

ROGER S. BAGNALL

P. NYU 15 AND THE KEPHALAIOTAI
OF KARANIS

STVDIA
PAPYROLOGICA

Tomo XVII

Enero - Junio 1978

Fasc. 1.º

P. NYU 15 and the *Kephalaiotai* of Karanis

This account, in three columns, is headed $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\xi$ ($\epsilon\omega\varsigma$) $\kappa\rho\iota\theta$ ($\omega\nu$)[. The editor dated it to "Ca. 320 A. D."

The basis for this dating was given in the introduction to P. NYU 12: "Nos. 12, 15, 16, and 17 are tied closely together by the names which they share with one another. Some of the individuals named in these lists are found also in PCair Isid, which suggests that the tenth indiction of **12** and **16** is that of 321/2 A.D." In a recent study of currency in the fourth century (*ZPE* 24 [1977] 122), P. J. Sijpesteijn and I suggested that the entire group was to be moved to the next cycle: 334/5 (P.NYU 17) and 336/7 (P.NYU 3, 12 and 16), with P.NYU 15 being placed in the immediate vicinity. The grounds for this redating were (1) that P.NYU 3, correctly dated by the editor to 336/7, stood on the recto of the papyrus of which P.NYU 16 occupied the verso, and that since both texts were dated to a tenth indiction and written by the same hand, both must belong to 336/7;¹ and (2) that the amounts of currency in P.NYU 12 were suitable for 336/7 but not for 321/2.

This conclusion still seems to me sound as far as concerns the date of P.NYU 3, 12 and 16. But a closer examination of the prosopographical connections of these texts, to which Lewis alludes, persuades me that the tie among all these texts is not

¹ As already noted by D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 2 (1968) 70-71.

entirely convincing and that they must be treated individually, not as a group.

In P.NYU 12, I identify 20 different persons. Of these, only four appear in P.Cair.Isid.² Equally strikingly, only one appears in each of P.NYU 16 and 17.³ In P.NYU 16, only one of seven persons appears in P.Cair.Isid.,⁴ and equally only one of the seven appears in P.NYU 17.⁵ In P.NYU 17, only one of eleven appears in P.Cair.Isid., and he is one of the four already enumerated for P.NYU 12.⁶

One may conclude from this evidence that all three of these texts are likely to be at some distance from the bulk of the Isidoros archive, although within a generation, and that the date of these documents must be fixed each independently, not as part of a whole, for their interconnections are manifestly tenuous. A date in the middle 330's is thus very suitable. When we turn to P.NYU 15, however, the situation is different. Only one person appears in this papyrus who also appears in any other NYU papyrus,⁷ but *every single person* mentioned in P.NYU 15 is attested in P.Cair.Isid. This contrast is so great that we are justified in assigning P.NYU 15, unlike the other accounts, to the time of the Isidoros archive.

² These are Papeeis son of Aion (P.NYU 12.5,41; P.Cair.Isid. 28.19); Abaous son of Paesios (P.NYU 12.13,17.32; P.Cair.Isid. 12.16); Papeeis son of Pantel (P.NYU 12.16,24,28 ?,33,42,57; P.Cair.Isid. 20.9; 57.3; 82.3,20); and Sarapion son of Patas (P.NYU 12.17,55; P.Cair.Isid. 21.11). I include in the reckoning two persons on the verso who do not appear on the recto, cf. the editor's introduction. I want to thank Naphtali Lewis for giving me his transcription of the verso.

³ Abaous son of Paesios, cf. supra, n. 2, in P.NYU 17, and Aphous son of Tiberinus, in P.NYU 12.26,27,48,71 and 16.6.

⁴ Heron son of Aion, P.NYU 16.11; P.Cair.Isid. 6.25; 9.95,204; 10.125; 12.22; 14.73,157; 17.49.

⁵ Komon son of Isidoros, P.NYU 16.3 and 17.7.

⁶ Abaous son of Paesios, cf. supra, n. 2.

⁷ Papeeis son of Pantel: P.NYU 15.5,8,23,26,35,41; P.NYU 12.16,24,28 ?,33,42,57.

It is possible to be yet more specific. D. Hagedorn has pointed out that the list of persons to whom payments are booked in P.NYU 15 is very close to the list of the κεφαλαιωται κώμης [Καρανίδ]ος in P.Cair.Isid. 57.

P.Cair.Isid. 57	P.NYU 15
Kastor s. of Sabinos	Kastor s. of Sabinos
Papeeis s. of Pantel	Papeeis s. of Pantel
Demetrios s. of Chairemon	Valas s. of Sarapion
Dioskoros s. of Tiberinus	Dioskoros s. of Tiberinus
Sarapion s. of Serenos	Sarapion s. of Serenos
Dioskoros s. of Kastor	Dioskoros s. of Kastor
Isidoros s. of Leonides	Isidoros s. of Leonides
Patieis s. of Isidoros	Patisis ⁹ s. of Isidoros
Paesis s. of Melas ⁸	Paesis s. of Melas
	Serenos s. of Horos

⁸ Another imperfectly preserved name follows; Hagedorn suggests (cf. *supra*, n. 1) that the name is Ουαλας, i.e. the son of Sarapion in P.NYU 15; the reading seems to me probable.

⁹ The name is read as Παρίσις in P.NYU 15.4,18,24,32,47, as well as O.Mich. I 106,347,348,590,614; III 1089; but as Παριεις in P.Cair. Isid. 9.118,229; 10.85,220; 27.7; 28.22; 34.8; 57.10; 59.36. Hagedorn first suggested (*ZPE* 2 [1968] 70) that Παριεις be read in P.NYU 15, but on checking the original, Lewis stated that this was impossible. Hagedorn then (*Gnomon* 41 [1969] 745) suggested that P.Cair. Isid. 57 read Παρίσις. But the epsilon is rather clear on the plate (P.Cair. Isid., pl. IV). Given the discrepancy, I asked Professor H. C. Youtie to examine the photographs of Isidoros papyri and Michigan ostraka, and he replied (letter of 28.ii.1977), "The readings are all as we gave them... there could be some doubt about O.Mich. I 590,6; III 1089,2, where the ink is badly rubbed. In those cases one might hesitate between Παριεις and Παρίσις." It is probable that these are in fact simply two writings of the same name. The feminine form appears as Παριεις in O.Mich. I 268.5 but as Παρίσις in O.Mich. I 517.4-5, dealing with the same person in both cases. See H. C. Youtie, *ZPE* 18 (1975) 85 for these texts and this name. At all events, I do not doubt that the persons are one and the same.

Except for the replacement of Demetrios son of Chairemon with Valas son of Sarapion,¹⁰ and the addition of Serenos son of Horos, the lists are identical. Hagedorn drew quite reasonably the conclusion that the amounts in P.NYU 15 were collections by the *kephalaïotai*.

The editors of P.Cair.Isid. remarked of the list of *kephalaïotai*, "The persons so designated were probably foremen in charge of the donkey caravans (κεφαλαιωταὶ κτηνῶν δημοσίων καταγωγῆς, Princeton Papyrus Roll ii, 13) which moved the barley receipted in Col. ii from the granary at Karanis to a river port." The receipts in Column II of the Isidoros papyrus are given to the komarchs of Karanis for a total of 80 artabas of barley provided for Hephaistion for the 3rd indiction = year 9-7, or 314/5. The receipts are dated to Mesore 25 and Thoth 14, or 18 August and 11 September 315. We learn from P.Cair.Isid. 58 that Hephaistion was the chief of the Blues at Alexandria, and that the barley was not a tax but a paid requisition, for the komarchs received 1,000 drachmas per artaba of barley delivered.¹¹

We return now to P.NYU 15. It seems to me exceedingly likely that since the same people are involved as in P.Cair.Isid. 57, and since the collection of barley is in both cases the subject, the two documents refer to the same year and activity. P.NYU 15 is thus to be attributed to 315, and precisely to Mesore 12-16, or 5-9 August 315. The conclusion is strengthened by the occurrence in both documents of reckoning the subdivisions of the artaba in μέτρα, a relatively unusual unit of measurement.¹²

¹⁰ Valas is probably the *apaitetes* (no patronymic) in P.Cair.Isid. 53.23, of A.D. 314.

¹¹ The statement of Lewis, P.NYU 15, introd., that this rate represents *adaeratio*, could be misleading, since we are dealing with compensation for a compulsory delivery, not *adaeratio* of a tax obligation. P.Princ.Roll iv.31, however, does represent *adaeratio* at this figure.

¹² The editor remarks that the unread part of line 1 might be read

Since P.NYU 15 covers a period very shortly before the date of the receipt in P.Cair.Isid. 57.13-22, one seeks naturally to establish a closer relationship. The barley amounts in P.NYU 15 total 62 artabas,¹³ and amounts are lost in lines 18 and 29. The receipt of Mesore 25 in P.Cair.Isid. 57 covers in all 58.5 artabas, which is fairly close (a discrepancy of 7.7 per cent). Since several readings of numbers in the NYU text are uncertain, this discrepancy may be only apparent.

In P.Cair.Isid. 58, the komarchs acknowledge receipt of three-quarters of the price which is to be paid for the barley (in all, 13 talents, 2,000 dr. for 80 art.), or 10 talents. In P.NYU 15.38-47, we have a list of sums of money next to the names of the men who had made the deliveries of barley.¹⁴ These sums total 43,000 dr.; now three-fourths of the price of the 58.5 artabas delivered in Mesore would have been 43,875 dr., remarkably close to the figure given here. From this small discrepancy (under 2 per cent) I conclude that the figures in lines 39-47 of P.NYU 15 represent not, as the editor thought, *adaeratio* for further deliveries of barley, but rather compensation for the deliveries already made. The sums are allocated to the men rather equally (4,000 or 5,000 dr. each), not in proportion to the amounts of barley credited to them earlier. If my conclusion is correct, the *kephalaiotai* occupy a somewhat more active role than that of transporting grain from the granary

κρῖθ[ω]ν θ [ἔ]ρο[υς], which might refer to the 9th and 7th years mentioned in P.Cair.Isid. 57.21, = 314/5. Naturally I do not accept the editor's suggestion that P.NYU 15 is related to "members of a pittakion?", already refuted by Hagedorn, loc. cit. (supra, n. 1).

¹³ This figure includes those payments where the person's name is gone, in lines 11, 14, 20, 21, 22 and 27.

¹⁴ Sarapion son of Serenos delivered 3.2 art. of barley but received no money, while Serenos son of Horos delivered no barley but received 4,000 dr. I think that Serenos is certainly the father of Sarapion; Serenos figures as landowner and taxpayer in P.Cair.Isid. 9, 10, 14 and 27, and is thus probably a member of the older generation.