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THREE PAPYRI FROM THEADELPHEIA IN GENT

In 1908 F. Cumont bought 48 documentary papyri for the University of Gent. With the exception of two now lost, they are kept in the library of the University. In 1922 twenty-seven Oxyrhynchus papyri (literary and documentary) were added to the collection after their publication by Grenfell and Hunt. A third and last fund of 60 fragments was acquired in 1927 from the Egyptian Antiquities Service, through J. Bidez.

Of the 135 (133) papyri of the Gent collection, only thirty-five have been published: the twenty-seven Oxyrhynchus-texts, which appeared in P.Oxy. and eight texts from the Fund Cumont. Because of the very fragmentary situation of the third fund, only one text of it has thus far been published. In this article three more papyri from the Fund Cumont are presented.

Nothing is known about the exact conditions in which this fund has been acquired. However, having had a close look at the material, we can safely call it a 'closed fund' of forty-three texts coming from the Fayum and dating to the Roman period. More than half of them can be linked with certainty to Theadelpheia either because the village name is explicitly mentioned, or for prosopographical reasons. There is ample reason to suppose that the other half belongs to the same village. Most of the texts are administrative documents.

Of these Theadelpheia papyri three will be published below in expectation of a full edition of the Fund Cumont, within the framework of a Ph.D. on the history of Theadelpheia and Euhemeria.

1. Fragment of a κατ’ ἐνδρα-ádiary

P.Gent Inv. 41 Recto

Theadelpheia

AD 165, June 25/27

18.2 x 22.5 cm. Text written along the fibres in two columns of respectively 20 and 23 lines. Between the columns is a free space of 1 to 2.5 cm. The papyrus is broken off to the right. On the left, at the top and at the bottom is a free space of respectively 0.9, 1 and 1.5 cm. The verso (upside down) contains in one column a very effaced list of names and amounts in kind.

This papyrus contains part of a sitologos diary. It mentions revenues of Epeiph 1 till 3 of AD 165 (June 25/27), derived from taxes in kind on state and private land located in Theadelpheia. Our text contains

---

1 With thanks to all those who read and criticized earlier versions of this paper, especially W. Clarysse, Hélène Cuvigny and P. van Minnen. The people of the Gent library, especially Dr. Martine De Reu, should be thanked for the unlimited access they gave us to their papyrus collection.

2 P.Gent Inv. 18 & 29.


4 P.Oxy. X 1264 (Inv. 49), 1313 (Inv. 50), XI 1366 (Inv. 51Vo), XII 1408 (Inv. 52Vo), 1430 (Inv. 53), 1444 (Inv. 51Ro), 1446 (Inv. 52Ro), 1466 (Inv. 54), 1478 (Inv. 55), 1503 (Inv. 56), 1505 (Inv. 57), 1522 (Inv. 58), 1569 (Inv. 59), 1588 (Inv. 60), XIII 1598 (Inv. 61), 1602 (Inv. 62), 1612 (Inv. 63), XIV 1626 (Inv. 64), 1632 (Inv. 65), 1635 (Inv. 66), 1641 (Inv. 67), 1653 (Inv. 68), 1683 (Inv. 69), 1690 (Inv. 70), 1701 (Inv. 71), 1729 (Inv. 72), 1751 (Inv. 73), 1764 (Inv. 74) and XV 1817 (Inv. 75). Some of these texts have only partially been published.

5 SB XVI 1520-1521-1522 (Inv. 1Ro), SB XIV 12680 (Inv. 1Vo, col. 1) & SB III 6951Vo (Inv. 1Vo, col. 2&3), SB III 7197 (Inv. 3), SB III 7198 (Inv. 4), SB III 7199 (Inv. 6), SB III 7264 (Inv. 8), SB III 7200 (Inv. 19&19a), SB III 6266=6704 (Inv. 44) and SB III 7201 (Inv. 45).


7 Five papyri (P.Gent Inv. 44 till 48), three Greek and two Coptic, form a separate group, to be dated to the sixth century or later.
the same data as P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo, I.9-IV.5, but presents them in a slightly different manner. The complete document must have contained the revenues of Epeiph 1 till 9, just as the Berlin document. Our papyrus offers the occasion to resolve an abbreviation and to correct or complete some minor readings in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo.

The main structure of both texts is clearly the same: for each day (Epeiph 1 - 2 - 3) the names of the tax-payers and the amounts paid are listed in the same order, followed by a day total (listed by crop). Finally for each crop a distinction is made between the revenues of the fifth year of M. Aurelius and the arrears paid for the fourth year.

There are however some basic differences between the two documents:

1. After the name of farmers holding state land, the Gent papyrus adds the abbreviation δη( ) (= δημόσιων / τῶν δημόσιων γεωργῶν ορ δημόσιως / δημόσιος γεωργός).
2. One δημόσιος γεωργός, Pasion son of Isidoros, found in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo II.16, is missing in P.Gent Inv. 41.
3. For some individual tax-payers the Berlin document distinguishes between contributions for the fifth year and arrears paid to the account of the 4th year. P.Gent Inv. 41 immediately gives the sum of both amounts. But this sum is not always correct. Nevertheless, and despite the absence of Pasion son of Isidoros, the day total is always the same as in the Berlin papyrus.
4. P.Gent Inv. 41 only makes a distinction between the 5th and the 4th year when making the subtotal by crop at the end of the day. But the amounts given are different from the Berlin ones.

To make clear the structure of both documents and the basic differences between each of them, we quote a few lines as a matter of example:

P.BERL. LEIHG. I 4VO, L. 18-19:

Дιός Ἀπολλωνίου [φακ(οῦ ἀρτάβσια)] η γ

CORRESPONDING PASSAGE IN P.GENT INV. 41RO, L. 8:

Διὸς Ἀπολλωνίου δημοσίων φακ(οῦ ἀρτάβσια) τ γ

What could have been the purpose of our Gent document and its relation with P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo? P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo was certainly not based upon the Gent document, as the latter does not distinguish between the payments for the fourth and those for the fifth year.

Was P.Gent perhaps based upon the Berlin text? Was it a rough copy for the village archives, e.g. because the very detailed and neatly written P.Berl. Leihg. had to be sent to the nome metropolis or to the toparch? In that case we have to assume that our scribe (for whom the distinction between a fourth and fifth year was not important) was not blessed with great talent in calculation, that he copied the day totals from P.Berl. Leihg. and that he forgot Pasion, son of Isidoros. But some serious objections remain. Why does the Gent author use different abbreviations and how can he provide supplementary information after the name of a person, as in l. 34? Why is Chairemon son of Billos mentioned in a different place, and maybe twice? Why don’t the subtotals by crop fit?

P.Gent 41Ro was possibly written at about the same moment and place of P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo with another purpose, or both documents were copied, with different purpose, from the same model.

TEXT

Col. I
1 Ὁρακλή[ς] Ὁρα[κ]λήῳ σευλι ( ) δη(μοσίων) (πυρὸν ἀρτάβαι) τη [dig]

a

2 Ἡρων Ἡρωνος τοῦ Ἀκείους δη(μοσίων) (πυρὸν ἀρτάβαι) πα [dig]

3 Σαρπηνίων Ἀλέξιωνος δη(μοσίων) (πυρὸν ἀρτάβαι) νθ [dig]
...
Instead of a translation a comparison of both texts is given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Taxpayer</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Col. Line</th>
<th>Year 5 (= 164/5 AD)</th>
<th>Year 4 (= 163/4 AD)</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epeiph 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaios s. Mystharion</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>39 1/4</td>
<td>39 1/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysthes s. of Mysthes</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philokrates s. of Mysthes</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>47 1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemaios s. of Dioskoros</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>45 1/2 1/24</td>
<td>30 1/2 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonios s. of Ammonios</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>7 1/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakles s. of Herakles</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>11 1/4 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron s. of Akes</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>80 1/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapion s. of Alexion</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>59 1/2 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aretion s. of Nason</td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>04 1/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papos s. of Arabimnos</td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>02 1/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapion s. of Loukios</td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>06 2/3 1/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron s. of Heron</td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>06 2/3 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deios s. of Apollonios</td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>08 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron s. of Apynchos</td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>07 1/2 1/3 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idem, land in Polydeukia</td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idem, ἀναθήματος</td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>00 1/3 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>352 2/3 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>029 1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>023 1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL BY YEAR</strong></td>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>331 2/3 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>21 1/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>07 1/2 1/3 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barley</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>00 1/3 1/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>21 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lentils</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>21 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Epeiph 02                 |      |           |                     |                     |              |              |      |
| Isas s. of Hermes         | wheat | 2.07      | 103 1/2 1/8         | 103 1/2 1/8         |              |              |      |
| Horiou s. of Zoilos       | wheat | 2.09      | 046 1/2 1/24        | 046 1/2 1/24        |              |              |      |
| Ision & Maron             | wheat | 2.11      | 046 1/2 1/24        | 046 1/2 1/24        |              |              |      |
| Pasis s. of Pherais       | wheat | 2.14      | 079 1/6 1/24        | 079 1/6 1/24        |              |              |      |
| Pasis s. of Isidoros      | wheat | 2.16      | 008 3/4             | 008 3/4             |              |              |      |
| Horiou s. of Horiou       | wheat | 2.18      | 043 1/2 1/24        | 043 1/2 1/24        |              |              |      |
| Petakes s. of Sambas      | wheat | 2.20      | 046 1/2 1/24        | 046 1/2 1/24        |              |              |      |
| Horiou s. of Dikoanos     | wheat | 2.21      | 041 1/3 1/8         | 041 1/3 1/8         |              |              |      |
| Phaseis s. of Belles      | wheat | 2.22      | 01 1/8              | 01 1/8              |              |              |      |
| Isarous d. of Ariston (private) | wheat | 2.23 | ---                 | ---                 |              |              |      |
| **DAY TOTAL**             | wheat | 3.01      | 475 1/6             |                     |              |              |      |
| **SUBTOTAL BY YEAR**      | wheat | 3.02      | 449 1/3 1/24        |                     |              |              |      |
|                           | wheat | 3.03      | 24 2/3              |                     |              |              |      |
|                           | wheat | 3.05      | 01 1/8              |                     |              |              |      |
COMMENTARY

Col. 1

1 Ἡρο[κ][λ][ή]νιον: in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo l.9 the patronymicon can now also be expanded to Ἡροκλήνιον.

2 σευλι( ): cf. σελ( ) in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo l.9 (corrected to σευλι( ) or σευλ( ) in the commentary) and σευλ( ) in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo VIII.17, cf. P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo VIII.1. The abbreviation remains unexplained. The proposal of the editors of the Berlin document (σευληνίς) is clearly impossible.

1a The symbol appearing regularly between two lines looks like δς. Possibly space was left for a further subdivision of the sums mentioned. It is nevertheless uncertain whether this sign has been written down with the document or has been added later on.

2 The reading τοῦ Μενε(ιους) of P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo can now be corrected into τοῦ Ἀκείνιους. This person is known from P.Col. V 2, l. 51 (about AD 160).

3 In P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo, l. 12 the editors suggested "α [η]" as the sum paid for the fourth year by Heron. In that case the sum would have been 81 1/8 1/12: a difference of 13/24 with the total mentioned in the Gent document. If however in the lacuna of P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo I.9 (corrected to πεςευληνίον) we read ζ[η], but in line 8 we read ζ[η] instead of ζ[η] as the sum paid for the fourth year by Ammonios son of Ammonios, the day and subtotals remain untouched, and the sum in P.Gent 41Ro becomes correct.

3 For Sarapion, son of Alexion, see P.Col. V 3, l. 86 & 109 (AD 155) and P.Col. V 2, l. 234 (about AD 160). If the first identification is correct, his grandfather was Pnepheros and his mother Thed(...).

4 For a list of documents in which Aretion son of Nason is mentioned, cfr. infra Text 2Vo, note to l. 8.

5 Papos son of Arabianos is one of the ἐπιτάκτεις in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6, l. 23 (AD 166-167).

6 The same man is possibly mentioned in P.Col. V 6, l. 57 (about AD 160-161).

7 ἐλατούφρηος(ος): the abbreviation ἐλ( ) in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo l.17 is not to be resolved into Ἑλ(ληνις), but into ἐλ(ατο-ύφρηος).

8 Deios son of Apollonios is found in P.Berl. Leihg. II 39Vo, l. 135 (AD 160-180), probably as candidate for a liturgic function. His name further appears in the tax document P.Col. V 3, l. 160 & 187 (AD 155) and in PSI VII 793, l. 16 (about AD 160), possibly a list of pittakiarchs. In P.Stras. 829, l. 58 (AD 138-161?), he is member of the pittakion of Psenatymis son of Deios. By the time of P.Col. V 4 (AD 165-180), l. 64, he has himself become πειτακτειοχρηστος, owning land in Thedelfephia and Polydeukeia. Next to his name appears ἀπεθανον(α:ν;?), which could prove that Deios died during the year the document was written. He finally appears (if it always concerns the same man) in P.Oxy. XII 1446, l. 89.

8 The symbol does not exclusively appear with tax-payers for which the Berlin document distinguishes between contributions for the fifth year and arrears paid to the account of the 4th year.
Is this the πιπτωκατάρχης of P.Col. V 4, l. 31?

The day total of wheat, being 352 2/3 1/8 artabs, is not as in the Berlin document divided into 331 2/3 1/24 and 21 1/12, but into 345 2/3 and 7 1/8. This seems an arbitrary division. If the hypothesis made under note 2 is exact, the 7 1/8 artabs could correspond with the arrears for one single man: Ammonios son of Ammonios.

The names Heron and Phaseis are so common in Theadelphia that we hesitate to identify this man with the homonymous person(s) in BGU IX 1891, l. 56 (AD 134), P.Col. V 3, l. 186 (AD 155) and P.Berl. Leihg. II 39Vo, l. 182 (AD 160-180).

We clearly read an e as the last cipher. If we assume that the first numeral was a π, the difference between the totals in P. Berl. Leihg. (83 19/24 artabs) and P. Gent (85 1/6 artabs) would amount to 1 9/24 artab. This seems to be an error in calculation.

For Ision son of Papos, see P.Berl. Leihg. I 3, l. 5 (AD 164-165) and (probably) P.Berl. Leihg. II 33, l. 51 (about AD 165).

For Isas son of Hermes is unknown in the prosopography of Theadelphia.

The author of P.Gent 41Ro does not mention Pasion, son of Isidoros, who appears in the Berlin document between Heron son of Phaseis and Heron son of Horion.

One expects 44 21/24 as the sum of the two amounts mentioned in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo. At first sight the 43 13/24 artabs seem another error in calculation. But here the copyist (?) apparently did not take into account the arrears of the fourth year of Marcus Aurelius.

Nothing is expected here. We can certainly not read the name of Pasion, son of Isidoros. Possibly this line has been added later on. P. van Minnen suggested to read γυμνος (\. .). W. Clarysse proposed ρόμις (\?).

Petekas son of Sambas also appears in P.Col. V 3, l. 70 (AD 155), where the names of his grandfather (Dionysios) and his mother (Thermouthis) are given.

Col. II

Since the first column shows that the amounts expected on the basis of P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo sometimes differ from the actual ones, we did not supplement the amounts at the ends of lines of the second column.

Two homonyms are known, one in P.Col. V 3, l. 127 (AD 155), where the name of the grandfather is Chois and of the mother Taorsenouphis, the other in P.Col. V 2, l. 243 (about AD 160), where the grandfather is named A(\...).

This female landowner makes a payment of 11 1/24 artabs of wheat in P.Berl. Leihg. I 3, l. 127 (AD 164-165). From BGU IX 1896, l. 336 (AD 166-167), we can conclude that she disposed of 9 arourae of private land. In BGU IX 1898, l. 137 (AD 148/149?), we read next to her name ἕτοι Όξιορωτης(\). She there makes a payment δίω Διοσκόρου Σαμβᾶ γων(\γωνο), probably the father of the Heron mentioned in our document. She further appears in BGU IX 1897a, l. 78 (AD 166-167).

Just as for Epeiphe 1, the day total of wheat for the δημοσίον γεωργεί, being here 474 1/24 artabs, is not as in the Berlin document split up into 449 1/3 1/24 and 24 2/3, but into 472 2/3 1/24 and 1 1/3. This again seems an arbitrary division, whereby once more the 1 1/3 artab could correspond with the arrears of one single person: Heron son of Horion (cfr. note to Col. I, l. 12).

Apynchis son of Petekas appears as νυκτοφύλαξ in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6, l. 48 (AD 166-167).

Chairemon son of Billos is mentioned just after Apynchis son of Petekas. Just after Ision son of Sokrates, where he normally had to appear, some illegible traces remain. Maybe he was mentioned there again. But because the amounts paid are not preserved, nothing can be said with certainty.

This man acts as a pittakion member in P. Col. V 4, l. 161 (AD 161-180); he also appears in P.Stras. 852, l. 33 (AD 175-200) and BGU IX 1900, l. 103 (about AD 196).

The same man appears in P.Col. V 3, l. 67 (AD 155), where the name of his mother is Θ(\...).

Heron son of Ischyrion is a μαγδαλοφύλαξ in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6, l. 79 (AD 166-167).

For Spartas son of Epaphroditos, see P.Col. V 2, l. 226 (about AD 160), P.Berl. Stras. 791, l. 19 (about AD 160) and P.Col. V 4, l. 107 (AD 165-180) where he appears as a pittakion member.

πρὸ(τερον): or should the abbreviation be resolved as πρό(γονος), as in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6, l. 42? We are not helped by the reading in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo III.14: Μέσοθῆς Ἡρᾶς Θ[ε][ς] ἀδελφοίς(\) δημοσίοι(\) (πωροῦ ἄρταβατι) γ. As no Heras step-son of Herak(\) is attested in Theadelphia, and as the normal abbreviation for πρό(γονος) is προ(\), we prefer πρὸ(τερον).

δικ(\) : P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo, III.15 reads «φορὰ(σ(οῦ ἄρταβατι)»\). Our inspection of the original showed that there should be read: «[\(\)]ος(\)» or «[\(\)]ος(\)». On the base of the Gent document we propose δικ(\) or [δικ(\)]. Should we read δικ(\) in both texts?

Chairemon son of Hermas appears in the following documents: P.Stras. 847Vo (AD 150 after), P.Berl. Leihg. II 39Vo, l. 118 & 191 (AD 160-180), P.Berl. Leihg. II 41, l. 31 (about AD 165) as κτημοτρόφος and BGU IX 1897a, l. 56 (AD 166-167).
This man, once known under the ghost-name Σπάρτασσάς (P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo III.18 and P.Stras. 55, l. 12) occurs also in BGU IX 1891, l. 84; P.Col. II 1a, VII.10; P.Col. II 2, V.17 and P.Col. V 3, l. 113. See the note by J. Schwartz in P.Stras. 847 (p. 74).

Maybe a papponymicon follows Ζαϊλώ, as in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo III.19 where the reading is very uncertain: τοῦ Μύθου;?

Ision son of Sokrates also appears in P.Col. V 2, l. 104 (about AD 160).

See note to line 28.

2. Report of Plêrôtai

P.Gent Inv. 17a Verso Plate XI
Theadelpheia about AD 155-165

23 x 20 cm. Text written on the verso against the fibres. The papyrus is complete and contains two columns of respectively 13 and 10 lines. Between the columns is a free space of 2.2 cm. The recto contains part of a land register, mentioning different types of land at Theadelpheia and Polydeaikia.

The papyrus contains three accounts or reports of πληροταί. The name of each πληροτής is followed by an amount in wheat for Pachôn 21, 22 and 23 (May 16 till 18) of an unknown year, followed by a subtotal until Pachôn 24 (May 19) and a global overview of revenues in wheat, barley and lentils from Pachôn 25 (May 20) until Pauni 18 (June 12). The three accounts are written by the same hand. On the base of the prosopographical data the Gent document can be situated in Theadelpheia about AD 160.

TEXT

Col. I
1 Πληρω(τής) Πανο[. . .]ς (? ) Κολ(λούθου?) Παχω(ν) καὶ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) η Λη
1a ἀλε[. . .] (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) καὶ β
2 κβ [(πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι)] νεα Λη γη (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) κζ [. . .]
3 ἀλλαί [πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι)] [. . .] (γίνονται) ἐως κδ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) [. . .]
4 (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) [ν] β [δ]
5 καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Παχω(ν) καὶ ἐως Παυνὶ η
6 (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) οὐὴ γη [κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) σδ Λη]
7 φακοῦ (ἀρτάβαπι) οι κδ
Free Space of 4 cm.
8 Πληρω(τής) Ἀρησίων Νάσω(νος) Παχω(ν) καὶ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) η β γκδ •
9 κγ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) ξ • [ἀλε(λαῖ)] ἀλ(λαῖ) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) κε γβ •
10 (γίνονται) ἐως κδ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) ρς κδ •
11 καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Παχω(ν) καὶ ἐως Παυνὶ η
12 (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) φης δ κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) ρι Λ γιβ
13 φακοῦ (ἀρτάβαπι) ζβ γη

Col. II
14 Ὄμρίων ο καὶ Σαβείνου(ς) Ἡρακλ(είδου)
15 Παχω(ν) καὶ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) κς γ •
16 κβ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) ιγ Λη γ •
17 ἀλλαί (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) δ Λη ἀλ(λαῖ) (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) λδ Λη •
18 κγ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) νς •
19 ἀλλαί (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι)
20 (γίνονται) ἐως κδ (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) [. . .] πλ Λη
COMMENTARY

The liturgic office of πληρωτής is attested in the Fayum from AD 1389 until the end of the second century. The πληρωτής, whose area of responsibility was the village, had to do with the cultivation of state land; they stood very close to the κυμογραμματεύ and the σιτολόγοι. In the larger villages a college of πληρωτίς existed; thus in P.Hamb. I 59 the γραμματέως πληρωτών declares all δημοσία and οίκισκη γη of Philadelphia ready for irrigation and sowing. In P.Princ. III 128 (after AD 163/164) the κυμογραμματεύς of Theadelphia answers a question of the college of πληρωτίς concerning the names of the members of a pittakion. This and the etymology of the word made the editors conclude that “the πληρωτίς saw to it that the public land was fully leased, properly flooded, and sown in good season”. Their duty could also have consisted in controlling the full payment of taxes on state land. See also P.Berl. Leihg. II 45 (the introduction to a list of candidates for the liturgic offices of among others σιτολόγοι and πληρωτίς) and P.Fay. 23 (2nd century AD), where the πληρωτίς of Sebennytos and Kerkesoucha seem to be mentioned. P.Stras. 606 (2nd century AD) mentions a πληρωτής of Philagris. In P.Stras. 847 and 848, two accounts from Theadelphia (about AD 150), payments, apparently in barley, are made to the πληρωτίς.

The purpose of the present document is not clear. The amounts are probably not the regular taxes paid on state land, because it is normally the task of the σιτολόγοι to register the payment of these taxes. Moreover the amounts are too small for the time of the year, in the middle of the harvest. Maybe they are arrears paid to the account of the preceding year.

There seem to have been at least three πληρωτίς in Theadelphia, if we may assume that the third section was also the work of a πληρωτής, although the exact function of the man is not given. The structure of the document is strange: the mention of four successive days, followed by a period of 24 days could suggest that the πληρωτίς worked in shifts of 4 days. And why were no payments at all made on Pachon 24?

Schematic overview of the amounts mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pachon 21</th>
<th>wheat 18 1/2 1/8 29 [ ] 1/12</th>
<th>12 1/3 1/24</th>
<th>26 1/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pachon 22</td>
<td>wheat 16 1/2 1/3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13 5/6 1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04 1/2 1/3</td>
<td>34 1/2 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachon 23</td>
<td>wheat 27 [ ]</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 2/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachon 21 till 24</td>
<td>wheat 152 1/4</td>
<td>116 1/24</td>
<td>130 5/6 1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachon 25 till Pauni 18</td>
<td>wheat 818 1/3 1/8</td>
<td>598 1/4</td>
<td>7 [j] 2/3 1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barley 204 1/2 1/8 071 1/24</td>
<td>110 5/6 1/12</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lentils 063 1/3 1/8</td>
<td>062 1/3 1/8</td>
<td>064 1/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first πληρωτής (Panouphis or Panouris son of Kollouthos ?) is new in Theadelphia. The second one, Aretion son of Nason (l. 8), is found in the following documents:
- P.Col. V 3 (AD 155), l. 180: list of tax-arrears to the account of the preceding year (154-155). His arrears amount to 10 drachmae.
- P.Meyer 4 (AD 161): the προσβήτεροι of Theadelphia report to the λαμπάντης of the sixth toparchy that all state land has been irrigated. Aretion is one of them.
- P.Princ. II 35 (about AD 161); he receives a receipt for the repayment of a (private?) loan.
- P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Ro (AD 165), VI.12: list of tax-arrears (probably) to the account of AD 161-162. His arrears amount to 1 1/2 1/3 artabs of wheat.
- P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo and P.Gent Inv. 41Ro (= Text 1) (AD 165): he pays 4 1/12 artabs of lentils to the σιτολόγοι for taxes on state land.
- In P.Col. V 4 (AD 165-180), l. 11 the pittakiarch Ἀ[ [ ]... ἰσονος may be A[retion son of Nason.

10 Cfr. N. Lewis, The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt, Firenze 19972, 42.
11 P.Princ. III 128, p. 32.
The name Nason, possibly a Latin name (one should mention Ovidius Nason), is not very frequent in Egypt. We find Γα»ω ᾿Ελι»ω Nãsvn in P.Mich. IV 224, l. 3720 (AD 172-173; Karanis) and Nãsvn k≈mhw Farba»ew in P.Ross.Georg. II 35B, l. 12 (AD 100-199).

The man responsible for the third report, Horion, alias Sabeinos, son of Herakleides is probably identical with the Sabinos son of Herakleides, whose name has been deleted in P.Berl. Leihg. II 41, l. 5, a list of liturgists (about AD 165).

3. List of Pittakion Members

P.Gent Inv. 17e Verso Plate IX
Theadelpheia about AD 165

15.7 x 6.5 cm. Text written against the fibres. The papyrus is broken off at the bottom. One column of 18 lines. Traces of a preceding column. The recto contains part of a land register (17 lines), mentioning different types of land at Theadelpheia (the Menatianê ousia is mentioned in ll. 11-12) and Euhemeria. Plate 3.

List of pittakion members: after the πιττακιάρχης follow his συγγεωργοί. This document must have been a draft: at every moment names could be deleted (by putting them between brackets) or added.

A pittakion was a group of tenants of public land, who subleased their land from the leader of the pittakion, the πιττακιάρχης13, who leased the whole lot from the state and was responsible for the payments of all pittakion members. Our document is a close parallel to P.Stras. 829, but the two fragments are not part of the same papyrus14. Most of the pittakion documents are not bare name lists, but offer the names of the pittakion members (the so called συγγεωργοί) and the number of arourae they rent and/or the payments made for land taxes on it. In P.Col. V 4, the most important pittakion document15, a pittakion in Theadelpheia counted on average 5.7 members. The two pittakia in the Gent document count respectively 8 and minimum 9 members. The strokes next to the names in the second part of the document must be checkmarks.

Due to the close relations of our document with P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo and 6, and P.Col. V 4, a date of about AD 165 can be proposed.

TEXT

1 Πιτ(τακιάρχαι) Χαϊρᾶς ᾿Α[πο]λλω[νίου]
2 καὶ ᾿ἀδελφός
3 Σαραπίων ᾿Ηρακλείδο(υ) χω(λ)
4 ᾿Αρφάςης ᾿Οννώ(φριος)
5 ᾿Ωρος ᾿ἀδελφός
6 ᾿Αρη»ης Κορᾶ
7 Σωκρά(της) ᾿Αρτεμιδόρο(υ)
8 Μυσθερα»ς ᾿Ακούτος

Free space of 2 cm.

9 / πι(τακιάρχης) Πόσις Σαμβᾶ
10 / ᾿Ωριγένης Νικάνδρου
11 / ᾿Αλκιμιο(ς) Χαϊρήμονο(ς)
12 / ᾿Αμψαίς υἱός

13 A list of documents mentioning pittakarchs is found in the introduction to P.Stras. 791.
14 With thanks to the Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Strasbourg (BNUS), and especially Mr. P.-H. Allioux for providing us with some excellent photographs.
15 Cfr. the introduction to P.Col. V for a general exposition on the pittakion system.
COMMENTARY

1 The term πιττακιάρχης has been abbreviated differently in l. 1 and 9. In line 1 we read πιττ( ); in line 9 the usual abbreviation, a monogram (a big Π, cut through by a big iota), is used.

2 In P.Berl. Leihg. II 27 (167 AD, December 19), l. 3 & 20, Chairas, son of Apollonios, one of the (illiterate) presbyteroi, gives a receipt for the delivery of seed by the στοιολόροι. He is then 35 years old. Most of the pittakiarchs must have been relatively well off. It is likely that the presbyteros Chairas, who belonged to the same stratum of village notables, is the same person as the one in our text.

3 ξο: χω(ματεπεμλητής)? Cfr. P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo, V.1. A Sarapion son of Herakleides, step-son of Neon is gyarches in P.Berl. Leihg. II 41, l. 9&48 (about AD 165), but it is not certain whether the same person is meant.

4 For Harphaesis, son of Onnophris, cfr. possibly BGU IX 1891 (AD 134 ), l. 266 and P.Col. II 1a (AD 134-135), V.18, with Onnophris as grandfather.

5 A Horos, son of Onnophris, husband of Tausiris, father of Heron is mentioned in BGU IX 1891 (AD 134), l. 311, P.Col. II 1b (AD 134-135), V.7, and P.Col. II 3 (AD 135-145), l.18.

6 The same man is mentioned as farmer in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo (AD 165) and as ἀρχέφοδος in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6 (AD 166-167), a list of public liturgists, l. 16. Instead of a patronymicon it is possible to read the occupational designation κεραι(μενος).

7 Sokrates, son of Artemidoros, appears in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6 (AD 166-167) as one of the νομοφηλάκες (l. 26).

8 Mystharas son of Akous is new to the prosopography of Theadelpheia.

9 This pittakiarch appears as an ἀρχεφοδος in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6 (AD 166-167), l. 17 and as a farmer in P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo (AD 165) where he pays respectively 40 artabs of wheat and 9 1/6 1/24 artabs of barley as taxes on state land.

10 On Epeiph 6 of AD 165, Alkimos, son of Chairemon, pays 7 artabs of lentils (P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo), In P.Col. V 4 (AD 165-180), l. 163, he rents a plot of 6 3/4 1/8 arourae as a pittakion member. Members of that same pittakion are among others: Chairemon son of Billos (mentioned in line 13 of our document) and Timokrates son of Ision (the father of Antonius and Heron, who are mentioned in lines 15 and 16 of our document). So apparently our document is younger than P.Col. V 4. It could show that the membership of a pittakion remained stable over a longer period.

11 Chairemon, son of Billos, is pittakion member in P.Col. V 4 (AD 165-180), l. 161, cfr. note to line 11. He is also mentioned as the member of an association of tenants of state land in BGU IX 1900 (about AD 196), l. 103. He appears in P.Stras. 852 (about AD 175-200), an alphabetical list of farmers (l. 33), and in AD 165 he respectively pays 2 1/2 1/3 1/12 artabs of wheat and 3 artabs of lentils as tax on state land (P.Berl. Leihg. I 4Vo).

12 Together with his father (Timokrates son of Ision) Antonius pays on Epeiph 5 of AD 165 63 3/4 artabs of wheat as tax on state land. In P.Col. V 4 (AD 165-180), l. 158, his father belongs to the same pittakion as Alkimos son of Chairemon and Chairemon son of Billos. He there rents a plot of 3 arourae.

13 Heron, son of Timokrates, appears as a φύλακς in P.Berl. Leihg. I 6 (AD 166-167), l. 62.

---

Cfr. P.Col. V, p. 146 about joint pittakiarchs. The joint pittakiarchs in P.Col. V 4, ll. 70-71 and 153 are also brothers. P. van Minnen suggests ‘(μέτο)’. 

---