TWO PAPYRI IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COLLECTION

REVEL A. COLES

University of Oxford

The two papyri here published were studied in the summer of 1965 during a visit to the University of Michigan to work with Professor Youtie, to whose guidance this paper owes so much.

Both papyri were acquired by purchase by the University from Dr. Askren in January 1924.

I. SALE OF A HOUSE

PMich. Inv. 1428 23.5 × 25 cm. Oxyrhynchus, A.D. 318

Acknowledgement by Aurelius [] apion to Aurelius [] lion, both of Oxyrhynchus, of the sale of a house and cellar in the city apparently registered in the name of the vendor's daughter. Some of the details of the transaction are expressed in terms of Roman law, although at this relatively late date and for Aurelii strict adherence to Roman legal forms in Egypt was perhaps the exception rather than the rule: cf. Taubenschlag, Law of Greco-Roman Egypt² 146-47. Possibly the contract could have been expressed equally well in terms of Graeco-Egyptian law as a sale by the daughter acting $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ her father: see further the commentary below, esp. on lines 3-4. The detailed account of the terms of the sale itself (esp. lines 12 ff.) follows well known lines: cf. e.g. POxy. 1200, 1208, 1276, 1697-1700, 1702, and 1704-5.

I would like to express my appreciation here to the Craven Committee in Oxford and to the Department of Classics of the University of Michigan for the financial assistance which made this visit possible; and to the University of Michigan for the hospitality and facilities afforded to me during my stay. I wish also to thank Professor and Mrs. Youtie for their constant kindness which helped to make my visit such a pleasant one; and Mr. J. K. B. M. Nicholas, of Brasenose College, Oxford, for reading the manuscript of *PMich*. Inv. 1428 and for a discussion of various points therein.

The text is written along the fibres and is complete except for the beginnings of lines (about eleven letters are missing on average). The body of the document is written in a formal upright documentary hand. The subscription of the vendor (23–25) is in a more slanting and less formal cursive hand, while finally (26) the document has been docketed by a notary in a cursive hand. The verso is blank. The papyrus was damaged in antiquity and roughly repaired with some small pieces of papyrus glued on to the verso.

- [Ύπατίας τῶν δε] σποτῶν ἡμῶν Λικινίου Σεβαστοῦ τὸ ε΄ καὶ Κρείσπου τοῦ ἐπιφανεστ[άτου Καί] σαρος τ[ὸ] α΄.
- [Αὐρήλιος] ᾳπίων 'Ηρᾶ μη(τρὸς) 'Αλεξάνδρας ἀπὸ τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λ<u>αμ</u>(προτάτης) '<u>Οξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως</u> Αὐρη[λ]ί[ω] . ίωνι Διδύμου μη(τρὸς) Θαήσιος
- [ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλ]εως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ πεπρα[κέ]ναι σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον τὴν ὑπ_[ρχο]υσάν μοι ἀγορασθεῖσαν
- [ύπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐν?]ταχθεῖσαν ἐπ' ὀνόματος τῆς ἡμετέρας θυγατρὸς Δὐρηλίας 'Αλεξάνδρας οὔσης μου ὑπ[ὸ] τῆ χειρὶ κατὰ τοὺς 'Ρωμαίων
- 5 [νόμους πρότερον? Α] ὐρηλίου Παπνούθιος οὐετρανοῦ τῶν ἐντίμως ἀπολελυμένων πρὸ δὲ τῆς στρατιᾶς χρη-μ(ατίζοντος) οὕτως Παπνοῦθις
 - [?Π]ενγωοῦτος μη(τρὸς) <u>Τ</u>αιώνιος <u>ἀ</u>πὸ κώμης Ταλεεὶ τοῦ ᾿Απολλωνοπολείτου κάτω νομοῦ τῆς Θηβαίδος
 - [κατὰ ἀ]σφάλειαν γενομένην ἐπὶ τῆ[s] ἐνεστώσης ὑπατίας μηνὶ Φαρμοῦθι κη καὶ αὐτοῦ πρότερον Αὐρηλίας [
 - [].. μη(τρὸς) Εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως χωρὶς κυρίου χρημ(ατιζούσης) τέκνων δικαίψ .[].[].[].[]. τος καὶ[]
 - [Αὐρηλί]<u>ου</u> Διονυσίου Παθερμουθίου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐν <u>τῆ</u> [αὐ]<u>τῆ</u> <u>πό</u>λει ἐπ' ἀμφόδ<u>ου</u> Βορρᾶ Κρηπῖδος οἰκείαν

- 10 [κε]νὴν ὑφ' ἢν κατάγιον σὺν χρηστηρίοις πᾶσι, ἦς γείτονες νότου δημοσία ῥύμη βορρᾶ κέλλα ὑπὸ τοὺς
 - [$\frac{d}{d\eta}$ ηλιώτου Δ ιοσκόρου έλαιοπώλου λιβός δημοσία ρύμη μεθ' ην το Σ εβαστίον, ἀναδέδωκ[α δ]έ σοι πρός
 - [τὴν σὴν ἀσφάλε]ιαν καὶ τὰς εἴς με προκτητικὰς ἀσφαλείους, $\tau\iota\mu[\hat{\eta}\varsigma] \underline{\tau}\hat{\eta}\varsigma \quad \sigma \nu\mu\pi\epsilon\phi\omega\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma \quad \pi\rho\dot{\delta}\varsigma \quad \grave{a}\lambda\lambda\dot{\eta}\underline{\lambda}o\upsilon\varsigma \quad \tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma \quad a\mathring{\upsilon}\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma$
 - [οἰκείας καὶ καταγ]ίου καὶ χρηστηρίων πάντων ἀργυρίου Σεβαστῶν νομίσμ[ατ]ος ταλάντων δεκατεσσάρων καὶ δραχμῶν τετρα-
 - [κισχειλίων, (γίνονται)] (τάλαντα) ιδ (δραχμαὶ) 'Δ, ἄπερ αὐτόθι ἀπέσχον παρὰ σοῦ ἐκ πλήρους διὰ χε[ιρ]ος, περὶ ἢς ἀριθμήσεως ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ σοῦ
- 15 [ώμολόγησ]α. διὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κρατεῖν σε καὶ κυριεύειν σὺν ἐγγόνοις καὶ τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ μεταλημψομένοις, ἔτι [ἐ]ξουσίαν δὲ
 - [ἔχειν ?χρῆσθαι] καὶ οἰκονομῖν περὶ αὐτῆς ὡς ἐὰν αἱρῃ ἀνεμποδίστως, ἥνπερ καὶ ἐπάναγκες παρέξομ[α]ί σοι βέβαιον διὰ
 - [παντὸς ἀπὸ] <u>π</u>άντων πάση βεβαιώσι καὶ καθαρὰν ἀπό τε όφιλης καὶ κα<u>τοχ</u>ης πάσης δημοσίας τε καὶ ἰδιωτικης κ[αὶ] <u>π</u>ολιτικης
 - [καὶ ?βουλευτικῆ]ς καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς ούτινοσοῦν ἄλλου, πάντα δὲ τὸν καθ' ὁνδηποτοῦν τρόπον ἐπελευσόμενον ἤ ἐμποιησόμενον ταύ-
 - [της ὅλης ἢ] μέρους αὐτῆς ἐπάναγκες ἀποστήσιν με παραχρῆμα ταῖς ἐμαυτοῦ δαπάναις, καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης. κυρία ἡ πρᾶσις
- 20 [γραφ]εῖσα ἥνπερ ὁπηνίκα ἐὰν αἱρῇ ἀνύσις διὰ δημοσίου οὐ προσδεόμενος ἐτέρας μου εὐδοκήσεως διὰ τὸ ἐν-

 $[\tau \epsilon \hat{v}\theta \epsilon \nu \ \epsilon \hat{v}\delta \circ \kappa] \underline{\epsilon} \hat{v} \nu \mu \epsilon \ \tau \hat{\eta} \ \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \circ \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \eta \ \delta \eta \mu \circ \sigma i \omega \sigma \epsilon i, \ \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{i} \ \delta \hat{\epsilon} \ \tau \circ \hat{v}$

ταῦτα ὀρθῶς κα[λ] $\hat{\omega}$ ς πεπρᾶχθαι ἐπερωτηθεὶς ώμολόγησα.

[ύπατίας της α] ψτης Φαρμοῦθι κδ΄.

[(2nd hand) Αὐρήλιος]πίων πέπρακα τὴν προκειμένην οἰκίαν καινὴν καὶ κατάγειον σὺν χρηστηρίοις πᾶσι καὶ [ἀπέσχον τὰ τ]ῆς τιμῆς ἀργυρίου τάλαντα δεκατέσσαρα καὶ δραχμὰς τετρακισχειλίας καὶ βεβαιώσω

25 $[καὶ εὐδοκῶ] τῆ δημοσιώσι, πάντα δὲ ὡς πρόκειται καὶ ἐπερωτη<math>\theta$ [εὶς] ὡμολόγησα.

(3rd hand) δι' ἐμοῦ Χαιρήμονος.

12. l. ἀσφαλείας?
 15. εγ'γονοις pap.
 20. l. ἀνοίσεις
 23. l. κενήν
 24. τι of τιμῆς corr. from αρ

TRANSLATION

In the consulship of our masters Licinius Augustus for the fifth time and Crispus the most noble Caesar for the first time.

Aurelius [lapion, son of Heras and Alexandra, from the illustrious and most illustrious city of the Oxyrhynchites, to Aurelius [lion, son of Didymus and Thaesis, from the same city, greeting. I acknowledge that I have sold to you from the present time for ever the ... empty house, beneath which is a cellar, with all its appurtenances, belonging to me in the same city in the North Quay quarter, bought by me and registered (?) in the name of my daughter Aurelia Alexandra who is under my power according to Roman law, formerly the property of Aurelius Papnouthis, an honorably discharged veteran, before his military service known as Papnouthis, son of . . . and Taionis, grandson of Pengoous (?), from the village of Taleei in the lower Apollonopolite nome of the Thebaid, in accordance with a ... agreement drawn up on the 23rd of the month Pharmouthi of the present consulship, and before him (?) the property of Aurelia ... daughter of ... and Irene, from the same city, acting without a guardian by the ius liberorum, (?) acting jointly with her husband Aurelius Dionysius, son of Pathermouthius, from the same city: of which the boundaries are, on the south a public street, on the north a storeroom used by . . ., on the east property of Dioscorus, oil-merchant, on the west a public street beyond which is the Augusteum; and I have also surrendered to you for your security the agreements made over to me relating to previous ownership. (I have sold this property to you) at the price mutually agreed upon for the same house and cellar and all appurtenances, namely fourteen talents and four thousand drachmae of silver of the Imperial coinage, tot. 14 tal. 4000 dr., which I have received from you forthwith in full from hand to hand, and in response to your question concerning this payment I have made acknowledgement. Wherefore from now on you shall own and possess the property with your descendants and successors, and shall further have power to use and manage it as you choose without hindrance: and I will of necessity deliver it to you guaranteed perpetually against all claims with every guarantee, and free from every debt and lien public and private and municipal and senatorial (?) and all other liabilities whatsoever. And every one who in any manner whatsoever proceeds against or claims this property, whether the whole or a part of it, I am of necessity to repel forthwith at my own expense, as if in consequence of a legal decision. This sale, written in ... copies, is valid, and you shall whenever you choose have it registered without requiring any further approval from me, because I now approve the eventual registration, and in answer to the question whether this is rightly and fairly done I have made acknowledgement. In the same consulship, Pharmouthi 24.

(2nd hand) I, Aurelius []apion, have sold the aforesaid empty house and cellar with all appurtenances, and I have received the fourteen talents and four thousand drachmae of silver of the price, and I will guarantee the sale and I approve the registration; and in all respects as aforesaid in answer to the formal question I have made acknowledgement. (3rd hand) By me, Chaeremon.

- 1. This line is separated from line 2 by a slightly wider space than is regular in the body of the document, and appears to have been written with a different pen in a rather rougher hand.
- 2. Read $[A \partial \rho \dot{\eta} \lambda \log \Sigma a \rho] a \pi i \omega v$? $A \partial \rho \eta [\lambda] i [\omega]$]. $i \omega v i$: space in the lacuna for from one to perhaps three letters. $\Omega \rho i \omega v i$ would be a possible reading.
- 3-4. The apparent incongruity here is obviated by the conditions of patria potestas under Roman law. See e.g. Taubenschlag, Law of Greco-Roman Egypt² 130 ff. Such strict adherence however to Roman legal forms in Egypt at this relatively late date and for Aurelii seems to have been the exception rather than the rule: cf. Taubenschlag, 146-47; also Wenger, Die Quellen des römischen Rechts 812; and Taubenschlag, "Die Patria potestas im Recht der Papyri," ZSS 37 (1916) 223 ff., = Opera Minora 2.314 ff. It may well be then that in Graeco-Egyptian law the property would have been regarded as the daughter's, and the present transaction could have been expressed as a sale by the daughter

acting $\delta\iota\acute{a}$ her father: see Taubenschlag, Law^2 , esp. 147–48, and also Pringsheim, Greek Law of Sale 215–16 ($\sigma\acute{v}\sigma\tau a\sigma\iota s$ given by the vendor). Note that in that case the price would have to be passed from father to daughter before the sale could become valid. But the transaction as we have it has perhaps been given, as it were, a veneer of Roman law, for whatever purpose: the sale is now made by the father, who states the property as his, and he has become the principal with respect to the various conditions and clauses of the document; and thus it is he who receives the price.

- 6. Π]ενγωοῦτος? perhaps cf. POxy. 1538.11, Πεγωοῦτος.
- 7. $\int \kappa a \tau \dot{a} d \sigma \phi \dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \iota a \nu$. It is unclear precisely what document is referred to here. It seems implausible that it should refer to the actual transference of the property from Papnouthis to the present vendor, even more so to the transference from Aurelia (lines 7-8) to Papnouthis. It could scarcely refer, again, to the $\delta\eta\mu\sigma\sigma'i\omega\sigma$ of the latter transaction, as the procedure implied by $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\chi\theta\epsilon\hat{\imath}\sigma\alpha\nu$, if that is correctly read, could hardly have taken place while registration of the previous ownership was still outstanding. It seems more plausible, but perhaps an abuse of the Greek, to take it as referring back to $\vec{\epsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \chi \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \alpha \nu$, or to $\dot{a}\gamma o\rho a\sigma\theta \epsilon \hat{i}\sigma a\nu$ (i.e. the $\delta\eta\mu o\sigma i\omega\sigma is$ of the transference from Papnouthis to the present vendor) and $\partial \tau \alpha \chi \theta \in \partial \sigma \alpha \nu$ together. The actual purchase of the property by [Sar-?]apion and the transference of it to his daughter may have taken place some considerable time before, but only now have been officially registered as a prerequisite (that is, the new purchaser so requesting) to the present transaction. Such delay in $\delta\eta\mu$ oσίωσις was not uncommon: see esp. PMich. VI 428.12, with the note.

However the structure of the document is much more satisfactory if $\partial \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i a \nu$ pertains to lines 5–6 immediately preceding. Possibly the transference of the property, and its $\partial \eta \mu o \sigma l \omega \sigma i s$, from Papnouthis to the present vendor had taken place some time before, but Papnouthis had now acceded to a request from the present vendor that, in view of his current status as veteran, he help to clear the title by a written acknowledgement, either that the purchase had indeed been made from him or asserting the continuity of his ownership over his change of status. This he did on the day preceding the present sale. The lacuna at the beginning of line 7 would have contained a word qualifying $\partial \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i a$.

αὐτοῦ πρότερον: perhaps cf. Paus. 1.1.2.

The end of the line is badly rubbed. Space for up to three letters in the final lacuna.

- 8. At end: read $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\alpha}$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\tau$ os... $\int \tau o\hat{\upsilon}$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\dot{\delta}s$ $A\dot{\upsilon}\rho\eta\lambda\dot{\delta}\upsilon\nu\kappa\tau\lambda$.? Cf. e.g. PLips. 4.9, PAmh. 72.3-4. But I have not been able to make out the last part of line 8. Alternatively Aurelius Dionysius in line 9 may conceivably have been the owner previous to the Aurelia of lines 7-8.
- 9. Boppâ $K\rho\eta\pi$ î δ os: see Rink, Strassen- und Viertelnamen von Oxyrhynchus (Giessen, 1924) 38–39.
- 10–11. κέλλα ὑπὸ τοὺς: Cf. PCorn. Inv. II.25, ed. Lewis, Mnemosyne 16 (1963) 258–59.
- 11. τὸ Σεβαστῖον: cf. POxy. 43 verso (= Wilcken, Chr. 474) i 22: τῷ Καισαρίῳ. Rink, op. cit. 47. Note also POxy. 1683.19 and PMert. 41.12. Cf. POxy. 2553.12, 14, with introd. and note on line 12.
- 12. τὰς εἴς με προκτητικὰς ἀσφαλείους. Cf. especially PLips. 4 (= Mitteis, Chr. 171) lines 12–18. Read ἀσφαλείας? (cf. e.g. PLips. 4.17, PFreib. 8 = Sammelb. 6291.28); unless this is an example of the use of the adjective: cf. PCair. Isidor. 94.4 note.
- 18. βουλευτικής? Cf. PSI 771.16 (A.D. 322); so also in POxy. 1208.21 (I have checked the original in the Bodleian Library in Oxford; supplement there $\pi[ολειτικής καὶ βο]υλευτικής?$). Or possibly supply $\gamma εουχικής?$ cf. POxy. 1638.15, 1699.20 note.
- 20. ἀνύσις (read ἀνοίσεις): cf. POxy. 1208.24, as corrected in PRyl. 163.13–14 note (Preisigke, Berichtigungsliste I, p. 333). Also cf. POxy. 1473.17, 1638.30.
- 23. For $\kappa \alpha i \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$ read $\kappa \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \nu$: since the house has been through several previous ownerships it can hardly be new.
- 26. On δι' ἐμοῦ see Gardthausen, "Di emu der ägyptischen Notare," Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 17 (1917) 1-8.

2. RECEIPTS FOR WHEAT

PMich. Inv. 1409 26.2 × 25.4 cm. Karanis, A.D. 315?

A series of receipts for wheat issued to Paianus, son of Valerius, on several days in Epeiph on account of tax due from the produce of a third indiction. The tax is being paid on account of two parcels of

5

land, one (col. i, and ii 16-20) at Karanis, the other (ii 11-15, 21-25) at Ptolemais Nea. The two payments from the land at Karanis are stated as being made on account of a πιττάκιον. One may perhaps conjecture from this information that Paianus was a holder of state land at Karanis which he farmed as a member of a syndicate, while he farmed on his own account a further area of land at Ptolemais Nea; possibly this latter area will also have been state land, assigned to him by epinemesis in his capacity as an individual landholder at Karanis. For further discussion see the commentary below.

The receipts are written in a documentary hand, the two last (ii 16–18 and 21–23) apparently with a different pen; they have been signed, countersigned, and docketed by various persons. The text is written along the fibres; it is complete but for the right hand edge of col. ii.² The verso is blank.

Col. i

'Επεὶφ ιβ. παρήνεγκεν Παιᾶνος
Οὐαλερίου ὑπὲρ τρίτης ἰνδικτίονος
κωμητῶν Καρανίδος πυροῦ καθαροῦ ἀρτάβας πέντε ἥμισυ τρίτον
δωδέκατον, (ἀρτάβας) ε∠γιβ μόνας, ἐτέρου
ἐνταγίου ἤτοι ἀποχῆς μὴ ἐπιφερομέ(νου)
τῶν προκ(ειμένων) ἀρταβῶν. (2nd hand) Θεόδοτος
σεσ(ημείωμαι).

(3rd hand) 'Ηρώδης σε(σημείωμαι). (4th hand) (ἀρτάβαι) ε∠γιβ (ὧν) πιτ(τακίου) Οὐφρ..... (ἀρτάβαι) ε∠γιβ.

Col. ii

(1st hand) Ἐπεὶφ κγ. παρήνεγκεν Παιᾶ[νος Οὐαλερίου] ὑπὲρ τρίτης ἰνδικτίονος κ[ωμητῶν Πτο-] λεμαίδος Καρανίδος πυροῦ κ[αθαροῦ ἀρτά-] βας δύο ἥμισυ τρίτον δωδέκατ[ον, (ἀρτάβας) β∠γιβ μόνας.]

² The two columns when complete extended over three kollêmata, and the right-hand kollêma has separated, taking with it the ends of the lines of the second column.

(3rd hand) ' $H\rho\omega\delta\eta s \sigma\epsilon(\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\alpha\iota)$. (2nd hand) 15 Θεό[δοτος σεσ(ημείωμαι).] (1st hand) καὶ τῆ κε ὁμοίως ὁ αὐτὸς Παιᾶν[ος Οὐαλερίου] ύπερ τρίτης ινδικτίονος κωμ[ητών Καρα-] νίδος πυροῦ καθαροῦ ἀρτάβας τ[ρεῖς, (ἀρτάβας) γ μόνας.] (4th hand) (ἀρτάβαι) γ (2nd hand) $\Theta \epsilon \delta \int \delta \sigma \tau \sigma s \sigma \epsilon$ σ(ημείωμαι).] (ὧν) Οὐφρ..... (ἀρτάβαι) γ. 20 (1st hand) $\tau \hat{\eta}$ $\alpha \hat{v} \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho \hat{q}$ $\delta \mu o \hat{\iota} \omega s$ $\delta \alpha \hat{v} \tau \hat{v} s$ $\hat{v} \pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \tau \hat{\eta} s$ αὐτῆς] ινδικτίονος κωμητών Πτολε[μαίδος Καρανίδος] πυροῦ καθαροῦ ἀρτάβας τρεῖ[ς, (ἀρτάβας) γ μόνας.] (2nd hand) Θεόδο [τος σεσ(ημείωμαι).] (5th hand) $\Phi\iota$ [25

παϊανος pap.

Translation

Epeiph 12. Delivered by Paianus, son of Valerius, for the third indiction on account of the villagers of Karanis, five and a half, a third and a twelfth artabae of pure wheat, $5\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{12}$ art. only, no other record or receipt being produced for the aforesaid artabae. (Second hand) Signed, Theodotus.

(Third hand) Signed, Herodes.

(Fourth hand) $5\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{12}$ art., of which on account of the syndicate of Ouphr..... $5\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{12}$ art.

(First hand) Epeiph 23. Delivered by Paianus, son of Valerius, for the third indiction on account of the villagers of Ptolemais, dependency of Karanis, two and a half, a third and a twelfth artabae of pure wheat, $2\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{12}$ art. only.

(Third hand) Signed, Herodes.

(Second hand) Signed, Theodotus.

(First hand) And on the 25th likewise by the same Paianus, son of Valerius, for the third indiction on account of the villagers of Karanis, three artabae of pure wheat, 3 art. only.

(Fourth hand) 3 art., of which (on account of the syndicate) of Ouphr.....3 art.

(Second hand) Signed, Theodotus.

(First hand) On the same day likewise by the same for the same indiction on account of the villagers of Ptolemais, dependency of Karanis, three artabae of pure wheat, 3 art. only.

(Second hand) Signed, Theodotus. (Fifth hand) Signed, Phi [].

- I. $\pi\alpha\rho\eta\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\nu$: the standard verb in receipts for chaff in the Michigan ostraca. I have not found any example of it in a receipt for wheat: though perhaps note *PCair*. *Isidor*. 47 and 57 (barley) and 56 (wood). But none of these are receipts issued to private individuals.
 - 1-2. Παιᾶνος Οὐαλερίου: cf. OMich. 942.2.
- 2. ὑπὲρ τρίτης ἰνδικτίονος: the third indictional year of 314/315 would be the earliest possible after the commencement of the indiction system (A.D. 312). The sowing of this third indiction would take place in January 315, and the subsequent crop would be attributed to the third indiction. This series of receipts then may date from July 315. 330 A.D. could not be excluded palaeographically, but 315 may be more likely as being more nearly contemporary with related material in the Michigan collection (cf. the references below).
- 5–7. ἐτέρου ἐνταγίου κτλ. With ἐνταγίου ἤτοι ἀποχῆs perhaps cf. POxy. 1891.18 (A.D. 495), and 1130.19 (A.D. 484), (where read συναποχῆs, cf. 1891 [so marginal note by Hunt in his copy of Vol. VIII]). On the ἐντάγιον note the article by Bell, "The Arabic Bilingual Entagion," Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. 89 (1945) 531 ff. However the meaning "order for payment" which Bell discusses could not suit the present context. The usual meaning in Byzantine papyri of "receipt" is not unsuitable here, as indeed ἀποχῆs attests, and is suggested by ἐπιφερομένου and by the use of ἤτοι, which commonly joins equivalent terms in papyri, to link ἐνταγίου and ἀποχῆs.

The presence in our text of this seemingly unnecessary stipulation may suggest a connection with such phrases as $\mu\dot{\eta}$ προ $\langle\sigma\rangle$ χρησάμενοι έτέρ ω συμβόλ ω διὰ τὸ φάσκειν παραπεπτωκέναι (BGU 214.13–16), on which see Wilcken's discussion, Griechische Ostraka I pp. 78–79. (See also p. 648 and p. 69 note 1; and Wilcken in Archiv I [1901] 141.) It may on the other hand perhaps suggest that a claim by Paianus,

that he had previously delivered the amount stated, had been disallowed because he could not produce a receipt; and it may imply that his claim could be reconsidered if the receipt were produced. But this would mean that the amount delivered was not paid as an *instalment* of tax due but pertained to a specific area of land; and in such circumstances one might expect the receipt to bear a rather later date. These objections might nevertheless be obviated if the phrase were intended to apply to all the receipts on the papyrus.

- 7. $\Theta \epsilon \delta \delta \delta \sigma \tau \sigma s$: cf. OMich. 1013-14, signed in the same hand.
- 8. ' $H\rho\omega\delta\eta s$: perhaps cf. OMich. 1007, also OMich. 180.3, as revised by Youtie, CP 37 (1942) 144: Youtie would now further emend $\Sigma\alpha\rho$ () to $\sigma\epsilon\sigma$ () in line 4. Palaeographic comparison has been inconclusive: but it may be noted that Herodes is not a very common name at Karanis at this time.
- 10. πιττάκιον: see particularly the discussions of Kalén, *PBerl. Leihgabe* no. 22 introd., and Day and Keyes, *Tax Documents from Theadelphia*, pp. 142 ff. Note the examples in the Michigan Ostraca (nos. 856, 990, and 991, with the references there cited); Pearl, *Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 25, no. 35; and *PCair. Isidor.* 24. It may be noted that only the payments on the land at Karanis are credited to the πιττάκιον. See the introduction above, and the note below on 12–13.

 $O\dot{v}\phi\rho$: the name here and in 20 should surely be the same: but the writing in both places is extremely cursive, and I have been unable to arrive at a reading satisfactory in both.

12–13. Πτολεμαίδος Καρανίδος: the village of Ptolemais Nea had close economic ties with Karanis and was administered from the latter for fiscal purposes. See PCair. Isidor. 22 introd., and 59 introd. The two names occur similarly combined in e.g. PCair. Isidor. 59.10, 20. See also PCair. Isidor. 11 and 12, with the introduction to no. 11; and Pearl, Aegyptus 33 (1953) 13, no. 13. Possibly in the present instance also the tax is being paid in respect of land at Ptolemais Nea assigned for cultivation to the villagers of Karanis by epinemesis. If this were so, from the statistics of the relative proportions of epinemesis with regard to state and private land (see the introd. to PCair. Isidor. 11) it seems likely that the land at Ptolemais so assigned and the land cultivated by Paianus at Karanis in the interests of a πιττάκιον would have been state land (and see Kalén, PBerl. Leihgabe, p. 208; PCair.

Isidor. 24.1 note). At this date therefore all this land would have been taxed at the fixed rate of 1½ artabae of wheat per aroura (PCair. Isidor. 11 introd., with PCair. Isidor. 1); but the relevant areas of land in the two localities can only be approximately calculated, and the margin of inaccuracy is increased by the uncertainty as to what extra charges may or may not have been included.

25. $\Phi_{\ell}[: \text{cf. }OMich. 197, 784, and 1009, all of which bear signatures written by a <math>\Phi i \lambda \iota \pi \pi \sigma s$. Palaeographic comparisons have proved inconclusive.