

CHRONIQUE  
D'ÉGYPTE

LXVI (1991)

Fasc. 131-132

— EXTRAIT —



FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH  
EGYPTOLOGISCHE STICHTING KONINGIN ELISABETH

BRUXELLES

BRUSSEL

# CHRONIQUE D'ÉGYPTE

**Rédaction:** J. BINGEN (*direction*), H. DE MEULENAERE (*égyptologie*), G. NACHTERGAEL (*papyrologie*).

On est prié d'adresser les manuscrits et les ouvrages pour compte rendu à l'adresse suivante: *Chronique d'Égypte*, FONDATION ÉGYPTOLOGIQUE REINE ÉLISABETH, Parc du Cinquantenaire 10, B-1040 Bruxelles (Belgique).

**Abonnement:** 2.200 FB.

Service gratuit de la revue aux membres de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth (cotisation annuelle: 1.500 FB).

Les cotisations ainsi que les demandes d'affiliation ou d'abonnement et les commandes de livres seront adressées à la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.

C.C.P. Bruxelles N° 000-0058725-40.

**Redactie:** J. BINGEN (*directie*), H. DE MEULENAERE (*egyptologie*), G. NACHTERGAEL (*papyrologie*).

Manuscripten en recensieëxemplaren dienen gestuurd te worden aan het volgend adres: *Chronique d'Égypte*, EGYPTOLOGISCHE STICHTING KONINGIN ELISABETH, Jubelpark 10, B-1040 Brussel (België).

**Abonnement** 2.200 Bfr.

Leden van de Egyptologische Stichting Koningin Elisabeth (contributie: 1.500 Bfr.) ontvangen het tijdschrift gratis.

Contributies, aanvragen om lidmaatschap of abonnement, alsmede bestellingen van boeken dienen gestuurd te worden aan de Egyptologische Stichting Koningin Elisabeth.

Giro: Brussel Nr. 000-0058725-40.

## Notes on Roman and Byzantine Documents

### 1. The Disappearance of the *Protostatai*

PUBLICATIONS of the last two decades have made it possible to establish the existence of officials called *protostatai* concerned with the economy and taxes of the land. They appear first in 296 and are attested only during that year and at the beginning of 297. The known holders of the office were all of bouletic status, and those known in fact appear to have been senior and important men. It was a collegiate office with a rotating headship. Alan Bowman portrayed them as forerunners of the *praepositus pagi*, a sign of the decline of the powers of the *strategos*, and a short-lived experiment perhaps cut short by the revolt of Domitius Domitianus<sup>(1)</sup>. In a recent article, John Whitehorne has argued that instead of a sign of a decline in the powers of the *strategos*, the *protostatai* were «an attempt to free the strategus from some limited functions of merely local importance in order to allow him to concentrate his energies on what Bowman himself has shown lies at the heart of the Diocletianic taxation system»<sup>(2)</sup>. Whitehorne argues further that the supposed decline of the *strategos*' power is not supported by the documentation for the late third century.

Interpretation of intentions is likely to remain as difficult as for most innovations in the absence of direct evidence. But much in these interpretations of the office depends on when it appears and disappears, and that is perhaps not quite so elusive a matter. It is worth quoting Whitehorne's argument on this point at length:

«As to the date of the protostateia, the office may be attested for a short time only but we cannot therefore assume that it operated only in 296 and 297 before being abolished. The terminus post quem for its establishment remains 256, when lists of village liturgists were still being addressed to the strategus (*P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2714), the terminus

(1) A. K. Bowman, «Some Aspects of the Reform of Diocletian in Egypt», *Akten XIII. Int. Pap.*, 48-50.

(2) «Strategus and Protostatae», *ZPE* 62 (1986) 159-72 at 162.

ante for its disappearance 307/8 when the duties of the office are seen as part of the responsibilities of the *praepositus pagi*. Bowman argued from P. Cair. Isid. 64 that the lack of any sign of a *protostates* currently in office in Karanis suggested that the position had disappeared by about 298, but this text as we have seen is dated only by the *strategia* of Aurelius Heron and could therefore be as late as early 302. Furthermore, the failure of the petitioners in P. Cair. Isid. 64 to mention any *protostates* in office is not proof that none existed. There may well have been one there still but the petitioners may have decided to bypass him in favour of approaching a higher authority because they had been unable to ensure the enforcement of his predecessor's ruling, as they themselves say in their petition (P. Cair. Isid. 64.13).» Whitehorne then suggests that the *protostatai* may have been eliminated either in 302, with the *dekaprotoi*, or in 307, with the *toparchies*, and concludes that either of these hypotheses «has more in its favour than the view that the office was created in 296 as part of an overall plan to replace the *strategus*, a plan which then had to be abandoned as unworkable less than two years later».

In P. Cair. Isid. 64, the petitioners tell the *strategos* that their brother appropriated the entirety of the movable property left by their deceased father, leaving the women only the arable land, on which they cannot pay the rents. «And at that time we approached the *protostates* of the village who was then in office, namely Serenus also called Harpocras, and he ordered him (i.e. Chaeremon) to turn over to us all the property that had been left by our father» (*προσήλαμεν δὲ καὶ τότε τῷ γενομένῳ πρωτοστάτῃ τῆς κώμης Σερήνῳ τῷ καὶ Ἄρπ[ο]κράῳ καὶ ἐκέ[λ]ευσεν αὐτὸν ἅπαντα τὰ καταλιφθέντα ὑπὸ τ[ο]ῦ ἡμῶν πατρὸς ταῦτα ἡμῖν πα[ρ]ασχεῖν*). One can, of course, suppose simply that lawlessness reigned and the orders of the *protostates* were ignored willy-nilly. But it is at least possible that the ineffectiveness of the order resulted in part from the intervening difficulties caused by the revolt of Domitianus Domitianus. The phrasing may also suggest that the office in question no longer existed. A similar situation may be seen in P. Oxy. LIV 3758, where Coles (introduction, p. 147) comments, «The apparent ability of the councillors/landowners to ignore the *praeses*' authority (16-17: implicit in *εἰ μὲν βούλονται ... καθὼς προτέτακται*) is at first sight astonishing, but is presumably explicable by the *praeses*' orders having been superseded by those of the prefect». The *praeses*' office is in fact described as *τὴν ἡγεμονίαν τὴν τότε* (line 43), not meaning simply that

the official had changed but that his office had been abolished and replaced by another in the reunification of Aegyptus under a prefect in 324. The parallel is certainly imperfect, since the official is mentioned in the one, the office itself in the other, but it remains to my mind suggestive.

Given that the papyrological documentation for the reign of Diocletian and the early fourth century is relatively heavy, that all of the attestations of the activity of the *protostatai* refer to a narrow band of time just before the revolt of Domitianus, and that soon after that revolt the office is spoken of in a manner that suggests it no longer exists, probability lies very much with the supposition that it was indeed an innovation just before the revolt and did not survive it. Whether the vigorous *strategia* of the period between 298 and 302, documented by Whitehorne, is simply a continuation of the past or in some sense a change made by the administration in response to the revolt, I do not know; and it remains unclear whether the *protostatai* were meant as a permanent or temporary office in the first place. But there is so far no good ground for supposing that they survived the revolt.

## 2. The Date of *P. Michael*. 33

Fl. Ptoleminos son of Eulogios writes to a *boethos* of the *exactor* of the Oxyrhynchite Nome to request the transfer of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  arouras of royal land and  $56\frac{5}{8}$  ar. of private land to the account of his daughter Sarpas, through her husband Ammonion. (The text must be used with the extensive corrections by H. C. Youtie) (3). Its date remains obscure. It was dated by the editor on palaeographical grounds to the fifth century or later fourth, and Youtie, though he had a photograph, reported that assessment without comment. A possible connection of the *boethos* Martyrios with a homonym attested in 432 (*PSI XVII Congr.* 29.3-4n.) has now led to the assessment «probablement du début du v<sup>e</sup> siècle» by Jean Gascou (4). My purpose here is to show that there is another possibility, and that there are good grounds to prefer it.

The writer of the request describes himself as *Φλάουιος Πτολεμῖνος Εὐλογίου πολιτενομένου Ὁξυρυγχίτου*. The editor suggests that *πολι-*

(3) *TAPA* 89 (1958) 378-80 = *Scriptiunculae* I (Amsterdam 1973) 288-90; corrections registered in *BL* 4.52.

(4) *Travaux et Mémoires* 10 (1987) 117 n. 112, citing the possible connection.

τευομένον is « perhaps a mistake for πολιτευόμενος ». The signature (Φλ. Πτολεμῖνος πολιτευόμενος ἐπιδέδωκα) supports that notion<sup>(5)</sup>. Ptoleminos is presumably a mature man, holding or having held a position which entitles him to be called Flavius, and with his daughter Sarapias already married. But his father Eulogios is nonetheless probably still alive, since one tract of land to be transferred to Sarapias is registered *ὀνόματος τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρὸς Εὐλογίου*, with no indication that he is deceased (in which case, of course, it should be registered in the name of his *κληρονόμοι*). It seems likely that Eulogios has retired from active life but is still alive and the owner of much property; his son acts for him in public. In this case, the father would probably still be a councillor, but the son would appear on his behalf, as we can see happening in *P. Oxy.* XVII 2110 (370), a report of proceedings of the *boule* in which Theon son of Ammonios, *bouleutes*, is represented by his son Makrobios in the matter of an unwanted *epimeleia*; the councillors assume that Makrobios will be the real liturgist, but his father is the titular of the land in question. The genitive is the more understandable if a similar situation obtains here.

As it happens, an Eulogios *politeuomenos* is now known; he appears in *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3393 (365), as an employer (and a dishonest one at that) of Dorotheos and Pappouthis. The editor of that text speculates that he may be the *praepositus pagi* of that name attested in *SB V* 7756 and *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3400 and 3425 (the first dated to 359, the other two undated). The speculation gains force from the fact that the village of Terythis (in the 4th *pagus*) is involved in both 3393 and 3425. He would certainly be a credible candidate for the father of Ptoleminos in *P. Michael.* 33.

But there are other interesting connections to be made. Ptoleminos' wife Kyria is the daughter of Barbatios. The latter name has appeared only one other time in the papyri, and precisely from the same archive, in *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3428, in a tax list where Fl. Barbatios is listed as the holder of 61 1/2 ar. (the scope of the list is not known). The name Flavius shows at once that he belongs to a stratum suitable for marrying off his daughter to another Flavius, a *curialis* and the son of a *curialis*. Additional interest here comes from the fact that his parcel is

(5) So also does the absence of *viós* before the patronymic, the usual way of dispelling confusion if the title is in fact to be referred to the father; cf. *P. Adolph.* 20.5n.

described as  $\delta\iota(\acute{\alpha})$  *Μαρτύριος βοηθ(οῦ) Γεροντίου*. It will be recalled that the *boethos* of the *exactor* in *P. Michael*. 33 is named Martyrios<sup>(6)</sup>.

We can now close the circle by returning to *P. Oxy*. XVII 2110, the report of proceedings mentioned above, dated 370. In it appear an *exactor* named Gerontios and an *ex-logistes* named Ptoleminos. If Ptoleminos had been *logistes* by 367/8, a circumstance compatible with his use of the name Flavius<sup>(7)</sup>, he could obviously be an *ex-logistes* in 370. Similarly with Gerontius, whose term of activity (perhaps present still in 367/8) would be past in 370. Now the only dating element in *P. Michael*. 33 is the 11th indiction. An 11th indiction fell in 367/8. That placement suits the information in *P. Oxy*. XVII 2110 perfectly. Eulogios had presumably retired in favor of Ptoleminos between 365 and 368 or so.

There is a further reason for preferring a fourth- rather than fifth-century date for *P. Michael*. 33, namely the appearance of *βασιλική* as a description of land. It is true that it figures in the Aphrodito land-register of ca 525/6 published by Gascou, but that is in fact the only published archaizing appearance of the term (instead of *δημοσία*) after the fourth century<sup>(8)</sup>. The last dated instance, in fact, is from 365 and the Oxyrhynchite (*SB* III 6612)<sup>(9)</sup>.

The names of these men are, to be sure, for the most part (with the noteworthy exception of Barbatios) increasingly common in the Oxyrhynchos of the 360s and 370s. It is impossible to be certain that every identification offered above is correct. But the precise dovetailing of dates, and the number and interconnections of the various people —

(6) Shelton takes *Μαρτύριος* in *P. Oxy*. XLVIII 3428 to bespeak an otherwise unattested name *Μαρτύρις*, but that is an unnecessary invention; nominative for genitive also appears in line 5 of this text,  $\delta\iota(\acute{\alpha})$  *Χωσῶς πραγματευτής*, which he simply corrects to genitive in the apparatus.

(7) J. G. Keenan, *ZPE* 11 (1973) 49; 13 (1974) 290-91. *Logistai* retained the name Flavius after retirement from the office.

(8) Klaas Worp tells me that it also appears on the unpublished verso of the 6th century *SB* VIII 9892.

(9) The appearance of *ιδιωτική*, cited by Gascou (*loc. cit.*), proves only that some categorical distinctions appeared on the books still at the times of the documents he cites, not that that term was opposed to *βασιλική*. The penultimate appearances of the latter term are *P. Sakaon* 4 (336) and *P. Col.* VII 174 (2nd quarter of 4th cent., perhaps 342).

every adult male except Sarapias' husband <sup>(10)</sup> has been identified — suggest strongly that 367/8 is the correct date for this papyrus.

### 3. *P. Oxy.* VII 1041: Whose Loan?

The editor describes as follows this « guarantee for a loan »: « In this deed Aurelius Plutarchus (?) <sup>(11)</sup> takes upon himself the responsibility for the repayment of a loan which had been made through his intervention to a friend, Philonikus. The transaction was connected in some way with another agreement in which Plutarchus was concerned, but the reference to this (ll. 9-10) is rather obscure ». This interpretation encounters serious difficulties. What Ploutarchos promises to do for the other party (whose name is lost; we shall call him NN) is described in lines 13-19:

ἐπεὶ τῷ με ταύτας σοὶ ἀπο-  
[καταστῆσ]αι ἐν τῇ διὰ τοῦ γεγεν{ν}ημένου ὑπὸ σοῦ ἀττῷ τῷ  
[Φιλονίκ]ω γραμματίου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῇ νεομηνία τοῦ Μεσορ <ῆ>  
16 [μηρὸς το]ῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους ἰδ ζ β τῆς παρούσης ἐνάτης  
[ἰνδικτίωνο]ς, καὶ [ἀ]νακομίσασθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τούτων  
γενό[μενον ἀττ]ῷ ὑπὸ σοῦ γραμματίου καὶ ἀναδοῦναί σοι  
εἰς ἀκ[ύρωσιν, γι]νομένης κτλ.

Ploutarchos promises (a) to repay to NN on the *prothesmia*, which is a month and a half away at the time, the 4,200 myriads of denarii at stake <sup>(12)</sup>, and to recover from Philonikos « the loan-note made by you to him and to return it to you for cancellation ». Now loan documents were virtually without exception written in the form of a homology from the borrower to the lender, held by the latter as the evidence of the indebtedness, and returned to the borrower for cancellation upon the

(10) Ammonion is not as common a name as one might imagine, but I have not found an attractive candidate. The Ammonion(s) of *P. Oxy.* XLVIII 3385 and 3386 (identity is attractive but speculative) are, three decades before the persons discussed here, not likely to be the same.

(11) The question mark is explained in the note: « Πλού[ταρχος] of course is uncertain, but it was a common name at Oxyrhynchos ». With another eight decades of publications, it can be seen that Hunt's instinct was right, his caution unnecessary. A search of the Duke Data Bank shows scores of Ploutarchoi from the Oxyrhynchite in the Roman period, but not a single other name with -ταρχ- (Kleitarchos in *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3168 is a cleruch's name, presumably a survival from the Ptolemaic period).

(12) This equals 28,000 talents, or about the value of one solidus at this period.

repayment of the loan. It follows that NN must be the *borrower*, not the lender, in this case.

That conclusion is supported by the earlier description of the transaction (lines 6-11) <sup>(13)</sup>:

ἐπεὶ [πισθεὶς] ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ἐγράψω Φιλον[ί]κω Βησάμμωνος  
 ἀπὸ τῆ[ς αὐτῆς π]όλεως εἰς ἀπόδοσιν ἀργ[υ]ρίων δηναρίων  
 8 μυριάδ[ων τε]τρακισχιλίων διακοσίων χρεωστούμενων  
 ἀψ[τ]ῶ [ὑπὸ σοῦ ἀ]πὸ λόγου διαφόρων ἀκο[λο]ύθως οἷς ἐθέμην  
 α[.]ε[.....ο]ις καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σε ἔχειν τὸ ἀσφαλὲς παρ' ἐμοῦ  
 [περὶ τῆς] τούτω[ν] ἀποδόσεως

NN had agreed on Ploutarchos' request to make an agreement with Philonikos for the repayment of the money which was owed him. By whom? By NN, according to Hunt's restoration in line 9. But if NN owed the money, he would presumably have made a written acknowledgement of that fact already. Moreover, the debt arises out of *διάφορα* in agreements made earlier by Ploutarchos. Hunt translated «extra payments», but the term refers to interest or penalties on loans. Ploutarchos had evidently been unable to pay some debt on time, had incurred penalties (which he also could not pay), and had persuaded NN to become the party owing it on his behalf in order to get an extension from the borrower, Philonikos. NN had therefore drawn up the agreement referred to here, on the strength of an unstated security. We must then restore line 9 as [ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ἀ]πὸ, a restoration of the same length.

When Mesore 1 arrives, NN will have to pay Philonikos. Ploutarchos agrees to pay NN the amount due and retrieve the document. In reality, he will presumably pay Philonikos directly on NN's behalf, in order to retrieve the document. He will then give NN the document, and all parties will be quit.

It is worth pointing out that this understanding also reestablishes the normal situation in another respect. Ploutarchos, now to be seen as the original borrower, comes from the village of Phoboou in the 5th pagus, while Philonikos and NN, the sources of credit, are both residents of the city <sup>(14)</sup>.

(13) With [περὶ τῆς] for [ἕως τῆς] in line 11 as suggested by F. Weber (*BL* 3.134).

(14) Cf. J. G. Keenan, *Proc. XVI Int. Congr. of Papyrology* (Chico 1981) 483-85.

4. The date of *P. Oxy.* VIII 1131

« An acknowledgement of a debt of 2 solidi less 8 carats, being the purchase money for some wine which had been delivered but not paid for ». The writer says, « I have from your excellency and owe to it for the price of wine sold me by you, ... and I am ready to pay this to your excellency at the *loipographia* of the *endoxos oikos* ». The writer is one Ioulianos, *nomikarios*, and he is addressing an *oinocheiristes* of the glorious house, whose name is only partly preserved. The glorious house itself is not identified<sup>(15)</sup>. The editor dated the papyrus simply « fifth century ».

Thirteen years later a *nomikarios* named Ioulianos appeared in *P. Oxy.* XVI 2032, published without comment<sup>(16)</sup>. In lines 16, 25, and 26 (simply  $\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tau\tilde{\omega}$  in 26), he is given as the recipient of a payment which now constitutes an obligation from him to the glorious house. The house in this case, of course, is that of the Apion family. This account may be dated *ca* 540<sup>(17)</sup>. It is impossible to prove that this is the same person, but the character of *P. Oxy.* VIII 1131 fits well with the entries in the account, which are for 2 93/96 s. minus 6 c. for price of wheat, 17 s. (reason unstated), and 2 1/2 s. A mention of the *ἔνδοξος οἶκος* is in any case better suited to the sixth century than the fifth (from which I know of no example), and its identification without a name is characteristic of the sixth-century Apionic documentation.

## 5. The Dossier of Aurelius Ammonion

The subject of what follows was certainly an important personage in his own time<sup>(18)</sup>, but only to a limited extent can his identity and

(15) As Hunt noted, *Ἰουλιανοῦ* follows  $[\sigma\tilde{\iota}]κον$  in line 2, but that must be an error for the nominative (or an omission of *παρά*). It is not the case, however, that the person who signs with *συμφωνῶ* is necessarily the recipient or debtor; *P. Herm.* 42 is a receipt from a lady to her steward for a payment, to which he assents: i.e., he agrees that this is an accurate statement of what he has paid. What determines matters here, rather, is that a *nomikarios* is not a likely titular for a glorious house.

(16) On another *nomikarios* in an Apionic account, cf. J. Gascou, *Travaux et Mémoires* 9 (1985) 58 n. 329, with citation of Skeat's discussion of the term in *P. Panop. Beatty* 1.252n.: a rural public agent, not a lawyer. That description fits Ioulianos' status here adequately.

(17) J. Gascou, *Travaux et Mémoires* 9 (1985) 58 n. 329.

(18) Cf. J. E. G. Whitehorne, *Aegyptus* 67 (1987) 113: « In fact the light shed by such a luminary upon a small community might dazzle very much further down the

activity be reconstructed today. The following documents enter into the discussion :

(1) *SB XIV 12158* (= VIII 9854) (n.d. : 3rd cent.) : M. Aur. Achilles alias Ammonios and M. Aur. Ammonion alias Achilles, former *exegetai* of Alexandria, Ammonion with his curator Aur. NN, *bouleutes* of Oxyrhynchos, acknowledge to Aur. Hierax alias NN the receipt (?) of something.

(2) *P. Harr. II 201* (ca 267) : Aur. Sarap[, a carpenter in Oxyrhynchos (?), to Calpurnius Horion and [ ] Ammonion. Sworn statement in response to an order of the prefect Iuvenius Genialis, concerning the price to be paid for something.

(3) *P. Oxy. I 118* <sup>(19)</sup> (n.d. : late 3rd cent.) : Letter of Saras and Eudaimon to Diogenes, informing him that they have been told by the ἀξιολογώτατος Ammonion to send for a ferryboat because of the uncertainty of the journey by road. They ask Diogenes to get the boat from the local people if possible, but if they refuse, to forward the instructions to the strategos and the eirenarchs <sup>(20)</sup>. He [Ammonion] has two days in the Herakleopolite, so hurry back once you have got what you need. Cooks have already been sent to the Oxyrhynchite ; send them on their way back.

(4) *P. Oxy. XX 2285* (2 Sept. 269) <sup>(21)</sup> : [Aur. Philomousos ?], *pragmateutes* of Aur. Ammonion *v.egr.*, orders Aur. Maximus, *pragmateutes*, to give a brickmaker 20 art. of wheat on account of the making of baked brick.

(5) *P. Oxy. XII 1544* (20 Oct. 270) <sup>(22)</sup> : Aur. Philomousos, *pragmateutes* of Aur. Ammonion *v.egr.*, acknowledges to Aur. Maximus, *pragmateutes*, receipt of 100 art. of wheat loaded onto the ship of Heraiskos at Pelusium.

social scale for even local tradesmen, although they might not know his name, would be aware that their client was 'the ex-hypomnemmatographus' ».

(19) Cf. H.C. Youtie, *TAPA* 94 (1963) 341-345 = *Scriptiunculae* I 393-97 [*BL* 5.75].

(20) « [S]o that Saras and Eudaimon may be cleared of responsibility in case of a mishap, » as Youtie said ; the editors did not translate ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀσφαλείας ἡμῶν καταχωρισθόμενον : « to be filed for the sake of our security. »

(21) Ed. : 285. There was no year 2 of Aurelian alone recognized at the time, cf. *P. Oxy.* XL pp. 15-26, and a later date is impossible (cf. below). To go back to 2 Gallienus would be most improbable. Cf. *P. Oxy.* LV, p. xvi.

(22) For the date see *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2775.5n. (not recorded in *BL* 6) ; D. W. Rathbone, *ZPE* 62 (1986) 123 ; M. Peachin, *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235-284* (Stud. Amst. 29, Amsterdam 1990) 43.

(6) *P. Oxy.* XXXVI 2775 (274/5 or 280/1, probably fall 274 or 280)<sup>(23)</sup>: Two men acknowledge to Aur. Maximus s. Saras, *pragmateutes* of property formerly of Ammonion now of the treasury, a loan of wheat for sowing both last year (29 art., from produce of the 4th year) and this year (18 art., from produce of the 5th year).

(7) *P. Oxy.* IX 1192 (29 Nov. 280): Chairemon, *grammateus demosion logon*, orders Isidoros, *pronoetes* of Episemou, to pay two *apaitetai* of *annona* 6.5 art. of lentils for the fourth 6-month period<sup>(24)</sup> for the account of Ammonion. No identification of Ammonion is given.

It is best to begin with the core and work outward. No. 5, thought by the editors to be Diocletianic, is dated with certainty because it uses the unique ἐπὶ ἐπάτων formula of the year 270. That in turn makes no. 4 easily datable to the previous year, since is the only «year 2» called that which is in any reasonable proximity. Working forward, then, it is clear that years 4-6 in no. 6 can refer only to those of Aurelian (thus yielding a date in 274) or of Probus (thus yielding a date in 280). No. 7 must be regarded as of uncertain relevance. The fact that it does not say «formerly of» is not sufficient to show that Ammonion was still in possession of the property at that date, since the mode of reference is brief.

With the year 6 date of no. 6 may be connected two further documents:

(8) *P. Oxy.* XII 1514: An order from Nemesammon<sup>(25)</sup> to Maximus, *pragmateutes*, to give two art. of barley to a donkey-driver of the brother τοῦ κρατίστου οὔσιακοῦ. Dated to year 5, Pauni 12.

(9) *P. Oxy.* XX 2286: An order from Nemesammon to Maximus, *pragmateutes*, to pay 15 art. of wheat to a *beneficiarius* for σνήθεια. Dated to year 6, Thoth 15.

It would be a reasonable, though not certain, surmise that these two orders immediately precede no. 6, and thus fall on 6 June and 12 September 274 or 280<sup>(26)</sup>. Nemesammon will in effect be a successor or equivalent of Philomousos.

The first three texts are more difficult, in part because of their poor preservation. No. 2 involves Calpurnius Horion, a figure of some sta-

(23) The current date is in year 6, but the month and day are lost. The fact that seed for sowing is the object of the loan suggests the fall.

(24) Cf. N. Lewis, *BASP* 4 (1967) 15-16.

(25) See *P. Oxy.* XX 2286 intro.

(26) G. M. Parássoglou, *Imperial Estates in Roman Egypt* (Am. Stud. Pap. 18, Amsterdam 1978) 90 dates no. 8 to 274 without discussion.

ture who was *hypomnematographos* of Alexandria and had the rank of *κράτιστος* in 270/1 (27). The editor of no. 2 suggested that the Ammonion there might be the same as the man in no. 1, and identified the other addressee of that text as the M. Aurelius Achilleus alias A[ who is also known to have been *hypomnematographos* and *κράτιστος*, as well as *neokoros* of Sarapis (28). This is at least suitable company for our Ammonion, though no. 1 must antedate the other texts by some while, since Ammonion is apparently a minor (though no doubt a rich one) and Achilleus alias Ammonios has not yet advanced beyond the rank of *exegetes* either.

No. 3 is intriguing. It certainly shows the Ammonion who is referred to as an important personage, for whose visit preparations of some elaborateness are made, and whose satisfaction with the arrangements is presumed to matter to the highest local officials. Though the term *ἀξιολογώτατος* is non-technical (29), it is suggestive that it also appears in an undated Oxyrhynchos papyrus mentioning the *παρουσίαν τοῦ ἀξιολογώτατου Καλπυνο[ρ]νίου*, perhaps Ammonion's co-addressee in no. 2, since Calpurnius Horion is attested as eirenarch with that epithet in 264 (*P. Oxy.* XXXI 2568), and another Calpurnius with the epithet is found in *SB XII 10918 (P. Iand. VI 99)*, as recipient of a letter from Philoromaios (30).

If the various connections are allowed, the rudiments of the career can be sketched: *exegetes* while still a minor, liturgies in Oxyrhynchos (where he no doubt had extensive holdings), a rise by 269 to the rank of *κράτιστος* along with his companions in nos. 1 and 2 (the only *hypomnematographoi* to hold that rank in the surviving documentation, incidentally; it was not a normal accompaniment of the office). It is no. 8 which suggests what office accompanied that rank, that of *procurator*

(27) See Whitehorne (above, n. 18) 117 no. 25 for references. He is surely another generation of the great Alexandrian family with Oxyrhynchite holdings known from many papyri. See, e.g., *P. Oxy.* L 3564 intro, and note to line 1 for references.

(28) Whitehorne (above n. 18) 117 no. 24. It is not impossible that he is the Aurelius Ammonios *κράτιστος* of *P. Oxy.* IX 1191 (280), who was probably not an *epistrategos* (J. D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt* (Pap. Colon. 6) II (Opladen 1982) 66 n. 16).

(29) As Youtie (above, n. 19) remarks, 341 = 393 n. 42, noting that «we can at least say that their visitor, although a person of considerable importance, was not the prefect of Egypt».

(30) Early 3rd century, according to the editor.

*usiacus* (31). He held office in difficult times, and at a certain point (whether 274 or 280) he no longer owned the property in the Oxyrhynchite which he earlier held. The phrasing of the papyri suggests loss rather than death, perhaps as a result of a fall from grace and confiscation.

Aurelius Ammonion is the latest known *procurator usiacus*. In the list given by Parássoglou, there is no secure holder of this office later than Aurelius Terpsilaos, who was in office in 217 but no longer so in 226 (32). There is also Myron, listed as a possible *procurator usiacus* on the basis of his description as *διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην* in 247/8 (*W. Chr.* 73), but Parássoglou showed (87) that there is no necessary connection between that function and the office of *procurator usiacus*. Ammonion's importance is that he is clearly of high, freeborn Alexandrian status and was thus not a freedman. Recent editors of papyri have pointed out that there is some reason to think that some second-century *procuratores usiaci* were imperial freedmen (33). On the other hand, Ulpus Herakleides (att. 174/5) seems unlikely to have been a freedman. Ammonion shows that at least toward the end of the office's existence it could be held by a wealthy freeborn man of high rank in Alexandria; but we still know far too few holders of the office to establish any rules (34).

#### 6. The Date of *P. Oxy.* LV 3787

These two columns of a list of taxpayers and amounts paid, arranged by village, stand on the back of *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3184, where it was described briefly with an extract. The publication in full has a number of points of interest, not least of which is the mention of a deacon at Thosbis (35) and a lector at Tampetei. The editor has identified the

(31) The other plausible possibilities of the time would be the *iuridicus*, a *procurator Caesaris*, the *dioiketes*, the *archiereus*, or an *epistrategos*.

(32) Parássoglou (above n. 26) 89-90.

(33) See *P. Oxy.* XLIII 3089 intro., 3092.3n., 3103.5-6n., L 3601.15n.

(34) In fact, of those on Parássoglou's list, nos. 2, 3, 4, 8, and 11, five out of eleven, seem to me quite uncertain. That leaves, adding in Ammonion, only seven, attested in 142, two between 161-169 or 176-180, 174/5, 214/5, 217-before 226, and now 269-274. That is a thin scattering.

(35) Assuming that the marginal annotation *Μερομέθων* (22) refers only to that line, which seems most likely.

payments as being for *ἐπικεφάλαιον πόλεως*, on the basis of the amounts, which range from 400 to 2600 dr. but are most commonly for 1200 dr.

The *terminus post quem* is provided by the documents on the other side, which are from late 296 and early 297. The editor argued for 303 as a *terminus ante quem* on the grounds that the mention «without ceremony» of the deacon and lector would not be found once the persecution of Diocletian had begun, preferring 301/2 on the basis of identification of the systates Lucius in the heading of the papyrus with his homonym attested in *PSI* III 163 of that year<sup>(36)</sup>. A date after the persecution, on the other hand, is rejected on the basis of another identification, this time of the same Lucius with the Lucius Septimius Serenus attested in *PSI* III 164, in 286/7. A career from 286 to (e.g.) 311 seems rather long, and the earlier date thus the more economical hypothesis.

This is for the most part reasonable enough, although the notion that L. Septimius Serenus was known by the single name Lucius (rather than Serenus, his last name) seems to me not probable. The real difficulties with a date around 301/2, however, are other. The greatest is the amounts paid. If in fact the identification of the tax is correct, they argue strongly for a later date. The distribution by amount paid *per person* is as follows<sup>(37)</sup>:

<i>Drachmas</i>	<i>Number of instances</i>
400	2
1000	2
1200	38
2000	5
2400	8
2600	1

At first glance, this distribution might lead one to think that the amount of the tax was 1200 dr., the rate that appears to have been in effect up to 304/5 (or perhaps 305/6, a year from which no receipt has yet been published). But that would leave us with no explanation for the larger amounts. Rea has pointed out (*P. Oxy.* LV p. 46) that the most economical explanation of the whole series of known payments is

(36) *P. Oxy.* LV 3789 introd. gives an updated list of documents concerned with this tax.

(37) Where an amount is paid for two people, it is listed here as two payments of half of the amount.

that installment payments were common (though not standard), and his preferred sequence of rises in the tax (to 1600 dr. in 306/7 and 2400 in 312/3) rests upon the principle (not stated as such) that the highest amount found for one person for one year is likely to be the rate of the tax.

By that reasoning, which seems to me sound, LV 3787 should be interpreted to fall during the period when 2400 was the normal rate, a period running from 312/3 to the last known receipt in 319/320. The one payment of 2600 is probably an aberration<sup>(38)</sup>. All of the other amounts are consistent with installment payments toward a 2400 dr. rate. Since fully a quarter of the payments are higher than 1600 dr., the rate in the period from 306/7 to 311/2, that period must be excluded along with the earlier years.

The second element of unease produced by an early date has to do precisely with the appearance of ecclesiastical offices in an official list. To my knowledge, there is no securely datable instance of the use of Christian clerical grades as forms of identification for individuals in official records before Licinius' victory over Maximinus and subsequent acquisition of Egypt (Constantine and Licinius are first attested in the papyri in September, 313, shortly after the last date by Maximinus). The one apparent exception is telling: *P. Oxy.* XXXIII 2673, the well-known declaration by the lector of the former church of Chysis that his church possessed nothing except a little bronze<sup>(39)</sup>. There the use of the term falls during the persecution, and appears precisely because it is in his capacity as a cleric (albeit a low-grade one)<sup>(40)</sup> that he must make the declaration to the authorities. That text provides no warrant for imagining that such titles would figure as normal identification in an official list *before* the persecution, at a time when the government, even if tolerant, gave no official recognition to church office as an occupation or distinction. The first such appearance to be securely dated is the deacon in *P. Col.* VII 171 (324), cited by Rea. It is, however, likely enough that *P. Berl. Bork.*, in which clerics are mentioned as househol-

(38) A curious parallel is found in *P. Oxy.* XLII 3040, where a man pays 1300 dr. in 298, at a time when 1200 dr. was standard; Rea characterizes this as 'anomalous,' which seems about as far as one can go.

(39) *ZPE* 35 (1979) 128.

(40) G. W. Clarke, «An Illiterate Lector?» *ZPE* 57 (1984) 103-04.

ders in Panopolis, dates to the decade between 314 and 324, certainly not very much later than that.

Both of these elements point in the same direction, then, toward a later date, with 313 as a *terminus post quem*. The last appearance of the *ἐπικεφάλαιον πόλεως*, 320, can serve as a provisional *terminus ante quem*, though it is subject to revision from new discoveries <sup>(41)</sup>.

*Columbia University*

Roger S. BAGNALL

(41) I am grateful to Klaas Worp for comments on various points in this article.

## NOTE AUX COLLABORATEURS

Nos collaborateurs sont instamment priés d'appliquer les règles suivantes dans la présentation de leurs manuscrits.

Texte courant en caractères romains. Traductions et citations, également en romains, entre guillemets, avec la même justification que le reste du texte. Caractères italiques pour tout mot étranger et tout titre d'œuvre. Les siècles en chiffres romains : II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant ou après J.-C. (*ou* : II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère, de notre ère).

Les notes sont numérotées, entre parenthèses, de 1 à l'infini. Dans le manuscrit, elles sont rassemblées à part, à la fin de l'article. Éviter les références internes.

Auteurs anciens : nom en capitales ; titre de l'œuvre en italiques. Ex. : HÉSIODE, *Théog.* 1-3 ; CALLIMAQUE, fr. 15 (Pfeiffer) ; POLYBE II 1,2.

Les abréviations des collections de papyrus sont celles de la *Checklist*, 3e éd. = *BASP* Supplement 4 (1985) ou de la *Bibliographie papyrologique*. Elles sont en italiques, avec indication du tome en chiffres romains. Ex. : *P. Oxy.* XXXIV 2714 ; *SB* V 7756 ; *P. Berol.* inv. 8953.

Les références bibliographiques, uniformes, sont du type suivant :

— Livre : J.G. MILNE, *A History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, 3e éd. (Londres, 1924).

— Livre d'une série : Cl. PRÉAUX, *Les Grecs en Égypte d'après les archives de Zénon* = *Collection Lebègue* 7e s., 78 (Bruxelles, 1947).

— Article d'un périodique : Cl. PRÉAUX, « Polybe et Ptolémée Philopator », *CE* 40 (1965), pp. 364-375, ou Cl. PRÉAUX, *CE* 40 (1965), pp. 364-375.

— Article d'un recueil : E.G. TURNER, « Half a Line of Virgil from Egypt », *Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni*, II (Milan, 1957), pp. 157-161, 2 pl.

Pour les revues et les périodiques usuels, utiliser les abréviations du *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* dans la partie pharaonique, celles de *L'Année philologique* dans la partie gréco-romaine, et celles de la *Coptic Bibliography* dans la partie chrétienne.

Les comptes rendus sont dépourvus de notes au bas des pages. La description bibliographique du livre recensé sera conforme aux usages appliqués dans le présent volume.

La Rédaction