑπι(ελητοῦ)
χόρτου Ἀρατοὺ
Πτολεμίου. ὁς Νιγε-
5 ρφ χόρτ(ον) ἑπ(οῦς) δίο, γ(ίνονται) β.
Χολάκ ἴθ.

Order from Agathinus, an οἰκίο in charge of the fodder for soldiers in the Arsinoite nome, to Ptoleminus (in line 4 l. Πτολεμίου) to deliver two horse-loads (cf. note on lxvii. 2) of hay. 2. Cf. Ox. Pap. I. 43 recto III. 11 ἐπιμεληταί ἄχρονοι. Below line 6 are some flourishes.


Μηνί Κασπαρείου ἐνάτην
ἐ( ) δι(α) Πεκύνου Φεμιάτος(ς)
ὑπηρετοῦ; χορτ(οῦ) λιμνάδος; δέ(σμας)
ἐκατὼν τριάκ(οντα), / δέ(σμα) ῥλ.

A receipt for 100 bundles of hay from marshy ground (?), paid by Pekusia. 1. l. μηνής.
3. λ in λίμνα is more like β.


Παράνεγκεν ἐν κάστρ(ο)εν ἀν(ό)ικοδομομέν(ο)εν ἐν κάλµη)
Διονυσιάδι Άννιανός Ἀπόλλωνος ἀπὸ κάλµης
Ταυρίνου ἄχρονοι κασπίου σάκ(κον) α.
(ἐτούς) ἵπ (ἐτοὺς) καὶ β (ἐτοὺς), Μεσορὴ ἐπαγ(ομένων) β.
5 Σκαμμεής σεισ(μείωμα).

A receipt for a sack of chaff for fuel supplied to the camp at Dionysias. Cf. p. 11.
The 14th year is that of Galerius, the second that of Severus. 1. παρανεγκεν Ost.

![Greek text]

'I have received from Paesias for the produce of the past second year for public land, to be placed to his account, ten ar tabae of barley, total 10 art.' A receipt given by a stiologist to a δημάρχον γεωργός for payment of rent. The difference in the formula between this and ordinary receipts for rent paid by δημάρχοι γεωργοί, e.g. lxxxv. 7, should be noted; cf. introd. to lxxxi. The date cannot be fixed with certainty. η (ήτους) could be read in line 3.


![Greek text]

An acknowledgement by a δεκάρωτος and his son (?) of the receipt of 2½ ar tabae of barley for land-tax upon κάποιον, paid by a priest of Eileithyia (I. Ἐιλείθυιας in line 3). The formula is similar to that of lxxxi; cf. introd. to lxxxi. 1. The sovereigns whose regnal years occur are Diocletian, Maximian, and the two Caesars, Constantius and Galerius. There is an error in the years of the Caesars, which should be γ not δ; cf. Gr. Pap. II. lxxiv. 7, where there is a similar mistake of two years in their date, and Pap. Ox. I. 43 recto III. 15, where there is an error of one year. With a treble system of regnal years such mistakes are not surprising. 3. The goddess Nekhbet worshipped at El Kab was identified with Eileithyia by the Greeks. 5. Ὄπασω: cf. cxxxiii. 17. 7. l. Χαρίς; the readings are very uncertain after this except in line 10.
24. Harl. Middle of the third century.

Θησαυροῦ Θεαδελφείας
γενημάτων e (έτους) διά κτη-

νων μητροπόλε-
ως Σωδίκης ποιμὴν

διά Ἀμμωνίου ὄνηλατῶν
σάκ(κοι) δ', (έτους) ἵ, Μεχ(είρ) ἵ, τῇ ὑμοῖοι ἀλ-

λοι σάκ(κοι) β', / σάκ(κοι) ἵ,

(έτους) ἵ, Μεχ(είρ).

On the meaning of this large group (24-40) see pp. 318-320. 24-29 were found together, and all of them concern the same person Sodikes. They belong to the third century, about the time of the Philippi and Decius (cf. 29). 6. ἵ corr. from δ.

25. Harl. Middle of the third century.

Θεαδελφίας
γενημάτων a (έτους) δι(δ)

ιδιο(υ) κτη(νους)
Σωδίκης

ποιμὴν δι(ος)

a. (έτους) β,

Φαδοφι κα.

Cf. 24; the formula is shortened by the omission of δησαυροῦ. The date is probably the reign of Decius; cf. 26.


Θεαδελφίας γενημάτων ἵ (έτους)
δημοσίων κτη(νων) Πέλα
Σωδίκης ποιμὴν

δι(ος) β. (έτους) α, Τοβί κε.

Cf. 24 and 25. δι(δ) not δη(μοσίων) would be expected at the beginning of line 2, but ἵ is clear. The village of Pela occurs again in 33. A comparison of the first year in line 4 with the sixth year in line 1, which on the analogy of 24 and 25 must be the year preceding, shows that the ostracon was written in the first year of an emperor whose predecessor died in his seventh year. Both Gordian and Philippus died in the seventh year of their reigns, but the day, Tubi 25 (Jan. 30), suits the first year of Decius, who became emperor in the autumn of Philippus' seventh year, not that of Philippus, who only succeeded in the spring of Gordian's seventh year.
27. Harlt. Middle of the third century.

\[ E (\eta t\nu{s}), T\upsilon\beta i \kappa \gamma, T\eta\epsilon \omega s \]
\[ \Sigma \omega \delta \kappa \kappa \nu s \pi o i- \]
\[ \mu \mu \nu \; \delta \nu o i \; \delta. \]

Cf. 24 and 28. \( T\eta \epsilon \omega s \) is no doubt a village name, sc. \( \delta i a \; \kappa \eta \tau \rho o \nu ; \) cf. the similar omission in 37. 2 and in the Sedment ostraca.

28. Harlt. Middle of the third century.

\[ E (\eta t\nu{s}), T\upsilon\beta i \kappa \epsilon, T\eta\epsilon- \]
\[ \omega s \; \Sigma (\omega) \delta \kappa \kappa \nu s \]
\[ \pi o i \mu \nu \; \delta \nu o i \]
\[ [\tau \epsilon] \; \delta. \]

By the same hand as 27, which was written two days earlier.

29. Harlt.

\[ \Gamma (\eta t\nu{s}) \; \gamma e n \nu (\mu \acute{a} t\nu o v) \; \beta (\eta t\nu{s}), T\upsilon\beta i \; \kappa \tau, \]
\[ \kappa \omega (\mu \nu \nu s) \; B \epsilon (\; ) \; \Sigma \omega \delta \kappa \kappa \nu s \; \delta \nu o i \; \gamma. \]

2. Perhaps \( \beta e (\mu e \nu \delta \nu o s). \)


\[ \Theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu r \rho o v \; \Theta e \alpha \delta (\lambda \phi \epsilon \iota \alpha s) \]
\[ \gamma e n \nu (\mu \acute{a} t\nu o v) \; \gamma (\eta t\nu{s}) \]
\[ \Lambda r i \tau (\; ) \; \delta \nu o (i) \; \delta \; (\alpha r t \alpha \beta a i) \; \delta \delta. \]


\[ M e \chi (c l p) \; \kappa \tau, \; \theta \eta (s a \nu r \rho o v) \; \Theta e \alpha \delta (\lambda \phi \epsilon \iota \alpha s) \]
\[ O \u o n t i s \; \pi r e \sigma \beta \delta \u o t e (r o s) \]
\[ s \alpha k (k o u s) \; i a. \]


\[ 'I s \; t \delta (c) \; \delta \eta (\mu \acute{a} s i o n) \; \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu r \rho o n \]
\[ \delta (\lambda) \; \Sigma \alpha r \alpha s \; 'A m \mu \alpha o n o s \; \kappa \tau \nu \nu o- \]
\[ \tau o p (o v) \; 'E r o w \; 'E r o w (o i) \; \pi u r o \delta \]
\[ k a t (a r o \delta) \; (\alpha r t \alpha \beta a i) \; \theta. \]

2. \( \lambda \Sigma \alpha r \alpha s \ldots \kappa \tau \nu \nu o r o f (o v) \) (written \( \kappa \tau \nu \nu o r o \)). This is clearly a receipt for wheat paid into the granary; cf. p. 319.

Παίλα δούν τις.
Πτολε(μαῖδος) Βασκ(ής)δος ؛
Μ . . . ιθς Ζωά(μου) ζ.
Σένεπτα δούν ια.
5 Δios Πετρ(μοῦδος) καὶ Απύχ(ος) αδελφ(ός).

Cf. 34 and 35. 1. l. Πέλαι, cf. 26. 2. 2. No village called Ptolemais Bacchias is known. 3. The beginning of this line is very uncertain; a village, not a personal name is expected. Perhaps we should divide Μ . . . ιθς(μου) . 4. A village called Senepa occurs in the Oxyrhynchite nome; cf. Ox. Pap. I. 72. 5 κόμη Σένεπτα.

34. Kaşr el Banât. Third century.

Iθ(έτους), ᾿Αθρ η, γενν(μάτων) η(έτους),
᾿Οξυρύγχων δούν ια,
᾿Αρεως δούν ζ,
Πτολ(εμαῖδος) Μελ(ὡς) δούν ε,
5 γ(ίνονται) δούν κβ.
πρὸς Ῥοῦαν
ῐῒ Ῥωνα.

Cf. 33 and 35. The first line here, which corresponds to the heading of e.g. 29, shows that 33–35 are probably abbreviated forms of the receipts given in full in 24. 2. Probably the village of Oxyrhynch in the Fayûm is meant. 3. A village called ᾿Αρεως in the Heracleopolite nome is known from B. G. U. 552. II. 6. 4. Ptolemais Μελ(ὡς) is also found in Wilcken, Ost. II. nos. 1102 and 1123.


Κινών(ν) δούν θ,
Τρικορία(ς) δούν ι,
Philakitikή(ς) δούν η,
Λυσομάχις δούν δ,
5 πρὸς Ῥοῦαν Ἡρωνα.

A line effaced.

Cf. 34, which refers to the same individual. In the first three lines the scribe seems to have written Ῥωνα first, and then inserted Ἡρωνα in each case. These villages are all in the Fayûm.


Ὃησ(αυροῦ) Ῥωνεμήριας
γενν(μάτων) ε(έτους) διὰ κτῆ(νων)
Philagriδος Κόλλου.
FAYUM TOWNS

Those Σαβείνως σάκ(κων) ι
5 διὰ Σουλίως ὄηλ(άτου).
(ἐτοῦς) ι, Φανερὼ γ.

Same formula as 24. 4. Σαβείνως, but the name is doubtful.

A (ἐτοῦς), Χύκακ ι, γενη(μάτων) γ (ἐτοῦς) Μεμφίτου νομού
[[Σκευής]]"Αρείος
'Αγχάφεως δοὺνι γ.

2. For the omission of διὰ κτηνῶν before Μεμφίτου cf. 27. 1. 4. οὐ χαφεως Οστ.

A (ἐτοῦς), Φαφῆς ι, γενη(μάτων)
τοῦ διελ(ηλυθότος) γ (ἐτοῦς) θεᾶς
"Ισίδου τῆς κόμης
δοὺνι β.

This ostracon and 39, 40, and 50, were found in the temple. The worship of Isis was probably associated with that of Suchus at Euhemeria as at Socnopaii Nestus; cf. p. 22. From the similarity of the formula to that in e.g. 27 and 37, it may be inferred that διὰ κτηνῶν is omitted before θεᾶς, but possibly a tax for the benefit of Isis is meant.

Θησ(αυρωκ) κόμης Εὐημε(ρείας) γενη(μάτων) α (ἐτοῦς),
κόμης Εὐημε(ρείας) δι(α) Κηπολ(ίων) καὶ
'Ιωάνν(ιοι) δι(ηλιοτόν) Ἀνοίφης
Πανεπηνύτος δι(α) κτη(νῶν)
5 Οξ(υρυγγ) ὄη(αϊ) ε
(ἐτοῦς) β, Φαφῆς ιτ.

Cf. 40, written on the same day, where the same ὄηλατοι recur. Both ostraca are in the same very cursive hand. 5. Either 'Οξ(υρυγγων), or 'Οξ(υρυγγίτου); cf. 34. 2.

Θησ(αυρωκ) κόμης Εὐημε(ρείας) γενη(μάτων) α (ἐτοῦς)
δι(α) Κηπολ(ίων) (καὶ) 'Ιωάνν(ιοι)
δι(ηλιοτόν) Ἀρμυφεως
δι(α) κτη(νῶν) 'Ιωάκ(ε) ὄη(αϊ) ε.
(ἐτοῦς) β, Φαφῆς ιτ.

Cf. 39. 2. καὶ is represented by $.
41. Kašr el Banát. Early fourth century.

Late διάλεκτον Κασρ στους σάκ(κ)ες για
στους (δραμάς) α.

This ostracon and 42 and 43 are specimens of over seventy ostraca with the same formula, found together in an oven. They are dated in Pauni, the harvest month, and are apparently receipts for corn brought to a granary. The amounts are generally given in σάκους; cf. 31, and the Sediment ostraca, where 1 sack (= 1 donkey load) is equivalent to 3 artabae. In the present ostraca, therefore, the one artaba of corn is separate from the three sacks of corn, which were equivalent to 9 artabae or thereabouts. The sign for artaba is made in the same way as in Brit. Mus. Pap. 431 and 432, being merely an approximation to the later Byzantine sign. Wilcken (Archív, I, p. 164) suggests that the sign in Brit. Mus. Pap. 431 means οίλου (ἄραμą), but, as the present ostracon shows, wrongly.

42. Kašr el Banát. Early fourth century.

Παοίνει ζ.

3Ωλ Διδήμου
στους σάκ(κ)ες
ς.

Cf. 41. 1. Παοίνε. Above πους is πα erased.

43. Kašr el Banát. Early fourth century.

Παοίνα ια,

Μονής Σαρε

ςτους σάκ(κ)ες

ς.

Cf. 41. 1. Παοίνε, 2. Μονής.

44. Harft. Second or third century.

Παοίνι ιθ,

απόδος Απο(γ)χι

Κφα α.

Order for the payment of 10 Coan measures (of wine). The Κφων is also found in B. G. U. 531. II. 8; cf. Wilcken, Okt. I, p. 766.

1. ιθ is scratched over a number erased. 2. ι of απόδος (1. άπόδος) corrected.

45. Kašr el Banát. First century.

Μη ἄχλει τοὺς
Σαμβάτος.

'Don't worry the people (or 'sons'?) of Sambas.' Cf. the equally laconic message in Brit. Mus. Pap. 379, which is addressed to an ἄχλεω. 1. άχλε.

\[ \text{Ἀργιος(ρ) στε( ) (δραχμαι) τι,} \]
\[ \text{δι( ) παρ( ) στε( ) Ἀφ,} \]
\[ \text{ιππάρχη(η) ? (πυρων) (ἀρταβη) α.} \]

A short account.

1. στε(φανον)? 2. δι(πωντ) ἐκρε(ων) στε(φανον) is possible.

47. Ῥαζ el Banāt. Late first century B.C. or early first century A.D.

\[ \text{Φαμο(θ)ι) θ, Τοῦθης Ἀφοὺς ὑπ(ρ)} \]
\[ \text{ἐκλήγου τῆς? συντάξεως} \]
\[ \text{ἀργ(ποιο) (δραχμᾶs) δ.} \]

A receipt for four drachmae, the arrears of a σωτακε.

48. Harit. Early first century A.D.

\[ \text{Παχ(δον) ιβ,} \]
\[ \text{Ἀδνῆς Αματ(ος)} \]
\[ \text{上官(νο) κεράμαη η, ιγ κεράμαη δ.} \]

Receipt for \(8 + 4 = 12\) jars of beer, perhaps as payment of beer-tax; cf. 8-11.

49. Ῥαζ el Banāt. A.D. 19?

\[ \text{τούς ζέκτου Τιθεριου Καίσαρος} \]
\[ \text{Σεβαστοῦ, Φαὼφι ζ, δ(έγραψε) εἰς βι-} \]
\[ \text{οπ . . . ναγιον Θωναρίμφης} \]
\[ \text{(δραχμᾶs) ἐκατόν, / (δραχμαὶ) ρ, καὶ τιμής} \]
\[ \text{ἀναβολε(ω) ε (τους) (δραχμᾶς) ιη} \]

The ink has faded, making parts of the ostraca illegible. The general formula is that of a tax-receipt (cf. 10), but the payment 'for the value of ἀναβολαι' is quite obscure.

50. Ῥαζ el Banāt. Third century.

\[ \text{Κάστρον Αἰωνισιάδος (?) μηνι} \]
\[ \text{Θιδ καὶ Φαώφι} \]
\[ \text{δ( ) Ἕρμυ( ) ταξίς (δραχμαὶ) η,} \]
\[ \text{καὶ Τῆθι καὶ Μεξίρ (δραχμαὶ) η,} \]
\[ \text{καὶ Φαμεθῆ(ο) . (δραχμαὶ) η.} \]

A military account. For the camp at Dionysias cf. 21; but the reading ὁμοῦ here is extremely uncertain.
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CLEOPATRA III AND SOTER II.


CLEOPATRA III AND PTOLEMY ALEXANDER.

Bap. Κλεοπάτρα θεῖ νεού Εὐεργῆς καὶ βασ. Πτολεμαῖος ἐπικαλούμενος Ἀλέξανδρος θεὸς Φιλομήτωρ
12. 1.
II. KINGS AND EMPERORS

Ptolemy Auletes.

[Bar.] Πτολεμαῖος θέας Νέας Διόνυσος Φιλοκάτωρ [Φιληδελφός] 236.

Cleopatra Tryphaena.

Βασιλίσσα Πτολεμαίου Νέας Διονύσου 88. 5.

Augustus.

Καίσαρ pp. 46, 53; 45. 1, 6; 89. 6, 15; Ost. 1. 1; 3. 1; 7. 4, 6; 8. 4, 6; 14. 3.
Καίσαρος κράτησε θεοί νικῶ 89. 2.

Tiberius.

Τιτέριος Καίσαρ Ζεύς κατός 25. 7. 13; 46. 1; 230; 299; Ost. 4. 1; 5. 3; 49. 1.
Τιτέριος Καίσαρ Ost. 17. 4.

Gaius.

Γαίος Καίσαρ Ζεύς. Γερμ. 29. 11, 21, 24; 214.

Claudius.

Τιτέριος Κλαύδιος Καίσ. Ζεύς. Γερμ. Αύστρ. 152; 288.
Θεός Κλαύδιος 40. 7.

Nero.

Νέρων Κλαύδιος Καίσ. Ζεύς. Γερμ. Αύστρ. 47. 1; 321; Ost. 10. 1; Inscr. 2. 1 (p. 33);
Nέρων altered to ερός Inscr. 2. 5 (p. 33).
Nέρων Κλαύδιος Καίσ. Ζεύς. Γερμ. 47. 10.

Vespasian.

Αύστρ. Καίσ. Ολυμπιασμός Ζεύς. 97. 1, 44; 191; Inscr. 3. 1 (p. 33).

Titus.

Αύστρ. Τίτος Καίσ. Ολυμπιασμός 191.
Τίτος ού κύριος 67. 2.

Domitian.

Αύστρ. Καίσ. Δομιτιανός Ζεύς. Γερμ. 110. 32; 111. 28; 298 verso.

Nerva.

Αύστρ. Νέρωνς Καίσ. Ζεύς. 48. 1. 1.

Trajan.

Αύστρ. Καίσ. Νέρωνς Τραϊανός "Αμαστος Ζεύς. Γερμ. Δακικος 47 (a). 1.
Αύστρ. Καίσ. Νέρωνς Τραϊανός "Αμαστος Ζεύς. Γερμ. 81. 1.
Αύστρ. Καίσ. Νέρωνς Τραϊανός Ζεύς. Γερμ. Δακικος 38. 8; 53. 1; 260; 262.
Αύστρ. Καίσ. Νέρωνς Τραϊανός Ζεύς. Γερμ. . . . 56. 1.
Αύστρ. Καίσ. Νέρωνς Τραϊανός Ζεύς. Γερμ. 48. ii. 1; 91. 1, 51; 100. 16, 22; 112. 23; 114. 23.
Τραϊανός "Αμαστος Καίσ. ού κύριος 296.
Τραϊανός Καίσ. ού κύριος 116. 22; 117. 28; 118. 27; 254; Inscr. 6. 8 (p. 54).
Τραϊανός ού κύριος 115. 13.
Τραϊανός p. 45; 20. 3.
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Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Λύρήλως Ἀντωνίνος Σεβ. Ἀρμ. Μηδ. Παρθ. Γερμ. Μέγας 162.
Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Λύρήλως Ἀντωνίνος Σεβ. Ἀρμ. Μηδ. Παρθ. Μέγας 346.
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Λύρηλως Ἀντωνίνος Καίσ. ὁ κύριος 27. 10; 30. 18; 280.
Λύρηλως Ἀντωνίνος ὁ κύριος 215.
Μάρκος 20. 3.

MARCUS AURELIUS AND COMMODUS.

Λύρηλως Ἀντωνίνος καὶ Κόμμαδος οἱ κύριοι Σεβ. 59. 1; 245.
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COMMODOUS.

\[\text{Marcus Aemilius Commodus 'Antinous Seb. Ebr. 363.}\\
\text{Marcus Aemilius Commodus 'Antinous 2seb. 41. i., ii. 9; 50. i, 196, 197, 279; 318; 351; 352.}\\
\text{Aemilius Commodus 'Antinous Seb. 39. 28.}\\
\text{Marcus Aemilius Commodus 'Antinous Kais. d. kouros Ebr. Ebr. Seb. Insbr. 4. i (p. 34).}\\
\text{Marcus Aemilius Commodus 'Antinous Kais. d. kouros 51. i.}\\
\text{Marcus Aemilius Commodus Kais. d. kouros 229; 289.}\\

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS.

\[\text{Lauses Septimius Seu. Ebr. Pertinax Seb. 79. i.}\\
\text{Lauses Septimius Seu. Pertinax Seb. 52. i; 390.}\\
\text{Lauses Septimius Seu. Seb. 42. 14.}\\

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, CARACALLA, AND GETA.

\text{Severios Septimius Venia Kais. Seb. 380.}\\

CARACALLA.

\text{Meg. Ebr. Seb. 202.}\\

SEVERUS ALEXANDER.

\[\text{Lautes. Kais. Markos Aemilius Seu. 'Alceniore Ebr. Ebr. Seb. 61. i; 90. i; 94.}\\
\text{1 (?).}\\
\text{Marcus Aemilius Seu. 'Alceniore Ebr. Ebr. Seb. 158; 208.}\\

GORDIANUS.


PHILIPPUS.

\[\text{Lautes. Kais. Markos 'Ioakim Philipes Ebr. Ebr. kai Markos 'Ioakim Philipes genwddato}\\
\text{kai epitheusantos Kais. Seb. Kais. 85. 13.}\\

VALERIANUS AND GALLIENUS.

\[\text{Ovaleriouan kai Gallienon Seb. 228.}\\

DIOCLETIUS, MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, AND GALERIUS.

\[\text{(Hron)x) d i kai (Hron)x kai d (i, x) (Hron)x (a.d. 298) Ost. 23. i.}\\

GALERIUS AND SEVERUS.

\[\text{(Hron)x) d (Hron)x kai b (Hron)x (a.d. 306) Ost. 21. 4.}\\

\[\text{Latukranto 20. 3, 11, 20; 217; 322.}\\
\text{Kaisar 20. 7, 14; 217.}\\
\text{Pathe patrilo 20 introd.}\\
\text{Indikforon 143.}\\

III.
### III. MONTHS AND DAYS.

#### (a) Months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Roman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Θάνθ</td>
<td>Δίος 236.</td>
<td>Σεβαστός 36. 20; 92. 3; 152.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαάθφα</td>
<td></td>
<td>Германиκός 110. 33; 111. 30 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Αθέρ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Νέος Σεβαστός 97. 3; 46; 163; 321.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χολακ</td>
<td>Περίτιος 98. 2.</td>
<td>Ναύμπερ 135 verso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τύχα</td>
<td></td>
<td>Νερώνειος 158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μεχαρ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Νερώνειος Σεβαστός 321.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φάμαρθ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Αδραδεύ 90. 3; 87. i. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φαμάρθ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Δεκέμπερ 135 verso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παμάν</td>
<td></td>
<td>Гермανίκειος 90. 4 (νος Παρ.); 111. 30 (?) 153; 191.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Επέχα</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ιούλιος 135 verso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μεσαρῆ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Κασιέρειος 36. 20; 81. 3; 115. 14;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Οστ. 20. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Αγούντος 135 verso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαγάγουσα ἡμέραι Οστ. 21. 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διάλος (Rhodian) p. 60.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Days.

καθ 'Ελληνως Μεσαρῆ ε... κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντες Θάνθ ἐγ 139. 4.

Φαάθφα μετὰ λόγων κτ., &c. 53. 2, 6, 8, 9; 54. 2 et sim.; 56. 4; 256; 316.

### IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

| Α' Αδραδέν | Ost. 41. 2. | Λακιολ 136. 14. |
| Α' Αδραδέν | 143. | Λακιολ 138. 1. |
| Α' Αγαθάδενος | 90. 9, 13, 16, 20; Ost. 19. 1. | Λακιδάδενος 15. 2; 18 (a), 2; 18 (b), 3; 33. 19; 43. 1; 89. 9; 146; 148. |
| Α' Αγαθάδενος | 217. 28. | Αλέξανδρος 12. 5; 30. 2; 33. 20; 57. 3; 90. 9; 96. 5. |
| Α' Αγαθάδενος | 335. | Alexandros 105. iii. 16. |
| Α' Αίγινα 101. reto ii. 1. | | Λεξίν 216. |
| Α' Αχροίμβθ 340. | | 'Αλκίμος 23. i. 1. |
| Α' Αγιάαδενος 46. 2; Ost. 18. 2. | | Αλλοθον 32. 10. |
| Α' Αγιάαδενος 222 (?) | Ost. 37. 4. | Αλλίπτος 133. 1. |
| Α' Αδραδέν 81. 6. | | 'Αλλίδθ (7) 68. 2. |
| Α' Αδραδέν 221. | | |
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90. 6 et saep.; 94. 4 et saep.; 208; Ost. 23. 7.

91. Αφραδίας 101. verse i. 11.

92. Αφαινός Ost. 47. 1.

93. Αφραδίανος 30. 4, 8, 17; 97. 15, 34; Ost. 7. 1.

94. Αφραδίανος 27. 5; 100. 1; 346.

95. Αχλάες 95. 1; 240.

Baibulas 105. iii. 3.

96. Βαχχάθος 37. 3.

97. Βελλίδων 91. 10 et saep.; 110. 1, 35; 111. 1, 33; 112. 1; 113. 1; 114. 1; 115. 22; 116. 1; 117. 1, 31; 119. 1, 37; 120. 1; 121. 1; 122. 1; 123. 1, 29; 264.

98. Βελλίδων 53. 4.

99. Βίον 79. 5.

100. Camariusis 105. iii. 2.

101. Capiton 105. ii. 4.

102. Chares 105. iii. 9.

103. Claudius 105. iii. 18.

104. Collutes 105. iii. 17.

105. Crispus 105. i. 16.

106. Faios 27. 2; 244.

107. Galateis 335.

108. Galates 105. iii. 12.

109. Γάμποσ 121. 1.

110. Γαμποσ 113. 15; 114. 20; 119. 30.

111. Γαμπλός 91. 11, 17, 48; 106. 7; 110. 1, 35; 111. 1, 33; 112. 1; 113. 1; 114. 1; 115. 23; 116. 1; 117. 1, 31; 119. 1, 37; 120. 1; 193; 248; 249; 252; 254; 255; 259; 260; 261.


113. Γεμμάνος 66. 2.

114. Γεμπάτος 135. 12.

115. Δαίος 32. 2; 48. ii. 3; 78. 7; 216; 263; 359; Ost. 33. 5.


117. Διάμα 47. 12; 48. 2.

118. Διάμας 47. 12; 312; 327.

119. Δαβάος 301.

120. Δαβάος 28. 1; 31. 17; 110. 25.

121. Διάδος p. 59; 39. 5; 99. 1.
Δίδυμος 16. 3; 28. 1; 59. 4; 81. 3; 12; 100. 3 et σαρπ.; 237; 244; Ost. 11. 1; 2; 42. 2; Inscr. 5. 27 (p. 49).
Διονύσης 23. i. 11; 32. 3.
Διδόσφορος p. 40.
Δίδωμος 24. 20; 251; 349.
Διονυσία 12. 5; 29.
Διονυσιάμων 27. 4; 12.
Διονύσιος 18. 2; 27. 4; 31. 2; 32. 6; 59. 4; 235.
Διονύσιος 105. i. 19, ii. 2, 18.
Δικίδανων 128. i. 13.
Δικτώρ 105. i. 13; 346.
Δικτυωτός 26. 2; 27. 9; 33. 8; 39. 9, 10, 25, 26; 61. 5; 64. 1.
Δικτυωτος 138. 1.
Δομήττος 38. 1.
Δομήττος Ost. 3. 2.
Ελείδων (Ελευθέρων) Ost. 23. 3.
Εμπαθία 44. 8.
'Ελέγξ 56. 5; 126. 10.
'Ελευθέρα 117. 3.
'Εμπιστ. 37. 1.
'Ερασμάτων 91. 49; 110. 2, 35; 111. 2, 32; 112. 1; 115. 21; 116. 2; 119. 25; 120. 2; 122. 1; 248; 249; 250; 252; 254; 259; 260.
Ερομοχείαν Ost. 105. ii. 15.
'Ερυθές 70. 2.
'Ερύθης 94. 4; 303.
'Ερυθής 305.
'Ερυθία Ost. 5. 1.
'Ερυθάδες p. 46.
'Ερυθάδας 113. 6; 114. 8.
'Ερυθών Ost. 32. 3.
Ευδαμίος 87. i. 3; 96. 7; 134. 1; 218.
Ευδμεία 130. 18.
Ευτυχίαν 87. i. 3.

Fabianus 105. ii. 16.

Ζεύς 19. 8; Ost. 11. 3.
Ζηρέλας 16. 4.
Ζωάλος 15. 1; 23. i. 6; 57. 4; 84. 5; 112.
12; 149; 149.
Ζωάτημα 224; 354.

'Ημιόπορος 53. 3; 56. 4; 96. 6; Ost. 17. 2; 18. 1.

'Ημείς 67. 4.
'Ημείς 152.
'Ημείς 26. 2.
'Ημείς 31. 5; 45. 2; 110. 23; 352.
'Ημείς 111. 7.
'Ημείς 16. 4; 25. 1; 25. 2; 30. 1; 35. 1; 47 (ας) 4; 52. 4; 58. 9; 70. 7; 92. 29; 98. 4, 19; 100. 2; 105. 3; 133. 2; 152; 193; 263; 301.
'Ημείς 68. 2; 10; 94. 4.
'Ημείς 63. 5; 109. 1, 15; 338; Ost. 15. 2.
'Ημείς 1. Ost. 1. 2.
'Ημείς 31. 4; 46. 5; 85. 2; Ost. 2. 2.
'Ημείς 32. 3; 216; (Ηράκλ.) Inscr. 5. 14.
26 (p. 49).
'Ημείς 54. 5.
'Ημείς p. 46; 27. 30; 31. 12; 33. 9; 34. 1; 10; 19, 27; 39. 5, 9, 21, 25; 48. i. 3, ii.
3; 55. 4; 60. 4; 72. 2; 82. 1, 24; 88. 1; 91. 6, 35; 46; 93. 6, 20; 97. 44.
98. 7 et σαρπ.; 99. 6, 7, 16; 100. 9, 19.
21; 110. 26; 112. 22; 115. 11; 125. 1;
133. 17; 198; 380; Ost. 2. 2, 3, 4, 6.
4; 34. 7; 35. 5; Inscr. 6. 6 (p. 54).

'Οσιάρρων 28. 6, 14.
'Οσιάρρων 28. 7; 153.
'Οσιώνιος 91. 1 et σαρπ.
'Οσιώνιος 124. 1.
'Οσιώνιος 127. 12.
'Οσιώνιας 11. 6; 12. 3; 324.
'Οσιώνιας 126. 8.
'Οσιώνιας 55. 5; 319.
'Οσιώνιος 11. 28; 23. i. 8; 27. 25; 31. 2, 12;
45. 2; 89. 10; 328.
'Οσιώνιας Ost. 49. 3.

Helius 105. iii. 5.
Hermes 105. ii. 9.
Hermopolis 105. i. 22.
Horus 105. iii. 7.

'Ισακήπας 66. 3.
'Ισάκης 67. 1.
'Ισακίδης 39. 19.
'Ισακίδης 66. 2.
'Ισακίδης 27. 2; 82. 15; 87. i. 6.
'Ισακίδης 91. 9; 36.
'Ισάκης 39. 8, 24; 123. 12.
'Ισακίδης 385.
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Mellaeus 79. 6.
Menas 101. 1. 12.
Midas 128. 1.
Mikroos p. 60.
Munianus 105. ii. 10.
Museiostos 40. 1; 92. 6, 14 (Münt.), 20, 32.
Muskos Ost. 7. 1.
Myschos 28. 3, 7; 29. 3, 18; 35. 11 (Münt.);
45. 2; 98. 18, 26; 130. 1, 23; 262.
Myrmès p. 60.
Mynoös Ost. 43. 2.

Nástitos (?) Ost. 16. 1.
Náph 133. 17; 135. 1.
Nefereos, 105. iii. 15.
Nefotianus 105. ii. 14.
Nélos 37. 2; 43. 1, 4; 98. 7, 20.
Nemeus 96. 6, 9.
Nepitampos 27. 8; 20; 63. 7.
Nepiastos 23 (a). 1; 206.
Nephiros 62. 4.
Nephiros 77. 7; 328; Inscr. 6. 3 (p. 54).
Nefriamus 51. 4.
Níkempos Ost. 19. 4.
Níkandros 39. 6, 22.
Nikos 39. 1.
Nímphos 224.
Nínax 212.
Nymiros 14. 3.

Zénon Ost. 14. 3.

'Orósmos 108. 4, 19.
'Orestes 18 (b). 1; 44. 2; 47 (a). 4; 54. 5; 97. 6 et Mephe.; 146; 151; Ost. 12. 1.
'Orías Ost. 34. 6; 35. 5.
'Orstamphos 24. 3; 25. 9; 47. 4, 12; 80. 3, 4; 112. 22; 115. 10; Ost. 7. 1.
'Orstées 36. 4; 219.
'Ouláromos 106. 7.
'Oústimos 121. 3.
'Oústis Ost. 31. 2.

Haii 15. 1.
Haima 18 (a). 3; 73. 1; 74. 1; 75. 2; 164; 165; Ost. 22. 1.
Haimos 90. 6.
Haininos 156. 1.
Haininos 34. 2, 11; 77. 6.
Hainwnis Ost. 39. 4.
INDICES

Παντελ. Οστ. 23. 2.
Παντελεήμονος 30. 3.
Παντεριάδης 344.
Παντερίου 244.
Παππίων 99. 24, 26, 38, 44; 339.
Παππίων 107. 14; 353 (?).
Πάπυρος 23. 1. 3.
Πασιόν 105. i. 2. 15, 23; ii. 6.
Πασίον 119. 33; Οστ. 18. 2.
Πασίων 76. 3; 108. 3. 15, 17.
Πατοκάρπης 14. 7.
Πατριάδης 85. 7.
Πάτρων 89. 8; Οστ. 4. 2; 17. 4.
Παυσανίας p. 60.
Πέτρος Οστ. 17. 3.
Πέτρος 89. 8.
Πέκτιος 54. 10; 82. 9; Οστ. 20. 2.
Πέκτιος 27. 27; 31.
Πέκτιος 25. 10.
Πέκτιος 29. 3; 6, 7, 18.
Πέθαλος 101. recto ii. 16.
Πετραίιος 24; 4.
Πετραίιος (?); Οστ. 33. 5.
Πετραίιος 18 (a). 3; 39. 9, 26; 47. 4, 12; 79. 5; 127. 10; 151; Οστ. 8. 1; 11. 1; 12. 1, 2; 14. 1; Inscr. 1. 1, 3 (p. 32); 2. 3 (p. 33); 3. 2 (p. 33); 4. 3 (p. 34).
Πετραίιος 18. 6.
Πετραίιος 153.
Πετραίιος 84. 9.
Πετραίιος 82. 5.
Πετραίιος (?); Οστ. 14. 3.
Πετραύδης 113. 3; 114. 5.
Πετρών 47 (a). 8; 65. 4; 109. 1.
Πετρόφου 32. 6; 39. 11; 27; 98. 10; 142.
Πετρόφου 32. 6; 39. 11; 27; 98. 10; 142.
Πετρόφου 1. 2 (p. 32); 2. 3 (p. 33); 3. 2 (p. 33); 4. 3 (p. 34).
Πέλας Οστ. 12. 3.
Πελευθέρας 220; 279.
Πελαξάς 96. 14.
Πελαξάς 128. 4. 7.
Πελαξάς 105. iii. 4.
Πελαξάς 16. 3; 128. 2.
Πελαξάς 25. 9.
Πελαξάς 24. 3. 18.
Πελαξάς (?); 78. 8.
Πελαξάς 105. ii. 8.
Πελαξάς 344.
Πελαξάς p. 41.

Πραγμάτα 28. 3; 206 (?).
Προλεκαμίας p. 46; 12. 22; 14. 1, 7; 16. 1; 16. 1; 33. 6, 7; 49. 3, 4; 58. 5; 60. 5; 67. 1; 93. 4; 96. 14; 125. 1, 15; 130. 17; 145; Inscr. 5. 27 (p. 49).
Προλεκαμίας 344.
Προλεκαμίας 37. 3; Οστ. 19. 4.
Προλεκάμιος 105. iii. 19.
Προλεκάμιος 33. 6.
Προλεκάμιος 48. i. 3, ii. 3; 101. recto i. 11.
Προλεκάμιος 105. iii. 10.
Προλεκάμιος 90. 6, 10, 21; 94. 6.

Ρουφίνος 105. iii. 21.

Σάββαθος 62. 4.
Σάββαθος 36. 2; 54. 4, 8; 83. 3; 102 introd.; 113. 2; 114. 2; 115. 8; 117. 2; 30; 119.
2. 8, 36; 121. 1; 122. 1; 123. 2, 18,
30; 250; 255; 261; Οστ. 36. 4.

Σακαρνίας 267.
Σαλαίνος 105. iii. 23.
Σαμμαθάθιαν Οστ. 3. 2.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 105. 8; 31. 8, 17; 80. 4; 100. 2;
143; 154; 335; Οστ. 45. 2.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 32. 5; 50. 4.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 36. 4, 22.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 94. 4 et seq.; 95. 1; 180. 1, 22.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 27. 7, 18; 30. 8; 83. 7.

Σαμμαθάθιαν 137. 5.
Σαμμαθάθιαν 23. 1, 4, 6, 8; 26. 20; 59. 3; 85. 7; 87. 4; 93. 3; 95. 1; 96. 3; 126. 1, 13; 131. 23; 333; Οστ. 8. 1.
Σαρίμ 109. 12; 351; Οστ. 32. 2.
Σαρίμ 98. (gen. = Σαρίμ) Οστ. 43. 2.
Σαρίμ 23. i. 13; 92. 8, 14, 23, 33; 99. 7.
Σαρίμ 105. iii. 24.
Σαρίμ 101. 1; Οστ. 10. 3.
Σαρίμ 106. 122.
Σαρίμ 25. 11.
Σαρίμ 109. 4, 8.
Σαρίμ 26. 12.
Σαρίμ 26. 12.
Σαρίμ ( ) 338.
Σαρίμ 17. 3.
Σαρίμ 90. 5; 85. 4, 13; 129. 10.
Σαρίμ ( ) 153.
Σαρίμ 55. 5.
Σιμών 14. 1.
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Τυρανώς 94. 6, 15.
Τύραννος 28. 1.
Τύρων 105. iii. 26.
Τυρανίς 105. iii. 6.
Τυρίς 105. i. 18.
Τυρίνδος 300.
Τυρίκος 328.
Τυρίνης Οστ. 17. 1.
Τετράς (?) Οστ. 20. 2.
Τετράδελφος 98. 5, 19; 23 (a). 1.
Τετράς 11. 6; 12. 3; 14. 3.
Τετράπτωρ 222.
Τετράπτωρ 324.
Τετράπτωρ 63. 5; 355.
Τετράπτωρ 264 (b).
Τετράπτωρ 38. 2.
Τετράπτωρ 38. 12.
Τετράπτωρ 342.
Τετράπτωρ 53. 3; 56. 4; 87. i. 3.
Τετράπτωρ 50. 4; 55. 5; 57. 4; 110. 23, 24.
Τετράπτωρ Οστ. 5. 1; 23. 7.
Τετράπτωρ 35. 2; 39. 4; 18; 42 (d). i. 3; 82.
Τετράπτωρ 25; 185 (a); 190; 323 (b).
Τετράπτωρ 122. 18, 20.
Τετράπτωρ 97. 25, 38; 238 (b).
Τετράπτωρ 100. 5; 24.
Τετράπτωρ 54. 6.
Τετράπτωρ 100. 4 et sæc. ; 263.
Τετράπτωρ 63. 7.
Τετράπτωρ 13. 3.
Τετράπτωρ 110. 21; 119. 8.
Τετράπτωρ 298 recto.
Τετράπτωρ 118. 11.
Τετράπτωρ 42. 2.
Τετράπτωρ 39. 6, 8, 23; 335.
Τετράπτωρ 39. 8; 85. 1.
Τετράπτωρ 34. 2; 69. 3; 77. 6; 82. 1, 24.
Τετράπτωρ 199; 213; Οστ. 6. 2.
Τετράπτωρ Οστ. 9. 2.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, DIVISIONS, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

Ἀγγατος 21. 2.
Ἄλεξάνδρεια 87. i. 9; 328; 338; 346.
Ἄλεξανδρίων πόλεις 87. i. 5.
Ἄμμωνικη 23 (a). 4.
Ἄρασινης νομὸς p. 41; 11. 8; 12. 4; 24. 1;
26. 1; 31. 3; 32. 4; 33. 1; 41. i. 1, ii. 1; 42. 2; 42 (a). i. 1; 89. 5; 90. 5;
91. 5; 92. 5; 94. 2; 97. 4; 98. 4;
105 νερό; 106. 12; 108. 1; 154; 222;
Οστ. 19. 3.
Ἄρσιναίων πόλεις 85. 4.

Ἔλληνες 139. 4.

Ἡρακλείδου μερίς 26. 10; 41. i. 2; ii. 2;
42 (a). i. 1; 105 νερό; 106. 11; 227;
289; 295.

Θεμιστοῦ μερίς 11. 5; 12. 4; 24. 1; 25. 2;
26. 1, 3, 5; 29. 5; 31. 6; 33. 1, 3, 42.
2; 44. 3; 55. 5; 89. 4; 91. 4; 92. 3;
93. 10; 97. 3; 98. 3; 100. 12; 108. 1,
9; 237; 296; 344.

Ἰουδαίος 123. 16.
Ἰταλία 20. 11. Ἰταλικὸς 242.

Καβαλατίτης 23 (a). 5.

Κρακοδίλων πόλεις 17. 1.
Κρόνος Οστ. 44. 3.
Μαρκυτωρίς 134. 6.
Μεγαλός 69. 2; 72. 2; 74. 2; 164-176.
Μεμφίτης Οστ. 37. 2.
μηδείς 36. 13.
Μετρολείτης 23 (a). 6.
μυτῆς πολικάς 23. i. 2; 6, 11, 25; 30. 5; 108.
6; Οστ. 24. 3.
Μύτυδα 12. 3.
Νυκέλιτες 104. 13.
νομού 23. ii. 11; 23 (a). 3; 36. 3; Ινστ. 5.
15 (p. 49).
Πέραγος τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς 11. 7; 12. 6, 11; 89. 8;
151.
Περαίας 91. 6, 35.
Πολέμων μερίς 16. 6; 24. 2; 26. 1, 3, 5;
33. 2; 36. 5; 42. 3; 86. 22; 108. 1.
πόλει (Ἀρσινοῦ) 88. 5; 113. 13; 114. 6;
116. 7, 10; 118. 18; 119. 10; 138. 2.
Συρακός 18 (b). 7.
τοπορχία Θεσπεδίων καὶ ἄλλων κωμῶν 81. 4.

(b) VILLAGES.

Ἀρξαράδορος 115. 16; 120. 6.
Ἀγρυδίτη Βερνίκης 280.
Α. ( ) 80. 21.
Βασιλέω 18. 4; 18 (b). 2; 57. 3; 67. 1;
71. 1; 72. 1; 73. 2; 74. 2; 75. 1;
76. 1; 79. 4; 137. 3; 161; 164-
189; 201; 208. Βασιλεία καὶ Ἡφαιστίων
15. 4; 106. 10. Βασιλεία Ἡφαιστίων 162;
207.
Βερνίκος 329; Οστ. 29. 2 (b).
Βερνίκος Ἀγγατοῦ 82. 3, 13; 342.
Βούσσατος 23. i. 6, 7, 10; 227.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL
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Βεοκολαία 39. 2; 257.
Βουνόρια 329.
Βυστή (8) 68. 2.

Διονυσίας 68. 1; 86. 18; 95. 8; 102. 30;
110. 16; 111. 12, 15; 112. 15; 113. 5;
114. 7; 118. 10; 243; 248; 251; 257;
340; Ost. 21. 2; 50. 1 (?).

'Ερωτίδα 23 (a). 1, 7.
Εὔμερεια 11. 4; 25. 2; 29. 2, 4; 33. 5, 13;
46. 3; 47. 6; 48. i. 3; 54. 6; 63. 8;
64. 3; 83. 4, 8; 86. 6; 87. i. 7; 91. 4;
17. 47; 97. 3, 47; 98. 3, 15, 24, 29;
214; 215; 240; 243; 245; 247; 258;
260 (?); 264 (?); 285; 286; 290;
Ost. 2. 3; 3. 3; 4. 3; 10. 4; 36. 1; 39. 1, 2; 40. 1.

'Ηράκλεια 23 introd.
'Ηράκλεια (8) 41. i. 5; ii. 4; 84. 9; 162;
208 (?). See Βακχαί.

Θεσσαλία pp. 53, 54; 11. 8; 12. 4, 13. 2;
17. 3; 31. 6, 14, 21; 32. 7; 33. 7, 35.
3; 39. 13; 45. 4; 51. 6; 53. 5; 56. 6;
8; 61. 5; 65. 6; 77. 5; 78. 6; 81. 4;
7; 85. 6; 86. 3 et sapt.; 86 (a). 3, 10;
88. 5; 92. 4, 31; 100. 12; 108. 9, 12;
230; 243; 318; 340; 343; 345;
359; 360; 361; 362; 365; 366; Ost.
24. 1.; 25. 1.; 26. 1; 30. 1; 31. 1.

Θεσσαλία 94. 3, 22.
Θετόν Βακχαί 329.
Θετόν 40. 1, 7.
Θετόν 183. 17; Ost. 23. 5.

'Ιδιών 329.
'Ιδιών Ελευσινανταρούν 23. i. 11, 12.
'Ιερών 329.

Καπν (8) 23. ii. 22.
Καπνός 41. 23. i. 14; 143; 195.
Καλλιφαί 329.
Κερκεσία 16. 6.
Κερκεσία 36. 1, 12.
Κερκεσία 329; 334.
Κερκεσία 329.

Κερκεσία 23 introd.; 62. 3; 113. 8; 114.
10.
Κανά 329; Ost. 35. 1.

Λισσαφία Ost. 35. 4.

Μαγγα 25. 4; 332.
Μισχα 329.

Ναμνόδυο 36. 5.
Νεόλον όλες 23. 1, 8.

Οἰνόμαχος 25. 9; 86. 22; Ost. 34. 2; 39.
5 (?).

Πηλέα (? 34. 9.
Πηλε Ost. 26. 2; 33. 1.
Πηλούσιον 89. 4, 7, 15.
Πολεδεκαία 34. 3, 8; 86. 9; 86 (a). 10;
108. 11; 343; 344.
Πολυερμέ 329.
Πολυερμέ Βακχαί (? Ost. 33. 2.

Πυρρος 23 introd., i. 31.

Πυρρος 230.

Σεβανός 23. i. 5, ii. 3.

Σεβασταί 344.

Σέβαστος Ost. 33. 4.
Σέβαστος Ost. 102. 12; 111. 22; 112. 19.

Σέβαστος Ost. 37. 3.
Σεβαστικός Νήσος 69. 1; 70. 1; 90. 7; 208;
244.

Σιτριαί 62. 6.
Σιτιτ ( ) 81. 7; 86. 13, 24.
Σιτιτ 23 (a), introd.

Τολκεί 23 introd.; 329.
Ταμανδός ( ) 23 introd.
Τάμονα 208.

Ταμονά 38. 9; Ost. 21. 3.
Τάμος (? Ost. 27. i; 28. i.
Τρακαία Ost. 35. 2.
Τρακαία Ost. 40. 4.

Φαρδέφα (8) 42 (a), i. 4.
(c) ἐποίκια, τόποι, &c.

ἐποίκιον 24. 9, 14; 36. 13; 232.
ἐποίκιον Ἀρμίνων 36. 7.
Δῆμα 24. 5.
Νηστός 84. 6.
Πισεῆ 90. 14.
ὁρισθ (διάφερε) Πυθαλμαίον 79. 4.

(τ) όσισία, Ἀδριατῆς 82. 14. Ἀστακάσα 60. 6.
Φν( ) διάφερε 287.
(χίμα) Δρα( ) 289.
'Ιωσίδους 25. 5.
'Χάλκης (?) 290.
Ψαλτερίων( ) 77. 5; 78. 5; 381.

(d) ἀγμοδα.

'Απολλωνίων Ἰεραπείου 27. 29.
'Αρχονταρχεῖων 95. 9.
Βουθών 49. 5; 52 (d). 2.
Βουθών Ἰσιώνος 23. note on i. 1; 31. 18.
Γεμαστίου 108. 5.
Διονυσίου Τώπων 98. 8; 250; 283.
'Ελληνερ 108. 4.
'Ερμοθανασί 28. 5. 8.
Θεοπροφορίας 27. 27, 31; 52. 5; 335.
'Ιερᾶς Πλάθης 98. 5; 349; 355.
'Ισιών Δώματος (?) 50. 5.

Δίβας 281.
Δυναστίας 59. 4; 90. 10.
[? Δύνασα 96. 7.
Δαναίου Τώπων 30. 6, 10.
Μακεδόνων 23. i. 1; 27. 6, 15.
Μοιρές 279; 354.
Πετρούπολος Οἰκον (?) 96. 4.
Σταυροῦ 'Αδημία 155.
Φρεμεί 23. i. 4.
Χρυσοβοσκίων 95. 4.
Χρυσοβοσκίων Ἐντιραν 93. 5.

(c) Demes.

Σεισιώμων ἐ καὶ Ἀλκαίων 93. 1; 212.

VI. SYMBOLS.

(a) MEASURES.

ζ ἄπτη 23 (a). 7 at.
— ἄρναθη 85. 10 at.

Σ — ἄρναθη Ost. 41. 4.

Π, πνεύμον ἄρναθη 18 (b). 8 at.
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(b) Coins.

| Denarius 105. i. 11 et saep. | Πενταβίολα 41. ii. 17 al. |
| Denarius 11. 17 al. | Ταλάντοι 11. 32; 44. 10, 11, 13. |
| " 101. recto ii. 7 al. | Τρίαμβος 23 (a). 9, 10; 87. i. 10, 13. |
| " 53. 6 al. | Τετραβίολα 54. 7 al. |
| " 54. 13 al. | Τριάμβος 41. ii. 12 al. |
| ⢄ διβάλοι 41. i. 16 al. | Χαλκοί δίοι 53. 6 al. |
| ⢄ διβάλοι δύο 54. 13 al. | Χαλκοί διά 55. 7 et saep.; 56. 7. |
| Οβολος 225. i. 1 et saep. | " 55. 6. |
| " 56. 6 et saep. |

(c) Numbers.

| Π 11. 15 al. | Π 82. 16 al. |
| Π 82. 16 al. | Π 86. 3 al. |
| Π 86. 2 al. So Ó 1, 2 &c. | Π 82. 18 al. |
| Π 101. recto i. 7. | Π 82. 23 al. |
| Π 34. 9 al. | Π 85. 10 al. |
| (Latin) 105. i. 17, 18, 26. | Π 86. 2 al. |

(d) Miscellaneous.

| \( y \) γίνεται, γίνομαι 14. 5 al. | \( \phi \) (Latin) "total" 105. i. 26, ii. 19. |
| \( \lambda \) ἔτειρ (?) 50. 5. | \( \lambda \) "Ost. 16. 4; 17. 4. |
| \( \iota \) 17. 3. | Meaning doubtful. |
| \( \delta , \omega \) 17. 4, 5. | |
| \( \mu \) 18. 4, 5. | |
| \( \epsilon \) 43. 3. | |
| \( \iota \) 119. 4. | |
| \( \lambda \) 291; 339. | |
| \( \delta \) Οστ. 16. 4; 17. 4. | |

VII. OFFICIALS.

(Military and religious titles are included.)

| Αὐγαλοσφάδας 222. | Βασιλέως γραμματέως 23 (a). 6; 26. 10; 33. |
| Δραφάδας 24. 4; 37. 1; 161; 231. | 3, 21; 237; 319. ὁ Βασιλεύς 117. 4. |
| Δραφάδας 125. 15. | Βιβλιοσφάδας ἑγερτής 31. 3; 32. 4; 164; |
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(a) WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

δραχμα 23 (a). 7, 9; 34, 9; 80, 5; 118, 21; 202; 233.

ἀργυρίῳ 11. 9 et sapf. 16. 7 (δραχμῆς); 69-76 (a); 81-86 (a); 89, 11 et sapf.; 90, 11.

99, 11; 101. 1, 3 (δραχμῆς) et sapf.; 111, 14. 19; 116, 15; 117, 7; 119, 32; 123, 7.

131, 3; 135, 16; 143; 146-152; 162.

164; 240; 263; 284; 285 (δραχμῆς); 300.

333; 336; 338-340; 342; Obst. 18, 3.

22, 4, 5; 23, 5, 6, 11; 30, 3; 32, 4;

41, 4; 49, 3.

διάρμ. 119, 4, 5; Obst. 20, 3, 4.

νόμισμα 220.

κράτων 73, 4; 74, 3; 104, 29; 130, 16.

Ὅστ. 7, 3; 11, 4; 48, 3.

κατάλογος 95, 17, 19, 26.

κοῦζος 133, 6.

(b) COINS.

Κόνων Ὀστ. 44, 3.

attività 242. Ἀλεξ. 331.

μετρητης 95, 14, 15, 22, 23; 96, 15-17; 104, 24; 258.

μέτρος 95, 24. μ. δημόσιων 82, 9; μ. δημόσιων ἔμπορον 81, 7; 83, 8; 84, 7; 85, 8. μ. ἐκτων (7) 102, 13, 8. μ. ἐκτονρήματος 60, 14; μ. ἐκτονρήματος 151. μ. τέταρτον 89, 15. μ. τεταρχοῖς 123, 11.

μοιχοχωριον 230.

πάγους 29, 19; 98, 11.

πάκος 92, 23; 118, 18; 336; 347. Ὀστ. 32, 6; 24, 6, 8, 31, 3; 36, 4; 41, 3; 42, 3; 43, 3.

χαλκοῦ 101. τετράδ. 1. 9 (7).

χέσιν Ὃπ. 58, 60, 61; 95, 14, 18, 24; 298.

---

denarius 105. i. 1 et sapf.

δραχμή 230.

μαία 119, 19.
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Διδυμόψης 27. 6.
Διδυμόψης 23. 21.
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Διδύμη 331.
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Διδύμη 12. 27; 20. 20.
Διδύμη 124. 19.
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Διδύμη 95. 25.
Διδύμη 116. 20.
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47. 3 κλ. τη.
Διδύμης 41. i. 7; ii. 6; 49. 3; 50. 3; 60.
3; 65. 3; 66. 1; 280.
Διδύμης. See Index IX.
Διδύμης 112. 8.
Διδύμης 24. 18; 36. 22; 39. 24; 91. 12;
92. 8, 10; 97. 25, 26; 98. 6, 12.
Διδύμης 105. ii. 18.
Δελτίον 12. 33.
Δελτίον. See Index VIII.
Δελτίον. See Index IX.
Δελτίον 91. 14; 30, 38.
Δελτίον 99. 13.
Δελτίον. See Index VIII.
Δελτίον 119. 32.
Δελτίον 139. 6.
Δελτίον 20. 22.
Δελτίον. See Index VII.
Δελτίον 20. 1, 11.
Δελτίον. See Index VII.
Δελτιομετρία 93. 7.
Δελτιομετρία 28. 13, 14; 96. 8; 97. 9; 98. 8, 9, 19.
Δελτιομετρία 121. 9.
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Δελτιομετρία 5. 6 (p. 48), 18 (p. 49).
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Δελτιομετρία 110. 19.
Δελτιομετρία 215.
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gamos 132. 2.
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gemius 114. 20; 115. 8; 119. 30.
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gemini 11. 33; 12. 33; 34; 13. 8; 19. 11;
20. 4, 15, 22; 21. 6; 22. 12, 23, 26;
23. 5 et saec.; 25. 3; 27. 6; 35. 10;
38. 4; 54. 9; 58. 8; 57. 6; 58. 13; 62.
8; 84. 10; 85. 10; 12; 90. 18; 91. 30;
94. 5; 100. 13; 102. 3 et saec.; 110. 6;
119. 34; 124. 17; 125. 11; 128. 2; 129.
7; 133. 8; 227; 304; Ost. 19. 5; 22.
5; 23. 6; 34. 5; Inscr. 5. 23; 26 (p. 49).
gemini 110. 16; 117. 3; 16; 123. 5; 23; 130. 6.
gemini 20. 4.
gemini 12. 21.
gemini 65. 5.
gemini 102. introd.
gemini 36. 22; 98. 6.
gemini 23 (a). 2; 24. 21; 38. 24; 90. 22;
91. 45; 92. 39; 94. 12; 97. 45; 98.
27; 100. 22, 29; 124. 6; 14.

gemini. See Index VII.
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γράφεως 24. 10, 19; 28. 15; 34. 20; 35. 11; 91. 44; 92. 28; 97. 36, 37, 44; 98. 26; 100. 21, 28; 112. 20; 117. 19, 22, 24, 27; 119. 14; 122. 10; 123. 4; 124. 3, 7; Inscri. 5. 15, 27 (p. 49); 6. 6 (p. 54).

γράφεως 31. 21; 23. introd.; 89. 7; 91. 47; 92. 31; 97. 47; 98. 29; 240; 260; 344.

γράφη 119. 19; 201.

γράμματα 27. 3; 31. 2; 32. 4.

γραμματοσφάλεια. See Index VII.

γράμματι 12. 20.

γυμναστήριον 22. 6, 19, 23, 29; 27. 7; 28. 5; 100. 21, 28; Inscri. 1. 5 (p. 32).

γυμνική. See Index IX.

διαδικασία 112. 11.

διάδοχοι 39. 26; 92. 7, 10; 97. 25, 26.

δανεία 11. 6.

δάνειον 119. 18.

δαπάνη 125. 9.

δαπάνη 42 (a), ii. 13; 53. 6; 101. verso I. 5; 115. 1.

δείκτης 105. i. 17; ii. 3.

δεύτερη 'bind') 108. 12.

δέα ('need') 107. 12; 109. 5; 125. 8.

δημοκρατία 132. 1.

δημοκράτησαν Inscri. 3. 3 (p. 33); 8. 1 (p. 54).

διάδοσει 11. 24; 12. 26; Inscri. 5. 10 (p. 49).

διάδοσις 156. 4.

διάδοσις. See Index VII.

δεμάριον. See Index VIII.

δεμαρίου. See Index IX.

διήλιν 11. 13; 39. 16; 122. 14.

δήλωσε 201.

δήλωσις, δήλωσε 12. 34; 38. 9. (ὑπέρ)

δήλωσιν: see Index IX. το δηλίσιον 20.

δηλίσιον 22; 31. 9; 64. 6. το δηλίσιον 296. δηλ. ὑπισχύσεις 20. 5. δηλ. γεωργία: see γεωργία.

δηλ. γῇ Ost. 22. 3. δηλ. διηναύρας Ost. 32. 1. δηλ. λαγνέας 42 (a). i. 12. δηλ. κτήνη Ost. 26. 2. δηλ. λόγον 201. δηλ. μέτρον: see μέτρον (Index VIII). δηλ. πυρός 23 (a).
indices


dóma 237.
dóma 20. 22.
dósa 117. 6; 123. 11, 14; 124. 11, 18; 134. 3; 135. 5; Inscr. 5. 11 (p. 49).
dósoi 20. 17; 106. 23.
dósoi Ost. 8. 1.
dósoi 52. (a). 1; 156. 2; Inscr. 5. 8 (p. 49).
dósum 102 introd.; 120. 9.
dósum. See Index VIII.
dósum 16. 7; 101. i. 3; 285.
dósum 43 (a). verso 2. Πολεμαίκος Δρομοί. See Index V.
dósum 10. 4.
dósum 20. 2, 10; 106. 17; 116. 15; 123. 8; 125. 7; 134. 4, 6; 296.
dósum see Index VIII.
dósum 112. 12.
dósoi, δοῦνα δόσι 110. 17.
dósoi 314.
dósoi 125. 13.

dósoi 122. 6, 9, 11.
dósoi 124. 9.
dósoi 21. 4.
dósoi 11. 20; 13. 10; 37. 1; 91. 50; 94. 7 (τί), 23; 96. 18; 97. 20, 35 (τί), 41; 98. 17, 25.
dósoi 20. 21.
dósoi 31. 3; 32. 4; 154.
dósoi 124. 8.
dósoi 398.
dósoi 12. 9; 124. 5.
dósoi 20. 11, 19, 20.
dósoi 125. 5.
dósoi 347.

See Index V.

eis 20. 17. See to the credit of 61. 7; 83. 6; 84. 8; 162.
eis 20. 17.
eis 73. 3; 74. 1; 300.
eis. See Index VII.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>επιστάμενοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>επιστροφια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.5, 23</td>
<td>επιστροφιοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.16</td>
<td>επιστήμονη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>επιστήμων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.6, 21</td>
<td>επιστήμωνοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 9, 14, 36.13, 38.6, 84.6</td>
<td>επίσκοποι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.14, 232</td>
<td>επίσκοποι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.25</td>
<td>επίσκοπος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>επισκόπος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.14, 18, 19, 32</td>
<td>εκκλησιάζοντας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.3, 78.4, 79.3</td>
<td>εκκλησιάζοντας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>εκκλησία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.2, 14, 17, 111.23</td>
<td>ερμηνευτὴς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>ερμηνευτής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6, 114.8, 132.1</td>
<td>ερμαζόμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.11</td>
<td>ερμαζόμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13, 12.14, 36.11, 47(a).7, 104.6</td>
<td>ευγένεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3, 94.12, 100.8, 104.6</td>
<td>ευγένεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164, 165</td>
<td>ευγένεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.7</td>
<td>ευθύνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.2, 9, 112.2, 113.10, 114.3, 117.3, 120.3, 121.3, 122.3</td>
<td>ευθύνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.17</td>
<td>εὐθυραυρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.9</td>
<td>εὐθυραυρός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.21</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>εὐθυγενεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.25, Inschr. 5, 24 (p. 49)</td>
<td>εὐθυγενεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.16, 18</td>
<td>εὐθυγενεία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.34, 120.9</td>
<td>εὐθύνους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>εὐθύνους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.7, 121.21</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.36, 228.122.13, 226.238.240</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.11, 12, 107.13, 228.238.240</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.25</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.12, 117.27, 125.10, 14; 127.3, 129.9, 130.3, 20, 131.22</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.16, 135.17, 136.12</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.20, 110.27</td>
<td>εὐθυμονώσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.7</td>
<td>εὐθύμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 (a).5</td>
<td>εὐθύμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.22, 12.19, 15.2, 23.1 et sita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.14, 85.12</td>
<td>εὐθύμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.9, 44.4, 64.3, 80.1, 85.12</td>
<td>εὐθύμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.3, 89.9, 90.10, 22, 91.13, 37</td>
<td>εὐθύμιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.11, 100.14, 107.11, 111.5, 115.18</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.3, 8, 10, 118.14, 18, 20, 24</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.23, 121.9, 122.21, 123.9, 125.6, 8, 131.6, 136.2, Ost. 5.2, 7.2</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3, 22.1, Inschr. 5.13 (p. 49)</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.7, 123.3</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.13, 112.9, 13, 20, 116.12, 118.12, 14, 122.9</td>
<td>εὐθυμίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.iii.30</td>
<td>εἰκῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.6, 115.19</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.12, 127.9</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>εἰκών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215, Ost. 10.4</td>
<td>εἰκωτική</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42(a).9, 47.5(7), 101, 104.12, 219, Ost. 8.3(f)</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4, 48.3</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2, 3; 138.1</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.26, 111.19, 195, Inschr. 3.4</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.13, 16, 109.4</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.19; 78.5; 91.18, 40; 94.13</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.13, 112.6, 17, 118.15, 122.23, 123.10, 130.5, 133.5, 139.5, 338, 340</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.23</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.17, 22.13</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76(a).3, al.</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.23</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.iii.26</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1, 27.13, Ost. 38.7</td>
<td>εἰκτοποιήσεως Ost. 8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. GENERAL INDEX, GREEK AND LATIN

habere 105. iii. 13 et saep.

item 105. ii. 3, 18.

item 117. 7.

item 113. 13; 114. 18.

item 75. 2; 76. 2; 188-189.

kathater 22. 14; 50. 22; 91. 33.

kathartikos 89. 11; 345; Ost. 23. 5; 32. 4.

kathartike 23 (α). introd.

kathēke 31. 29; 91. 20; 107. 9; Inscr. 5.

καθάρων 94. 11.

καθός 34. 31; 91. 43; 92. 27; 93. 20; 97.

καθός 41. 43; 98. 25; 130. 8; 133. 9; 333.

καθάρων 121. 5.

καίσιμον. See Index II.

καύρος 27. 13; 80. 17; 133. 9; 135. 2.

κακολογητής 12. 15.

κακοίρησ 108. 11.

κάλλαμος 345.

καλέω 104. 9.

καλός 13. 5; 125. 3; 127. 5.

κάμαρος 106. 19.

καμηλία 195.

κάμηλος 68. 2; 70. 2.

κανθάρος 39. 25.

κατηλέξ 12. 23.

κατηρέω 91. 19; 127. 6; 258.

κατηρέων 133. 12.

καταπάλη 90. 10.

κατακόπτω (?) 38. 10.

κατάρα Ost. 21. 1; 50. 1.

κατά 32. 14, al. κατά ἄνθρωπον: see ἄνθρωπον.

καταβαίνειν 129. 4.

καταβιβάζω 12. 22; 22. 8; 63. 4.

καταβαίνεις 110. 6, 30.

κατάγεσις 195.

καταγραφή 100. 14.

κατάγραμμα 66. 1.

καταληψεον 130. 8.

καταλήψεως 65. 7; 101. ii. 5, 6, ενεργεία. 1. 14.

καταληψεον 154.

κατασκευάζειν 20. 19; 114. 11.

κατασκευάζω 24. 13.

κατακυκλωσία 21. 21.

κατασκευάζοντες 118. 11.

κατασκευάζω 11. 27.
κατάβασις Inscr. 5. 9 (p. 49).
καταβάσεις 112. 23; 296.
καταχωρίσεις 30. 16; 35. 9; 94. 10; 100. 19.
καταχωρισμός 108. 25.
κατάχρησης 123. 8; 131. 10.
κατάγων 109. 11.
κατάλογοι 20. 7.
κατάλογοι 11. 4; 26. 13; 98. 14; 23.
καταλογία 12. 27.
καταλογισμός 65. 6.
κατόπιν 11. 4; 27. 5; 8; 25; 41. ii. 12; 42 (a). 1. 13; 56. 5; 8; 57. 4; 61. 7; 83. 8; 85. 10; 162; 190; 191; 193; 201; 263; 264; 319; 330; Ost. 23. 4.
κατάσκοπος Ost. 21. 3.
κατασκευή 347.
κατασκευή 119. 21.
κατάστασις 21. 4; 12; 27. 11; 32. 11; 33. 10; 78. 5; 108. 16.
κατάληψεις 347.
κατάληψεις. See Index VIII.
κατάστασις 333.
καταστροφή 347.
καταστροφή 41. i. 5; ii. 5.
καταστροφή 101. ii. 4; tergo ii. 2.
κατάστασις 348.
καταστροφή. See Index IX.
καταστροφή 121. 8.
κατάδυσις 26. 17.
κατάδυσις 109. 2; 5; 10.
κατάδυσις Ost. 119. 20.
κάθετα 16. 6; 41. i. 3; ii. 3; 65. 6; 88. 4; 99. 11; 101. ii. 18; 110. 12; 125. 4; 328; 338; 340; 345.
κάθετα 82. 13, 17, 19; 86. 5, 8, 14, 18, 19; 86 (a). 7, 8; 338.
κάθετα 348.
κάθετα 101. ii. 2 et saep.; Ost. 16. 2.
κάθετα 22. 28 (?); 110. 13.
κάθετα 12. 15.
κάθετα Ost. 5. 28 (p. 49).
κάθετα 88. 15; 24.
κάθετα 115. 19; 120. 5.
κάθετα 112. 8.
κάθετα See Index IX.
καθετισμός 110. 3; 114. 3; 122. 5; 130. 15.
καθετίσεις 58. 7.
καθετισμός 118. 19; 119. 33.
καθετισμός 110. 11.
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λάζος 44. 2.
авгоафелов 29. 7.
αναγραφην. See Index IX.
λεγομενα (τε) 348.
λαχμαν 70. 3; 119. 33; 131. 15.
λεγώντα 23. 13.
λαχμουστήροι 68. introd.; 89. 10, 17; 90. 11, 16, 23; 135. 15; Ost. 17. 2.
λόγιαν 20. 9; 21. 2; 88. 7; 106. 4; 109. 3, 9; 110. 6; 111. 9 (δίς); 14; 128. 16, 19, 22, 24; 128. 3; 165.
λαγών 91. 11.
λειψωρτικα 106. 21.
λεπαθνον 348.
λέμμα 42 (a). i. 6; 86. 1, 22, 26; 208; 285.
λειψωρτικα 114. 21.
λέμμα 117. 24.
λειψωρτικα 101. i. 4.
λειψωρτικα 120. 4.
λειψωρτικα 103. 30.
λειψωρτικα 110. 11.
λειψωρτικα 111. 20.
λειψωρτικα 120. 3.
λειψωρτικα See Index VIII.
λειψωρτικα 134. 5.
λειψωρτικα 119. 23.
λειψωρτικα 11. 29; 12. 30; 244; Ost. 12. 1.
λειψωρτικα 21. 9.
λέγον 19. 8; 34. 12; 41. i. 5, ii. 5; 44. introd.; 63. 6; 64. 3; 60. 21; 94. 10; 101. ii. 8, 16, verso i. 1, ii. 1; 103. 1; 108. 27; 109. 6; 201; 278; 334; Ost. 5. 2; εις λόγον 46. 3; 47. 7, 8, 13; 52 (a). 3; 59. 6; 219; Ost. 2. 3; 4. 3; μετα λόγον 53. 2, 7; 8, 9; 54. 3, 9, 11; 12, 15, 18; 56. 4; 256; 316. Οδος λ. 23 (a). 3.
λαγώντα 109. 7.
λάον 39. 12; 42 (a). i. 6; 58. 6; 65. 5; 96. 17; 118. 17; 122. 8, 9; 133. 14; 300; 320; Ost. 6. 3.
λαον 110. 15.
λάες 119. 7; 120. 8.
λαοτικα 111. 14, 15, 18.
μα σκληρος 19. 8.
μαγγαλον 98. 5; and see Index IX.
μαγγαλοντας 108. 13.
μαγγαλοντας 104. 4, 6.
μάλιστα 20. 3, 22; 106. 23; 118. 14.
μάλλον 20. 16, 18, 19; 136. 5.
Μαρκιανος 134. 6.
ματα 21. 22.
ματαφόρος 101. i. 18, verso i. 4; 302.
μάχης 145.
μαγαλυφευχια 20. 6.
μαγαλυφευχια 111. 3; 112. 14.
μάχης 18. 3; 123. 16; 125. 11; 137. 1
(δίς); 241; Inscr. 1. 4 (δίς) (p. 32); 2. 3 (p. 33); 3. 2 (p. 33); 4. 3 (p. 34).
μάχης See Index II.
μάχης 20. 2.
μάχης 26. 15.
μάχης 20. 4, 6; 114. 16; 115. 6; 118. 19;
119. 22; 126. 6; 137. 3.
μεσοερευνη 21. 16; 111. 3; 112. 14.
μεσον 35. 10; 90. 20; 96. 19; 111. 12;
137. 2; Inscr. 5. 4 (p. 48).
μεσον Ost. 14. 1; 15. 1; 16. 1; 17. 1.
μεσον See Index V.
μεσωμος 54. 13, 18; 125. 7; 256.
μεσωμος 97. 16, 32.
μέρος 31. 10, 15; 32. 13; 34. 27; 47 (a).
5. 9; 91. 27; 98. 9 (δίς); 100. 10; 104. 12.
μέσος 108. 11; 339.
μετα λόγον. See λόγος.
μεταβάλλει 122. 3.
μεταβάλλει 26. 20; 135. 11.
μεταβλητος 19. 12.
μεταμόλυνος 124. 23.
μεταφέρει 185.
μεταχειρισθενα 108. 23.
μεταφέρει 116. 12.
μεταφέρει 13. 3; 41. i. 4, ii. 4; 42. 4; 42 (a).
i. 3; 61. 4; 54. 4; 57. 3; 61. 5; 64.
2; 82. 2, 24; 83. 4; 84. 5; 86 (a). 3;
87. 4 et sapr.; 88. 2, 10; 147.
μεταφέρει 16. 3; 18 (a). 2, 6, 8; 18 (δ'). 5; 10;
81. 5, 12, 13; 82. 3, 26; 83. 5; 84. 6;
85. 6; 122. 12; 235; 332; Ost. 23. 2.
μεταφέρει 302.
μεταφέρει. See Index VIII.
μεταψ 20. 18.
μεταψ. See Index VIII.
μεταψ 91. 10; 94. 7; 97. 7.
μέχρι 34. 18; 91. 21; 94. 13; 112. 10.
μεχρίς 94. 10.
μήτηρ 22. 25. 27; 27. 5; 11; 28. 4; 7; 30. 8; 39. 5; 47 (a); 8; 49. 4; 50. 4; 53. 4; 54. 6; 77. 7; 78. 7; 90. 6; 94. 6; 99. 4; 124. 10; 21; 26; 127. 1; 17; 153; 335.
μητρόπολη. See Index V.
μηχανή 95. 11; 122. 17.
μηκός 127. 12; 13.
μήδες 20. 9; 39. 26; 92. 7; 10; 97. 25; 26; 104. 1; 113. 14; 116. 11; 119. 5. miles 10. 10.
μικροθέου 20. 4.
μικρός 91. 23; 27; 41; 103. 3.
μικρούν 93. 6; 18; 19; 95. 5.
μίσθωσις 96. 12; 20.
μηδεμία 39. 1; 60. 5; 82. 15.
μίν. See Index VIII.
μικρή 19. 10.
μικροτεμία. See Index IX.
μικρός 20. 9; 15; 36. 6; 93. 12; 133. 15.
μικρούρος 220. 2.
μίζοις 121. 13; 244.
μικροσαμία 93. 12.
μικρός 331.
μικροσοφία 93. 6.
νάνδρες 347.
νανθίων. See Index IX.
νανθισμός 42 (a). ii. 13; 143.
ναπτές 248.
νεκρός 103. 1.
νέων 97. 16.
νέων 89. 11; 102. 1 et saep.; 117. 10; and see Index II.
νεοφόροι 102. introd.
νεκάω 22. 20.
νεκροφόρος Inscr. 5. 10 (p. 49).
νεομαρχή. See Index VII.
νεομάρχεια 34. 7.
νεομία 42 (a). verso 6; 61. 7.
νεομία 109. 4; 10.
νεομός 124. 18.
νεομόρφος. See Index VII.
νεόμος 22. 12; 15.
νεόμος 38. 3; 89. 5; and see Index V.
νεοθήλεια 19. 5; 20.
νέων 339.
νιμπτόμαι 105. iii. 30.
νυμ β 7; 23. 5 et saep.; 23 (a). 6.
ξημ 136. 10; 299.
ζωικός 104. 3; 22. 28.
ζηρόμυρος 331.
ζηρός 348.
ζυλαγή 118. 21.
ζυλικός 104. 20.
ζυλων 118. 23.
ζυντός 83. 9; 84. 12; 85. 8.
ζυντρέχου 347.
δ, παρά τοίς καὶ τοῖς 20. 5.
ζωλίκεια passim.
ζωστερέω 10. 5.
ζυγον 112. 8; 120. 8.
ζύγων 111. 5.
ζύγων 20. 2; 106. 15; 136. 4.
ζυγετικα 20. 9.
ολία 12. 13; 18; 27. 13; 15; 18; 31. 11; 16; 32. 13; 98. 15; 24; 100. 10; 126. 5; 319.
οικονόμος 133. 2.
οικόπεδον 23 (a). 8; 26. 8; 42 (a). ii. 15.
οίνων 31. 13; 17; 112. 23; 115. 5; 12; 117. 9; 10; 16; Inscr. 2. 2 (p. 33); 3; 2 (p. 33).
οίκος 91. 13; 18; 92. 18; 97. 12; 30. ол. олекеос 87. 5; 88. 5.
οικοτίκος 19. 3; 18.
οικοπολίς 63. 8.
οικός 63. 9; 73. 4; 74. 3; 103. 4; 104. 3; 22; 123. 7; 14; Ost. 7. 3.
οίσιον 129. 10.
οισία 348.
οίσιον 31. 15; 16; 102. 11; 19; 28; 29; 119. 6.
οίκων 24. 5; 206.
οίκων 91. 24; 42.
οίκων 106. 20.
οίκων 47. 8; 85. 4; 87. 11; 16; 95. 15; 23; 101. ii. 18; verso i. 6; 102. 1 et saep.; 104. 21; 300; 328.
οίκων 34. 3; 89. 9; 90. 5; 19; 22; 91. 5; 32; 37; 92. 5; 20; 94. 2; 16; 23; 97. 5; 9; 28; 98. 4; 12; 18; 20.
οίκωρια 91. 1; 97. 22.
οίκωριος 32. 9.
οίκωριος 32. 8; 97. 7; 29.
οίκωριος 111. 7; 119. 3; Ost. 24. 5; 36. 5; 39. 3; 40. 3.
οίκωμα 20. 7; 22. 4; 29. 15; 30. 14; 64. 6; 85. 7; Ost. 22. 3.
οικοδόμος 97. 2; 69. 3; 71. 3; 72. 3; 73. 3; 74. 3; 75. 4; 76. 4; 92. 11; 22, 34;
INDICES

στρατηγικός 135. 4.
στρατηγός. See Index VII.
στρατιά 135. 6.
συγγεινή 91. 8; 36; 100. 1; 115. 4; Inscr. 5. 14 (p. 49).
συγγραφή 11. 12; 33.
συγκελέω 12. 17; 135. 7.
συγκεφαλίδα 135. 3.
συγκεφάλι 12. 30.
συγκέφαλοι 100. 11.
συγκεραυνίς 31. 21.
συγκεραυνία Inscr. 5. 5 (p. 48).
συλλέκτης 21. 7.
συλλέκτης 129. 2.
συλλέκτης 11. 16.
συμβολέος. See Index IX.
συμβολην 34. 6; 47 (a). 7; 11; 54. 3; 64. 8; 94. 12; 19; 104. 27; 31; 303.
συμβολικός (?) 20. 18.
συμβολήν 105. iii. 27; 30.
σύμβολο 34. 12; 85. 13.
συμβολέος 94. 9.
συμβολήσατε 44. 10.
συμβολογενέστατός 109. 11.
συμβολικός 112. 17.
συμβολικός 92. 15; 138. 4.
συνάγεται 11. 31.
συναίρεσις 109. 6.
συνάλλαξις 11. 22.
συνάπτεσθαι 14. 7.
συναπτέσθαι 20. 16.
συνέκις (') 143.
συνεποκολουθείς 43. 4.
συνεπίθισμα 39. 21; 23.
συνεργός 12. 10.
συνέχεια 12. 31.
συνέχεια 34. 10; 118. 14.
συνέχθης 38. 3.
συνεκτείνει 12. 16; 35. 4; 109. 9.
συνενέκτειν Inscr. 1. 3 (p. 32); 3. 2 (p. 33).
συνενέκτησις 31. 13; 37. 3.
συνέποντος 20. 23.
συνεπίθετον 26. 13.
συνεπικεφαλικός 145.
συνεπίκεφαλος. See Index IX.
συνεπίθετος 16. 2; 302; Ost. 47. 2.
συνεπίθετος 107. 6.
συνεπίθετος 20. 7.
συνεπίθετος 12. 8; 25.
συνεπίθετος 34. 20.
συνεπέχει 133. 7.
συνοπτικός 34. 27; 35. 11.
σφερία 347.
σφαγή 123. 8; 339.
σφυρί 102. 3 el τάρφ.
σφηδά 104. 21.
σφηδων 110. 28.
σφώτα 34. 20.
σφωτικός 21. 10.
σφωτισμός 33. 18.
σφόδρος 106. 15.
σφόδρος 20. 14; 21.
τάξιμον 104. 4.
ταξιδιαρχός 104. 15.
τάξιμον. See Index VIII.
τάξιμων 110. 7; 300.
τάξις 29. 17; 30. 15; 35. 10; Ost. 50. 3.
ταχεύτης 13. 4.
ταχυχρόνιος 15. 4.
τάφων 29. 15; 30. 13; 111. 22; 129. 3; 130. 8.
ταφικός 112. 8; 115. 16; 120. 12; 131. 17; 253.
ταφή 103. 2.
τάχι 117. 12.
ταχύ 126. 7.
τάκτων Inscr. 1. 1, 5 (p. 32).
τάκτων 110. 28; 123. 19.
τάλεον 36. 14; 68-76 (a).
τάλεον 106. 21.
τάλεαρα. See Index IX.
τάλεαρα 23. 3; 29. 9, 16; 30. 11, 15; 65. 8; 97. 14; 33.
τάλεμνή 30. 17.
τάλεον. See Index IX.
τάλεμνή 40. 3; 82. 14.
τάρμα 217.
testamentum 10. 2.
tετραμετρής 106. 12.
tετραμετρικότατος 82. 12; 83. 10.
tετρακοστά 113. 14.
tετράστυλος 104. 11.
tετραστυλος (sic) 347.
tετρακύκλος 122. 12.
tετράδεια 109. 6; 119. 17.
tετράδιον 131. 18.
tεμή 11. 30; 31. 19; 47. 12; 62. 6; 60.
X. GENERAL INDEX, GREEK AND LATIN

18; 92, 16, 25; 100, 9; 101, verso i. 8, 9; 110, 25; 111, 17; 129, 10; 134, 8; 219; 333; 348; Ost. 7, 2; 49, 4.

timos 19; 2, 17; 129, 1.
tumagōs 102, 29.
tupsanv 101, 2, 12.
tiwos 99, 13, 23.
tiwoskōpov 20, 6.
tōπērhē. See Index VII.
tōπιρκία 81, 4; 85, 5.
tōπος 11, 25; 23 (π). introd.; 30, 7; 95, 12; 100, 10; Inscr. 5, 19 (p. 49).
tρα( ) 153.

transerre 105, iii. 25.

trāpēza 17, 1; 18, 1; 87, 3; 96, 4; 291, 7; 335, 7 demōsia τρ. 41, i, 17, ii, 16; 42, 9; 333.

trαπεζίτης 12, 22; 17, 2; 18, 3; 100, 3.

tραματαιος 108, 14.

trāμι 124, 27.

trāβεθα 22, 23.

trākōs 95, 6; al.

trākēlōn 117, 17.

trākōs 21, 12; 94, 13; 17; Inscr. 5, 10 (p. 49).

trαφα 115, 5.

trαχύς 133, 4, 12, 15.

tυχάνειν 19, 15; 136, 10; 296.

tυχωλειτεών (τιε) 104, 3.

tύχη 24, 8; Inscr. 5, 4 (p. 33).

τυχαντών 12, 15.

τύλως 134, 4, cf. ἔλθως.

δεσις 12, 17, 32.

dημιούργης 127, 3; 180, 3.

δηρός 331.

δημοτικός 135, 12.

δήμως 110, 15, 17; 119, 34; 131, 9.

δύνας 104, 1, 2.

u{n}ticum 105, i, 14, iii, 29.

dē. See Index IX.

γίδος 27, 8; 28, 9; 30, 7; 31, 8; 89, 2; 113, 2, 15; 114, 1; 117, 2, 30; 119, 2; 36; 206; Ost. 23, 9.

διαστός 95, 22.

διαφόρος 235.

διαφέρειν 12; 23 (α). 7; 26, 8; 32, 12, 16; 33, 12; 87, 5; 90, 19; 91, 16, 32; 94, 14, 18, 25; 96, 12; 106, 10; 304.

ἐπερθανός 110, 9.

ἐπεριθέναι 133, 5.

ἐπερθανός (?) 95, 12.

ἐπέχει 21, 25.

ἐπιπτήρης 24, 20; 26, 20; Ost. 20, 6 (?).

ἐπι, διότι ἐπι κραθήν, or the like, Ost. 14, 2; 15, 2; 16, 2, 3; 17, 2.

ἐπιγράφειν 97, 24.

ἐπιγραφήνει 91, 33; 93, 18.

ἐπιγραφή 122, 13.

ἐπίδημον 123, 16.

ἐπίδεικνυς 143.

ἐπίδεικνυς 23, 9.

ἐπικαΐσθαι 42 (α). I, 11.

ἐπικλαμείναν 124, 25.

ἐπικλαμείναν 91, 25.

ἐπικοίνων 11, 21.

ἐπικόινων 28, 12; 29, 14.

ἐπικοινωνίας 106, 1.

ἐπικοινωνίας 132, 5.

ἐπικοινωνίας 112, 3.

ἐπικοίνων 27, 11; 106, 20.

ἐπικοίνων 107, 2.

ἐπικοίνων 36, 14.

φαγεμ (φαγάς) 127, 15.

φαίνειν 26, 14; 36, 21; 93, 18; 107, 10; 108, 26; 298, 303.

φακός 86, 2 et sap.; 88 (α). 2; 101, i, 16, iii, 5, verso ii, 4; 127, 15; 339; Ost. 18, 3, 4.

φαίνει 24, 21; 36, 24.

φαίνει 20, 5.

φάμος (φαμάς) 116, 3.

φελεθενία 20, 19.

φελάσθη 347.

φέρεμ 119, 10, 34; 134, 3; 136, 7.

φεράμη 22, 10, 15, 17.

φεδή 127, 9.

φελασθραία 20, 16.

φελέως 118, 26; 119, 26.

φελάλα 135, 10.

φιλοφελής 125, 1, 14; 126, 3; 131, 14.

φιλόσοφος 87, 6.

φιλόσοφος 21, 21.

φιλία 60, 4; 164.

φιλεμνέον (δ). 6; 88, 2 et sap.; 88 (α). 7; 101, i, 6, 13, 17; 146, 148; 333.
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φόρος. See Index IX.

φυτοί 198. 8.

φυτωτικών 38. 2; 96. 13.

φυτωτική 33. 8; 61. 6 (?); 95. 2; Inscr. 6.

5 (p. 54).

χαλά ( ) 297.

χαλά 42 ( ). 15; 53. 9; 115. 3.

χαλάσσων 124. 13.

χαινερά 19. 11.

χαινέρα 42. 12; 111. 25; 113. 9, 10; 114. 15.

Ost. 13. 1.

χαίρω. vixion 73. 4.

χαίρων 2. 13; 4. 14; 14. 4; 16. 2; 18 ( ).

2; 18 ( ). 4; 19. 2, 17; 43. 1; 44. 4;

48. 2; 100. 3; 109. 1; 110. 2; 111. 2;

113. 2; 114. 2; 122. 2; 123. 3; 124. 2;

125. 2; 126. 2; 127. 2; 128. 2; 129. 1;

130. 2; 134. 1; 135. 1; Ost. 7. 2; 8. 2;

11. 2; 12. 2.

χαικέων 85. 11.

χαικεία 11. 17, 31; 12. 24, 32; 15. 5; 43.

3; 44. 10, 12, introd.; 49. 5; 50. 6;

52. 6; 55. 7, 8, 9; 56. 6, 7; 101. verso i;

6. 7; 130. 7, 11; 191; 196-9, al.; Ost.

3. 3.

χαικείων 348; and see Index VIII.

χαίρε 20. 1.

χαίρει 348.

χαίρε 124. 16; 136. 8. χαίρε 107. 5; 116.

10; 128. 5.

χαίρε 89. 26; 91. 13; 92. 8, 10, 18; 97. 12,

25, 26, 30.

χαιροτήτης 63. 7.

χαιροτητίζει 34. 4; 84. 1; 303.

χαιροτετίζειν. See Index IX.

χαιροτετίζον 26. 11.

χαιρέ Ost. 2. 2.

χαιρέ 108. 17, 21, 23.

χαίρει. See Index VIII.

χαιρετικόν 108. 6.

χαιρετικών 108. 16; 111. 4, 10; 115. 4, 7.

χαίρετικά 124. 20.

χαιρετί 347.

χαιρετίς 119. 4, 6, 15, 17; 119. 34; 326.

Ost. 19. 3; 51; 20. 3.

χαίρε. See Index VIII.

χαιρέ 108. 2.

χαιρεία 106. 13, 17; 117. 8; 130. 14.

χαιρετικήν 135. 14.

χαίρε 20. 12.

χαιρετικά 12. 28; 20. 16 (?); 100. 3; 137.

2, 4.

χαιρετισμός Inscr. 5. 22 (p. 49).

χαιρετισμός. See Index VII.

χαιρετισμό. See Index VIII.

χαίρε 90. 11.

χαίρετι 217.

χαιρετικών 106. 2.

χαιριδός 11. 16, 18; 20. 6; 106. 13; 117.

28; 131. 6; 136. 13; Inscr. 4. 4 (p. 34).

χαιραιδός 20. 12.

χαιρέ 25. 4, 5; 289 (?).

χαιραμερολόγος 214.

χαιραμερεία 42 ( ). ii. 6; 77. 3; 78. 4; 79.

3; 359.

χαίρε 110. 10.

χαίρε 95. 10.

ψηφίζει 20. 8 ( )

ψηφίζει 335.

ψηφίζει 119. 34.

δέ 108. 8; 117. 12; 123. 10.

αυτοί (tis) 115. 15.

άλλην 110. 29.

αυτοκεφάλα 62. 4.

άλμα 132. 4; 139. 5.

άνελε 118. 31.

άνερέ 106. 24.

άνερέ 17. 2; 24. 15; Ost. 11. 3, al.
XI. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

DISCUSSED IN INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES.

(The numbers refer to pages.)

άδωιρετος 142.
Alexandria, property owned by, 220.
Amenemhat III 5.
άντιστρόμβολον 125, 202.
άπνησμα 157.
άπομαχα 160, 163.
Arsinoë 9; property owned by Arsinoë 222.
Arsinoë Philadelphus 9.
Artaba, fractions of, 225, 243.
Asylum, right of, 49–50.
ἀτέλειον, τελωνευτής, 157–8, 214.
Augustus, era of the κράτησις of, 223.

Bacchias. See Ümm el 'Atl.
Bahr Yusuf 1, 3–7, 10–11.
Bank and tax-collector's receipts 159, 193.
Beer-tax 170.
Berenices Alymolo, site of, 14.
Biahmu 5–7.
Birket el Kurin 1, 6.
Βοσκεί 147–8.
Brown, Major R. H., on Lake Moeris 1, 3, 5, 6, 17.
Bubastus, site of, 11.

Calendars, Julian and Egyptian, 293–4.
Camel, prices of, 199.
Cartonnage, papyri, 19, 22, 55.
Charia Borghiana 14, 17.
Coinage, ratio of silver and copper, 167–8, 243–4.
Crusius, Prof. O., 75, 83, 87.

Daressy, M. G., on Yâkûta, 11.
Decempristri 215–6.
Demotic papyri 38, 45.
Deputation of tax-collecting 145–6, 148; appointment of deputy-strategus 272.

δαγγαμφί 235.
Dimê 6–7, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22–4.
Diodorus on the Fayûm 5, 16.
Dionysias 11.
Divorce 126.
Donkeys, prices of, 199.

Edwa 6.
eidos 183–4.
Embankments 204–5.
etiðokhipo 213.
Euhemeria. See Kašr el Banât.

Fayûm in prehistoric times 2, under the Old Empire 3, Middle Empire 5–7, New Empire 7–8, Ptolemies 9, 15. Decline of Fayûm 16.
Flint factory near Ümm el 'Atl 7, 8, 42.

Gebala 14.
Gemellus papyri 261–3.
Gurob 14.

Half, symbols for, 180.
Hephaestus, position of, 107.
Herodotus on the Fayûm 5, 8, 17.
Illahîm 4, 5, 13, and see Ptolemais Harbour.
Isis 22.

Jar-sealings, inscribed, 53, 59.
Jews 279.

Karanis. See Kom Ushîm.

1 This index does not include the subjects sufficiently indicated by the titles of the papyri, for which see Table, pp. xi–xiv.
Kaşr el Banat 3, 9, 16, 21, 22-4, 43-50, 61-2.
Kaşr Kurün 3, 11, 22, 63.
Kenyon, Dr. F. G., 207, 209.
Kharabt el Yehudî 63-4.
Kharabt Hamûlî 63.
Khaomsû 209.
Kom Oshîm 3, 7, 9, 19, 21, 22-3, 27, 30-5.
Land-tax 183.
Leaden tokens 71-4.
Levels 2-3, 5.
Linat 1.
Liberalis, praefecture of, 131.

Myedîr 154, 180.
Mamertinus, praenomen of, 125.
Maspero, M. G. 4.
Medinet el Fayûm 2, 4, 6, 10.
Medinet Hâtî 64.
Memphis road 7, 195 sqq.
Nebdet of the Fayûm 10.
Mittis, Prof. L., 118, 122-3, 280.
Moeris, Lake, 1-10, 15-17, 197.
Monopolies 149-152, 231.

Neroneus and Neroneus Sebastus 296-7.
Nepheres 22, 45.
Nezla 14.
Nile, rise of, 3.

Oil, production of, 234.
Ostraca, discovery of, 44, 46, 53, 63, 317.


Petersuchus 22, 30, 34.
Petrus, Prof. W. M. Flinders, 3, 6, 10, 12, 19.

Philadelphia, site of, 11, 16.

Philadelphia 9, 15.

Philoteris. See Wadfa.

Fig-tax 182.

Pliny on the Fayûm 7.

Pnepheros 22, 30, 34.

Polydeucia, site of, 14.

Poor-relief 179.

Ports of the Fayûm 6, 7, 13, 197.

Pottery, Ptolemaic, 37, 53, 55-62; Roman, 37, 47, 53, 58-9, 61.

Psamnis, site of, 14.

Ptolemais Harbour 12-14, 17.

Ptolemus, Claudius, 11-13.

Raphanus oil 234.

Recto and verso, exception to the rule, 216.

Rhodian amphoraq 57, 60.

Romance, Greek writers of, 75.

Rubayyat 11.

Scarabs 55, 62.

Schweinfurth's temple 4, 6.

Sekh 22.

Sedment ostraca 318-20.

Sekhetenis 22.

Sen菲r 14.

Severus Alexander's remission of aurum coronarium 117-8.

Shetet 4.

Smitty, Mr. J. G., 13, 151.

Soconpaei Nesu. See Dimê.

Sokanobkoneus 22.

Soldiers' pay 252-3.

Spiegelberg, Prof. W., 22, 45.

Stamps, inscribed, 40, 41, 46, 54.

Stops, three kinds of, 92, 95.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. INDEX OF SUBJECTS</th>
<th>371</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strabo on the Fayûm</td>
<td>5, 8, 15–17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suchus 22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣωματισμός 145.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talei, site of</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarlt 12, 14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebtunis. See Úmm el Baragât.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temples 22–3; Kôm Ushîm 30–32; Úmm et 'Atî 36–8; Kašr el Banât 44; Hart 52.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theadelphia. See Hart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs, Ptolemaic, 41, 55–8, 62; Roman, 41–2, 58–9, 62.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Úmm el 'Atî 7, 9, 21, 22–4, 35–42.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Úmm el Baragât 2, 3, 6, 8, 15, 21, 22–4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetius on soldiers' pay 252.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadfā 3, 9, 15, 21, 22–4, 62–3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardan, Bahîr, 15, 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages, rate of 248.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yākūta 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF PLATES XIV-XVII

PLATE XIV (a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Gizeh Journ.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLATE XIV (b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Gizeh Journ.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>33:351.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLATE XV.

7. Comb. UMB el 'Atl.
13, 14. Spindles. UMB el 'Atl.

PLATE XVI.

3. ? UMB el 'Atl.
8. Spits. UMB el 'Atl.
10. Keys. UMB el 'Atl.
11. Palette. UMB el 'Atl.
13. Part of table-stand. UMB el 'Atl.
14, 15. Black earthenware vases from temple. UMB el 'Atl. p. 47.
17. Blue glaze ink-pot. UMB el 'Atl.
PLATE XVII.

4. Fringed cap (?). Kaşr el Banāt. p. 47.
5. Ox-blinders (?). Kaşr el Banāt. p. 47.
6. Shadīf ropes. Umm el 'Atl,
8. Float (?). Umm el 'Atl.
TEMPLE OF PNEPHEROS AND PETESUCHOS
AT KOM USHIM

SCALE: 1:460
(a) KASR EL BANAT FROM THE WEST

(b) HARIT FROM THE EAST
PLATE X

(a) TEMPLE OF KAŞR KURÜN

(b) PTOLEMAIC VASES, ETC. HARIŞ CEMETERY
(a) EARLY ROMAN POTTERY, KAŞR EL BANÂT

(b) PTOLEMAIC AND ROMAN POTTERY, ETC. KAŞR EL BANÂT
(a) Roman Pottery. Harit Cemetery

(b) Roman Pottery. Harit
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