

THE ARCHIVES OF THE TEMPLE OF SOK- NOBRAISIS AT BACCHIAS¹

ELIZABETH H. GILLIAM

INTRODUCTION

THE POPYRI² which are the subject of this study belong, with the exception of VII, to the archives of the temple of the crocodile god Soknobraisis in Bacchias, a village in the northeastern part of the Fayûm. There can be little doubt that the papyri now divided among three collections were found together and divided later. The texts in all three collections are closely related in content and date. Nine of them are temple reports and related documents. Ten are receipts for temple reports which had been submitted to various officials. Four are concerned with the attempt of the priests to gain

¹The material of this paper was treated in fuller form in my doctoral dissertation (Yale, 1941, unpublished). This dissertation was directed by Professor M. I. Rostovtzeff and Professor C. B. Welles, who had previously studied and transcribed a number of the Yale papyri which are published here (see n. 2). To them I am deeply indebted for their unfailing interest and assistance. MM. Octave Guéraud and Jean Scherer have also read the manuscript of the paper and contributed valuable criticism.

²These twenty-five papyri are divided among three collections. Four of them (VIII, XIV, XXII and XXIV) are in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo and were first published by A. Bataille in *Études de Papyrologie* IV (1938), pp. 197-205, and republished a year later by him in *Papyrus Fouad* I (nos. 11-14). Eight of them (III-VI, X, XII, XVII, XXI [XXI is composed of two fragments: *P. Lund* 3 8 + *P. Yale* 348]) are in the University at Lund and were published by K. Hanell in *Bulletin de la Société royale des Lettres de Lund* 1937-1938, no. 5, pp. 119-137. The remaining thirteen papyri and a fragment of XXI are in the Yale Collection and are published here for the first time. This paper was intended to be a complete collection of the papyri from the archives of Soknobraisis. When it was about to go to the press, Dr. Erik J. Knudtzon informed me that he was preparing for publication several additional texts from the temple which had been found in the Lund collection subsequent to Hanell's publication. I received a copy of Knudtzon's publication (*Bakchias-texte und andere Papyri der Lunder Papyrusammlung* [*P. Lund Univ. Bibl.* 4], Lund, 1946) while correcting my first proof. It was then too late to include all the new Lund texts and too late to discuss in full the material in them, but *P. Lund* 4 2 is reprinted (V) and *P. Lund* 4 7 has been used to restore XXIV, a copy of the same text as *P. Lund* 4 7. In accordance with Knudtzon's designation, the Lund texts published by him are cited as *P. Lund* 4 1-14 and those published by Hanell are cited as *P. Lund* 3 1-10.

privileges in respect to labor on the dikes, and the remaining two texts are of uncertain content. The reports and petitions addressed to various officials by the priests must be copies of the original documents which were actually sent.

These papyri furnish considerable evidence about the gods and their temples at Bacchias, the organization of the priesthood, the temple reports submitted to government officials, and the liturgies and taxation of the priests. Because of their character, they naturally throw more light on the relations between the temple and the government than on the cult of the god and the life of the individual priests. They reveal much about the economic position of a small Egyptian temple in the second and early third centuries A. D. and the Roman government's policy of strict supervision of temples and curtailment of the power and privileges of priests.

The Gods of Bacchias and their Temples

Before the discovery of the papyri from the archives of the temple of Soknobraisis, there was evidence for only one god at Bacchias. The god was called Soknokonnis, and papyri which mention him were found in the temple³ which stood in the center of the village, the only temple discovered at Bacchias during the excavations.⁴ Soknokonnis was one of the forms of the Egyptian crocodile god, Sebek, whose worship was particularly widespread in the Fayûm.⁵ Sebek appeared under a variety of names in local cults. His Egyptian name is represented by the letters SBK and was transliterated into Greek as Σούχος, or in an abbreviated form, Σοκ-. The name of the god in the local

³ *P. Fay.* 18 and 137 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 121). See also *P. Enteux.* 54. With *P. Fay.* 137 was found a similar question to the oracle addressed to κύριοι Διόσκουροι (*P. Fay.* 138 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 95], first or second century A. D.).

⁴ The excavations of the village, the modern Umm el 'Atl, which were conducted in 1895-1896 by D. G. Hogarth, B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, are described by them in *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, London, 1900, pp. 35-42, and a plan of the temple is given in Pl. III. Hereafter I shall refer to this book as *Fayûm Towns* and to the texts published in it as *P. Fay.*

⁵ The crocodile cult in Egypt is described by G. Roeder, *s. v.* "Sobk," Roscher, *Lexicon* IV, 1093-1120; O. Höfer, *s. v.* "Suchos," Roscher, *Lex.* IV, 1580-1590; H. Kees, *s. v.* "Suchos," *RE* IV A, 540-560; J. Toutain, "Le culte du crocodile dans le Fayoum sous l'empire romain," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* LXXXI (1915), pp. 171-194; C. Kuentz, "Quelques monuments du culte de Sobk," *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale* XXVIII (1929), pp. 113-171; O. Guéraud, "Une stèle gréco-romaine au Cartouche d'Amenemhet III," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* XL (1941), pp. 553-560; for Pharaonic Egypt, see E. A. W. Budge, *The Gods of the Egyptians*, London, 1904, II, pp. 354-359.

cults generally retained the Σούχος or Σοκ- element, as Soknebtunis at Tebtunis, Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos, and Petesouchos, who was worshipped in several places.⁶ Altogether there are more than a dozen of these local cult names. While the first element of the name of Soknokonnis clearly places him in this group, there is considerable difference of opinion about the meaning of the second and third elements.⁷

The excavations of the temple did not produce any inscriptions or any reliefs or frescoes portraying the god. Until the discovery of the papyri from the archives of Soknobraisis, the cult of Soknokonnis at Bacchias was only known from three texts.⁸ These showed that he was worshipped in the village at least from 219-218 B. C. until some time in the first century A. D.⁹ The archaeological evidence, furthermore, made it seem improbable that the temple was built after the early third century B. C. The village of Bacchias is known to have existed as early as 256-255, and the temple most probably was built before that date, since the village seems to have developed around it.¹⁰

It is now known that a second crocodile god, named Soknobraisis, was worshipped at Bacchias. The first two elements of his name are familiar; the first is Σοκ, the crocodile, and the second is a variant of *nb*, "master." The meaning of the last element is less certain than that of the first two, and may be a place-name.¹¹ There is some variation in the spelling of the name.¹² I have adopted the form "Soknobraisis," rather than

⁶ The formation of the local cult names of the crocodile god is discussed by Kuentz, "Soknobraisis," *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 206-211 (n. 2 and n. 3 on p. 208 should be reversed). Soknebtunis is "the crocodile, lord of Tebtunis" and Soknopaios is "the crocodile, lord of the island." Petesouchos' name means "the gift of Souchos"; see U. Wilcken, "Der Labyrinthbauer Petesuchos," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* XXII (1884), pp. 136-139; see Kees, *s. v.* "Suchos," *RE* IV A, 548, for the places where Petesouchos was worshipped.

⁷ According to Spiegelberg (quoted in *Fayûm Towns*, p. 22, n. 1), Σοκαροβκορέις, the form of the name which appears in *P. Fay.* 18, is composed of the following elements: Σοκ (Sebek) + αροβ (Anubis) + κορευς (meaning obscure). Kuentz (*op. cit.*, p. 208), on the other hand, has explained the second element as a form of *nb*, "master." Hanell (*Bull. de Soc. roy. de Lund* 1937-1938, no. 5, p. 121, n. 1) suggests that Σοκαροβκορέις contains in it the name of Chon, the moon god. See the commentary on III, 1. 2.

⁸ See n. 3, above.

⁹ *P. Enteux.* 54; *P. Fay.* 137.

¹⁰ *P. Petrie* II, 6, 1. 8; *Fayûm Towns*, p. 36.

¹¹ Kuentz, *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 206-211 and J. Černý, "ΣΟΚΝΟΒΡΑΣΙΣ," *Ét. de Pap.* VI (1940), pp. 45-47 suggest several possibilities.

¹² The following variations appear in the genitive case: Σοκροβραϊσέως in I, 1. 5;

"Soknobrais," since it is spelled that way twice as often. Bataille spelled it "Socnobrais" because both times the name appeared in the Fouad papyri (VIII and XXIV) it had that spelling, and Kuentz, having only the Fouad papyri at his disposal, also used "Soknobrais."¹³

The papyri which mention Soknobrais date from the first half of the first century A. D. (XXIV) to 212 (XVI). Three of the texts (I-III) show that Soknokonnis and Soknobrais were worshipped at Bacchias simultaneously, at least until 171. It is not certain from present evidence whether they were both established in one temple, that is, the temple found during the excavations of the town¹⁴ or were housed in separate buildings. There are some indications that Soknobrais as well as Soknokonnis was worshipped in the temple in the center of the village. In the first place, no other temple was found by the excavators, and perhaps one would not expect to find two distinct *λόγια ιερά* (III, l. 4) in a small village such as Bacchias. For a *λόγιον ιερόν* seems to have been officially recognized as a temple of the first rank.¹⁵ The singular form *ιερόν*, moreover, occurs in a statement concerning liturgies made jointly by both priesthoods (II, l. 55). A double establishment under one roof would not be without parallel; Souchos and Haroëris were separately worshipped in the temple at Ombos.¹⁶ A close connection between the two priesthoods may be seen in the fact that in certain years they submitted joint *γραφαὶ ιερέων* (I-III). Even more striking evidence of this close association is found in the fact that they apparently received a certain income jointly.¹⁷

On the other hand, there is reason to believe that Soknobrais

IV, l. 7; VI, l. 6; XII, l. 4; XIII, ll. 7-8; XVI, l. 6; *Σοκνοβραϊσίου* in V, ll. 6-7; IX, l. 4 and XI, l. 5; *Σοκνοβράσεως* in VIII, l. 5; X, ll. 4-5; and XXIV, l. 4; *Σοκνοβράσιος* in II, l. 26; *Σοκομβρ[αίσεως?]* in XXII, l. 4. The orthography of such names was generally careless. Cf. the commentary on III, l. 2 for the spelling of Soknokonnis and Preisigke, *s. v.* "Socnebtunis," *Wörterbuch* III, 392-393. The nominative of Soknobrais, like that of Soknokonnis, may have ended in *-eus* rather than in *-is*.

¹³ Bataille, *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 197-205; Kuentz, *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 206-211.

¹⁴ Cf. Bataille (*op. cit.*, p. 199), who suggests that perhaps Soknobrais was a *σύνναος θεός* of Soknokonnis. It is to be remembered, however, that he did not have the evidence of the joint returns, I-III.

¹⁵ S. Schubart, *BGU* V, p. 32, n. 201; A. Calderini, "Sacerdozi e sacerdoti nell'Egitto degli Antonini," *Bilychnis* XVII (1921) I, p. 164.

¹⁶ Roeder, *s. v.* "Sobk," Roscher, *Lex.* IV, 1105-1106; G. Jéquier, *Les Temples ptolémaïques et romains (L'Architecture et la Décoration dans l'ancienne Égypte)*, Paris, 1924, pp. 5-7.

¹⁷ II, ll. 48-54, discussed on p. 206 below.

had a separate temple. The excavated temple in which Soknokonnis is known to have been worshipped does not have the architectural features of a double establishment such as that at Ombos. It is not impossible that a temple of Soknobrais was overlooked in the rather hasty excavations of the site.¹⁸ In II, a joint report, we find the phrase *ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς* (l. 6) and below [*ἐν ἱερῷ Σοκ]νοκόννεως* (l. 8) and *ἐν ἱερῷ Σοκνοβ[ράσ]ιου* (l. 26). It is evident from this text that each god had his own *ιερόν*, whether a separate building is implied or not.

In any event it is clear from the collection of texts as a whole that the two establishments were quite independent. Each had, that is, its own priesthood and presbyters, its own archives¹⁹ and temple furniture. The priests of Soknobrais made reports and petitions to officials without reference to the priesthood of Soknokonnis. One seems justified therefore in following the example of II and referring to the establishment of each god as a temple.

A third crocodile god, Pnepheros,²⁰ was possibly worshipped as a *σύνναος θεός* of both Soknokonnis and Soknobrais. A *ναός* of this god is listed among the furniture of each of them. *P. Oxy.* 1256, ll. 12-15 seems to indicate that a god became a *σύνναος θεός* when his shrine was placed in the temple of another god: [*ἐ]ρεδὸς Ἀνούβιδος καὶ Λητοῦς [καὶ] τῶν συννάων θεῶν [οἱ]ς συναθίδρυνται ναὸς θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ [Κα]ίσαρος ἱερῶν πρωτολογίμων.* The emperor Augustus²¹ seems to have been added to the number of *σύνναοι θεοί* in the temples of Anubis and Leto when his *ναός* was placed in them. The act of making him a *σύνναος θεός* is indicated in the *συν-* prefix (*συναθίδρυνται ναός*). The fact that Pnepheros is not designated *σύνναος θεός* in the texts does not necessarily mean that the god did not hold such a position. Although both Soknebtunis in Tebtunis and Soknopaios in Soknopaiou Nesos had associated *σύνναοι θεοί* in their temples, these *σύνναοι θεοί* were not in every case mentioned in the title of the temples.²²

¹⁸ Cf. the history of the excavations at Karanis in *Fayûm Towns*, pp. 27-35; A. E. R. Boak, *Karanis: Reports 1924-1931 (Univ. of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. XXX, Ann Arbor, 1933)*, pp. 3-55.

¹⁹ The papyri in this collection clearly indicate that the priesthood of Soknobrais kept separate archives. All the texts, with the exception of the joint reports, are apparently concerned with the affairs of Soknobrais exclusively.

²⁰ See Kees, *s. v.* "Suchos," *RE* IV A, 548; E. Breccia, "Teadelphia e il tempio di Pnepheros," *Monuments de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, Bergamo, 1926, I, pp. 87-131.

²¹ For the worship of the emperors as *σύνναοι θεοί*, see A. D. Nock, *Σύνναος Θεός, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* XLI (1930), pp. 1-62. *P. Oxy.* 1256 is not referred to in that article.

²² *P. Teb.* 295, l. 6; *BGU* 183, ll. 18-19.

One priest of Boubastis, two priests of Isis, besides priests of Soknobraisis and other undesignated priests in Bacchias are mentioned in XXIV (first century A.D.). The fact that one priest of Isis is listed in the *γραφὴ ἱερέων* of Soknobraisis for 188 (V) seems to indicate that Isis was worshipped in his temple. It is uncertain whether the cat goddess had a Boubasteion of her own, as was the rule elsewhere.²³

The Priesthood

Our papyri furnish considerable evidence for the size, organization, and membership of the priesthoods of Soknobraisis and Soknokonnis. In particular, they reveal that in regard to the organization of the priesthoods and the management of the temples, the situation at Bacchias differed in some respects from that found in the larger Egyptian temples, such as those at Soknopaiou Nesos and Tebtunis.

We are well informed about the number of priests²⁴ at Bacchias during the second century A.D., but what the size of the priesthoods had originally been in the Ptolemaic period we do not know, except that presumably it was considerably larger than in the later period. No. XXIV, dating from the first half of the first century A.D., states that the priests had decreased from a large number to a few. It is not known how many priests there were before and after this decrease. Moreover, we are not informed of its cause.²⁵ We do know, however, that the Egyptian temples in general suffered a loss of power and wealth when Egypt came under the control of the Romans. Although a reduction in the number of priests at Bacchias may not have been directly ordered by the Roman officials, the decrease may well have been the result of the general policy of the government. With the loss of their land and other sources of income, temples could hardly have been able to support so large a staff as formerly.

Unfortunately, there are no papyri from the first century A.D. later than XXIV, and we do not know whether the priesthoods continued to decrease in size during the century after Augustus.

²³ P. Lund 4 9, ll. 16-17 names a priest of the temple of Ammon in Bacchias. Reference should also be made here to the question to the oracle addressed to Dioskouroi found in the temple at Bacchias. See p. 182, n. 3.

²⁴ By "priests" I mean *ἱερείς*, that is, priests of high rank, in contrast to *pastophors* and other groups of priests of lower rank, who were separately organized.

²⁵ See Knudtzon's commentary on P. Lund 4 7.

Not until 116 is there any further evidence. At that time, Soknokonnis had twenty-two or twenty-three priests.²⁶ By 171, however, there were only twelve.²⁷ How many priests Soknobraisis had in 116 we do not know since the list in I is incomplete, but it seems probable that there was a similar decrease between 116 and 171. In 171 there were fourteen priests.²⁸ The priesthoods of these gods, reduced to only a dozen or so by 171, are in sharp contrast to the number at Soknopaiou Nesos and Tebtunis.²⁹

It is interesting to find that the number of priests of Soknobraisis increased from fourteen in 171 to fifteen in 178³⁰ and sixteen in 188.³¹ Perhaps this increase in the temple staff is a further indication of the government policy of conciliation toward the temples, shown in repeated promises of exemption from forced labor on the dikes during this same period.³²

It is not surprising to find that the organization was simpler than that found in the larger temples. The priesthoods of the Egyptian temples in both the Ptolemaic and Roman periods were regularly organized in five *φυλαί* or tribes, known as the *πενταφυλία*.³³ Yet there is no definite evidence for the *πενταφυλία* in the temples at Bacchias.³⁴ This fact may perhaps be attributed to their small size. The tribal division, as Otto pointed out,³⁵ had the practical purpose of rotating the priests in the per-

²⁶ I, ll. 21-42. See the commentary on I, ll. 2-5.

²⁷ II, ll. 15-25. Only eleven priests are listed, but the list does not include the presbyter who drew up the document.

²⁸ Thirteen are listed in II, ll. 34-47. To this number must be added the presbyter, Ammonios, who drew up the document and who is not found in the list. If the priesthood of Soknobraisis suffered a decrease between 116 and 171 corresponding to that of Soknokonnis, it probably numbered about twenty-six in 116.

²⁹ Although the size of the temple building of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos was actually slightly smaller than that found at Bacchias, the god had about eighty priests in the second century (BGU 406 + 627), and the temple of Soknebtunis at Tebtunis had at least fifty priests in the first and early second centuries (P. Teb. 298-299 and PSI 1146). The temple of Tebtunis was, of course, a large one. (See G. Bagnani, "Gli scavi di Tebtunis," *Aegyptus* XIV [1934], p. 5.)

³⁰ XXI, ll. 31-32. This is a list of those who claimed privileges with regard to labour on the dikes. In addition to the fifteen *ἄνδρες*, one *ἀφῆλιξ* is listed.

³¹ V. The last of the sixteen priests, is a *ἱερεὺς Ἰσίδος*.

³² See below, pp. 192-203.

³³ See W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1905-1908, I, pp. 23-38.

³⁴ There is an obscure reference to a *πενταφυλ(?) λεμησίας* in II, ll. 52-53.

³⁵ Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, pp. 24-25.



formance of the cult rites. When a priesthood numbered no more than fourteen priests, as those of Soknokonnis and Soknobrais, there was perhaps no rotation in the performance of duties and consequently no division into tribes.

In the Roman period the administration was in the hands of a college of presbyters who were chosen each year from the priests of the temple.³⁶ That of Soknebtunis had five presbyters in 107-108,³⁷ and ten in 116-117.³⁸ The number varied in the temple of Soknopaios also; there were usually five presbyters, but sometimes there were six,³⁹ and even seven.⁴⁰ The priesthood of Soknobrais, on the other hand, never appears to have had more than three presbyters.⁴¹ Evidence is lacking, but presumably the priesthood of Soknokonnis had the same or almost the same number.

The office of presbyter was an annual one.⁴² It appears likely, however, that in the priesthood of Soknobrais the office was held by the same priests in successive years.⁴³ Perhaps this was not the case in larger priesthoods. In any event, the same priests must have held the office many times, even if not in successive years, in priesthoods such as that of Soknobrais which had as few as fourteen members and yet had three presbyters.

The presbyters acted for their priesthood in presenting reports and petitions to government officials. It appears that there was no fixed rule which stipulated in what cases priesthoods should be represented by the entire college of presbyters.⁴⁴

The members of the priesthood were regularly chosen from

³⁶ See Otto, *op. cit.*, I, p. 47; O. Montevecchi, "Γραφαὶ ἱερέων," *Aegyptus* XII (1932), pp. 327-328; M. I. Rostovtzeff, "W. Otto, Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten. I. II," *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* CLXXI (1909), p. 615.

³⁷ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90). It is not clear how many there were in the unidentified temple referred to in *P. Bouriant* 41a; cf. Montevecchi, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-326.

³⁸ *P. Teb.* 309.

³⁹ See Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, p. 49, n. 2, where the evidence is collected.

⁴⁰ *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 184 (139), ll. 3-8; cf. the comment of Wilcken in "Urkunden-Referat," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* VII (1924), p. 108.

⁴¹ XXI, ll. 2-3 and 22-23; XXII, ll. 3-4. See the commentary on XIII, l. 7.

⁴² *Priester und Tempel* I, p. 50.

⁴³ See the commentary on VI, l. 5.

⁴⁴ The annual *γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* were usually drawn up by only one of the presbyters of the priests of Soknobrais (I-III, V-VI, VIII-XIII, and XVIII). Four times (IV, XIV, XV and XVI) the priest is not designated presbyter, and it is uncertain whether the priest was not a presbyter or whether the title was omitted. There is less evidence for the priesthood of Soknokonnis; I was submitted by a priest and II by a presbyter. One petition was drawn up by two presbyters of the priests of Soknobrais (XIX), and two others were

the sons of priests. The aspirant who claimed the right to priesthood had to furnish proof that his father and grandfather were priests.⁴⁵ One of the rules laid down in the Gnomon of the idios logos (91) was that when paternity was doubtful because of the age of the father, the aspirant could not be admitted to priesthood. It is rather surprising, then, in lists of priests from Bacchias, to find one priest of Soknobrais and one priest of Soknokonnis described as *ἀπάτωρ*.⁴⁶ The name of the mother, however, is given in both cases. Elsewhere the name of the father is always found, but not that of the mother. In no other temple is there evidence for a priest who was *ἀπάτωρ*.⁴⁷ The naming of the mothers of the two "fatherless" priests at Bacchias may not be without significance. Possibly the mothers were priestesses or were in some way connected with the temples, and if so, their illegitimate sons may have been given the right to enter the priesthood by special dispensation. If the two priests' claims had rested on the priestly rank of their maternal grandfathers, one would expect the name of the grandfather to be given.

The *γραφαὶ ἱερέων* from Bacchias enable one to compile statistics for the age of the priests. The youngest priests were thirteen.⁴⁸ In the temple of Soknopaios we know of none younger than seventeen and eighteen,⁴⁹ but in other temples boys of fourteen and fifteen were admitted to priesthood.⁵⁰ The sons of the priests who were candidates for priesthood were designated *ἀφήλικες*.⁵¹ Apparently there was no regulation providing that

written by three presbyters (XXI, ll. 2-3 and 22-23). A petition from the temple of Soknopaios was addressed by the entire college (*Stud. Pal.* XXII, 184). On the other hand, one from the temple of Soknebtunis was presented by a single presbyter (*P. Teb.* 302).

⁴⁵ Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, pp. 217-230.

⁴⁶ II, ll. 19 and 41-42.

⁴⁷ In the Ptolemaic period, if a priest married outside his own class, his children were considered illegitimate. See R. Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, New York, 1944, p. 82 and n. 19. There is evidence for a regular system of prostitution in the temple of Soknebtunis in the Ptolemaic period. Of fifty temple servants or slaves, the majority were born within the temple precinct, and all but seven are described as *ἀπάτωρ*. The mother's name is invariably given, but we do not know if she held the rank of priestess. In no case, however, is there evidence that one of these sons of prostitutes became a priest. See H. Thompson, "Self-Dedications," *Actes du V Congrès International de Papyrologie*, 1938, pp. 497-504. Cf. Herod. 2. 64, where the practice of prostitution in Egyptian temples is denied.

⁴⁸ V, ll. 27-28.

⁴⁹ *BGU* 406, Col. II, ll. 14 and 18.

⁵⁰ See Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, I, p. 211, and *SB* 779.

⁵¹ One *ἀφήλις* of the temple of Soknobrais is mentioned in a list of priests claiming special privileges with regard to labor on the dikes in 178 (XXI, l. 32).

the priests retire at a certain age. We find among the *γραφαὶ* many in their late sixties or seventies. Particularly striking is the case of one of the priests of Soknokonnis who was eighty-seven.⁵² Of those of Soknokonnis in 171, one was between thirty and forty; three between forty and fifty; three between fifty and sixty; two between sixty and seventy; and three over seventy.⁵³ Of the priests of Soknobraisis in the same year, three were in their twenties; one in his thirties; three in their forties; one in his fifties; and six in their sixties.⁵⁴ Of those of Soknokonnis whose ages we know in 116, two were in their thirties, three in their forties, two in their fifties, and two were sixty.⁵⁵ The age of the majority of the priests makes it obvious that there had been no admission of young priests on a large scale for a number of years.⁵⁶

It is difficult to distinguish individual priests from one another in many cases because they often have identical names. There are, for example, three priests called Peteuris, all three sons of a Peteuris, among the fourteen priests of Soknobraisis in 171. Peteuris, son of Peteuris, presbyter in 188, however, is distinguished from the other priests of that name by the addition of his grandfather's name, Mysthes (V, VI and VIII). In four cases we can distinguish a family relationship; the name of a priest is followed by that of another who is described as his brother.⁵⁷

In no case are the *ιερείς* at Bacchias designated by their priestly titles of prophet, stolistes, pterophor, or the like. There was a clear distinction made, however, between *ιερείς*, that is, the priests of higher rank, and pastophors, who were priests of lower rank. When the priests petitioned for exemption from dike work, they were described as *ιερείς καὶ παστοφόροι*.⁵⁸ The pastophors are not included in the *γραφή ἱερέων*.⁵⁹ Unfortunately it is impossible to

⁵² II, l. 17.

⁵³ See II, ll. 15-25 and l. 58.

⁵⁴ See II, ll. 34-47 and 59.

⁵⁵ See I, ll. 21-30; the list is not complete, however.

⁵⁶ A list from the temple of Soknopaios (BGU 406 + 627, second or early third century) furnishes a striking contrast. Of forty seven whose age can be determined from the papyrus, all but nine were under forty. The comparative youth of the priests in that list would indicate either that an older generation of priests had recently been replaced to a large extent or that the temple staff was increased by an addition of young priests. V shows a similar situation in the temple of Soknobraisis in 188.

⁵⁷ I, ll. 23-28; II, l. 46.

⁵⁸ XX, l. 1; XXI, l. 14.

⁵⁹ The pastophors of the temple of Isis Nanaija at Nabana had their own presbyters and presented their own *γραφή παστοφόρων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* (P. Lond.

make even a rough estimate of the temple staff as a whole since we do not know the number of pastophors, nor even what other minor priests or attendants were attached to the temple.

Γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ

The Egyptian temples were required by the Roman government to submit an annual report on the number of the priests and the inventory of the temples. This document was called a *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*.⁶⁰ No *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* has been found which dates from the Ptolemaic period, but it is probable that some such report was required at that time. As a matter of fact, we do have a *γραφή* (ν) ἱερέων καὶ πρ[οφ]ητῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν λειτουργικῶν (καὶ) τῶν ὑπαρ[χ]όντων περὶ τὴν κόμην from Kerkeosiris, dated 115-114 B. C.⁶¹ This document was compiled by a government official, the komogrammateus, and presumably included all the temples of the village.⁶² The Roman *γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* of the second and third centuries A. D., on the other hand, were drawn up by the priests themselves and submitted to the government, and in most cases each priesthood made out its own report separately.

There are a considerable number of *γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*,

845 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 102], dated 193). Likewise the *θεολογ* in the temple of Sokopichonsis at Tebtunis submitted their own *γραφή* (BGU 1023, dated 185-186).

⁶⁰ The *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* has been discussed in C. Wessely, "Karanis und Soknopaiu Nesos," *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, phil.-hist. Kl. XLVII (1902), Abh. 4, pp. 56-81; B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, introduction to *P. Teb.* 298; Otto, *Priester und Tempel* II, pp. 150-155; Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1912, I, 1, p. 128; T. Grassi, "Le liste templari nell'Egitto greco-romano," *Studi della Scuola papirologica* (R. Accademia scientifico-letteraria in Milano) IV (1926), Parte 4; Montevicchi, *Aegyptus* XII (1932), pp. 317-328; Bataille, *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 197-205; Hanell, *Bull. de la Soc. roy. de Lund* 1937-1938, no. 5, pp. 123-128; M. Hombert and C. Préaux, "Les papyrus de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth," *Chronique d'Égypte* XXIX (1940), pp. 148-149. *Χειρισμός* in the phrase *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* has been variously translated by these scholars. I have taken *γραφή χειρισμοῦ* to mean inventory (of temple furniture). The content of V shows that statements on the financial administration of the temple were not invariably included in the *γραφή χειρισμοῦ*. In the phrases *γραφή τῶν χειρισμῶν* (P. RyI. 110, ll. 9-10) and *ἐξέτασις χειρισμῶν* (VI, l. 3) *χειρισμοί* means "the articles inventoried" or "the furniture." In *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 73 (cf. *BL* I, p. 37 and n. 4) a basilikos grammateus acknowledged receipt of a *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* with the phrase *ἔσχον τὸν προκείμενον χειρισμῶν*. Here *χειρισμός* is equivalent to *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* and means "a report."

⁶¹ P. Teb. 88 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 67), ll. 2-4.

⁶² Cf. P. Oxy. 1256.

all dating from the second and third centuries A.D.⁶³ But before the discovery of the archives of Soknobraisis, there was not one completely preserved text, and most of the *γραφαί* were extremely fragmentary. It is of interest, therefore, that from the archives of Soknobraisis we now have six *γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* (I-VI), of which II and V are complete.

No. II contains, first, lists of the furniture and priests of Soknokonnis, followed by similar lists of the furniture and priests of Soknobraisis. It concludes with a brief statement enumerating the obligations—taxes and liturgies—which were met by the priests during the year. Nos. I and III are fragments of the beginning of similar documents. V, on the other hand, contains the lists of the furniture and priests of only one god, Soknobraisis, and it lacks a concluding statement such as that in II. Similar to the beginning of this text are the fragments IV and VI. All these documents, whether from one priesthood or both, are almost identical in content and arrangement, except for the concluding statement which appears in II.

The *γραφαί* from other temples, however, show that there was some variation in the content and arrangement of this type of document. *BGU* 590 + 162 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 91, time of Commodus) from the temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos is similar in content and arrangement to the Bacchias texts, in so far as it is preserved.⁶⁴ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90), dated 107-108, from the temple of Soknebtunis, on the other hand, begins with a list of priests and, after a lacuna of undetermined length, ends with a detailed account of temple finances—income and expenditure—which is not found in the Bacchias texts. A list of furniture may have filled part of the lacuna. Similarly, *P. Rainer* 8 (Wessely, *Sokn. Nes.* 8; first half of the second century) contains an account of temple finances combined with a list of priests and a list of furniture from the temple of Soknopaios.⁶⁵

⁶³ See Montevicchi, *Aegyptus* XII (1932), p. 317. From her list should be removed *BGU* 296 and *P. Lond.* 353 (see p. 195 n. 77, below).

⁶⁴ *PSI* 950 (from an unidentified temple in the third century A.D.); *BGU* 387 (from the temple of Soknopaios, 177-181; see *BL* I, p. 43); and *BGU* 488 (from the temple of another crocodile god in the Arsinoite nome, second century) begin similarly with a list of furniture but break off before a list of priests. See p. 195, n. 77 below for a new reading of *BGU* 488.

⁶⁵ Unfortunately this text was incompletely published by Wessely, *Denkschrift. Ak. Wien* XLVII (1902), Abh. 4, pp. 58-60 and 71 f., and it is impossible to tell from his description what the arrangement of the document was, except that the account of finances seems to have followed the list of priests. There are several other fragments which seem to be accounts of finances from temples.

Another variation was the separation of the various parts of the *γραφή ἱερων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*. In the second half of the third century, an Egyptian temple in the city of Hermopolis was required to submit to the high prophet of Alexandria *τὴν γραφὴν ἡμῶν τε αὐτῶν [καὶ τῶν ἀφη]λίκων παίδων μετὰ καὶ τῆς γραφῆς τῶν χειρισμῶν [καὶ τῶν προσό]δων*.⁶⁶ The list of furniture, entitled *γραφή τῶν χειρισμῶν*, is submitted separately.⁶⁷

The majority of the *γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* were drawn up by individual priesthoods. Three of the texts from Bacchias (I-III), however, are *γραφαί* from the two priesthoods of Soknobraisis and Soknokonnis. Of these, I is dated 116; II and III, 171. Of the single *γραφαί* from the priesthood of Soknobraisis alone IV is dated 172; V is dated 188; VI, 184-192. It will be noted that none of the *γραφαί* submitted jointly dates after 171, and that those drawn up for the temple of Soknobraisis separately date after that year, one in 172. A receipt for a *γραφή* in 209 (XV), however, may indicate a joint report in that year. It is uncertain whether this uniformity of practice was maintained over long periods, or whether changes in the method of reporting were comparatively frequent. It is possible that certain government officials at various times required a joint *γραφή* from the two priesthoods, and others a separate *γραφή* from each one, but unfortunately the evidence is insufficient to determine whether this was so.

There was also considerable variation within the lists of priests (*γραφαὶ ἱερέων*). The lists of priests at Bacchias are headed with the statement that the priests whose names follow have been examined and have paid the *εἰσκριτικόν*. The name of each priest, his father's name, and his age are given. This description is briefer than that found in most lists of priests from other temples. *BGU* 1196, like the lists from Bacchias, gives only the name of

They may be fragments of documents similar to *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90) and *P. Rainer* 8; *P. Aber.* 62 (first century A.D.), probably from Soknopaiou Nesos; four second-century texts from Soknopaiou Nesos: *BGU* 337 + 1 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 92); *BGU* 149 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 93); *P. Brua.* 7535 (published in *Chron. d'Égypte* XXIX [1940], pp. 134-149); *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 183; also *P. Oxy.* 1143 (ca. 1 A.D.) and 1144 (late first or early second century A.D.) from Oxyrhynchite temples.

⁶⁶ *P. Ryl.* 110, ll. 8-10. [*καὶ τῶν προσό]δων* is my restoration, though the space suggests that perhaps the article was omitted. Cf. VI, l. 3. The reading of the editors is [*καὶ τῶν εἰ]δῶν*.

⁶⁷ *P. Ryl.* 110, ll. 10-19. *P. Jand.* 34 (see *BL* I, p. 199) refers to a *γραφή χειρισμοῦ*. Here, however, the phrase may stand for the whole *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*, just as *χειρισμός* was sometimes used to designate the *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*. See above, p. 191, n. 60.

the priest and of his father, and *P. Bouriant* 41a likewise does not name the grandfather, although the name of the priest's mother is given.⁶⁸ Usually, however, the names of the paternal grandfather and of the mother are both given.⁶⁹ In two lists, the maternal grandfather was also named.⁷⁰ Such a description avoided the confusion between priests of the same name which exists in the Bacchias list.

All the lists agree in giving the age of each priest (with one exception)⁷¹ and in the general order of listing. The priests are arranged, when any principle is evident, not alphabetically nor according to age, but by family relationship.⁷² In most cases there is no designation of priestly title after the name of each priest.⁷³

It is difficult to determine whether or not the officials usually required that the *γραφαί* be submitted under oath, because of the fragmentary condition of most of the texts. Usually *ἀπογραφαί* of all sorts were unsworn in the Arsinoite nome,⁷⁴ and II and V, the only completely preserved *γραφαί*, are not exceptions to that rule. *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90), however, and *P. Ryl.* 110, a temple *γραφή* from the Hermopolite nome, conclude with oaths. *PSI* 950, a text of unknown provenance, begins with one. The most that one can say with certainty, then, is that within the Arsinoite nome, we have one sworn *γραφή* and two unsworn; from the Hermopolite nome, one sworn *γραφή*; and one sworn *γραφή* from an unknown place.⁷⁵

The temples obtained a receipt or *ἀποχή* from the official to

⁶⁸ *BGU* 1196 is a list of priests, probably from Bousiris, dated 12-11 B.C. *P. Bouriant* 41a, dated 197 A.D., includes a copy of a list of priests from an unknown temple with other official documents. For three exceptions to the rule in the Bacchias lists, see p. 189 and n. 46 and p. 190.

⁶⁹ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90); three second century lists from Soknopaiou Nesos: *BGU* 162 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 91); 258; 406 + 627.

⁷⁰ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90); *BGU* 406 + 627; perhaps also *BGU* 258.

⁷¹ *BGU* 1196.

⁷² This is particularly clear in *BGU* 406 + 627 in which a priest is followed by his sons, according to age, and then by his younger brother and his sons.

⁷³ In *BGU* 1196, however, one of the priests is called prophet (l. 32) and another pterophor (l. 37). *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90) gives not only the priestly title but the year of examination and fee paid.

⁷⁴ See E. Seidl, *Der Eid im römisch-ägyptischen Provinzialrecht*, Erster Teil, Munich, 1933, pp. 65-66; A. M. Harmon, "Egyptian Property Returns," *Yale Classical Studies* IV (1934), p. 167 and n. 38.

⁷⁵ See also *P. Oxy.* 1029, a sworn *γραφή* of hieroglyphic carvers, one of whom (ll. 15-16) was attached to a temple, submitted to the basilikos grammateus of the Oxyrhynchite nome in 107.

whom they submitted a *γραφή*. This receipt was in the form of a letter of transmittal written by the priests and accompanying the *γραφή*.⁷⁶ It was endorsed by the official when he received the *γραφή* and was then returned as a receipt to the temple archives.⁷⁷ There is virtually no variation in the formula of the priests' statement, but there is some difference in the endorsement of the officials. This is quite natural since the receipts were endorsed in different offices. Nos. XIII-XVI signed by the basilikos grammateus read: *κατεχωρίσθη βασιλικῶ γραμματέι*. The two receipts from the office of the strategos (VIII and XI) were both signed: *κατεχωρίσθη στρατηγῶ διὰ τοῦ δέινος*. On the other hand, *ὁ δείνα σεση (μείωμαι)* is the formula used by the bibliophylax (XII) and the receivers of the documents for the eklogistes (IX).⁷⁸

The procedure of presenting the *γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* was not completed when the *γραφή* was filed in the office of the official and the receipt (endorsed letter of transmittal) was deposited in the archives of the temple. A further step was taken by the priests, who presented to the official an acknowledgment of the

⁷⁶ There are ten of these documents (VIII-XVII) from the archives of Soknobraisis, and three from the temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos: *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 73; *BGU* 296 (see *BL* I, p. 37); and *P. Lond.* 353.

⁷⁷ Bataille (*Ét. de Pap.* IV [1938], p. 199) first pointed out that this type of document was intended as a receipt and was, in fact, called an *ἀποχή* in *P. Jand.* 34. Montevocchi (*Aegyptus* XII [1932], p. 322) had misunderstood *BGU* 296 and *P. Lond.* 353, which are receipts, as extracts or duplicates of the *γραφή*. Preisigke (*BL* I, p. 48) mistook *BGU* 488, which is a *γραφή* and contains the beginning of an inventory of furniture, for a receipt. He restored ll. 5-6 as follows: *με]γίστων κόμ[ης . . . κατεχωρίσασμέν σοι γραφήν ἱερέων] | καὶ χειρισμο[ῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ] | ἐνεστώτος . . .* This makes l. 5 much too long (39 letters besides the name of the village), in comparison with the other lines (l. 1 is only 26 letters) *γραφή ἱερέων*. The length of this restoration is much more suitable (letters long). My restoration of l. 5 is: *με]γίστων κόμ[ης]* (a name with ca. 10 letters). Montevocchi followed Preisigke's restoration and because of the *καταχωρίζεω* formula which he had restored, mistook the text for a document similar to *BGU* 296 and *P. Lond.* 353, which are receipts, not *γραφαί*, as *BGU* 488 actually is.

⁷⁸ Yet one cannot conclude that there was never a variation within one office. In X, addressed to Hermophilos, the basilikos grammateus, the signature reads *δὲ Έρ(μοφίλου)*, while *BGU* 296 and *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 73 from the temple of Soknopaios are both signed: *βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς Έρακλείδου μερίδος ἔσχον τὸν προκειμένον χειρισμὸν* (see *BL* I, p. 37). *P. Lond.* 353 was signed by the basilikos grammateus either *[ἐσημειώ]θη* or *[κατεχωρίσ]θη*. Bataille (*op. cit.*, p. 199, n. 6) did not believe the character of *P. Lond.* 353 was as clear as that of the other receipts because the editors did not indicate a change of hand in the signature. An examination of the photograph (Pl. LXXXIV), however, indicates a definite difference in the handwriting between the statements of the priests and the official: the *μ*, *ε* and *ρ* of the official are not those of *μερίδος* (l. 1) and *η* is also different.



receipt. No. XVIII from Bacchias and *P. Jand.* 34 from an unidentified temple are two such acknowledgments. The form of these documents is in part similar to that of a receipt. After the address to the official we find the statement: *κατεχάρισά σοι γραφήν . . .*, but the following phrase is added: *καὶ ἔσχον* (or *ἔσχομεν*) *τὴν ἀποχήν*.

There is another similar acknowledgment of a receipt for a different type of return (*SB* 7342).⁷⁹ Since there are three acknowledgments of receipts almost identical in formula, one may assume that the acknowledgment of a receipt was not extraordinary, but a practice regular enough for the formula of the document to have become standardized. It does perhaps seem unnecessary to acknowledge a receipt, and it may be well to consider why it was done.⁸⁰ One might regard the acknowledgment as a form of receipt, that is, a receipt kept by the official as proof that he had given the priests their receipt, the endorsed letter of transmittal. The purpose of a receipt is to protect the addressee. Such an acknowledgment would forestall any subsequent complaints on the part of the priests that the official had not given them a receipt for the *γραφή*.⁸¹

It is indicated in the *γραφή* itself that it was submitted annually: *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος . . . ἔτους*, that is, a report for the current year. It was regularly submitted in the last month of the Egyptian year, Mesore. Five of the receipts are dated Mesore the fifth intercalary day.⁸² Probably the *γραφὴ*

⁷⁹ *SB* 7342 (S. Möller, *Griechische Papyri aus dem Berliner Museum*, Göteborg, 1929, pp. 54-58, no. 5, dated 145, place unknown) is an unaddressed acknowledgment of a receipt for a return written by the *ἐπιτηρηταὶ Ἐξωπύλης καὶ ἔχανοδέσμων*. Cf. *P. RyI.* 83.

⁸⁰ Möller (*loc. cit.*), who failed to cite *P. Jand.* 34 as a parallel for *SB* 7342 (*Griech. Pap.* 5), did not recognize the acknowledgment of a receipt as a regular procedure. As an explanation of the text, he suggested that the official to whom it was addressed had demanded a report which had already been submitted, either because the first report was mislaid or in order to exercise stricter control. But it is doubtful, in my opinion, if these documents were all written as a result of a demand for returns which had already been filed. If that were the case, the documents would probably be less brief and standardized, perhaps even in the style of complaints.

⁸¹ One need not be troubled by the fact that XVIII, an acknowledgment addressed to the basilikos grammateus, was found in the archives of the temple. It is most probably a copy of the original document which was actually sent to the basilikos grammateus. It is to be remembered that the *γραφαὶ* and various petitions found in the archives must be copies of the original documents which were sent to the officials to whom they were addressed. Apparently the archives of the temple contained a record of all official correspondence in the form of copies.

⁸² Nos. IX-XI and XIV-XV. No. XVI and *P. Lond.* 353 (from Soknopaiou

had to be submitted before the end of the year, and the priests delayed until the last possible day. No. XVIII shows that before the close of the year (the seventh year of Septimius, 198-199?), the temple of Soknobraisis had presented its *γραφὴ* to the basilikos grammateus, obtained a receipt, and acknowledged the receipt. *P. Jand.* 34, on the other hand, reveals that an unidentified temple did not acknowledge the receipt for almost three months after the new year had begun.

The papyri from the archives of the temple of Soknobraisis show that a *γραφὴ* was submitted to at least five different officials. These officials were the strategos, the basilikos grammateus, the bibliophylax, the eklogistes, and the inspector (*ἐξεταστής*) appointed by the idios logos.

There are several reasons why a *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* was submitted to the strategos. He acted as the local representative of the archiereus of Egypt in the supervision of the priests and the temples. The temples quite naturally furnished him with an annual report of the number of priests and their status. Moreover, as the official responsible for the collection of taxes in the nome, the strategos probably made use of such information as that concerning the number of priests to check the returns of the collectors.

The basilikos grammateus was particularly concerned with the financial side of the administration of the nome, and he received returns of all kinds. Since he kept a list of people subject to the poll tax, and placed these lists at the disposal of the tax collector, he required information concerning the number of priests in each temple.⁸³

It is likewise not surprising to find that a *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* was submitted by the priests to the *βιβλιοφύλακες τῶν δημοσίων λόγων*, where the financial statements of the nome were filed.

The eklogistes, to whom the priests also submitted a *γραφὴ*, was a financial officer of the nome.⁸⁴ It was his duty to compute the tax assessments and to audit the accounts. The priests were

Nesos) are dated on the thirtieth of Mesore. No. II, a *γραφὴ*, is dated the eighteenth of Mesore; V, Mesore the fourth intercalary day; *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90) from Tebtunis and XIII, Mesore the fifth; *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 183 sometime in Mesore; XVII the first of Mesore.

⁸³ E. Biedermann, *Studien zur ägyptischen Verwaltungsgeschichte in ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit. Der Basilikos Grammateus*, Berlin, 1913, p. 36.

⁸⁴ See S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, Princeton, 1938, pp. 32-33. Bibliography is cited by Wallace, *op. cit.*, p. 369, n. 12.

required to give him information concerning the size of their priesthood. No doubt he also required an annual account of income and expenditure which was sometimes included in the *γραφή* in order that he might judge the size and wealth of the temples and assess the taxes accordingly.

The fifth official to whom it is known that the priests submitted a *γραφή* is the inspector (*ἐξεραστής*) appointed by the idios logos (VI). He travelled around personally examining financial administration of the temples. He appears to have made a practice of arriving unexpectedly, and the priests passed word around to warn when his arrival might be looked for. He had authority to take into custody any priest who failed to comply with regulations and to bring him before the archiereus at Alexandria. He undoubtedly checked the *γραφή* in person when he visited each temple.

The idios logos, who appointed this inspector, it is to be remembered, was a financial officer who had charge of special accounts from various irregular sources of revenue such as land which had been confiscated or was ownerless, and all sorts of fines.⁸⁵ The Gnomon of the idios logos laid down certain rules concerning the functions of different ranks of priests and fines for infraction of these rules. It also forbade the priests to lend out temple funds at interest, and ruled that one-fifth of the income of the temple should be given to the prophet of the temple.⁸⁶ The inspector would inform the idios logos if there were any infractions of rules for which fines should be paid. Charged with such a duty, he was of course not a welcome visitor at the temples. It was natural for the priests to inform one another when he was approaching and to fear him as a harsh man.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ G. Plaumann, s. v. "Ἰδιος λόγος, RE IX, 882-903, and "Der Idioslogos," *Abhandlungen der Königl. Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1918, no. 17; *Gnom. Id. Log. (BGU V. 1)*; H. S. Jones, *Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy*, Oxford, 1920; J. Scherer, "Papyrus Fouad 1^{er} inv. 211," *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale* XLI (1942), pp. 43-73.

⁸⁶ Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 25: "The reason why these provisions are mentioned in the Gnomon is no doubt because the *ἴδιος λόγος* was concerned, not directly with the maintenance of the cult as such, but with the status of the various grades of ministrants, partly because the posts to which emoluments were attached were sold by the Government, sometimes, though not always, by auction, partly, no doubt, because pecuniary penalties attached to any attempt to usurp the title or privileges of a higher grade."

⁸⁸ P. Teb. 315 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 71), ll. 18-19, ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος λείαν ἐστὶ[ν] ἀστρηρός.

Liturgies and Taxation of the Priests

It is not known whether the priests of Soknobraisis enjoyed any special privileges in respect to labor on the dikes before 171 A. D., the date of the first document from the archives which mentions that liturgy. In the annual *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*, dated August 11 of that year, the priests state that they have performed the work on the dikes.⁸⁹ Although they performed the required labor, they did it unwillingly, and earlier in this same year they had complained to the strategos (XIX), taking the first step in an attempt to gain a privileged position. On June 14 they addressed a petition to the strategos, Potamon, in which they complained that it was not the custom for them to be sent away from Bacchias to do dike work, but that the ekboleus, who was appointed by the aigialophylax, was forcing them to work far away from Bacchias. They asked the strategos to order the ekboleus to stop his outrageous treatment of them so that they could work near to the temple and perform their religious duties. In this petition the priests do not complain because they are forced to work on the dikes, but because they are forced to do that work far from home.⁹⁰ If they hoped eventually to gain further privileges, they did not express the desire in this petition to the strategos. The priests very likely thought that if they were successful in this petition, they might hope to gain an even greater privilege. It is also possible that the priests did not ask the strategos for anything more because they intended to appeal directly to the archiereus at Alexandria. It is to be noted that in the petition to the strategos the priests do not refer to any privileges previously granted to them. They refer only to what was customary. Unlike the priests of an unidentified temple in the time of Hadrian,⁹¹ they do not say that they are entitled to exemption because their temple is *λόγιμον*, though it is certain that the temple of Soknobraisis was called *λόγιμον*.⁹² If the priests of temples called *λόγιμα* were generally exempt from labor on the dikes in the time of Hadrian, it would appear that by 171 the situation had changed.

Whether or not the petition of the priests to the strategos

⁸⁹ II, ll. 56-57.

⁹⁰ Cf. BGU 15 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 393, dated 194) in which the prefect ruled that a man could not be forced to perform a liturgical duty elsewhere than in his own village. The liturgy referred to in this text, however, is the holding of public office.

⁹¹ BGU 176 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 83).

⁹² See p. 184 above.

asking that they be allowed to work near home had the desired effect is not certain. In any case it was not long before they appealed to a higher authority to intercede with the local dike officials in their behalf. Barely two months after the petition to the strategos, on September 26, the priests appeared before the archiereus of Egypt, Ulpius Serenianus, and complained that the officials forced them to work in person on the dikes, contrary to his order.⁹³ If the archiereus had granted definite privileges expressly to the priests in the order to which they refer, the grant would seem to have been made after the petition was sent to the strategos on June 14, since it is not mentioned in that text. This would mean that within two months the priests had received an order from the archiereus giving them certain rights, that the order had been disregarded by the local officials, and that the priests had appealed again for a second order.⁹⁴ It is possible, however, that the order of the archiereus which they claim had been disregarded was a general order issued by the high priest defining the rights of priests in all temples.⁹⁵ In his decision at the conclusion of the audience, the archiereus said that the strategos should see that force was not used.⁹⁶ Presumably, the archiereus meant by this statement that the priests would not be forced to labor in person on the dikes.

Apparently the priests had difficulty in maintaining this exemption from forced labor on the dikes. Seven years later, in 178, they brought to the strategos and the basilikos grammateus copies of a petition which they had presented to Ulpius Serenianus, the archiereus, with his endorsement.⁹⁷ Unfortunately we have only covering letters, dated 178, not the petition itself. Yet these covering letters suffice to show that on the strength of this endorsed petition and certain accompanying orders from the strategos to the basilikos grammateus, the priests claimed freedom from laboring in person on the dikes.⁹⁸

⁹³ XX.

⁹⁴ It is possible that such an order was disregarded between June and September; this was the season when the labor on the dikes was done. See F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, Leipzig, 1917, pp. 62-82.

⁹⁵ Cf. *P. Aber.* 16, an open circular letter to the nome officials, concerning immunity of the priests from liturgies.

⁹⁶ XX, l. 10.

⁹⁷ XXI.

⁹⁸ XXI, ll. 24-29. The date of the petition itself is not given, and we cannot therefore determine whether it was presented to the archiereus in the same year as its covering letters or whether it belonged to an earlier period, perhaps to the time of the audience in 171, and was for some reason presented to the local officials at this later date.

Wherever they are explicit, the documents we have seem to be concerned exclusively with petitions of the priests of Soknobraisis alone in regard to work on the dikes. This is not strange, for the papyri come from that god's archives. It is very likely, however, that the priests of Soknokonnis were presenting their own petitions at the same time and perhaps in conjunction with the other priesthood. Together they made the statement in II that they had performed the labor. It would be surprising if one priesthood attempted to gain exemption and the other did not.

Although the priests did claim exemption from working *in person* on the dikes, they may still have been held responsible for the liturgy. There are several ways in which they might have met the obligation without doing the work themselves. The dike officials might have used the labor of the priests' sons who were not yet officially recognized as *ιερείς*.⁹⁹ Or the villagers of Bacchias might have made an agreement to assume the liturgies of the priests, in return for which the temple would make some financial compensation.¹⁰⁰ The priests might also have paid to the government a tax in lieu of doing the work, that is, an *adaeratio*.¹⁰¹

The payment of a tax, however, would be no solution to a problem which faced the irrigation officials—shortage of labor.¹⁰² Because of the urgent necessity of accomplishing the dike work, the irrigation officials may have been forced to draft the priests in spite of their claims to exemption. The strategos, no doubt, realized that there was a need for the labor of the priests, and

⁹⁹ This substitution is suggested by *BGU* 176 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 83). There has been considerable difference of opinion as to what *παίδες* in that text means. Wilcken (*Chrest.* 83) was inclined to think that they were slaves, but in his review of Hanell's publication, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 234, n. 1, he has apparently changed to the view that they are the sons of priests.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *BGU* 194 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 84) in which the village of Nilopolis assumed the *πρακτορία ἀργυρικῶν* for the priests in 177.

¹⁰¹ See Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, pp. 140-143. *P. Lund* 4 1 indicates that there was some such arrangement as this in 198. In this text the priests complain to the prefect that although they have paid their head tax of eight drachmae, they have been fined one hundred and twenty drachmae for not performing work on the dikes.

¹⁰² The years between 171 and 179 were difficult ones for the whole Roman Empire. Its resources and manpower were sorely taxed by the war in Germany and by the terrible plague which had broken out in 165 and which for several years devastated the empire. Egypt was one of the provinces affected by the plague, and its burdens must have been made heavier by the other difficulties in the period. The situation in the Fayûm, moreover, would have been particularly bad if the depopulation of that area had already begun by the second half of the second century (see n. 103 below).

he perhaps considered that the irrigation officials were not unjustified in their claim upon the services of the priests. He was in a rather awkward position. As the local representative of the archiereus, he was obliged to carry out the order of that official to respect the rights of the priests, but as the administrative head of the nome, he was obliged to see to it that the work was done on the dikes and canals. For it was absolutely essential to the very life of the Fayûm that its irrigation system should be kept working efficiently. When the irrigation system did finally fall into a state of hopeless disrepair in many parts of the Fayûm in the third century, Bacchias and other villages became a desert.¹⁰³

In contrast to the pressure brought to bear on the priests by local irrigation officials was the policy of conciliation shown by the archiereus in his repeated promises of exemption from labor in person on the dikes and perhaps also in the increase in the size of the priesthood.¹⁰⁴ This policy was probably part of an attempt of the government to conciliate and placate the Egyptian priests at the time of the revolt in the Boukolia. The inhabitants of this district in the Delta near Alexandria began a revolt under the leadership of a priest by the name of Isidoros. They killed a centurion, defeated Roman troops in a battle, and would have captured Alexandria but for the intervention of Avidius Cassius, the governor of Syria, who succeeded in putting down the revolt in 172-173. Isidoros, the priest, is said to have surpassed all his contemporaries in bravery, and the successes which he achieved before his final defeat may have awakened in the Roman government a realization of the threat to their peaceful rule of the province which lay in the power of the native priesthood. At a time when even more pressing dangers claimed the attention of the imperial forces in the north, it was probably thought more expedient to conciliate the priests by granting them certain favors than to attempt to crush them by taking away other privileges and risk a spread of the revolt. It was, in general, the policy of the emperor, Marcus Aurelius, to treat rebels with clemency. Avidius Cassius, who had defeated Isidoros and his followers, led a revolt himself in 175. After its collapse, when the

¹⁰³ See *Fayûm Towns*, p. 16, for the abandonment of Bacchias and other sites by the fourth century A. D. *P. Fouad* 29 shows that by 224 there was no Nile water at Bacchias and the inhabitants were forced to look for water at a distance. This text elucidates *P. Lond.* 322 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 358) (214-215), in which there is a list of twelve persons migrating from Bacchias to Soknopaiou Nesos. The cause of the migration was very likely the lack of water.

¹⁰⁴ See p. 187, above.

emperor visited the Eastern provinces, he treated the supporters of Cassius with mildness.

The obligation to cultivate state land was perhaps a heavier burden than the labor on the dikes. Unfortunately the papyri furnish us with no information about the performance of this duty except for the brief statement at the conclusion of the *γραφή* for 171 that the priests cultivated state land.¹⁰⁵ They may not have acquiesced in this burden any more willingly than they did in the labor on the dikes, and perhaps from time to time they made an attempt to gain exemption from it. The priests of the neighboring temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos succeeded in securing from the prefect an order freeing them from this liturgy in 53-54 A. D.¹⁰⁶

The priests paid a tax amounting to twelve drachmae called the *εἰσκριτικόν*. This was a fee set upon admission into the priesthood and was not probably paid annually.¹⁰⁷ The information concerning the payment of the tax by the priests at Bacchias is found in the headings of the *γραφαὶ ἱερέων*. The lists of priests are introduced by the phrase *ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἱερέων τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα πάντων ἐπιτεκμημένων ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ἕβ και διαγραφάντων τὸ εἰσκριτικόν*.¹⁰⁸ It might at first glance appear that there were two taxes involved, a fee of twelve drachmae paid at the time of an *ἐπίκρισις* or examination, and the *εἰσκριτικόν*. But the phrase most probably refers rather to only one tax, an *εἰσκριτικόν* of twelve drachmae, and is to be translated "the list of priests all of whom have been examined (and assessed) at twelve drachmae and have paid the *eiskritikon* (so assessed)." There can be little doubt that the fee of twelve drachmae was the *εἰσκριτικόν*. In a similar heading to a *γραφὴ ἱερέων* from the temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos, twelve drachmae is designated as the amount of the *εἰσκριτικόν* (*ἐπιτεκμημένων* being omitted): *ἔστι δὲ και ἡμῶν τῶν ἱερέων [τὸ κα]τ' ἄνδρα πάντων διαγραφάντων τὸ [εἰσκ]ριτικόν ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ἕβ τῷ ἑκάστῳ παρα[δοχίμ]ῳ*.¹⁰⁹ That this fee of twelve drachmae was the *εἰσκριτικόν* and not a separate payment made when the candidate for priesthood was examined is further shown by a descrip-

¹⁰⁵ II, l. 57.

¹⁰⁶ *OGI* 664

¹⁰⁷ The *εἰσκριτικόν* is discussed by Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, pp. 213, n. 1; 227, n. 2; 245; II, pp. 182; 327-328; 346; Grenfell and Hunt, *P. Teb.* 294, note on l. 20; Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, pp. 249-251, and 298-299; Knudtzon, *P. Lund* 4, pp. 94-107.

¹⁰⁸ I, ll. 18-20 and (restored) II, 51-52; II, ll. 13-14 and ll. 31-33; III, ll. 12-13; V, ll. 12-13. Cf. IV, ll. 14-15.

¹⁰⁹ *BGU* 162 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 91), ll. 15-17. For *παραδόχμιος*, hereditary, cf. *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90), l. 10.

tion of the priests of Soknebtunis at Tebtunis: τῶν τῶι ε (ἔπει) ἐπικερμ (ένον) ἐπὶ Λουκίου Τυλλίου Κ[.]β[.]ο]υ ἐ[πὶ] (δραχμαῖς) νβ.¹¹⁰ A payment of fifty-two drachmae is designated as the payment for the priesthood in the same text, ὑπὲρ δ[ε] τῆς ἱερατείας[s] (δραχμαῖς) νβ.¹¹¹ and presumably this is equivalent to the εἰσκριτικόν.¹¹² The amount of the tax varied considerably. The priests at Bacchias paid the same as those of the larger temple of Soknopaiou Nesos, but much less than the priests of the temple at Tebtunis. The highest amount known is the two hundred drachmae paid by the heirs of the prophethood of Soknebtunis.¹¹³ The lowest sum is eight drachmae paid by minor priests, the pastophors, at Elephantine.¹¹⁴

The purpose of the priestly ἐπίκρισις, as well as of the civil ἐπίκρισις, was to judge the qualifications of the candidate to enter a privileged class.¹¹⁵ One of the privileges which resulted from passing the ἐπίκρισις for Roman citizens and Alexandrians was exemption from the poll tax (λαογραφία). Candidates having proper qualifications after passing the priestly ἐπίκρισις also obtained the same exemption.¹¹⁶ All priests may well have enjoyed freedom from this tax in the Ptolemaic period,¹¹⁷ and they may have continued to enjoy such freedom without limitation in the early Roman period, as Otto thinks probable.¹¹⁸ As long as the govern-

¹¹⁰ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90), l. 27. Cf. ll. 20 and 25 of the same text and *P. Teb.* 598 and 600 (unedited).

¹¹¹ *P. Teb.* 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90), l. 14.

¹¹² Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, p. 250, interprets the payment of fifty-two drachmae in this way.

¹¹³ *P. Teb.* 294 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 78 [146]). The office of prophet was a lucrative one; see *Gnom. Id. Log.* (BGU V. 1), 79.

¹¹⁴ *WO* II, 136 (126) and 137 (undated); *O. Bruss.-Berl.* 35 (126).

¹¹⁵ The priestly ἐπίκρισις is defined as "Berechtigungsnachweis" by Preisigke (*Fachwörter des öffentlichen Verwaltungsdienstes Ägyptens*, Göttingen, 1915, p. 86). Otto does not discuss the ἐπίκρισις in any detail and refers to it only once (*Priester und Tempel* II, p. 251, n. 6). A distinction is to be made between this examination and the earlier examination before the high priest of Egypt, who investigated the parentage of the applicant and gave permission for circumcision, a prerequisite to priesthood (see *P. Teb.* 291; Wilcken, *Chrest.* 76-77; *BGU* 82; *P. Gen.* 1-3 [SB 15-17]). See the discussion of the civil ἐπίκρισις in Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, pp. 109-119.

¹¹⁶ Grenfell and Hunt, *P. Teb.* 298, note on l. 11; Schubart, *BGU* 1199, note on l. 11; W. Uskull-Gyllenband, *Der Gnomon des Idios Logos* (BGU V. 2), p. 86.

¹¹⁷ *P. Petrie* III, 59^b (third or second century B.C.). See the recent discussion of this text and of the poll tax in general under the Ptolemies by C. Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides*, Brussels, 1939, pp. 380-387. For a tax of uncertain character paid by the priests of Soknokonnis in the late Ptolemaic period, see *P. Fay.* 18.

¹¹⁸ Otto, *Priester und Tempel* II, pp. 249-250.

ment granted exemption to all priests, this right would be conferred as a result of the ἐπίκρισις which admitted the candidate to priesthood. This was not, however, the purpose for which that examination was instituted, and it continued to be required for admission to priesthood although the priests did not always retain an unlimited exemption. By the early second century they were limited to a certain number of exemptions from the poll tax in some temples at least.¹¹⁹ Though the priests at Bacchias had passed their ἐπίκρισις and were designated ἐπικερμιμένοι, they nevertheless declared in the γραφή for 171 that they were enrolled in the list of payers of the poll tax.¹²⁰ They said nothing about a limited number of exemptions and there is no evidence that any priest at Bacchias was designated ἀπολύσιμος, or exempt, as the fifty exempted priests at Tebtunis were regularly described.¹²¹ Presumably, then, there were no exemptions from the tax granted at Bacchias.¹²²

The question arises whether the temple paid the poll tax for its priests or whether the individual priests paid it themselves. The temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos included in an account of its expenses for one year of unknown date a payment of 637 drachmae, the unspent balance of its income, for the poll tax of the non-exempt priests.¹²³ In 201 it paid 477 drachmae for the poll tax of these priests.¹²⁴ Whether this was a regular procedure, however, one cannot be sure. The account of expenses for the year 138 mentions no such payment.¹²⁵ Perhaps the tax was paid only when the temple had a balance in its treasury, as Johnson has suggested.¹²⁶ There is no evidence that the temples at Bacchias paid the poll tax for their priests.¹²⁷ It is

¹¹⁹ Fifty priests were allowed exemption at the temple of Soknebtunis in Tebtunis (*P. Teb.* 298 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90], l. 11; 299, ll. 12-14; *PSI* 1146, l. 11). An undetermined number were allowed exemption at the temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos (*P. Lond.* 347, ll. 6-7 and *BGU* 1 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 92], ll. 15-16).

¹²⁰ II, l. 56.

¹²¹ See n. 119 above.

¹²² Cf. the exemption of the presbyters of the pastophors in the temple of Isis Nanaia at Nabana in 193 (*P. Lond.* 345 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 102]).

¹²³ *BGU* 1 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 92), ll. 15-16.

¹²⁴ *P. Lond.* 347. See also *P. Aber.* 173.

¹²⁵ *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 183.

¹²⁶ A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, Baltimore, 1936, p. 656.

¹²⁷ Bataille's reading of XXIV, l. 1 ὑπὲρ λαο]γγ(αφίας?) is now proved incorrect. See the introduction to that text.

indicated that in some cases priests paid the tax themselves by receipts for payment issued to them.¹²⁸

There is a reference to another tax, the *ἐπιστατικὸν ἱερέων* in XXIV, l. 1. As Wallace pointed out, no payment of this tax has been found in an account of temple expenditures in the Roman period before the second century A. D.¹²⁹ He concluded that this did not necessarily mean that this tax was introduced in the second century, but that a change in the method of collecting and recording the tax may account for its sudden appearance in the second century. Here, however, is a parallel in the first half of the first century for the second-century temple accounts, in which payments for the *ἐπιστατικὸν ἱερέων* are found.

The *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* for 171 includes a rather puzzling statement concerning a payment in kind which the priests made to the state treasury for an income derived from the public and usiac tenants of their village: "The six *artabae* which are due us from the public and usiac tenants for which we pay thirty *choinikes* to the state treasury it was not necessary for us to exact because the aforesaid sum was included in the *πενταφυλ* () *λεμησίας* from the village."¹³⁰

One possibility which suggests itself is that the six *artabae* are the *σύνταξις* or subvention of the priests at Bacchias.¹³¹ Yet six *artabae*, or probably barely half the amount needed by one priest for a year,¹³² seem like a very small amount. The known *σύνταξις* of other temples was about one hundred and fifty to two hundred *artabae*.¹³³ One temple at Bousiris, however, received only thirteen *artabae* in return for which the priests gave one loaf of bread per month to the topogrammateus.¹³⁴ Whatever the income of six *artabae* was, the statement concerning it will remain obscure until the *πενταφυλ* () *λεμησίας* has been identified.¹³⁵

The evidence of liturgies and taxation of the priests of Bacchias has shown that by 171 the priests were required to perform labor on the dikes and to cultivate state land like the other inhabitants of their village. Nor did they apparently enjoy even a limited number of exemptions from the poll tax. The *εἰσκριτικὸν* paid

¹²⁸ P. Teb. 306 (162-163) from Tebtunis; P. Fay. 51 (186) from Theadelphia; P. Lond. 1235 (176-177) from Theadelphia.

¹²⁹ Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, p. 253.

¹³⁰ II, ll. 43-54.

¹³¹ See the commentary on II, l. 48.

¹³² Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, p. 301.

¹³³ Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, pp. 240-241.

¹³⁴ BGU 1202 (18 B. C.).

¹³⁵ See the commentary on II, ll. 52-54. Perhaps a *σύνταξις* is indicated in the phrase *τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς κώ(μης) κτλ.*

for priesthood was as high as that paid at the larger temple at Soknopaiou Nesos.¹³⁶ While their social and economic position was still a favored one compared to the other villagers, their privileges were being undermined and their numbers were declining. Yet they did not bear the burdens imposed on them by the state in uncomplaining acquiescence. They took advantage of the period of unrest in the seventies when the government feared the spread of revolt among the priesthoods to demand and obtain exemption from manual labor on the dikes, though perhaps not complete freedom from responsibility for that liturgy. The slight increase in the number of priests of Soknobraisis during these years may also not be without significance. That the priestly class in Egypt was subjected to strong economic pressure by the state under the Empire was already a well-established fact. The evidence from Bacchias is of interest and importance because it reveals more clearly than in the case of any other small village temples just how severe this pressure was, and how it was at times modified by a policy of conciliation.

I.

P. Yale 363

21.6 x 8.4 cm.

116 A. D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. The text is written on the recto in a small, carefully formed hand which is quite similar to Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol.* 27 (second century A. D.). The verso is blank. The papyrus is a fragment complete above and below with an upper margin of 1.7 cm. and a lower of 2.8 cm. It originally contained at least three columns,¹³⁷ each approximately 6.5 cm. in width. About 1 cm. of the left side of Column I is missing, and only 1 cm. of Column II is preserved. The extant fragment has almost been torn in half vertically down the center, where there is a lacuna of .2-.5 cm. almost the entire length of Column I. The text is a *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*, "a list of priests and an inventory," from the temples of Soknokonnis and Soknobraisis in the village of Bacchias. It is very similar in form and content to II-VI. The second column of this text has been

¹³⁶ This might be taken to mean either that the priests at Bacchias were forced to pay an excessively high *εἰσκριτικὸν*, or that to be a priest of Bacchias was considered by the government to be as great a privilege as priesthood at Soknopaiou Nesos, financially and otherwise.

¹³⁷ See the commentary on l. 58.



restored by a comparison with II, which is preserved completely except for the left margin of Column I. In this earlier *γραφή*, unlike the later ones, the numerals in the inventory of furniture are written out.

Column I

- [...]·νοι βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ) Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακ(λείδου)
μερίδο(ς)
[παρὰ] Ψενατύμεως τοῦ Ψενατύμεω(ς)
[ἱερ]έως Σοκνοκόννεως καὶ Πετε-
[σοῦχο]ν Πετεσοῦχου πρεσβ[υ]τέρου
5 [ἱερέων] ἱεροῦ Σοκνοβραίσεω[ς] τῶν ὄν-
[των ἐν] κώμη Βακχιάδι. γραφὴ [ἱε]ρέων καὶ
[χειρισμ]οῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἰθ(ἔτους) Τ[ραι]ανοῦ
[Καίσαρος] τοῦ κυρίου. τῶν μὲν ἐν ἱερῶι
[Σοκνοκόν]νεως τὸ καθ' ἐν· ν[αὸς Σο]κνο-
10 [κόννε]ως θεοῦ ξύλινος περικεχ[ρ]υσω(μένος)
[καὶ Πνεφε]ρώτος ναὸς ξύλι[νο]ς περικε-
[χρυσω(μένος)] λυχνεῖαι χαλκαὶ σα[λ]πιγγωταὶ
[δέκα πέ]ντε· ποτήρια χαλκᾶ [δέ]κα·
[θυμιατ]ήριον χαλκοῦν ἕ[ν]· συρίγ-
15 [για ξύ]λινα δύο ἕχ[ο]ν(τα) ἕκ[ασ]τον
[φύλλα] χαλκᾶ ἑπτὰ· δίσκοι [έ]ξ ἔξυλινοι
[περικεχ]ρυσω(μένοι) δύο· χαλκίον χαλ-
[κοῦν ἐν.] ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἱερέων [τ]ὸ κατ' ἀνδ(ρα)
[πάντ]ων ἐπικεκ(ριμένων) ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ἰβ καὶ
[δια]γεγρα(φηκότων)
20 [τὸ εἰσκρι]τικόν·
[Πετ]εσοῦχος Πετεχωῖντο[ς] (ἐτῶν) μ
[...]νεώτ(ερος) Φαλοῦτ[ο]ς (ἐτῶν) ξ
[Πετε]ῆσις Ψενατύμεως (ἐτῶν) νε
[Ὀρσεν]οῦφισ ἀδελφός (ἐτῶν) ξ
25 [Πετ]εῆσις Ὀρσενούφεως (ἐτῶν) λβ
[Πετε]ῆσις νεώτ(ερος) ἀδελφός (ἐτῶν) ..
[...]...ως Ψεναμούνεως (ἐτῶν) ν
[Ψενα]μοῦνις ἀδελφός (ἐτῶν) μ
[Ψενα]τύμις Νεφερώτος (ἐτῶν) μ
30 [...]ς Νεφερώτος (ἐτῶν) λε

Column II

- 31 Ὀνωφ[φρις]
Ἀμμώ[νιος]
Ψενα[...]
Ψε[...]
35 Ψ[εν]αμ[οῦνις]
Ἀμμώ[νιος]
Ψενα[...]
Ψενα[...]
Πετε[...]
40 Πετ[ε]...
Ὀρσε[νοῦφισ]
Ψε[... τῶν δὲ ἐν]
ἱερῶ [Σοκνοβραίσεως τὸ καθ' ἐν·]
ναὸς [Σοκνοβραίσεως ξύλινος περικεχρυσω(μένος)]
45 καὶ Πυ[εφερώτος ναὸς ξύλινος περικεχρυσω(μένος)·]
λυχν[ία] χαλκαὶ σαλπγγωταὶ δέκα πέντε·]
θυμ[ιατήριον] χαλκοῦν ἐν· σαλπγγια]
χαλκ[ᾶ] δύο· σαλπγγια ξύλινα δύο]
ἕχον(τα) [ἕκαστον φύλλα χαλκᾶ ἑπτὰ·]
50 δίσκ[οι] ξύλινοι περικεχρυσω(μένοι) δύο· χαλκίον χαλ-]
κ[οῦν] ἐν [ἐν. ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἱερέων τὸ κατ' ἀνδρα ἐπικεκ(ριμένων)]
ἐπὶ [(δραχμαῖς) ἰβ καὶ διαγεγρα(φηκότων) τὸ εἰσκριτικόν·]
Πε[...]
[...]...]
55 Πετ[ε]...
Πετ[ε]...
Πετ[ε]...
Πετ[ε]...

Translation

To ———, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Psenatumis, the son of Psenatumis, priest of Soknokonnis, and Petesouchos, son of Petesouchos, presbyter of the priests of the temple of Soknobraisis, (the gods) which are in the village of Bacchias. A list of priests and an inventory for the current nineteenth year of Trajan Caesar our lord. The enumeration of those things which are in the temple of Soknokonnis: a gilded wooden shrine of the god Soknokonnis, and a gilded wooden shrine of Pnephros, fifteen bronze trumpet-

shaped lamp-stands, ten bronze cups, one bronze censer, two wooden pipes each having seven bronze bands, two gilded wooden platters, one bronze kettle. And there follows the enumeration of the priests, all of whom have been examined (and assessed) at twelve drachmae and have paid the eiskritikon (so assessed):

Petesouchos, son of Petechon, age forty
 ----- the younger, son of Phalous, age sixty
 Peteësis, son of Psenatumis, age fifty-five
 Orsenouphis, his brother, age sixty
 Peteësis, son of Orsenouphis, age thirty-two
 Peteësis the younger, his brother, age -----
 -----, son of Psenamounis, age fifty
 Psenamounis, his brother, age forty
 Psenatumis, son of Nepheros, age forty
 -----, son of Nepheros, age thirty-five
 Onnophris -----
 Ammonios -----
 Psena -----
 Pse -----
 Psenamounis -----
 Ammonios -----
 Psena -----
 Psena -----
 Pete -----
 Pete -----
 Orsenouphis -----
 Pse -----

The enumeration of those things which are in the temple of Soknobraisis: a gilded wooden shrine of Soknobraisis, and a gilded wooden shrine of Pnepheros, fifteen trumpet-shaped bronze lamp-stands, one bronze censer, two bronze trumpets (?), two wooden pipes each having seven bronze bands, two gilded wooden platters, one bronze kettle. And there follows the enumeration of the priests who have been examined (and assessed) at twelve drachmae and have paid the eiskritikon (so assessed):

Pe -----

 Petes -----
 Pete -----
 Pet -----
 Pet -----

Commentary

L. 1: The name of the basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides in the nineteenth year of Trajan is not known.

Ll. 2-5: Because of the fragmentary state of the text it is impossible to tell whether the two priests who submitted the report are included in the lists given below; cf. II, in which neither of the presbyters who submitted the report is listed below among the priests. It is to be noted that the priest of Soknokonnis who submitted this report does not have the title of presbyter, as the priest of Soknobraisis does. Cf. IV, XIV, XV and XVI.

Ll. 5-6: Cf. II, ll. 4-5. I have taken τῶν ὄντων in agreement with Σοκνοκόννεως and Σοκνοβραϊσεως. Cf. *P. Mich.* 175 (193 A. D.), ll. 3-4: *ιερέως τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῇ κόμῃ θε[ο]ῦ*. It might also be taken in agreement with *ιερωῶν* understood, supplying *ιεροῦ* before Σοκνοκόννεως (l. 3) as it is found in l. 5 in the phrase *ιερέων] ιεροῦ Σοκνοβραϊσεω[s]*.

Ll. 6-7: *γραφὴν ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*, "a list of priests and an inventory." The definition of *χειρισμός* in this phrase is discussed in p. 191, n. 60.

L. 7: The date is the nineteenth year of Trajan (115-116 A. D.). A more precise date for the writing of the document can be determined, since it is known that the *γραφὴν ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* was regularly submitted at the close of the Egyptian year in the month of Mesore, usually toward the end of the month. The document, then, was most probably written between July 25 and August 28, 116.

Ll. 9-10: *ν[αός] Σο[κνο]κόννε[ως] θεοῦ ξύλινος περικεχ[ρ]υσω(μένος)*. This *ναός* was a portable shrine in which the image of the god was carried in sacred processions.¹³⁸ A broken wooden shrine with bronze fittings was actually found in the temple of Soknokonnis at Bacchias.¹³⁹ A shrine in the temple at Gynaikon Nesos is similarly described as *ναός Ἀρποκράτου θεοῦ ξύλινος περικεχρυσωμένος*, and in this shrine was an image, *Ἀρποκράς ξύλινος περικεχρυσωμένος*.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ See *Gnom. Id. Log.* (BGU V. 1), 93; OGI 90, ll. 41-43; Herod. 2. 63. See also the discussion in Otto, *Priester und Tempel I*, p. 94, n. 1; Grassi, *Studi della Scuola pap.* IV (1926), 4, pp. 36-37; M. I. Rostovtzeff and P. V. C. Bauer, *Dura Report II*, pp. 181-193.

¹³⁹ *Fayûm Towns*, p. 37.

¹⁴⁰ P. Rainer 8 (apud Wessely, *Denkschrift. Ak. Wien XLVII* [1902], Abh. 4, pp. 58-59).

L. 12: *λυχνίαι*. Cf. the spelling *λυχνίαι* in II, l. 28 and III, l. 9.

Ll. 12-13: *λυχνίαι χαλκαῖ σα[λ]πιγγωταῖ [δέκα πέ]ντε*. The size of the lacuna indicates this restoration, and in any case a higher number would be surprising. The restoration is confirmed by a comparison with V, l. 8. Although V contains an inventory of Soknobraisis, not of Soknokonnis as here, the number of each article in the two temples is in all cases but one identical. These *λυχνίαι* are lampstands.¹⁴¹ An undetermined number of *λυχνίαι χαλκαῖ* are also listed among the furniture of the temple of Soknopaios,¹⁴² and there were two in the temple at Gynaikon Nesos.¹⁴³ The same type of lampstand (*λυχνία χαλκᾶ σαλπγγωτή*) is mentioned in an inscription of the second century B. C. from Teos.¹⁴⁴ These stands may have been used in the temple at the celebration of the rite of *λυχναφία* (see the commentary on II, ll. 54-55).

L. 13: *ποτήρια χαλκᾶ [δέ]κα*. The temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos possessed only one.¹⁴⁵ The *ποτήρια* were used for religious purposes in pagan temples of the ancient world,¹⁴⁶ and later in Christian churches.¹⁴⁷

L. 14: [*θυμιατ*]ήριον χαλκοῦν. The temple of Soknopaios had an undetermined number of these bronze censers as well as censers of an unknown material,¹⁴⁸ and they are found in property lists from other Egyptian temples of this period.¹⁴⁹ The use of censers in these temples was no doubt a continuation of an ancient tradi-

¹⁴¹ See Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, p. 332; Grassi, *Studi della Scuola pap.* IV (1926), 4, pp. 10-14.

¹⁴² *BGU* 387, Col. II, l. 7.

¹⁴³ *P. Rainer* 8 (apud Wessely, *Denkschrift. Ak. Wien* XLVII [1902], Abh. 4, p. 59). The Christian church of Apa Psaios in Ibion in the fifth or sixth century lists four bronze and two iron lampstands among its property (*P. Grenf.* II, 111 [Wilcken, *Chrest.* 135], ll. 18-19).

¹⁴⁴ *CIG* 3071, l. 8.

¹⁴⁵ *BGU* 387, Col. II, l. 16.

¹⁴⁶ See the discussion of Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, p. 396, n. 2; A. Castiglioni, "Contributi alla nomenclatura dei vasi secondo i papiri greco-egizi," *Studi della Scuola pap.* III (1920), pp. 142-144; Grassi, *Studi della Scuola pap.* IV (1926), 4, pp. 4, 61, and 69; M. I. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles, *Dura Report V*, pp. 307-310.

¹⁴⁷ *P. Grenf.* II, 111 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 135), l. 5 (the church of Apa Psaios at Ibion).

¹⁴⁸ *BGU* 387, Col. II, ll. 8 and 20.

¹⁴⁹ The temple at Gynaikon Nesos (*P. Rainer* 8 [apud Wessely, *Denkschrift. Ak. Wien* XLVII (1902), Abh. 4, p. 59]), and two unidentified temples of the second century A. D. (*P. Oxy.* 521, l. 19, and *BGU* 488, l. 11).

tion, for censers were used in Egyptian temples in the Old Kingdom.¹⁵⁰

Ll. 14-16: *συρίγγια ξύλινα δύο ἔχ[ο]ν(τα) ἑκ[ασ]τον [φύλλα] χαλκᾶ ἑπτά. ἔχοντα* is written out in full in II, ll. 11 and 29. The restoration of *φύλλα* is made certain by a comparison with II, l. 29; IV, l. 12; and V, l. 10. These two wooden instruments with seven bronze bands are also listed in the later inventory of the furniture of Soknokonnis in 171 (II, ll. 11-12), and there are two of them listed among the furniture of Soknobraisis (IV, l. 12; V, l. 10, and II, ll. 29-30). It is difficult to identify these instruments precisely, because they are called *συρίγγια* in this text, but *κανόνια* in IV and V, and *σαλπίγγια* in II. Although there is this variety of terms, in each case the instruments are described as *ἔχοντα ἕκαστον φύλλα χαλκᾶ ἑπτά*¹⁵¹ so that there is little doubt that the *συρίγγια*, *κανόνια* and *σαλπίγγια* are terms used to describe the same instrument.¹⁵² These instruments were probably *auloi* or double oboes which had three finger holes in one pipe and four in the other.¹⁵³ The seven bronze *φύλλα* were the metal bands used to change the finger hole arrangement.¹⁵⁴ The purpose of these bands which encircled the pipes was to cover the finger holes when not in use. When a finger hole was in use, the band which covered it was turned around until a hole which pierced it was directly over the finger hole.

Ll. 16-17: *δίσκοι [ξ]ύλινοι [περικεχ]ρυσω(μένοι) δύο*. These articles are not found in other temple inventories, but a *δίσκος μέγας* is mentioned among other receptacles stolen from a private house in the Fayûm in the second or third century A. D.¹⁵⁵ The *δίσκος* was probably a salver or platter.

¹⁵⁰ The ancient censer has been studied by K. Wigand ("Thymiateria," *Bonner Jahrbücher* CXXII [1912], pp. 1-97). See also Grassi, *Studi della Scuola pap.* IV (1926), 4, pp. 3-4, 6-7, and 16-17; F. E. Brown, *Dura Report VII-VIII*, pp. 158-163.

¹⁵¹ There is one exception: only five bands are mentioned in III, l. 11. See the commentary on that line.

¹⁵² Dr. Curt Sachs tells me that inexactitude in the use of terms to designate musical instruments is common.

¹⁵³ C. Sachs, *Die Musikinstrumente des alten Ägyptens (Mitteilungen aus der ägyptischen Sammlung, Band III, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, 1921)*, pp. 79-88.

¹⁵⁴ To Dr. Sachs I am indebted for identifying the *φύλλα*. See A. A. Howard, "The *Ablos* or *Tibia*," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* IV (1893), pp. 1-60. The word *φύλλον* is found in its diminutive form as a term for silver appliqué in *P. Lond.* 191, ll. 10-11: *σκοῦτλια ξύλινα λελακκαμένα δύο [...]* *φύλλια ἀργυρᾶ ὀκτώ*. Perhaps one should restore *ἔχον(τα)* in the lacuna.

¹⁵⁵ *BGU* 388 (Mitteis, *Chrest.* 91), Col. II, l. 22.

ll. 17-18: χαλκίον χαλ[κοῦν ἐν]. No bronze kettle is found in the inventories of Egyptian temples except in those at Bacchias.¹⁵⁶ They may have been votive offerings such as the χαλκία dedicated to Athena at Athens in the sixth century B. C.¹⁵⁷ Whether they served some purpose in the religious ritual is uncertain. They are frequently mentioned in papyri among domestic utensils. It is at least to be suggested that the kettle was used not as a receptacle but to create a sound effect.¹⁵⁸

ll. 19-20: ἐπικει(ριμένον) ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ἰβ καὶ [δια]γεγρα(φηκότων) [τὸ εἰσκρ]ιτικόν. Cf. BGU 162 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 91, from the temple of Soknopaios), ll. 15-17: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν ἱερέων [τὸ κα]τ' ἀνδρα πάντων διαγραφάντων τὸ [εἰσκ]ριτικόν ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ἰβ. . . .

[δια]γεγρα(φηκότων). Elsewhere the aorist διαγραφάντων is found; see BGU 162, quoted above; II, l. 33; III, l. 13.

ll. 42-43: This phrase which introduces the inventory of the furniture of Soknobraisis is restored from ll. 8-9. As in II, the furniture list of Soknobraisis follows the name of the last priest of Soknokonnis (l. 26). Perhaps ἱερῶ[ι should be restored as in l. 8.

ll. 44-51: The restoration of the following lines has been made largely from II, ll. 26-31, the furniture list of Soknobraisis. It is to be remembered that the present text is dated 116 and therefore restorations made from II, dated 171, are not absolutely certain, since the inventory may have changed in the meantime. No difference, however, appears in the inventory of Soknokonnis, which is preserved in both texts.

ll. 47-48: σαλπίγγια] χαλκ[ᾶ δύο is restored from II, l. 31. It is not quite certain, however, whether one should restore two of these instruments or only one. In II, dated 171, there are two of them, but in IV, dated 172, and V, dated 188, there is only one. It would appear that one of the articles was lost between 171 and 172 or that the enumeration of two in 171 was a mistake. It is to be noted that these σαλπίγγια are not described as having seven metal bands, as are the σαλπίγγια which are next listed in the inventory (ll. 48-49) and which have been interpreted as double oboes of the *aulos* type with seven finger holes

¹⁵⁶ Cf. II, ll. 12 and 30-31; IV, ll. 10 and 13, and V, l. 11.

¹⁵⁷ IG I², 393.

¹⁵⁸ Strabo (VII, frag. 3) describes τὸ ἐν Δωδώνῃ χαλχεῖον. It was struck by a scourge of bone and emitted extremely long tones; cf. Menander, *Frag.* 66 ('*Ἀρρηφόρος*).

(see the commentary on ll. 14-16 above). It is doubtful, therefore, that they are the same type of instrument. Just what this σαλπίγγιον was one cannot be certain. It may have been closely related to the σάλπιγξ, or trumpet.

L. 58: The second column ends here in the middle of the list of priests of Soknobraisis. In II, which is complete, Soknokonnis had listed for the year 171 eleven priests, and Soknobraisis thirteen. In this text, Soknokonnis had twenty-two priests (exactly twice the number listed for 171)¹⁵⁹ and it is not improbable that Soknobraisis also had roughly twice the number in 116 that he had in 171, that is, about twenty-six priests. This would mean that Column III contained at least twenty lines of a γραφή ἱερέων and perhaps more.¹⁶⁰ Presumably the document closed with the signature of Psenatumis and Petesouchos; cf. the close of II and V.

II.

P. Yale 902 + 906 (Plate I)

22.8 x 21.2 cm.

August 11, 171 A. D.

This papyrus is medium brown in color. The text is written on the recto in a clear, legible hand, somewhat similar to Schubart, *Pap. Graec. Berol.* 26a (159-160 A. D.). The verso is blank. The sheet of papyrus is complete at the top, bottom, and right side. There is a lacuna on the left side, with approximately 2 cm. missing from the lower left half and 7.5 cm. from the upper left half (this measurement allows for the restoration of the beginning of the lines and a margin of 1 cm., thus making the vertical crease divide the sheet exactly in half). Most of the lower left half column (ll. 15-32) is a separate fragment (*P. Yale 906*). There is a lacuna at the joining in ll. 15-27. The upper margin is 1.4 cm., the lower 2 cm.; there is no margin on the right. Column I was 11-12 cm. and Column II 8.3-9 cm. wide. The γραφή ἱερέων or list of priests in Column II is indented. The scribe is inconsistent in his system of abbreviation, at one time writing χαλκοῦν but at another χαλκ(οῦν), and sometimes dropping a final ν and at other times retaining it. This inconsistency makes restoration (l. 5 in particular) uncertain. The papyrus is of considerable interest because it is a completely preserved γραφή

¹⁵⁹ To the number listed for 171 must be added the presbyter who wrote the report for that year but was not included in the list.

¹⁶⁰ In one case the name of one priest in II (ll. 41-42) takes up two lines.



ιερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ, and because it closes with an interesting but rather obscure and puzzling statement (ll. 48-57) concerning an income of the temple in grain and the obligations of the priests toward the government. Like I, it is a joint *γραφὴ* of the priests and furniture of the two gods, Soknokonnis and Soknobraisis.

Column I

- [τῷ δεῖν βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ) ? Ἄρσι(νοῖτου) Ἡρακλ(είδου)
μερίδο]ς
[παρὰ Ψοσνέως . . .] αλοῦτος πρεσβ(υτέρου) ιερέω(ν)
[Σοκνοκόννεως θεοῦ μεγίστου] καὶ Ἀμμωνίου Πέτω(ς)
[πρεσβ(υτέρου) ιερέω(ν) Σοκνοβραίσσεως θ]εοῦ μεγίστου ἀμφο-
5 [τέρων ιερέω(ν) ιερέων τῶν ὄντων] ἐν κόμῃ Βακχιά-
[δι. γραφὴ ιερέω(ν) καὶ χειρισμοῦ τ]ῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
[τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ια (ἔτους) Αὔρηλιου Ἄντ]ωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ
[κυρίου. ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἐν ἱερῷ Σοκ]νοκόννεως ναὸς ξύλ(ινος)
[περικεχρυσω(μένος) καὶ Πνεφερωτός] ναὸς ξύλ(ινος) περικεχρυσω-
(μένος).
10 [λυχνίαι χαλκαῖ σαλπιγγω(ταῖ) ι]ε· ποτήρια χαλκ(ᾶ) ι·
[θυματήριον χαλκ(οῦν) α· σαλπίγγι]α χαλκ(ᾶ) β ἔχοντα ἕκαστο(ν)
[φύλ(λα) χαλκᾶ ξ· δίσκοι ξύλ(ινοι) β] περικεχρυσω(μένον)·
χαλκ(ίον) χαλκ(οῦν)
[α. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱερέων τὸ] κατ' ἄνδρα ἐπικεκρι(μένων) ἐπὶ
(δραγμαῖς) ιβ
[καὶ διαγραφάντων τὸ ἱσκρι]τικόν·
15 [.....].[.....] (ἐτῶν) μγ
[...].ου.[.....] (ἐτῶν) μα
[Ψεν]αμοῦν[ις ...].[.....] (ἐτῶν) πξ
[Ψεν]αμοῦνις Πνεφερω[το]ς (ἐτῶν) οδ
[Ψενανο?] ἤπις ἀπάτωρ μη(τρὸς) [Πνεφ]ερωτός (ἐτῶν) να
20 [Ψεν]αμοῦνις Ὀνώφρ[εω]ς (ἐτῶν) οθ
[Πετε]ῆσις Ὀρου (ἐτῶν) ξξ
[Ψεν]αμοῦνις Ὀνώφρεω[ς] (ἐτῶν) λξ
[...].ις Ὀνώφρεως (ἐτῶν) ξα
[Πετε]σοῦχον (sic) Ὀνώφρεω[ς] (ἐτῶν) νη
25 [ἔστι] δὲ ἐν ἱερῷ Σοκνοβ[ράσ]ιος ναὸς Σοκνοβράσιος
[ξύλ(ινος) πε]ρικεχρυσω(μένος) καὶ Π[νεφ]ερωτός ξ[ύ]λ(ινος)
περικεχρυσω-

- [σω(μένος)· λ]υχνίαι χαλκαῖ σαλπιγγω(ταῖ) ιε· θυματήριον
[χαλκ(οῦν)] α· σαλπίγγια ξύλ(ινα) β ἔχοντα ἕκαστον φύλ(λα)
30 [χαλκ(ᾶ) ξ]· δίσκοι ξύλ(ινοι) περικεχρυσωμένοι β· χαλ-
[κίο]ν χαλκοῦν· σαλπίγγια χαλκ(ᾶ) β. ἔστι δὲ καὶ
[τῶν ι]ερέω(ν) τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα πάντων ἐπικεκρι(μένων)

Column II

- ἐπὶ (δραγμαῖς) ιβ καὶ διαγραφάντων τὸ ἱσκριτικ(όν)·
Σισόις Ὀρσενούφεις (ἐτῶν) λγ
35 Ὀρσενούφεις Ὀρου (ἐτῶν) μ
Πετεύρις Πετεύριος (ἐτῶν) μα
Πετεύρις Πετεύριος (ἐτῶν) μς
Πετεύρις Μύσθου (ἐτῶν) νδ
Ὀρσενούφεις Αἴνους (ἐτῶν) ξδ
40 Πετεύρις Ὀρου (ἐτῶν) ξθ
Μύσθης ἀπάτωρ μη(τρὸς) Ταορσε-
νούφεις (ἐτῶν) κα
Πετσεῖρις Πετσεῖριος (ἐτῶν) ξθ
Πετεύρις Ὀρ[σ]εν[οῦ]φι[ος] (ἐτῶν) ξα
45 Ὀρσενούφεις Ὀρσε[νο]ύφι[ος] (ἐτῶν) ξδ
Πετσεσοῦχος ἀδ[ελ]φός (ἐτῶν) ξθ
Πετεύρις Πετεύριος (ἐτῶν) κβ
τὰς δὲ ὑποκει(μένας) ἡμεῖν παρὰ τῶν δη(μοσίων)
καὶ οὐσιακῶν γεωργῶν τῆς κώ(μης)
50 (ἀρτάβας) ς ὑπὲρ ὧν διαγρά(φομεν) εἰς τὸ δη(μόσιον)
χο(ίνικας) λ
οὐκ ἐδέησεν ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτῆσαι
διὰ τὸ ἐνπερι(ληφθῆναι) τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς κώ(μης)
πενταφυλ() λεμησίας τὸ προκ(είμενον) κε-
φάλαιον. τὰς δὲ λυχναψίας τοῦ
55 ἱεροῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ποιούμεθα.
λαογρα(φούμεθα) δὲ καὶ τελοῦμεν τὰ χωμα-
τικὰ ἔργα καὶ γεωργού(μεν) δη(μοσίαν) γῆν.
Ψοσνεῦς (ἐτῶν) ν ο(ἰλή) ποδὶ δεξ(ιῶ)
Ἀμμώνιος (ἐτῶν) κθ ο(ἰλή) γό(νατι) δεξ(ιῶ)
60 εἰκ(ονίσθη) φα(μένων) μὴ εἰδ(έναι) γρά(μματα) δ(ε) Ἡρω()
νο(μογράφου)
(ἔτους) ια Αὔρηλιου Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος
τοῦ κυρίου [[. . .] Μεσορῆ ιη

Translation

To -----, basilikos grammateus (?) of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Psoseus, son of -----, presbyter of the priests of Soknokonnis, the most great god, and Ammonios, son of Petis (?), presbyter of the priests of Soknobraisis, the most great god, both priests of the temples which are in the village of Bacchias. A list of priests and an inventory of those things which are in the temples for the current eleventh year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord. In the temple of Soknokonnis there are the following: a gilded wooden shrine (of Soknokonnis) and a gilded wooden shrine of Pnepheros, fifteen bronze trumpet-shaped lampstands, ten bronze cups, one bronze censer, two bronze pipes, each having seven bronze bands, two gilded wooden platters, one bronze kettle. There follows the enumeration of the priests who have been examined (and assessed) at twelve drachmae and have paid the eiskritikon (so assessed):

----- age forty-three
 -----, son of -----, age forty-one
 Psenamounis, son of -----, age eighty-seven
 Psenamounis, son of Pnepheros, age seventy-four
 Psenanoupis (?), father unknown, whose mother is
 Pnepheros, age fifty-one
 Psenamounis, son of Onnophris, age seventy-nine
 Peteësis, son of Horos, age sixty-seven
 Psenamounis, son of Onnophris, age thirty-seven
 -----, son of Onnophris, age sixty-one
 Petesouchos, son of Onnophris, age fifty-eight
 Onnophris, son of Psenamounis, age forty-three

There are the following articles in the temple of Soknobraisis: a gilded wooden shrine of Soknobraisis and a gilded wooden (shrine) of Pnepheros, fifteen bronze trumpet-shaped lampstands, one bronze censer, two wooden pipes, each having seven bronze bands, two gilded wooden platters, one bronze kettle, two bronze trumpets (?). And there follows the enumeration of the priests, all of whom have been examined (and assessed) at twelve drachmae and have paid the eiskritikon (so assessed):

Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, age thirty-three
 Orsenouphis, son of Horos, age forty
 Peteuris, son of Peteuris, age forty-one
 Peteuris, son of Peteuris, age forty-six

Peteuris, son of Mysthes, age fifty-four
 Orsenouphis, son of Aines (?), age sixty-four
 Peteuris, son of Horos, age sixty-nine
 Mysthes, father unknown, whose mother is
 Taorsenouphis, age twenty-one
 Petseiris, son of Petseiris, age sixty-nine
 Peteuris, son of Orsenouphis, age sixty-one
 Orsenouphis, son of Orsenouphis, age sixty-four
 Petesouchos, his brother, age sixty-nine
 Peteuris, son of Peteuris, age twenty-two

The six *artabae* which are due us from the public and usiac tenants of the village for which we pay thirty *choinikes* to the state treasury it was not necessary for us to exact because the aforesaid sum was included in the . . . (?) from the village. We provide for the illumination of the temple from our own funds, and we are listed as payers of the poll tax, perform the work on the dikes, and cultivate public land.

Psoseus, age fifty, with a scar on the right foot
 Ammonios, age twenty-nine, with a scar on the right knee

Since the above declare that they are illiterate, the document was written by Hero -----, the nomograph. The eleventh year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord,
 Mesore the eighteenth.

Commentary

L. 1: It is uncertain to which official this report was addressed. It might be the strategos, the eklogistes, the bibliophylax, or the inspector of the idios logos, as well as the basilikos grammateus. See pp. 197-198 for a discussion of the officials to whom a *γραφή* was submitted.

Ll. 2-3: Neither of these presbyters is listed below among the priests. The restoration of the name of Psoseus is made from his signature at the end of the document (l. 58).

Πέτεω(s). The nominative form is not certain.

Ll. 4-5: ἀμφο[τέρων ἱερέω(ν) ἱερώων τῶν ὄντων] ἐν κόμῃ. For the restoration of ἱερώων, cf. III, l. 4. Another possibility is θεῶων; see the commentary on I, ll. 5-6. The significance of the plural, ἱερώων, is discussed on pp. 184-185.

Ll. 5-6: I have omitted the final ν in ἱερέων in accordance with ἱερέω(ν) in l. 2.

L. 6: τῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς. Cf. *P. Jand.* 34 (*BL* I, p. 199),
 ll. 6-8: κατεχωρ[ίσασμ] ἐν σο[ι γραφήν] χ[ιρισμ]οῦ τῶν ὄντων ἐν τῷ
 προ[κειμένῳ] ἱερῷ.

L. 7: The date is restored from l. 61.

L. 8: ναός ξύλ(ινος). This ναός belonged to Soknokonnis; cf. I,
 ll. 9-11. For a discussion of the ναός and the following objects,
 see the commentary on I.

L. 10: [λυχνίαι χαλκαῖ σαλπύγγω(ται) ι]εῖ is restored from I, ll. 12-13
 and V, l. 8.

L. 11: [θυματήριον χαλκ(οῦν) α] is restored from I, l. 14 and V, l. 9.

ll. 11-12: σαλπύγγι]α χαλκ(ᾶ) εἰ ἔχοντα ἕκαστο(ν) [φύλ(λα) χαλκᾶ ζ].
 The word σαλπύγγια is restored from l. 29 below. Presumably
 these pipes are identical with the pipes listed in the inventory of
 116 (I, ll. 14-16) though here they are described as bronze and
 in I as wooden.

L. 12: I have written χαλκᾶ unabbreviated as in l. 31 below
 rather than as χαλκ(ᾶ) in l. 11 because the restoration of the line
 is somewhat short compared to the preceding one. Perhaps φύλλα
 was also unabbreviated as in IV, l. 12 (but cf. l. 29 of this text).

L. 14: ἰσκρι]τικόν. Cf. the spelling in l. 33.

L. 27: ναός is to be supplied with Πνεφερωῖτος.

L. 47: The year sign is repeated.

L. 48: τὰς δὲ ὑποκει(μένας) ἡμεῖν . . . (ἀρτάβας)Ϛ. The word ὑποκεῖσθαι
 is used as a technical term in connection with the income of a
 temple meaning "to belong to" or "to be granted to" in both
 the Ptolemaic¹⁶¹ and Roman periods. The priests of Bousiris in
 2-1 B.C. refer to a grant of σύνταξις or subvention¹⁶² to their
 temple of one hundred artabae of wheat as [τὰς καρ'] ἔτος
 ὑποκειμένας πυροῦ ἀρτ[άβας ἑκατόν] (*BGU* 1200, l. 28).¹⁶³ This

¹⁶¹ *UPZ* 23 (162 B.C.), l. 21; τῶν ὑποκειμένων εἰς τὰ ἱερά; cf. *UPZ* 21 and 24
 and Wilcken's commentary on these texts.

¹⁶² For the σύνταξις, see Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, pp. 380-384; Rostovtzeff,
Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates (*Archiv für Pap.*, Beiheft I,
 1910), p. 101, n. 1, and pp. 160, 164, 178-179; Wallace, *Taxation in Roman
 Egypt*, pp. 239-241. Cf. the use of ὑποκεῖσθαι for a specified tax, e. g., ὑποκειμένα
 βασιλικῆ γραμματεία. Preisigke, s. v. ὑποκείμενα, *Wörterbuch* III, 252.

¹⁶³ Cf. *BGU* 1197 (12-11 B.C.), l. 4: ὑπόκειται τῶν προκειμένων ἱερῶ (l. ἱερῶ)
 σύνταξις, and l. 10: [ἰ]γερῖς (l. ἱερῖς) μὴ λαμβάνοντες τὰ ὑποκείμενα αὐτοῖς;
P. Teb. 298 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 90) (107-108 A.D.), l. 52 and commentary.

expression is a close parallel to the phrase in the present text.
 Another parallel is to be noted in the income in grain derived
 from γεωργοί of the village by the priests at Soknopaiou Nesos
 (*Stud. Pal.* XXII, 183, ll. 138-139). The nature of this grant to
 the priests is discussed on p. 206.

L. 50: At the end of the line I read χ^ο followed by λ with a half-
 effaced abbreviation stroke above it. The priests paid thirty
 choinikes of wheat to the treasury for the six artabae. If the
 artaba is reckoned at forty choinikes¹⁶⁴ the priests paid to
 the treasury thirty of two hundred and forty choinikes, or one-
 eighth of the income which they derived from crops of the state
 farmers.

ll. 52-54: διὰ τὸ ἐνπερι(ληφθῆναι) τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς κώ(μης) πενταφυλ()
 λεμησίας τὸ προκ(είμενον) κεφάλαιον. The meaning of the whole
 phrase is obscure. I have been unable to find the word λεμησία
 as the name of a deity, a place-name or a common noun.¹⁶⁵
 πενταφυλία means the priesthood of an Egyptian temple organized
 in five tribes.¹⁶⁶ There is also a little-known tax attested at
 Thebes called the πενταφυλία.¹⁶⁷ Perhaps some sort of σύνταξις
 is being referred to in these lines.

ll. 54-55: τὰς δὲ λυχνάβιας τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ποιούμεθα. In the
 Ptolemaic period, the βασιλικοὶ γεωργοὶ made contributions for the
 lighting of lamps in the temples.¹⁶⁸ In the Roman period, the
 illumination of city temples was sometimes provided for by
 gymnasiarchs.¹⁶⁹ The priests at Bacchias declare that they did
 not receive any such contribution toward the λυχνάβια and that
 it was provided by them at their own expense. Possibly such
 revenues were taxed. Lamps were burned daily in the temples.¹⁷⁰

L. 56: λαογρα(φούμεθα). Cf. *PSI* 1146 (second century A.D.),

¹⁶⁴ A. Segré, *Metrologia e Circolazione monetaria degli Antichi* (Bologna,
 1928), pp. 29-38.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. *P. Teb.* 122, l. 1 κοίτη Λεμεισα; *SB* 1007 Τυράννου . . . λεμύσου Σούχου
 θεοῦ μεγίστου; *P. Ryfl. Dem.* III, p. 234, n. 6; the Coptic word ΛΕΜΗΗΩΦΕ,
 "warrior, champion," equivalent to δύνατος in *I Kings* 17, 51, and στρατηγός
 in *Job* 15, 24 (Crum, *Coptic Dict.* 143b); Spiegelberg, *Demotica* I, 6.

¹⁶⁶ See p. 187 and n. 33.

¹⁶⁷ *O. Tait.*, p. 88, no. 82; *O. Mey.* 38 (ε φυλίας is expanded as πενταφυλίας);
 Wallace, *Taxation in Roman Egypt*, p. 249.

¹⁶⁸ *P. Teb.* 88 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 67), l. 12.

¹⁶⁹ *P. Amh.* 70 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 149).

¹⁷⁰ *P. Oxy.* 1453. For the λυχνάβια see the commentary on *P. Bruz.* 7535
 (*Chron. d'Égypte* XXIX [1940], pp. 134-149); Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I,
 p. 10 and n. 7.

l. 12, *λαογραφοῦνται*. The word ordinarily appears in the participial form *λαογραφοῦμενος*.

L. 60: *εἰκ(ονίσθη) φα(μένων) μὴ εἰδ(έναι) γρά(μματα) δ(ιὰ) Ἑρω() νο(μογράφου)*. An exact parallel for this illiteracy formula is found in *BGU 17, l. 25 (BL I, p. 9)*: *εἰκο(νίζεται) φαμέ(νον) μὴ εἰδό(τος) (l. εἰδέναι) γρ(άμματα) δι(ὰ) νο(μογράφου)*. The verb *γράφειν* is ordinarily found in this phrase instead of *εἰκονίζειν*¹⁷¹ which appears to have the same force as *γράφειν* in this use.¹⁷² I have preferred *εἰκ(ονίσθη)* to *εἰκ(ονίζεται)* because the aorist *ἔγραψα* or *ἔγραψα* is ordinarily found. Unlike II, V does not contain an illiteracy formula, but it is impossible to tell whether or not the other *γραφαί* from Bacchias were written by a nomograph for the priests, since they are fragmentary and the close of the documents is lost. There is no illiteracy formula in the letters of transmittal sent with the *γραφαί* (VIII-XVII), nor was XIX, a petition addressed to the strategos from two priests and signed by them, apparently written for the priests by a nomograph. It is probable that the majority of the priests at Bacchias, as at Tebtunis and Soknopaiou Nesos, knew how to write Greek.¹⁷³

III.

P. Lund 3 6

9 x 5 cm.

171 A. D.

This papyrus was published without a description or photograph by Hanell, who said only that it is very much torn on both sides. It dates from the same year as II, and it was a similar document, judging from the extant fragment, although it is not an exact duplicate.

A photograph furnished by Knudtzon has enabled me to make a transcription which differs considerably from that of Hanell in readings and restorations. The fundamental difference is that Hanell, on the basis of the texts then available, believed this to be a *γραφή* of the priests and furniture of Soknobraisis alone. I believe, however, that it is, like I and II, a joint *γραφή* of the priests and furniture of both gods and that the part which is

¹⁷¹ The illiteracy formulas have been collected in E. Majer-Leonhard, *Ἀγράμματοι* (Marburg, 1913) and F. X. J. Exler, *A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington, 1923), pp. 124-127.

¹⁷² The meaning of *εἰκονίζειν* has been the subject of much discussion; for bibliography, see Preisigke, *Fachwörter*, p. 66.

¹⁷³ See Otto's discussion of the education of the priests in Ptolemaic and Roman times (*Priester und Tempel*, II, pp. 234-238).

preserved is the *γραφή* of Soknokonnis rather than of Soknobraisis, as Hanell restored it. The list of furniture includes *ποτήρια*, listed before the *θυματήριον* (l. 10: the space requires this restoration). These articles are not found in the *γραφή* of Soknobraisis in II from this same year, and appear in his furniture for the first time in 172 (IV, l. 11). In both IV and V, moreover, they follow *θυματήριον*. On the other hand, the *γραφή* of Soknokonnis both in I and II does contain *ποτήρια* in the position found here. A second piece of evidence of the same sort is that the inventory lists no *σαλπίγγιον χαλχούν*, one or two of which are invariably included in the inventories of Soknobraisis. (See the commentary on I, ll. 47-48).

Although this text dates from the same year as II, there are differences which one might not expect to find in a copy of a *γραφή* for the same year. In III one finds *λογίμων* which is not in II, and other variations are possible in l. 2 and in the list of priests. A possible explanation is that the two documents were presented to different officials by different priests.

Restoration is made more difficult by the fact that neither margin is preserved. The restorations of ll. 5-13 may be considered almost certain as far as content is concerned, but the abbreviations employed and the beginnings and endings of lines may well not have been precisely those found here.

]. . . ε[
[.....] γνοθεως θε[.....]
[.....] πρε[σβ(υτέρου) ιερέων Σοκ[νοβραίσεως θεού]
[μεγίστου τῶν λ] ογίμων ιερώ τ[ῶν ὄντων ἐν κόμῃ]
5 [Βακχιάδι. γραφή] ιερέων καὶ χειρ[ισμοῦ τῶν ὄντων]
[ἐν τοῖς ιεροῖς τοῦ ἐ]νεστῶτος ια (ἔτους) Αἰρηλί[ου Ἀντωνίνου]
[Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου] υ. ἔστι δὲ τῶν μὲν ἐ[ν ιερῷ Σοκνο-]
[κόνεως ναὸς ξύλ(ινος) περικε]χρυσω(μένος) καὶ Πνεφερ[ῶτος ναὸς]
[ξύλ(ινος) περικεχρυσω(μένος)· λυχ]νείται χαλκαὶ σαλπγγω[ταί ιε·]
10 [ποτήρια χαλκ(ᾶ) ι· θυμια]τήριον(ν) χαλκ(ούν) α· συρί[γγια ξύλ(ινα)
β]
[ἔχοντα ἕκαστον φύλλα] χαλκ(ᾶ) ε· δίσκοι ξύλ(ινοι) β [περικεχρυσω-
(μένοι)·]
[χαλκίον χαλκ(ούν) α. ἔστι δ]ὲ καὶ τῶν ιερέων τὸ κ[ατ' ἀνδρα]
[ἐπικεκ(ρμένων) ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ιβ καὶ δι]αγραφῶν τὸ ἰσκρ[ιτικόν·]
II] ἐτεήσιος (ἔτῳ) μα
]μα. [
Ψεναμ] ούνε[ως
Ψεν] αμού[νεως]

15

Commentary

Ll. 1: One might read these letters as Ψό[σνε]ως, the name of the priest of Soknokonnis who submitted II in this same year. There is, however, no trace of the vertical stroke of Ψ which one would expect.

L. 2: It is unfortunate that more of this line is not preserved. The letters]γνοθεως are difficult to explain. The names of all the priests of Soknobraisis and all except one of Soknokonnis are sufficiently well preserved in II to rule out the interpretation of the letters as part of their names. In any case there would not be sufficient space to restore *ιερέως Σοκνοκόνηως* or the like before the name of the presbyter of Soknobraisis. The phrase θε[οῦ μεγίστου], as is found in II also from 171, suggests itself at the end of the line, but]γνοθεως cannot be reconciled with any known version of the name of Soknokonnis.

L. 3: In II the presbyter was Ἀμμωνίου Πέτεω(s).

L. 4: The phrase *λογίων ιερῶν* indicates a joint return. For the significance of *λόγιμος* as an indication of the rank of a temple, see p. 184 and note 15.

Ll. 5-6: χειρ[ισμοῦ τῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς] is restored from II, l. 6.

L. 6: The text is dated in the eleventh year of Marcus Aurelius (170-171). See the commentary on I, l. 7.

L. 8-9: Hanell omitted *ξύλ(ινος)* which invariably describes the first *ναός* listed in the inventories from Bacchias.

L. 10: Hanell read only *θυμια]τήριον(ν) χαλκ(οῦν) α σύρι[γγες*. For my restoration, cf. I, ll. 14-16.

L. 11: [ἔχοντα ἕκαστον φύλλα] χαλκ(ᾶ) ε is my restoration. These instruments are described in the inventory of Soknokonnis for 116 (I, l. 16) as having seven bands, not five. It is possible that two of the original bands of bronze were removed or lost between 116 and 171. See the commentary on I, ll. 14-16.

[περικεχρυσω(μένοι)]. This restoration I made from a comparison of IV, l. 13 and V, l. 11.

L. 12: χαλκίον χαλκ(οῦν) α is my restoration; cf. I, ll. 17-18; II, l. 12; IV, ll. 10 and 13; V, l. 11.

L. 13: The restoration of this line, except for *ισκρ[ιτικόν]*, is mine; cf. I, l. 19; II, ll. 13-14 and 32-33; V, l. 12.

Ll. 14-17: In these lines we have presumably the beginning of the *γραφὴ ἱερέων* of Soknokonnis. Unfortunately most of the corresponding part of the list in II is fragmentary. The son of Peteësis may be the second priest in II, l. 16, judging by the age. The year sign is not absolutely certain; it is possibly only a connecting line. If we are dealing with names of fathers here, three of them may be equated with lacunae in II, ll. 15-17, and one son of Psenamounis may be that in II, l. 25. The appearance of the name Psenamounis in ll. 16-17 of this text and ll. 17-18 of II, however, suggests the possibility that in III, as in II, they are names of priests, not of their fathers. In either case the vertical alignment of names would seem uneven.

IV.

P. Lund 3 5

Two fragments:

172 A. D.

a) 7 x 3 cm.

b) 10 x 6 cm.

This papyrus was published without a photograph by Hanell, who describes it as consisting of two fragments and very carelessly written. A photograph was subsequently furnished by Knudtzon. My text for the most part follows that of Hanell. Variants in readings and restorations are noted in the commentary below. This document differs, I believe, from the preceding *γραφαί* in the fact that it is a *γραφὴ* of the priests and furniture of Soknobraisis alone rather than of the two gods. It is to be noted that in I-III the joint report begins with the inventory and list of priests of Soknokonnis, whereas this text begins with those of Soknobraisis. Similar *γραφαί* of the priesthood of Soknobraisis alone are V and VI.

] [

[παρὰ Ὀρσε]γούφως ἱερέως Σο-
[κνοβραΐσεως θ]εοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλου
[κώμης Βακχιάδος Ἡρα]κλ(είδου) μερίδος. γραφὴ
5 [ἱε]ρέω[ν καὶ χειρ]ισμοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ
[ἐ]νεστώτος ιβ [(ἔτους)]. ἔστι δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
[Σ]οκνοβραΐσεως ναὸςξύλ(ινος) περικεχρυσω(μένος)
καὶ Πνεφερώ[το]ς ναὸς περικεχρυσω(μένος).
[λ]υχνίαι χαλκ(αί) σαλπινγ(ωταί) ιε· θυμια-
10 [τ]ήριον χαλκ(οῦν) α· [[χαλκίον χαλκ(οῦν) α·]]

- [π]οτήρια χαλκ(ᾶ) ι· σαλπύγγ(ιον) χαλκ(οῦν) α·
 κανόνια ξύλλ(ινα) β ἔχων φύλλα χαλκ(ᾶ) ζ·
 [δί]σκοι ξύλλ(ινοι) β [πε]ρικεχρυσω(μένοι)· χαλκ(ιον) χα(λκοῦν) α·
 [ἐ]στι δὲ κα[ὶ τῶ]ν ἱερέων τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα
 15 πάντων .[.....].....
 [Σ]ισόις [Ὀρσε]νούφ[εως] (ἐτῶν) [λδ]

Commentary

L. 1: This line contained the name and title of the official to whom the document was addressed.

L. 2: As in I, XIV, XV and XVI a priest not designated presbyter presents the γραφή. A Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, heads the list of priests of Soknobraisis in the preceding year (II, l. 34). The restoration is not certain, however, since we only know that the father's name is Orsenouphis and the same list contains the names of three other priests, Peteuris, Petesouchos, and Orsenouphis, also sons of an Orsenouphis (II, ll. 44-46), but the limited space of this line makes a short name preferable. A Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, represented the priests in a petition of the previous year (XIX) and again in 178 (XXI and XXII). He may also be the Sisois in XXIII (178-179).

L. 6: The text is dated in the twelfth year of Marcus Aurelius (171-172). See the commentary on I, l. 7.

L. 10: The scribe erased χαλκίον χαλκ(οῦν), and added it at the end of the list (l. 13).

L. 11: In the inventory of the previous year, the temple of Soknobraisis had two σαλπύγγια χαλκᾶ listed (II, l. 31). See the commentary on I, ll. 47-48. The ten ποτήρια had apparently been acquired during the year. They are not listed in II, and there is not space to restore them in I.

L. 12: κανόνια. Cf. V, l. 10. See the commentary on I, ll. 14-16. It is not clear whether ἔχων is a mistake in form or a misspelling of ἔχον(τα) (cf. I, l. 15).

L. 13: Hanell read the end of this line as χαλκχακ. I read these letters as χαλκ(ιον) χα(λκοῦν) α, the item which was erased in l. 10 above. The scribe used a more abbreviated form here than above, either because he inserted this correction after the following line had been written or because he wished to start the next line with the γραφή ἱερέων.

L. 15: One would expect to find here something similar to I, ll. 19-20; II, ll. 13-14 and 32-33; or BGU 162 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 91) ll. 15-17. It would have to be in a considerably abbreviated form, however, and it is difficult to see how the extant traces of letters could be fitted in. Hanell read [διαγρα]ψ[ά]γτων ἦν, but this is a doubtful as well as unsatisfactory reading.

L. 16: The list of priests of Soknobraisis begins with this line. Hanell read]ισοις [] νοεσ[. My restoration is based on an identification of this priest with Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, cf. above, on l. 2. He was thirty-three years of age in 171, according to II, so that his age is restored as thirty-four in this text.

V.

P. Lund 4 2

15 x 21.3 cm.

August 27, 188 A. D.

This papyrus is a complete γραφή ἱερέων from the temple of Soknobraisis. It consists of four fragments, of which one, *P. Lund* inv. nr. 99, was published by Hanell as *P. Lund* 3 7. Knudtzon has now published the complete text as *P. Lund* 4 2 with a photograph. The text printed here is the same as Knudtzon's edition with several slight exceptions. For a full commentary on the text see Knudtzon's edition.

(Traces of two lines)

- [παρὰ Πετεύρεως Πετεύρεως πρε]σβ(υτέρου) ἱερέων
 [Σοκνοβραίσιος θεοῦ μεγάλ(ου)] μεγάλ(ου) κώ[μ]ης
 5 [Βακχιάδος. γραφή ἱερέων κα]ὶ χρισμοῦ το[ῦ]
 [ἐ]ρεστῶ(τος) κη ἔτους. ἔσ[τι] δὲ τ[ῶ]ν μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ Σο-
 [κ]νοβραίσ[ι]ος ναὸς ξύλλ(ινος) περιεχρυσω(μένος) καὶ Πνεφερωῶ(τος)
 [ν]αὸς περ[ικ]εχρυσω[μ]ένος·] λυχνία χαλκ(αῖ) σαλπύγγω(ται) ιε·
 [θ]υματ(ήριον) χαλκ(οῦν) α· ποτήρια χαλκ(ᾶ) ι· σαλπύγγ[ο]ν
 10 χαλκ(οῦν) α· [κ]ανόνια ξύλλ(ινα) β ἔχοντα φύλλα χαλκ(ᾶ) ζ·
 δίσκοι [ξύλλ(ινοι)] β περιεχ[ρυσω(μένοι)]· χαλκίον χαλκ(οῦν) α.
 ἐ[σ]τι δὲ καὶ [τ]ῶν ἱερέων τῶ[ν] κατ' ἄνδρ[α] πάντων) ἐπικ(εκρυσμένον)
 ἐπὶ (δραχμαῖς) ιβ
 κ[α]ὶ διαγρα(ψάντων) τὸ ἰσ(κριτικόν).
 Πετεύρις Πετεύρεως τοῦ Μ[ύ]σθου] πρεσ(βύτερος) (ἐτῶν) μγ
 15 Σισόις Ὀρσενούφεως (ἐτῶν) μδ
 Πετεύρι[ς] Μύσθου (ἐτῶν) .
 Ἀμμώνιο[ς] Πετεύρεως (ἐτῶν) μδ



	Ὀρσενούφ[ι]ς Ὀρου	(ἐτῶν) λθ
	Ἀμμώνιος Ὀνώφρεως	(ἐτῶν) ηε
20	Θούλις Ὀρσενούφρεως	(ἐτῶν) λδ
	Πετεύρις Ὀρου	(ἐτῶν) λς
	Μύσθης Πετεύρεως	(ἐτῶν) λδ
	Ἰερανοῦ[π]ις Πετεύρεως	(ἐτῶν) κθ
	Ὀρσενούφης Ὀρου τοῦ Πετεύρεως	(ἐτῶν) κβ
25	Ἀμμώνι[ο]ς Ὀρου	(ἐτῶν) κ
	Θο[ύλι]ς Πετεύρεως	(ἐτῶν) ιζ
	Ἰερανοῦ[π]ις Ἀμμωνίου	(ἐτῶν) ιγ
	Πε[τ]εῦρις Μύσθου	(ἐτῶν) ιγ
	Ὀνώφρις Ὀρου ἱερεὺς Ἰσιδος	(ἐτῶν) κα
30	Πετεύρις (ἐτῶν) μγ	
	(ἔτους) κη [Μ]άρκου Α[ύ]ρηλίου Κομμώδου Ἀ[ν]τωνίου Καί- [σ]αρος	
	τοῦ κυρί[ου] ἐπαγο(μένων) δ.	

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: These lines most likely contained the name and title of the official to whom the *γραφὴ* was addressed.

L. 16: Knudtzon reads λ as the age of this priest. I would suggest ο, seventy.¹⁷⁴

L. 20: Knudtzon reads λα.

VI.

P. Lund 3 4

9 x 10 cm.

184-192 A.D.

Knudtzon has furnished me with a photograph of this papyrus published by Hanell. The left side is missing; the width of the lacuna in ll. 1-6 appears to be about 10-12 letters. The restoration of ll. 7-9, about which there can be little doubt, would fill a lacuna of only 7-8 letters. As Professor Welles pointed out, the margin was probably indented. The document is a *γραφὴ ἱερέων* καὶ *χειρισμοῦ* of Soknobraisis alone, since there is no space to insert the name and title of a priest of Soknokonnis. Cf. IV and V.

¹⁷⁴ A priest of the same name listed in II as fifty-four in 171 would be seventy-one when this report was made. A mistake of one year would not be extraordinary.

It is the only *γραφὴ* addressed to the inspector (*ἐξεταστής*) appointed by the *idios logos*.

[]ακους αἰρεθέντι ὑπὸ Κλωδίου -
[Ἀπολλωνίου το]ῦ κρα(τίστου) πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ πρὸς
[ἐξέτασιν χει]ρισμῶν τε καὶ προσόδων ἱερέων
[καὶ τῆς ἱερέων ?]προστασίας
5 [παρὰ Πετεύρεω]ς Πετεύρεως τοῦ Μύστου πρεσβ(υτέρου)
[ἱερέων ἱεροῦ Σοκ]νοβραίσεως θεοῦ μεγάλου με(γάλου)
[λογίμου ? κ]ώμη(ς) Βακχιάδος. *γραφὴ ἱε-*
[ρέων καὶ] χειρισμοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος [. . . (ἔτους)]
[Ἀυρηλίου] Κομμώδου Ἀνω[γίνου Καίσαρος]
10 [τοῦ κυρί]ου . . .
[.....] . . . α[

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: Claudius Apollonios held the office of *idios logos* in 194 A.D., according to Wilcken, *Chrest.* 52, and it now appears that he was already in office under Commodus, though not before October 5, 183, when Modestus is known to have been *idios logos*.¹⁷⁵ I have dated this text 184-192; even if Claudius Apollonios succeeded Modestus, at some later date than October 5, in the year 183, a *γραφὴ* would not be filed until the next July.

L. 3: *ἐξέτασιν* is Wilcken's restoration.¹⁷⁶ Hanell had already pointed out that the official in this text was referred to in *P. Teb.* 315 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 71, from the second century A.D.), in which he is called [ἐξε]ταστήν [τ]ῶν χειρισμῶν [τ]ῶν ἐν τοῖ[ς] ἱερ[ο]ῖ[ς] (ll. 11-12). Cf. *P. Fouad* inv. no. 211 (published by Scherer in *Bull. de l'Inst. fr. d'Arch. or. XLI* [1942], pp. 43-73), Col. II, ll. 4-5: ἐξέτασι]ς τοῦ χειρισμοῦ καὶ τῶν <<καὶ τῶν>> ἀναθημάτων γινέσθω . . . χει]ρισμῶν τε καὶ προσόδων ἱερέων. Wilcken (*Chrest.* 71, l. 11) has suggested "Bestände (eigentlich die Verwaltungsobjekte)" as the meaning of *χειρισμῶν* in this phrase. The *πρόσδοδος* is the income of the temples concerning which certain rules were laid down in the Gnomon of the *idios logos* (73, 74, and 79). No doubt the inspector of the *idios logos* determined whether these rules were being observed. Cf. *P. Rein.* 94, a declaration of two hierotektones from a temple in Oxyrhynchos, ll. 15-21: Ὀμνύομεν . . . μήτε χειρισμὸν ἢ πρόσοδον ἔχειν . . .

¹⁷⁵ *P. S. I.* 928. See the bibliography on the *idios logos* in p. 198, n. 85, above.

¹⁷⁶ Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 233.

L. 4: *προστασίας*. This word is used in the sense of management of a temple in *P. Theb. Bank. 2*, l. 6 (second century B. C.).¹⁷⁷ In that text an *Ἀσκληπιεῖον* is leased by the king and with it the *λειτουργία* and *προστασία* of the *Ἀσκληπιεῖον*.¹⁷⁸

L. 5: The restoration was suggested by Bataille in his commentary on VIII (*P. Fouad 11*), l. 3. This is the only text in the group in which the spelling is *Μύστου* instead of *Μύσθου*. Peteuris, son of Peteuris and grandson of Mysthes, appears as presbyter not only in this text but also in VIII (ca. 186), and V (188). The Peteuris, son of Peteuris, who was presbyter in 187 (IX) and perhaps also in 189 (the probable date of XI), was very likely the same priest. For only one priest named Peteuris, son of Peteuris, is listed in the *γραφή* of 188 (V).

L. 6: *ιερέων ιεροῦ* is my restoration; cf. XV, l. 5 and XVI, l. 5. Although *ιεροῦ* does not always follow the title *πρεσβ(υτέρου) ιερέων*, it seems advisable to restore it here if *λογίμου*, which should modify *ιεροῦ*, is restored in the next line. Hanell's text does not indicate the abbreviation of the second *μεγάλου*.

L. 7: It is very uncertain what should be restored at the beginning of the line. I have suggested *λογίμου* found in XIII, ll. 7-10: *ιερέων θεοῦ Σοκνοβραίσεως μεγάλου μεγάλου λογίμου κόμης Βακχιάδος*. In that text *λόγιμος* would appear to agree with *θεοῦ*, but it was a common description of *ιερόν*, as in III, l. 4 and XXI, l. 3. Another possibility is *-γάλου*, continued from l. 6. Cf. *ιερέων* in ll. 7-8.

Ll. 8-10: The restorations are mine.

VII.

P. Yale 378 + 379

8 x 8.5 cm.

Undated

This papyrus is medium brown in color with traces of red paint. The text is written on the recto in a hand which resembles that of I (116 A. D.) and which is not unlike Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol. 27* (second century A. D.). The verso is blank. The

¹⁷⁷ Cf. *OGI 331*, l. 22 (Pergamum, second century B. C.). Welles, *Royal Correspondence* no. 65, l. 18; cf. *ibid.* p. 360.

¹⁷⁸ See the comments of Otto (*Priester und Tempel I*, p. 235) and F. Preisigke (*Girwesen im griechischen Aegypten* [Strassburg, 1910], p. 240 and n. 1) on this text.

papyrus has a left margin of 1.1 cm. and a lower margin of 1.3 cm. but is incomplete at the top and on the right side. Judging from the part preserved, perhaps as much as one half of the text is lost on the right side. How much was lost above, it is impossible to determine. The papyrus is actually composed of two fragments which I have joined together.

It is very questionable whether the text comes from the archives of Soknobraisis. There is no reason, as a matter of fact, to believe that it does come from Bacchias except that it was purchased in the same group of papyri. The articles listed in the inventory are not the same as those found in the inventories of Soknobraisis and Soknokonnis at Bacchias, and there is no evidence that there was at Bacchias a temple of Aphrodite, which is mentioned in this text. The text is, however, of interest in connection with the *γραφαί* from Bacchias because it contains detailed descriptions of gilded objects similar to those at Bacchias. The document was apparently not a *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ* like the preceding texts, for it contains the inventories of furniture for more than one temple. It appears to be more like *P. Oxy. 1449*, which is an inventory of articles from a number of temples and contains no lists of priests.

] []
 Ἐρμῆς ξύλινος π[ε]ρικεχρυσομέ[νος] ναὸς ξύλινος περιεχρυσομένος
 πετάλοις]
 ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν κύων ξύλινος περιεχ[ρυσομένος] ναὸς ξύλινος]
 περιεχρυσομέν[ο]ς πετάλοις ἐν ᾧ ἔ[στι] περιεχρυσομέ-]
 5 νον πετάλοις κ[αί] ἔχον φύ[λλα] ?]
 ὡς ναὸς ξ[ύ]λινος περιεχρυσ[ομένος] πετάλοις ἐν ᾧ ἔστι]
 [π]ερί[κ]εχρυσομένην πετάλοις [ναὸς ξύλινος πέ-]
 ρικεχρυσομένος πετάλοις ἐ[ν] ᾧ ἔστι περιεχρυσομένος πε-]
 τάλοις καὶ ἐν ἱερῷ Ἀφροδ[ίτης] ἐστὶ ναὸς ξύλινος περιεχρυσ-]
 10 σομένος πε[τά]λοις [. . .] [περιεχρυσ-]
 σομέ[ν]ον π[ε]τά[λ]οις] . κε. [βα-]
 σίδιον . []

Translation

A gilded wooden Hermes . . . a wooden shrine gilded with leaves in which there is a gilded wooden dog . . . a wooden shrine gilded with leaves in which there is . . . gilded with leaves and having . . . a wooden shrine gilded with leaves in which there is . . . gilded with leaves . . . a wooden shrine gilded with leaves

in which there is . . . gilded with leaves and in the temple of Aphrodite there is a wooden shrine gilded with leaves . . . gilded with leaves . . . a small base . . .

Commentary

L. 2: Ἐρμῆς ξύλινος π[ε]ρικεχρωμέ[νος]. Similar objects are mentioned elsewhere. The temple at Gynaikon Nesos had a gilded wooden shrine of Harpocras within which was an image described as Ἄρποκρᾶς ξύλινος περικεχρωσμένος,¹⁷⁹ and in the temple of Soknopaios at Soknopaiou Nesos there were three representations of Besis, one of bronze, one of silver, and the third of an unknown material.¹⁸⁰ These images may have been dedicatory offerings like the images of wood, bronze, and marble mentioned in *P. Oxy.* 1449. The bronze statuette of Osiris, the head of which was found in the temple of Soknokonnis at Bacchias,¹⁸¹ is perhaps to be recognized as such an offering.

L. 3: κύων ξύλινος περικεχ[ρωσμένος]. An image of a dog is not found in any other inventory of temple property. It is probably to be connected with the worship of Anubis, the jackal god.¹⁸² The temple of Soknopaios had images of lions¹⁸³ and one image of the sacred ibis.¹⁸⁴

L. 4: περικεχρωσμέν[ο]ς πετάλοις This phrase refers to the process of gilding with sheets of gold leaf.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁹ P. Rainer 8 (apud Wessely, *Denkschrift. Ak. Wien* XLVII [1902], Abh. 4, pp. 58-59). For these statuettes in general, see Grassi, *Studi della Scuola pap.* IV (1926), 4, pp. 37-38; Otto, *op. cit.* I, p. 332; W. Schubart, *Ägyptische Goldschmiedarbeiten (Mitteilungen aus der ägyptischen Sammlung I, Königliche Museen [Berlin 1910])*, pp. 192-193.

¹⁸⁰ BGU 387, Col. II, ll. 9, 11, 25.

¹⁸¹ *Fayûm Towns*, p. 38; cf. the statuette of Osiris found in the temple at Euhemeria (*op. cit.*, p. 45).

¹⁸² For the worship of Anubis, see Budge, *Gods of the Egyptians*, II, pp. 261-266, and R. Pietschmann, s. v. "Anubis," *RE* I, 2645-2649. See also SB 5796, a dedication erected to Anubis by a κννοβοσκός at Philadelphia in behalf of Apollonios and Zenon.

¹⁸³ BGU 387, Col. II, l. 5. For the worship of the lion in Egypt, see Budge, *op. cit.* II, pp. 359-362.

¹⁸⁴ BGU 387, Col. II, l. 22.

¹⁸⁵ See A. Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* (London, 1934), pp. 188-190; Schubart, *Ägyptische Goldschmiedarbeiten*, p. 193 and n. 1; C. R. Williams, *Gold and Silver Jewelry and Related Objects* (Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities, New York Historical Society, New York, 1924); A. Neuberger, *The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients* (London, 1930), pp. 29-37; H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern* (Leipzig, 1886), IV, 1, pp. 229-230.

L. 5: ἔχον φύ[λλα? Another possibility is ἔχον φύ[λλα. Cf. *P. Lond.* 191, ll. 10-11, and see the commentary on I, ll. 14-16. In this text it is almost certainly not any musical instrument which had the φύλλα but a small image of some sort within a shrine. The word may be used here to describe some kind of metal appliqué.

L. 6:]ως ναός. The ending -ως is very probably the genitive ending of the name of a deity.

L. 11:].ικε[. The word περικεχρωσμένος is not to be restored here because the letter following ε appears to have a straight vertical stroke and cannot be read as χ.

Ll. 11-12: βα]σιδιον. Cf. BGU 781, Col. III, l. 6, where βασιδιον means the bottom or base of a saucer.

VIII.

P. Fouad 11

12 x 7.5 cm.

ca. 186 A. D.

According to Bataille (*Ét. de Pap.* IV [1938], p. 198) the papyrus is greyish yellow and the hasty, careless writing, which is parallel to the papyrus fibers, is similar to Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol.* 26a. The text is that of Bataille with the exception of the restoration of ll. 12-13 and several other minor changes which are explained in the commentary. No photograph was published. The document is a letter of transmittal which accompanied the γραφή and was signed by the official to whom the γραφή was submitted. It was then returned to the temple and kept as a receipt (ἀποχή). Nos. IX-XVII are similar documents.

Ἀπολλοτᾶ στρ(ατηγῶ) Ἄρσι(νοίτου)

Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος

παρὰ Πετεύρωσ Πετε[ύρωσ]

τοῦ Μύσθου πρεσβ(υτέρου) [ἱερέων]

5 Σοκνοβράσεωσ θεο[ῦ]

μεγάλου μεγάλου

κόμησ Βακχιάδο[ς.]

κατεχώρασα τὴν γρα[φὴν]

ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμ[οῦ τοῦ προκ(ειμένου)]

10 ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶ[τος κ. (ἔτους)]

Μάρκου Αὔρηλιο[ν Κομμόδου]

Ἄντ[ω]νείνου [Κ.]αίσαρος. [(second hand): στρ(ατηγῶ) δι']

Ἄρποκ() βοηθ(οῦ) κατεχ(ωρίσθη).

Translation

To Apollotas, strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Peteuris, son of Peteuris and grandson of Mysthes, presbyter of the priests of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted the list of priests and the inventory of the aforesaid temple for the current twenty ----- year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar. (Second hand): It had been filed with the strategos through Harpoc (), his assistant.

Commentary

L. 1: For Apollotas, the strategos, see H. Henne, *Liste des Stratèges des Nomes égyptiens à l'Époque gréco-romaine* (Cairo, 1935), pp. 9 and 55 and Bataille, *Ét. de Pap. IV* (1938), p. 198. He is known to have held office in 186.

Bataille restored Ἀροι[νοίτου] but I have assumed that the word was abbreviated, as it regularly was in the other texts of this group.

Ll. 3-4: For Peteuris, son of Peteuris and grandson of Mysthes, the presbyter, see the commentary on VI, l. 5.

L. 4: Bataille restored the title as πρεσβ(υτέρου) [τῶν ἱερ(έων)], but in the group of texts from Bacchias neither the article after πρεσβύτερος nor the abbreviation ἱερ(έων) is found.

L. 8: σοι is omitted after κατεχώρισα, as in XVI. This is the only text in which there is the definite article before γραφήν.

L. 10: Bataille based his restoration of κ. (ἔτους) on the fact that Apollotas held office in 186.

Ll. 12-13: Bataille restored these lines: Ἀντ[ω]νείνου [Κ]αίσαρος. [2^o main Ὁ δέινα βασ(ιλικός) γραμματεὺς δ(ιὰ)] Ἀρποκ() βοηθ(οῦ) κατεχ(ώρισα). In my restoration, I have rejected Bataille's suggestion that the document though addressed to the strategos was signed by the basilikos grammateus,¹⁸⁶ because XI, like this text addressed to the strategos, is signed for the strategos by his assistant (l. 16), κατεχ(ωρίσθη) στρα(τηγῶ) δι' Ἀμμω(νίου). In writing δι' I follow the example of X and XI. I have expanded κατεχ(ωρίσθη) with the dative case on the basis of XVI in which

¹⁸⁶ Bataille, *Ét. de Pap. IV* (1938), pp. 199-200.

it is written out in full as κατεχωρίσθη. Bataille has indicated no trace of writing after κατεχ and presumably in this case the date was omitted; cf. XII.

IX.

P. Yale 362

21.7 x 5.8 cm.

August 28, 187 A.D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. The text is written on the recto and the verso is blank. The lower half of the sheet of papyrus is blank. The left margin is 1-1.5 cm., the upper 1.7-2 cm., the lower 11.2 cm., and the right .3 cm. This text reveals that a γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ was sent to the eklogistes, a fact hitherto unknown. Unlike similar documents found in the archives, the signature of the official to whom it was addressed is apparently not written by a second hand. The document would, then, appear to be a copy. Probably, as Scherer suggests, the original document was sent to the office of the eklogistes in Alexandria and a copy was made by Didymos, one of the receivers of the documents, and given to the priests. (See the commentary on l. 1.)

παραλή(μπταις) βιβλ(ίων) ἐγλογ(ιστοῦ)
 παρὰ Πετεύρεως Πετε-
 ύρεως πρεσβ(υτέρου) ἱερέων
 Σοκνοβραίσιος θεοῦ
 5 κόμης Βακχ(ιάδος). κατε-
 χώρισα ὑμῖν ὅστ[ε]
 τῆ ἐγλογιστῆ γρα-
 φῆν ἱερέων καὶ χειρι[σμου]
 τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτ[ος]
 10 κζ (ἔτους). Δίδυμος ὁ καὶ Π[το-
 λεμαῖος σεση(μείωμα).
 (ἔτους) κζ Μάρκου Αἰρηλείου
 Κομμόδου Ἀντωνείνου
 Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
 15 Μεσορῆ ἐπαγομ(ένων) ε

Translation

To the receivers of the documents of the eklogistes from Peteuris, son of Peteuris, presbyter of the priests of Soknobraisis, god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you for the

eklogistes a list of priests and an inventory of the temple for the current twenty-seventh year. I, Didymos called Ptolemaios, have signed it.

The twenty-seventh year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar the lord. Mesore, the fifth intercalated day.

Commentary

L. 1: παραλή(μπται) βιβλ(ίων) ἐγλογ(ιστοῦ). It is clear from ll. 6-7 that the function of the receivers of the documents of the eklogistes was to receive the official documents of the eklogistes, who was not himself in the Arsinoite nome, and to deliver them to him in Alexandria. This is the only case in which these officials were called παραλήμπται; but cf. *P. Amh.* 69 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 190, dated 154 A.D.), ll. 2-4: Ἀφροδισίω καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ προχειρισθείσι πρὸς παράληψ[ιν] κ[αὶ κα]τακομιδὴν βιβλῖως (1. βιβλίων) πεμ[π]ομ(ένων) εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τῷ τοῦ νομοῦ ἐγλ[ο]γιστῇ καὶ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ.¹⁸⁷

Ll. 2-3: For Peteuris, son of Peteuris, see the commentary on VI, 1. 5.

L. 4: Σοκνοβραΐσιος. For the variation in the spelling of the god's name, see p. 183, n. 12.

Ll. 6-7: ὡστ[ε] τῷ ἐγλογιστῇ, "for the eklogistes." For this use of ὡστε, see Preisigke, *s. v.* ὡστε, *Wörterbuch* II, 780.

Ll. 10-11: Didymos is most probably one of the receivers rather than the eklogistes himself. *P. Amh.* 69 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 190) is signed by two of the receivers and *P. Flor.* 358¹⁸⁸ by one, as in our text.

Ll. 12-15: Presumably these lines containing the date were written in the original document by the first hand, as in XV.

X

P. Lund 3 2

10 x 8 cm.

August 28, 188 A.D.

This papyrus was first published without a photograph or description by Hanell. Knudtzon furnished me with a photo-

¹⁸⁷ Cf. *P. RyI.* 83 (138-161 A.D.) and *P. Flor.* 358 (146), which was first published in *Ausonia* II (1907), p. 138 and is frequently cited as *P. Ausonia* 2. See the note on *P. RyI.* 83, l. 18 on the eklogistes.

¹⁸⁸ See n. 187 above.

graph and has reedited the text (*P. Lund* 4 5). It is a difficult one to read: the handwriting is careless and there are many holes in the papyrus. Our readings differ in several lines, especially ll. 4-5.

Ἑρμοφίλῳ βασιλ(ικῷ) γρ[α(μματεῖ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου)]

Ἡρακ(λείδου) μερίδος

παρὰ Πετε[ύρ]εως . . .

πρεσβ(υτέρου) ἱερέων . . . ου [Σοκνο-]

5 β<ρ>άσεως κώμης Βακχ[ιάδος.]

κατεχώρισά σοι γραφὴν

ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ

ἐνεστῶτος κη (ἔτους) Αὐρηλίου

Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος

10 τοῦ κυρίου Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ

(second hand):

δι' Ἑρ(μοφίλου) Με(σορή) ἐπαγ(ομένων) ε

Translation

To Hermophilos, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Peteuris, son of . . . , presbyter of the priests of Soknobrais of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory . . . for the current twenty-eighth year of Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar the lord Pius Augustus.

(Second hand): Through Hermophilos, Mesore the fifth intercalated day.

Commentary

L. 1: I have restored Ἀρσι(νοίτου) which is not omitted in the other texts of the group. The photograph shows that there is ample room for this restoration.

Ll. 3-4: ὁμοί[ως] is Knudtzon's reading. Hanell read Ὠρ[ου]. Μύσ[θου] is also possible.

L. 4: ἱεροῦ should follow ἱερέων but I cannot read it.

Ll. 4-5: Hanell read Σοκ[νο]β<ρ>άσεως; Knudtzon reads [Βου]-βάσεως.

L. 7: I cannot find room for Knudtzon's reading of [τοῦ ἱερ]οῦ [το]ῦ after χειρισμοῦ.

L. 8: κη is Knudtzon's reading. Hanell read κ.

L. 11: Hanell did not attempt a reading. Knudtzon reads δὲ Ἐρ(μοφίλου) βασ(ιλικοῦ) [γρ(αμματέως)?] ἐπαγο(μένων) ε.

XI

P. Yale 361

20.2 x 7.5 cm.

August 28, 188 or 189 A.D.

This papyrus is light brown in color with medium-brown color stains. It has a left margin of 1-1.5 cm., upper of 1.2-1.5 cm., lower 5 cm., and no right margin. The text is written on the recto, and the verso is blank. The hand is rather large and careless and inclines to the right. The signature is written with a thicker stroke and is less inclined to the right. While the lines written by the first hand tend to go upwards toward the right, those written by the second hand go downwards. This document, like VIII, is addressed to the strategos.

Ἀμμωνίῳ στρα(τηγῷ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου)
 Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος
 παρὰ Πετεύρεως Πετε-
 ύρεως πρεσβυτέρου
 5 ἱερέων Σοκνοβραΐσιος
 θεοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλου
 κόμης Βακχιάδος.
 κατεχώρισά σοι
 γραφήν ἱερέων καὶ
 10 χειρισμοῦ τοῦ προ-
 κειμένου ἱεροῦ τοῦ
 ἐνεστῶτος κθ (ἔτους)
 [Μ]άρκου Αὔρηλίου
 [Κο]μμόδου Ἀντωνίνου
 15 Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
 (second hand):
 κατεχω(ρίσθη) στρα(τηγῷ) δι' Ἀμμο(νίου)
 κη Μεσορῆ ἐπαγο(μένων) ε.

Translation

To Ammonios, strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Peteuris, son of Peteuris, presbyter of the

priests of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory of the aforesaid temple for the current twenty-ninth year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Caesar the lord.

(Second hand): It has been submitted to the strategos through Ammonios. The twenty-eighth year, Mesore, the fifth intercalated day.

Commentary

L. 1: The date of this text is the twenty-ninth year, according to the priest who wrote the statement (l. 12), but August 28 of the twenty-eighth year, according to the assistant of the strategos, Ammonios, who signed it (l. 17). It is known that Ammonios was strategos from February of the twenty-ninth year to the thirtieth year and that Ammonios' predecessor, Apollonios called Ptolemaios, was in office at some time during the twenty-eighth year. There is then, nothing to preclude assigning this document to August 28 of the twenty-ninth year (189). We cannot be absolutely certain, however, that Ammonios had not succeeded Apollonios some time in the twenty-eighth year. See Henne, *Liste des Stratèges*, p. 55. The presbyter in 188 (V) bore the same name as that of the presbyter in this text and was very likely the same priest. This is not conclusive evidence, however, for dating this text in 188 since the same priest might have been presbyter in both years. See the commentary on VI, l. 5.

L. 16: Cf. VIII, ll. 12-13. Ammonios is perhaps the βοηθός of the strategos rather than the strategos himself. As in *P. RyI. 283*, the strategos and his βοηθός may have had the same name.

L. 17: The year sign is omitted.

XII.

P. Lund 3 1

15.5 x 9 cm.

199 A.D.

This papyrus was published by Hanell with a photograph (Tafel II). It has a left margin of 2 cm., upper of 1.2-1.5 cm., lower of 1.5 cm. and no right margin. The writing on the right half of the papyrus is in general quite blurred. The hand is the same as that of XVIII. My transcription for the most part follows that of Hanell, except that I have put into brackets or

dotted a number of letters which are completely or almost completely invisible in the photograph.

- Ζωίλω βιβλ[ω]φύλακι τ[ο]ῦ
 Ἄρσι(νοίτου)
 παρὰ Ὁρσενούφωος Ὀρ[ο]ῦ
 πρεσβ(υτέρου) ἱερέων Σοκνοβραΐσεω[s]
 5 θεοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλου
 κάμης Βακχιάδος.
 κατεχώρισα ὑμῖν γρ[αφή]ν
 ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ τοῦ ἱ[εροῦ]
 τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ζ (ἔτους) Αὐτο-
 10 κρατόρων Καισάρων Λουκίου
 Σεπτίμιου Σεβήρου Εὐσεβίου
 Περτίνακος Ἀραβικοῦ Ἀδια[βητικοῦ]
 Παρθικοῦ Μεγίστου καὶ Μάρκου
 Αὐρηλίου Ἀντω[ν]ίνου
 15 Σεβαστῶν.

(second hand):

Ζωίλος βιβλι[οφύ]λαξ τ[ο]ῦ Ἄρ(σινότου)
 σεση(μείωμαι)

Translation

To Zoilos, bibliophylax of the Arsinoite nome, from Orsenouphis, son of Horos, presbyter of the priests of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory of the temple for the current seventh year of the imperial Caesars, Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus Maximus and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Augusti.

(Second hand): I, Zoilos, bibliophylax of the Arsinoite nome, have signed it.

Commentary

L. 1: Hanell attempted no reading of the line after βιβλ; the rest was proposed by Wilcken.¹⁸⁹ Zoilos, the βιβλιοφύλαξ δημοσίων λόγων, is otherwise unknown. As Hanell pointed out, *P. Oxy.* 1256 (282 A.D.) a γραφή ἀφηλίκων νίων ἱερέων is addressed to the

¹⁸⁹ Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 233. Cf. the comments of van Groningen, *Museum* XLVII (1940), 168.

βιβλιοφύλακες δημοσίων λόγων. There were two of these officials, and they were ordinarily both included in the address of documents sent to their office.

Ll. 3-4: Orsenouphis, son of Horos, also appears in XVIII as presbyter.

L. 7: ὑμῖν. As Hanell pointed out, the writer used ὑμῖν instead of σοι although he is addressing only one of the two bibliophylakes. Ordinarily, as I said above, documents were addressed to both of them, not just one. The writer may have had both officials in mind when he wrote ὑμῖν.¹⁹⁰

L. 9: The date is the seventh year (198-199). See the commentary on I, l. 7.

L. 16: Hanell did not attempt a restoration of this line beyond βιβλιο. The rest was suggested by Wilcken.

XIII.

P. Yale 903

16 x 6.8 cm.

July 29, 204 A.D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. The writing is on the recto and the verso is blank except for a few smudges of ink. There is a left margin of 1.2-1.5 cm., upper of 1.5 cm., lower of 1.8 cm. and no right margin. The handwriting of the main text which is almost a back-hand and the signature below are on the whole careful and legible hands.

Κανόπῳ τῷ καὶ Ἀσκ[λεπιάδῃ]
 βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ) Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἑρα(κλείδου) μερίδος
 διαδεχ(ομένη) καὶ τὴν στρα(τηγίαν)
 τῆς αὐ(τῆς) μερίδος
 5 παρὰ Σισίτιος Ὁρσε-
 νούφωος καὶ τῶν
 λοιπ(ῶν) ἱερέων θεοῦ Σο-
 κνοβραΐσεως μεγά-
 λου μεγάλου λογιμῶν

¹⁹⁰ In E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin, 1906-1936) II. 1, pp. 40-43, and P. Collomp, "La Lettre à plusieurs destinataires," *Atti del IV Congresso internazionale di papirologia*, 1936, pp. 199-207, the use of the plural instead of the singular in addressing a single official is discussed.

- 10 κόμης Βακχιάδος.
κατεχωρίσαμέν σοι
γρα(φήν) ἱερέων καὶ χειρισ-
μοῦ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος
δωδεκάτου ἔτους
(second hand):
15 κατεχω(ρίσθη) βασι(λικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ) δια-
δεχο(μένῳ) καὶ τὴν στρα(τηγίαν)
ιβ (ἔτους) Μεσορῆ ε.

Translation

To Kanopos called Asklepiades, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome and acting strategos of the same meris, from Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, and the rest of the priests of the famous (temple) of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. We have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory for the current twelfth year.

(Second hand): It has been submitted to the basilikos grammateus and acting strategos. The twelfth year, the fifth of Mesore.

Commentary

Ll. 1-3: Kanopos called Asklepiades is known to have held the office of basilikos grammateus from February, 202, to April, 203 (see Henne, *Liste des Stratèges*, p. 69). He is also designated acting strategos in XXV (recto and verso).

L. 7: λοιπ(ῶν). Cf. XIX, ll. 3-4; XXIV, l. 4; *P. Lond.* 347, l. 6; *BGU* 296, l. 11; *P. Jan.* 34, l. 5; *P. Teb.* 313, ll. 7-8, in which the rest of the priesthood is included as οἱ λοιποὶ ἱερεῖς after the names of one or two priests. A similar phrase, σὺν ἑτέροις, includes the rest of the priests with the three who address the petitions in XXI-XXII. Both phrases very likely designate as presbyters the priests whose names they follow.¹⁰¹

L. 9: λογίμου. The temple of Soknobraisis was called λόγιμον in III and XXI. Here one should supply ἱεροῦ after ἱερέων.

L. 17: ε might possibly be read λ (the thirtieth of Mesore), or perhaps ἐπαγο(μένων) is to be supplied. As in XIV, XVI, and XVIII the year is given without the name of the emperor by

¹⁰¹ Otto, *Priester und Tempel* I, pp. 47-48; II, p. 291, n. 2.

both the priest and the official. The year is identified as the twelfth of Septimius Severus by the name of the official, Kanopos Asklepiades (ll. 1-3).

XIV.

P. Fouad 12

28 x 8 cm.

August 28, 207 A.D.

This papyrus was first published by Bataille in *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1933) with a description on p. 200 and a photograph in Pl. V. My transcription is substantially the same as his except that I have dotted several letters which I cannot make out completely in the photograph.

- Μονίμου Γεμέλλου βασι-
λικῶ γρα(μματεῖ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος
παρὰ Ἀμμωνίου Ὀννώφρη[ι]φ[ι]ς
ἱερέως Σοκνοβρ[αί]σ[ι]ως
5 θεοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλου κό-
μης Βακχιάδος.
κατεχωρίσά σοι γραφήν
ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ
τοῦ προκειμένου ἱεροῦ
10 τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ιε (ἔτους).
(second hand):
κατεχ(ωρίσθη) Γε(μέλλου) βασι(λικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ)
(ἔτους) ιε Μεσορῆ ἐπαγ(ομένων) ε.

Translation

To Monimus Gemellus, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Ammonios, son of Onnophris, priest of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory of the aforesaid temple for the current fifteenth year.

(Second hand): It has been submitted to Gemellus, basilikos grammateus. The fifteenth year, Mesore, the fifth intercalated day.

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: Monimus Gemellus is known to have held this office in 212 A.D. (see Henne, *Liste des Stratèges*, p. 69, and Bataille,

Ét. de Pap. IV [1938], p. 201). XV (209) is also addressed to him.

L. 2: γρα(μματεῖ). Bataille read γρ(αμματεῖ).

L. 3: Like I, IV, XV and XVI this document is presented by a priest without the title of presbyter.

L. 4: Bataille restored the name of the god as Σοκνοβρ[ασ]έως. See p. 183 and nn. 12-13 above.

L. 11: Bataille expanded the abbreviations as κατεχ(ώρισα) Γε(μέλλος) βασ(ιλικός) γρ(αμματεῖς), but cf. XVI, l. 13, κατεχωρίσθη.

L. 12: As in XIII, XVI and XVIII the name of the emperor is not given, but he can be identified as Septimius Severus by the name of the basilikos grammateus, Monimus Gemellus.

XV.

P. Yale 907

23 x 7.5 cm.

August 28, 209 A. D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. It has a left margin of 1 cm., upper 2 cm., lower 2.5-3 cm., and right .2 cm. There is a lacuna of 1.6 cm. in the upper right half of the papyrus. The text is written on the recto and the verso is blank. The hand of the body of the text is similar to but not identical with that of XII and XVIII. The second hand is distinguished from the first particularly by the formation of the epsilon and by the faintness of the color of the ink.

P. Lund inv. nr. 299 is a small fragment which fills the lacuna in the upper right half of the Yale papyrus (ll. 1-12). Knudtzon has sent me a transcription of it with permission to insert it here. The vertical line indicates where the Yale papyrus ends and the Lund fragment begins.

It is possible that, unlike VIII-XIV and XVI, this is a receipt for a joint γραφή of the priests and furniture of both the gods, rather than of Soknobraisis alone. Named in it are two priests, whereas in the other receipts only one priest of Soknobraisis is said to have presented the report. They are not designated priests of Soknobraisis, but simply "priests of the temple(s)." Moreover, the report is termed "a list of priests and an inventory of the aforesaid village." A joint return, such as II, would of course be presented by two priests.

Μονίμω Γεμέλλω | βασιλ(ικῶ)
γρα(μματεῖ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακ(λείδου) μερ|ίδ(ος)
παρὰ Ὀρσενούφω|ς Ὀρ[ο]υ

καὶ Θεόδωω Ὀρσ|ενού-

5 φεωσ ἱερέων ἱ|ερ[ῶν ?]

κόμησ Βακχ|ίδωσ.

κατεχωρίσαμέ|γ σοι

γραφήν ἱερέω|ν καὶ

χιρισμοῦ τῆ|ς προ-

10 κειμένησ κόμ|ησ

τοῦ ἐνεστῶτωσ | ἔξ (ἔτους)

καὶ .[.]. [..]με... | του

τὸ ἴσο[ν].

(second hand):

κατεχ[ω(ρίσθη)] βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ)

15 (ἔτους) ἔξ ἐπαγο(μένων) ε.

(first hand):

(ἔτους) ἔξ Δουκίου Σεπτιμίου

Σεονήρου Εὐσεβοῦσ Περτίνακωσ

καὶ Μάρκων Αὐρηλίων Ἀντων[ίνω]

Εὐσεβοῦσ Σεβαστῶν

20 καὶ Πουβλίων Σεπτιμίου

Γέτα Καίσαρωσ Σεβαστοῦ

Μεσορῆ ἐπαγο(μένων) ε.

Translation

To Monimus Gemellus, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Orsenouphis, son of Horos, and Theudis, son of Orsenouphis, priests of the temples (?) of the village of Bacchias. We have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory of the aforesaid village for the current seventeenth year, and . . . the duplicate.

(Second hand): It has been submitted to the basilikos grammateus, the seventeenth year, [Mesore], the fifth intercalated day.

(First hand): The seventeenth year of Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius, Augusti, and Publius Septimius Geta Caesar Augustus, Mesore, the fifth intercalated day.

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: XIV is also addressed to Monimus Gemellus.

Ll. 3-5: The name Theudis does not appear elsewhere in the archives. Its nominative form is uncertain.

L. 5: $\epsilon|\epsilon\rho[\omega\nu?]$. Cf. II, l. 6 and III, l. 4. If this is a return for the temple of Soknobraisis alone, $\epsilon\rho[\omega\nu]$ should be restored.

L. 12: $\tau\omega\upsilon$ is my interpretation of $\tau\omega$ (?) which Knudtzon gives in his transcription. It would fit in with the reading of ll. 12-13 suggested below. I have not been able to verify it with a photograph of the Lund fragment.

Ll. 12-13: This type of document ordinarily ends with the date of the current year. The additional phrase is unique. It is possible to read the traces as $\kappa\alpha\iota \xi[\sigma]\chi[\sigma]\mu\epsilon\nu \tau\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \tau\acute{\omicron} \zeta\sigma\omicron[\nu]$, but what the true reading is is uncertain.¹⁹²

Ll. 16-22: The full dating formula is written out below by the first hand; cf. IX.

XVI.

P. Yale 904

17 x 6.6 cm.

August 23, 212 A. D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. It has a left margin of .7 cm., upper 1 cm., right .5 cm., and lower 4.5 cm. The writing is on the recto and the verso is blank. The hand is more careless than in the other similar texts.

Ἀὐρηλίῳ Ἰσιδότῳ τῷ
 καὶ Ὀργένει βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ)
 Ἀρσι(νοῖτου) Ἑρα(κλείδου) μερίδος
 παρὰ Ἱερανούπεως
 5 Πιτύρεως ἱερέως ἱεροῦ
 Σοκνοβραΐσεως θεοῦ
 μεγάλου μεγάλου
 κόμης Βακχιάδος.
 κατεχώρασα γρα-

¹⁹² The content of these two lines is too uncertain to justify interpretation. Cf., however, XVIII, ll. 10-11.

10 φῆν χειρισμοῦ
 καὶ ἱερέων τοῦ
 ἐνεστῶτος κ (ἔτους)
 (second hand):
 κατεχωρίσθη βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ)
 Μεσορῆ λ.

Translation

To Aurelius Isidotus called Origenes, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Hieranoupis, son of Peteuris, priest of the temple of Soknobraisis, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted an inventory and a list of priests for the current twentieth year.

(Second hand): It has been submitted to the basilikos grammateus. The thirtieth of Mesore.

Commentary

Ll. 1-2: Aurelius Isidotus called Origenes is known to have been basilikos grammateus in 216-217 A. D. (see Henne, *Liste des Stratèges*, p. 69).

Ll. 4-5: As in I, IV, XIV and XV, a priest not designated presbyter presents the *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*.

Ll. 9-11: *γραφὴν χειρισμοῦ καὶ ἱερέων*. This is the only instance of the reversal of the phrase *γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ*. As in VIII, *σοι* is omitted after *κατεχώρισα*.

L. 12: κ (ἔτους). The emperor, Caracalla, is identified by the name of the official (ll. 1-2). As in XIII, XIV and XVIII, the emperor's name is omitted. It looks as if some letter may have been written after κ and then erased.

XVII.

P. Lund 3 3

10.5 x 5.5 cm.

End of the second century A. D.

This text was published by Hanell without a description or photograph. A photograph subsequently furnished me by Knudtzon shows that almost certainly a second hand wrote the

endorsement of the receipt in l. 7. The upright handwriting of the main body of the text is unusually clear and careful, resembling somewhat Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol.* 28 (second century A. D.). The handwriting of the endorsement inclines to the right and is less careful.

Since the lacuna in the right half of the papyrus is of an undertermined size and restoration is consequently very uncertain, it is impossible to tell whether or not this is a receipt of a *γραφὴ* of the single type, like VIII-XIV and XVI, or of a joint *γραφὴ* of the priesthoods of both gods, such as XV may be.

κατεχωρίσ[θη
 Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακ[λ(είδου) μερίδος
 γραφὴ ἱερέω[ν καὶ χειρισμοῦ
 Βακχιάδος [
 5 Ἄντωνείνου [
 Μεσορῆ α
 (second hand):
 δι(ὰ) Σαραπά[μμωνος

Translation

A list of priests and an inventory of Bacchias . . . has been presented to . . . of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome . . . Antoninus . . . , Mesore the first.

(Second hand): Through Sarapammon . . .

Commentary

L. 1: Hanell restored *κατεχωρίσ[ατο*, but Wilcken, *Archiv. für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 233, suggested *κατεχωρίσ[θη*. The rest of this line probably contained the name of the official to whom the document was addressed.

L. 2: Hanell did not abbreviate Ἡρακλείδου.

L. 3: The nominative case of *γραφὴ* indicates a passive construction of the statement; in the other receipts it is active.

L. 7: Sarapammon is either the official to whom the document was addressed or his assistant. Cf. VIII, ll. 12-13; X, l. 11; XI, l. 16.

XVIII.

P. Yale 344

10.7 x 4.8 cm.

ca 199 A. D.

This papyrus is medium brown in color. Approximately 2 cm. has been torn from the left side (allowing space for the lost letters and a margin of 1 cm.). It has an upper margin of 1.2 cm., lower of 3.4 cm., and right of 2 cm. The text is written on the recto, and the verso is blank. The handwriting and the name of the priest are identical with XII, which is dated 199. Unlike the preceding texts (VIII-XVII), this is not a letter of transmittal, but, as the last line indicates, an acknowledgment of a receipted letter of transmittal. See pp. 195-196.

[τῷ δέϊνι] βασιλ(ικῷ) γρα(μματεῖ)
 [Ἄρσι(νοίτου)] Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος
 [παρὰ Ὁ]ρσενούφειος Ὁρου
 [πρεσβ(υτέρου) ἱ]ερέων Σοκνοβραί-
 5 [σεως θ]εοῦ μεγάλου μεγάλο[ν]
 [κώ]μης Βακχιάδος.
 [κατ]εχωρίσά σφι γραφὴν
 [ἱερέ]ων καὶ χειρισμοῦ
 [τοῦ ἱ]εροῦ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος
 10 [. (ἔτους)] καὶ ἔσχον τὴν ἀπο-
 [χῆ]ν.

Translation

To -----, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Orsenouphis, son of Horos, presbyter of the priests of Soknobrais, twice great god of the village of Bacchias. I have submitted to you a list of priests and an inventory of the temple for the current . . . year and I have the receipt.

Commentary

Ll. 3-4: Orsenouphis, son of Horos, was presbyter in 199, according to XII, which is written by the same hand as this undated text. One cannot, however, definitely assign this text to that year. In a small priesthood such as that of Soknobrais, the same priests held office in more than one year.

L. 10: As in XIII, XIV, and XVI, the name of the emperor is omitted. The receipted letter of transmittal was acknowledged sometime before the close of the year in which the *γραφή* was submitted, because the priest refers to the *γραφή* for the current year (l. 9). In *P. Jand.* 34, on the other hand, the receipt was not acknowledged until the thirtieth of Hathur (November twenty-sixth) of the following year. In that text, it is the *γραφή* of the past year (l. 9, *διεληλυθός*) which is referred to.

Ll. 10-11: *καὶ ἔσχον τὴν ἀπο[χρή]ν*. The aorist is regularly found in this and similar phrases. This phrase distinguishes the text as an acknowledgment of a receipt. Acknowledgments of a similar type are *SB 7342* (145) and *P. Jand.* 34 (190). *P. Jand.* 34 is the closest parallel, since it also is an acknowledgment of a receipt for a temple *γραφή*.

L. 11: Unlike the texts quoted above, this one does not have the dating formula written in full.

XIX.

P. Yale 349

June 14, 171 A. D.

22.5 x 9.7 cm.

This papyrus is medium brown in color and is fairly well preserved. Lacunae occur along the two vertical folds, and the bottom right corner is missing. There are traces of three horizontal creases. The upper margin is 1.2-1.4 cm., the left 1.2-1.7 cm., the lower 3.7 cm., but there is no margin on the right. The writing on the recto is clear and legible. The verso is blank.

The priests petition the strategos for redress against the insults of a dike official (*ἐκβολεύς*) who has forced the priests to work on the dikes far from their temple. The petition is written in the usual phraseology of complaints addressed to officials. The grievance is first presented, then the request is expressed by the *ἀξιῶ* formula, closing with the desired result of the petition in the purpose clause, *ἵν' ὤμεν βεβοηθημένοι*.¹⁹³

Ποτάμῳ στρα(τηγῶ) Ἄρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακ(λείδου) μερίδος
παρὰ [Πε]τεῦριος Πετεῦριος καὶ
Σισότος [Ὀρ]σενούφειος καὶ τῶν λοι-
πῶν ἱε[ρ]ῶν ἱεροῦ τοῦ ὄντος

¹⁹³ See the discussion of such petitions in Exler, *A Study in Greek Epistolography*, pp. 122-123 and the tabulation of formulas, pp. 116-122.

- 5 ἐν κώμῃ Βακχιάδι. ἐπεὶ ἔθος
ἡμῖν ἔστιν ἀγεσθαι εἰς χωματικὰ
ἔγρα οὐκ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις, εἰ μόνον
ἐν διώ[ρηνγι] Πατσώντε[ω]ς λεγομέ-
νη ἀ[φ] ἤς] τὰ τε περὶ τῆ[ν] κώμην
10 ἐδάφ[η] ὑδρ]εῖται καὶ ἰς [τ]ῆ ὑδροστά-
σια τὰ ὑ[π] ἀ[φ] τῆ κατέρχεται, νῦν δέ
δ' ὑπὸ τῶ[ν] αἰγιαλοφύλακος καταστα-
θεὶς ἐκβολεύς βιάζεται ἡμᾶς παρὰ
τὸ ἔθος ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις μακρόθεν
15 τῆς κώμης ἐργάζεσθαι, ἀξιούμεν
ἐὰν σοὶ δόξη κελεύσαι αὐτὸν ἀποστῆ-
ναι τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπηρ[ί]ας ἰς τὸ
δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς ἐν τοῖς σ[τ]ρα[τη]γῶσι
τόποις ἐργαζομένους π[ρ]οσ[τά]ξι-
20 σι τῆ κώμῃ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν
τὰς τῶν θεῶν θρησκείας ποιέισ-
θαι γεινομένας ὑπὲρ τε δ[ι]αμονῆς
τοῦ κυρί[ου] ἡμῶν αὐτοκ[ρ]άτορος
Αἰρηλίου Ἀγτωνείνου Καί[σαρος] κ[αὶ]
25 τοῦ ἱερωτάτου Νείλου τε[λείας]
ἀναβάσ[ε]ως ἵν' ὤμεν βεβ[ο]ηθημένοι.]
Π[ε]τεῦριος (ἔτων) μ ἄση(μος)
Σισότις (ἔτων) λε ἄση(μος)
(ἔτους) ἰα Αἰρηλί[ου] Ἀγτωνείνου Καί[σαρος] τοῦ
30 κυρίου Παῦνι κ

Translation

To Potamon, strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Peteuris, son of Peteuris, and Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, and the rest of the priests of the temple which is in the village of Bacchias. Since it is the custom for us not to be taken away to work on the dikes in other places, except on the canal of Patsontis from which comes water to irrigate the fields of the village and to fill the basins below it, but now the ekboleus who was appointed by the aigialophylax is forcing us to work in other places far away from the village, contrary to custom, we ask you, if it so pleases you, to order him to stop this outrageous treatment of us, so that we may work in the usual places near the village and be able to perform each day the cere-



monies of the gods, made for the preservation of our lord the Emperor Aurelius Antoninus Caesar and on behalf of a full rise of the most holy Nile, in order that we may obtain relief.

Peteuris, age forty, no mark of identification

Sisois, age thirty-five, no mark of identification

The eleventh year of Aurelius Antoninus Caesar the lord, Pauni the twentieth.

Commentary

L. 1: Potamon was strategos, according to the date of this text, as early as June 14, 171 A. D. It was previously established that he was in office from 173 to 175 (see Henne, *Liste des Stratèges*, p. 55, and *P. S. I.* 1105).¹⁹⁴ He also appears in XXI, ll. 30 and 34.

Ll. 2-3: These two priests, Peteuris son of Peteuris and Sisois son of Orsenouphis, appear in a list of the priests of Soknobraisis in II, dated August 11, 171 A. D., the same year as this petition. Peteuris, forty years old when this petition was made (see I, 27), is undoubtedly the third priest in the list (II, l. 36), who is Peteuris, son of Peteuris, age forty-one. He has become forty-one between June 14 and August 11. Since the list in 171 gives three priests of Soknobraisis all called Peteuris, son of Peteuris, it is uncertain whether the priest in this text is the one of the same name who appears in XXI and XXII. Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, heads the lists of priests of Soknobraisis in II (l. 34), where he is said to be thirty-three years old (his age, that is, on August 11, 171), but he is said to be thirty-five years old here in l. 28 (June 14, 171). There is no other Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, in the list of priests for 171, so that a mistake was apparently made in at least one of the two texts in giving his age. He is probably the same priest who presented the *γραφή* in 172 (IV) and petitions in 178-179 (XXI-XXIII).

Ll. 3-4: For the significance of the phrase *καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἱερέων*, see the commentary on XIII, l. 7.

L. 7: Reading *ἦ* for *εἰ* is Guéraud's suggestion.

Ll. 8-9: *διώ[ρυγι] Πατσώντε[ω]ς λεγομένη*. This canal is very probably the *ὄρεινὴ διώρυξ*, the canal bordering on the desert,¹⁹⁵ which

¹⁹⁴ Since Potamon was already in office in 171, it appears that the agreement made between the priests and villagers of Nilopolis during Potamon's term of office which is referred to in *BGU* 194 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 84), dated 177, may have been made as much as six years before *BGU* 194 was written.

¹⁹⁵ There are a number of references to the canal in papyri which have been collected by A. Calderini, "Ricerche sul regime delle acque nell' Egitto greco-

has been identified as the Bâhr Wardân.¹⁹⁶ It took its name from the village of Patsontis¹⁹⁷ and extended northward from Philadelphia to Bacchias and from there westward to Karanis.

L. 9: *ἀ[φ' ἦς]*. This restoration was suggested by Professor Rostovtzeff.

L. 10: *[ὕδρ]έεται*. Cf. *Stud. Pal.* V (*Corpus papyrorum Hermopolitanorum*), 95, l. 12.

[τ]ὰ ὑδροστάσια are presumably water reservoirs; cf. *BGU* 492 and *P. Fay.* 131.¹⁹⁸ *P. Fay.* 131, ll. 9-12 reads *ἐ[ἀ]ν τὸ ὕδωρ κατέλθῃ πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ χρῆσαι ἔστ' ἂν τὸ ὑδροστάσιον γεμισθῇ*. One must supply a subject for *κατέρχεται* in our text, and *P. Fay.* 131 suggests *ὕδωρ*.

Ll. 12-13: *ὁ ἐπὶ το[ῦ] αἰγιαλοφύλακος κατασταθεὶς ἐκβολεύς*. The ekboleus was the official in charge of throwing up the dikes. He is also called *χωματεκβολεύς*,¹⁹⁹ but ekboleus is more common.²⁰⁰ It is clear from this phrase that he was a subordinate of the aigialophylax. The aigialophylax is found only in papyri from the Fayûm. There was apparently only one aigialophylax for the whole Arsinoite nome.²⁰¹ He was in charge of the irrigation works, and accompanied the strategos and basilikos grammateus on an inspection tour of the dikes and canals.²⁰²

Ll. 16-17: *ἀποστῆναι τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιη[ί]ας*. An exact parallel to this phrase is found in *BGU* 340 (148-149), ll. 20-21.

Ll. 22-26: The priests described the religious ceremonies as made for the preservation of the emperor and a full rise of the most

romano," *Aegyptus* I (1920), pp. 203-204. Parts of the canal were named after villages through which it passed: (ὄρεινὴ) Πατ(σώντεως) Φιλαδελφίας; ὄρεινὴ Πατ(σώντεως) Βακχ(ιάδος); and ὄρεινὴ Πατ(σώντεως) Καρανίδος. The excavations of the canal are described by G. Caton-Thompson and E. Gardner, *The Desert Fayum* (London, 1934), p. 144. The canal has been traced from Philadelphia to Bacchias. The priests probably did not add Βακχιάδος to the name of the canal because there was no doubt about which village they meant.

¹⁹⁶ See *P. Teb.* II, p. 392.

¹⁹⁷ This village was, perhaps, not far from Bacchias; see *P. Teb.* II, p. 394.

¹⁹⁸ A Ptolemaic reservoir in the Fayûm has been excavated and is described in Caton-Thompson and Gardner, *The Desert Fayum*, pp. 149-150.

¹⁹⁹ *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 178, l. 26. See Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, p. 193.

²⁰⁰ *P. Oxy.* 1301 (unedited; late third or early fourth century A. D.); *P. Lond.* 1648 (373), ll. 7 and 13; 1649 (373), l. 8; and *P. Lond.* inv. no. 1709 (quoted in *P. Ryf.* 90, note on l. 17). The official and his title are discussed in the introduction to *P. Lond.* 1648.

²⁰¹ *P. Fay.* 222 (third century A. D.).

²⁰² *BGU* 12 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 389, dated 181-182), ll. 23-25; cf. Oertel, *Die Liturgie*, pp. 192-193. See also *P. Mich.* 174 (145-147), l. 6.

holy Nile. In *BGU* 176 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 83), ll. 10-12, the priests similarly describe the religious training of their *παῖδες* which was prescribed by Hadrian as τὴν κλενοσθείσαν παιδείαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἄδριανοῦ αὖσαν ὑπὲρ ἀναβάσεως τοῦ ἰ[ε]ρωτάτου [Νείλου καὶ δια]μονῆς τοῦ αἰωνίου κόσμου τοῦ κυ[ρί]ου Καίσαρος . . .²⁰³ Cf. *BGU* 12 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 389), ll. 1-5.

L. 25: τε[λείας] ἀναβάσ[ε]ως. Cf. the edict of Hadrian (136 A. D.) in *P. Oslo* 78, ll. 6-7: οὐ τελείαν μόνον ἀλλὰ κ[αὶ] μείζω [σχεδὸν ὅσην οὐκ ἄνωγρον ἐποιήσα]το τὴν ἀνάβασιν . . .²⁰⁴

XX.

P. Yale 351 (Plate II)

22 x 21.5 cm.

September 26, 171 A. D.

This papyrus is medium brown in color, with 3 cm. of another lighter piece of papyrus attached on the left side. It is a square sheet of papyrus with a left margin of 3 cm., right of 3.5-4 cm., upper 1.5 cm., and lower 7.5 cm. The left margin is even, but the right varies considerably. The hand-writing, as in similar documents, is an upright, unembellished book-hand. No paragraphing is indicated. The date is written 3 cm. below the last line of the text. Several mistakes in spelling have been crossed out and corrected above.²⁰⁵ Whether this was done by the scribe who wrote the text is not certain. After the text was written, the papyrus was sealed closed. There are six seal holes across the blank space beneath the date which grow progressively larger from right to left. The method of sealing seems to have been as follows: the papyrus was folded vertically from right to left. The left margin which remained on the outside was stamped with a seal. The papyrus was folded horizontally several times after being folded vertically.²⁰⁶ When the document was opened, the

²⁰³ W. Schubart (quoted by Plaumann, *Abh. Ak. Berl.*, 1918, no. 17, p. 40, and Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII [1939], p. 234, n. 1) completed and interpreted παιδείαν. I have supplied ὑπὸ τοῦ and Νείλου καὶ before διαμονῆς. I would also suggest filling the lacuna at the beginning of l. 10 of the same text with [εἰς τὰ ἔργα τῶν] χωμάτων.

²⁰⁴ See in the editors' note on l. 6, the comment on the expression τελεία ἀνάβασις. The usual expression for a satisfactory inundation of the Nile is δικαία ἀνάβασις.

²⁰⁵ In the transcription, letters between double brackets have been crossed out and letters in angular brackets are the corrections above the line. See the note on l. 10.

²⁰⁶ If it had been folded horizontally first, there would be seal holes on the top as well as the bottom half of the papyrus.

seal was cut or roughly torn out and the hole became smaller the deeper it penetrated. Thus the right margin which was folded in first has the smallest hole.

No. XX is an account of an audience before the archiereus of Egypt, Ulpus Serenianus. In form, the document is for the most part similar to extracts from the journals of officials, which were called ὑπομνηματισμοί.²⁰⁷ These journals were kept in the bureaux of the officials, and extracts from them were made by νομογράφοι for parties involved in audiences before the officials.

The general arrangement and the content of XX are characteristic of such extracts. It begins with an introductory genitive absolute, ἐντυχόντων ἱερέων καὶ παστοφόρων . . . The advocate's statement of the priests' complaint and request follows, and the account of the audience concludes with the decision of the archiereus. Both the words of the advocate and the archiereus are expressed in direct discourse.

In one respect, however, this text differs from other extracts. It is unique in the abruptness of the beginning. The account of the audience is not introduced by either the heading ἐξ ὑπομνηματισμῶν τοῦ δαίνοσ or the date which regularly precedes such extracts. (The date in XX is written several lines below the main body of the text.)

The erasure in the last line presents another problem. It may have contained more of the decision of the archiereus which the corrector of the text decided it was unnecessary to copy. Another possibility is that the scribe began at this point to write by mistake the beginning of the next entry in the journal, and that the mistake was then realized and corrected.²⁰⁸

The faulty orthography of the text might be due to dictation.²⁰⁹ The mistakes were crossed out and corrected above the line.

²⁰⁷ See U. Wilcken, "Υπομνηματισμοί," *Philologus* LIII (1894) pp. 80-126; A. von Premerstein, *s. v. Commentarii*, *RE* IV, 726-759; O. W. Reinmuth, *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 42-44; F. F. von Schwind, *Zur Frage der Publikation im römischen Recht* (Munich, 1940), pp. 182-184. An account of a hearing which presents several problems is published in C. B. Welles, "The Immunities of the Roman Legionaries in Egypt," *Journal of Roman Studies* XXVIII (1938), pp. 41-49; cf. P. Fouad 21 and W. L. Westermann, "Tuscus the Prefect and the Veterans in Egypt," *Classical Philology* XXXVI (1941), pp. 21-29.

²⁰⁸ Cf. *BGU* 347 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 76), an account of an audience before this same archiereus concerning an application for circumcision. After the heading, it begins (ll. 3-4) ἐν Μέμφει . . . Ἡσάσατο τὸν λαμπρότατον ἡγ[ε]μόνα καὶ μετὰ τα[ύτ]α . . . Wilcken pointed out that this phrase, which has nothing to do with the following audience, was carelessly copied down by the scribe from the journal.

²⁰⁹ *P. Oslo* 18 (162), a similar document, also has many mistakes in spelling.

Whether these corrections were made by the same scribe who wrote the extract or not is uncertain. Nor is it absolutely certain that the date is written in the same hand as that in which the rest of the text is written.²¹⁰ The possibility of a change of hand suggests that the document may have been written by a nomograph and then corrected and sealed by someone else in the bureau of the archiereus.

ἐντυχόντων ἱερέων καὶ παστοφόρων
 ἀπὸ κώμης Βακχιάδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου,
 Ἀπολλόφιλος βήτωρ παρεστὼς αὐτοῖς εἶπεν·
 οἱ πραγματικοὶ βιά[[σ]][[ξ]]ονται τοὺς συνηγορομέ-
 5 γους σωματικῶς ἀπεργάζεσ[[τ]][[κ]]θαι τὰς ἐργασίας
 παρὰ τὰ ὑπὸ σοῦ [[καί]][[κ]]ελεσθέντα. ἀξιοῦσιν οὖν
 κ[[αί]]κελεῦσαι σὲ ὡσπερ καὶ ἄλλους εὐερ[[καί]][[κ]]ελεῖσθαι
 ἀπερενοχλήτους αὐτοὺς εἶναι. Οὐλπίος
 Σεργημανὸς ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν
 10 εἶπεν· ὁ στρατηγὸς προνοήσει βίαν μὴ γίνεσθαι
 [[θαί αἰ]] . . . νω . α . μεν]]
 (ἔτους) ιβ' Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου μηνὸς
 Θῶθ' [[κξ]] κη

Translation

When the priests and the pastophors from the village of Bacchias in the Arsinoite nome made an appeal, Apollophilos, the advocate who represented them, said: "The officials are forcing the plaintiffs to labor in person contrary to your orders. They therefore ask you, just as you have helped others, to order that they shall be unmolested." Ulpus Serenianus, the archiereus, said: "The strategos shall see to it that force is not used" . . .

The twelfth year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Thoth the twenty-eighth.

Commentary

L. 1: παστοφόρων. Cf. XXI, l. 14.

L. 2: Ἀρσινοίτου. Read Ἀρσινοίτου.

L. 3: Ἀπολλόφιλος. This name does not appear in Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, but cf. Hermophilos in X.

²¹⁰ See the commentary on the text, ll. 12-13.

L. 4: οἱ πραγματικοὶ very likely include the ekboleus, accused in XIX of mistreating the priests, and perhaps the aigialophylax who was the superior of the ekboleus.

βιάσονται was corrected to βιάζονται.

L. 5: ἀπεργάζεσται has been corrected to ἀπεργάζεσθαι.

L. 6: καλεσθέντα has been corrected to κελεσθέντα. The confusion of ε and αι, particularly in this word, is not unusual.

L. 7: καλεῦσαι is also corrected.

εὐερκαίτησας is corrected to εὐεργέτησας.

L. 8: ἀπερενοχλήτους has not been corrected to ἀπαρενοχλήτους.²¹¹

Ll. 8-9: Οὐλπίος Σεργημανὸς ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν. Cf. XXI, ll. 13-14 and 24-25, and XXII, l. 5, where his title is ὁ κρείστος ἀρχιερεὺς. In these texts, a petition addressed to him with his endorsement is referred to in petitions addressed to nome officials in 178 and perhaps the petition was presented to Serenianus earlier in that same year.²¹² It is known that he was in office as antarchieus or archiereus from 160-171.²¹³

L. 10: For εἶπεν, read εἶπεν. The trace of a letter which follows εἶπεν is curious and unnecessary. It does not look like a punctuation mark.

-θαι was originally written at the beginning of l. 11 below. Later l. 11 was entirely crossed out and -θαι added above, either by the original scribe or by a later corrector.

L. 11: For this line, see the introduction to the text. Another possibility is that some form of ἀναγιγνώσκων followed -θαι.

Ll. 12-13: The date is the twenty-sixth of September in the twelfth year of Marcus Aurelius (171 A. D.). Scherer raises the question whether this is not the date on which the copy was made by the scribe rather than the date of the audience. If it were the date of the copying, one would probably find the date of the audience somewhere in the text, which is not the case. Perhaps the two dates were the same. The name of the emperor as written here is of interest because Ἀντωνίνος Καῖσαρ ὁ κύριος usually designated Antoninus Pius only. That this text was written in the twelfth year of Marcus Aurelius (171) and not of

²¹¹ There is a space between ἀπερ and ενοχλήτους. The correct reading was pointed out by Dr. H. J. Wolff.

²¹² See p. 200, n. 98.

²¹³ Scherer, *Bull. de l'Inst. fr. d'Arch. or.* XLI (1942), pp. 59-60.

Antoninus Pius (148) is quite certain, because of the naming of the archiereus, Ulpus Serenianus.

κζ, the twenty-seventh, was originally written and then changed to κη, the twenty-eighth.

XXI.

P. Lund 3 8 + P. Yale 348 (Plate III)

P. Lund 3 8 16 x 13 cm.

178 A.D. or after

P. Yale 348 13 x 8.5 cm.

*P. Lund 3 8*²¹⁴ and *P. Yale 348* are almost certainly fragments of the same papyrus. When they are joined together, it appears that the text of the former is continued directly on the latter. If the crease on the right side of the Yale papyrus is placed directly in line with the corresponding crease in the Lund papyrus, the right margins coincide, and the long stroke of the ρ in ἐρέων of *P. Lund 3 8*, l. 23 can be traced on the top edge of *P. Yale 348*. Moreover, it is obvious that the lost left half of *P. Yale 348* was torn off just where there is a crease in *P. Lund 3 8*. The Lund text was itself almost torn apart along this crease where there are several lacunas. The hand-writing of the two fragments is identical. It is a fairly clear and legible hand, but the lines waver considerably. In the one word βιβλιδίου in *P. Yale 348*, l. 2 the υ is written 3 cm. higher than the initial β. The text was written on the recto. There is no writing on the verso of *P. Yale 348* and presumably not on that of *P. Lund 3 8*. As Wilcken pointed out in his review of the publication,²¹⁵ there is no way of determining just how much of the papyrus is missing above l. 1 of *P. Lund 3 8*. Nor is it quite certain that the document ended with the last line of *P. Yale 348*. Though there is a lower margin of 3.5 cm., there may have been a second column. *P. Yale 348* can be largely restored with the help of XXII, which seems to be an exact duplicate of XXI, ll. 20-29 (= *P. Lund 3 8*, l. 20—*P. Yale 348*, l. 6). No. XXI contains copies of petitions addressed to officials concerning privileges with regard to labor

²¹⁴ Hanell, *Bull. de l'Inst. roy. de Lund* 1937-1938, no. 5, pp. 119-137, gave no description of this text but included a photograph (Tafel I, not II as he cites it). My transcription of the text is substantially that of Hanell except that I have dotted certain letters which are not clear in the photograph. Such changes in the readings and restorations as I have made are indicated in the commentary.

²¹⁵ Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), pp. 232-236. My references to Wilcken in the commentary on ll. 1-23 (= *P. Lund 3 8*) refer to this review.

on the dikes. To the original petitions had been appended various documents which are not, however, copied in XXI. One of the petitions included is dated August 7, 178 A. D., and the covering document must have been written after that date, how long afterwards one cannot tell. The covering document was presumably a petition, to which were attached the various documents which are preserved in our fragment.

No. XXI contains the following documents: (1) a letter dated August 8, 178 A. D. from the priests of Soknobraisis to the strategos, Flavius Apollonios, covering a petition to Ulpus Serenianus, the archiereus, with his endorsement, and asking the strategos to safeguard their rights in accordance with the endorsement; (2) a copy of the letter from the same strategos to the basilikos grammateus, Apollonios, covering the same petition to the archiereus and asking him to preserve it; (3) a certificate of a hyperetes; (4) a letter of the priests to the same basilikos grammateus covering the same petition to the archiereus, certain undesignated documents addressed to the basilikos grammateus by the strategos, a letter of an earlier strategos, Potamon, addressed to Serapion, the aigialophylax, and a list of the priests.

[Φλαυίω Ἀπολλωνίω στρα(τηγῶ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρακλ(είδου)
μερίδος

[παρὰ Σ[ισόειτος Ὀρσενούφ[ε]ως καὶ Ὁρον Πετεύρεως καὶ
[Πετεύρε]ως Πετεύρεως [τ]ῶν γ' σὺν ἑτέροις ἱερέσιν ἱερῶ λογίμ[ου]
[Σοκνοβραί]σεως κόμη[ς] Βακχιάδος. οὐ παρεκομισαμέν σοι β[ι]-

5 [βλιδίου ἐπὶ] ὑπογραφῆς το[ῦ κ]ρατίστου ἀρχιερέως τὸ ἀντίγραφον
[ὑπόκειται]. ἀξιοῦμεν ἀκούλουθα τῇ ὑπογραφῇ κελεῦσαί σε τὰ δ[ι]-
[καία ἡμῖ]ν φυλαχθῆναι. (ἔτους) ιη Ἀδρηλίων Ἀντωνείνου καὶ
[Κομμόδου] Καισάρων τῶν κυρίων Μεσορῆ ιδ.

[ὑπετάχθη] τὸ ὑποκείμενον βιβλίδιον. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἐπι-
10 [στολίου] τὸ ἀντίγραφον· Φλαύιος Ἀπολλώνιος στρατηγὸς
[Ἀρσι(νοίτου) Ἡρ]ακλείδου μερίδος Ἀπολλωνίω βασιλικῶ
γρα(μματεῖ) τῆς αἰ-

[τῆς μερ]ίδος τῷ φιλάτῳ χάρειν. τοῦ ἐπενεκθέντος μο[ι]
[ἐπὶ σφρα]γίσματος βιβλιδίου [ἐπὶ ὑπογρα]φῆς Οὐλπίου
[Σερην(ιανού)]

[τοῦ κρα]τίστου ἀρχιερέως [ἐ]ξ [ὀνό]ματ[ο]ς ἱερέων καὶ
πα[στοφόρων]

15 [κώ]μης Βακχιάδος ἀξιοῦντων μὴ ἀγεσθαι σωματικῶς

[ἐπὶ] τῇ τῶν χωμάτων ἀπεργασίᾳ τὸ ἀντίγραφον φυλα-
[χθήτω] ται δ.....

- [.....]...[.....].....
 [.....] μαῖος ὑπηρέτης μετέλλ(αβον) ἀξίω-
 20 [μα?.....]ω οὕτως·
 [Ἀπολλωνίω βασιλικῷ] γρα(μματαί) Ἄρσιν(οίτου) Ἡρακλείδου
 μερίδος
 [παρὰ Σισόειτος Ὀρσενούφειος κα]ὶ Ὀρου Πετεύρειος καὶ
 [Πετεύρειος Πετεύρειος τῶν γ ἐ]ρεῶν [σ]ὺν ἐ[τέρους θεοῦ]
 [Σοκνοβραΐσειος κώμης Β]ακχιάδος. οὗ ἀνετίναμεν τῷ [κρα-]
 25 [τίστῳ ἀρχιερεῖ Οὐ]λίπῳ Σερηνιανῷ βιβλιδίου παρ[ακεί-]
 [μένων δικαιοματ]ῶν τινῶν καὶ ἐπισταλέντων σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ [τοῦ]
 [νομοῦ στρατηγοῦ ἀ]ντίγραφον ὑπετάξαμεν ὅπως ὑ[π-]
 [εξαίρεθῶμεν τοῦ σωμα]τικῶς ἀπεργάζεσθαι εἰς τ[ὰ]
 [χωματικὰ ἔργα. ὑ]πετάξαμεν δὲ καὶ ἀντίγραφον [ἐπι-]
 30 [στολοῦ τοῦ γρα(φέντος)] ὑπ[ὸ] Π[ο]τάμωνος στρατηγοῦ τῷ[ς]
 Ἡρακλ(είδου)]
 [μερίδος τοῦ Ἄρσιν(οίτου) Σε]ραπίωνι αἰγιαλοφύλακι περὶ ἡμῶν
 [καὶ τὸ]
 [κατ' ἄνδρα ἡμῶ]ν ἄγδ(ρες) ιε ἀφῆλιξ α
 [ὑπετάχθη] ταῦτα τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πραχθέντα [καὶ ἐπιστόλιον]
 [τὸ ἐπι]σταλὲν Σεραπίωνι αἰγιαλοφύλακι [ὑπὸ Ποτάμωνος]
 35 [τοῦ στρ]α(τηγοῦ) καὶ τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα πάντων ἡμῶν.

Translation

To Flavius Apollonios, strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, and Horos, son of Peteuris, and Peteuris, son of Peteuris, these three with the other priests of the famous temple of Soknobraisis in the village of Bacchias. A copy is appended of the petition which we brought to you with the endorsement of the archiereus. We ask that in accordance with the endorsement you order that our rights be safeguarded for us. The eighteenth year of Aurelius Antoninus and Commodus Caesars, the lords, the fourteenth of Mesore.

The attached petition was appended below. And there follows the copy of the letter: Flavius Apollonios, the strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, to his dearest Apollonios, basilikos grammateus of the same meris, greetings. Let the copy of the petition brought to me under seal with the endorsement of Ulpus Serenianus, the archiereus, in the name of the priests and pastophors of the village of Bacchias asking not to be forced to labor in person on the dikes be preserved.

. . . (2½ lines) . . . I, . . . maios, the assistant, have received the petition . . . thus:

To Apollonios, basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, and Horos, son of Peteuris, and Peteuris, son of Peteuris, the three priests with the other priests of the god Soknobraisis of the village of Bacchias. We have appended below a copy of the petition which we presented to the archiereus, Ulpus Serenianus, together with certain documents sent to you by the strategos of the nome so that we may be freed from laboring in person on the dikes. We have also appended a copy of a letter written by Potamon, the strategos of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, to Serapion, the aigialophylax, about us and the list of our number, fifteen men and one minor.

Appended below were the things which were done from the beginning and the letter written to Serapion, the aigialophylax, by Potamon, the strategos, and the list of all of us.

Commentary

L. 1: The supplying of the address to the strategos in the lacuna was suggested by Wilcken.

Ll. 2-3: These three priests also wrote the petition to the basilikos grammateus in this text (ll. 21-32, duplicated in XXII). For Sisois, son of Orphenouphis, see the commentary on IV, l. 2, and XIX, ll. 2-3. Here only is the name spelled Sisois. Horos, son of Peteuris, who not only helped to draw up the petitions to the strategos and basilikos grammateus which are included in this text, but probably also wrote XXIII, does not appear in the list in II. Hanell's suggested restoration of the name of the third priest, [Πετεύρε]ως Πετεύρειος, now seems certain, because in a list of the priests of Soknobraisis for the year 171 A. D. (II, ll. 34-47) every priest whose father was called Peteuris was himself called Peteuris. See the commentary on XIX, ll. 2-3.

L. 3: [τ]ῶν γ οὖν ἐτέροις ἱερέωσι. This phrase probably indicates that the priests were presbyters. See the commentary on XIII, l. 7.

Ll. 4-6: οὗ παρεκομίσαμεν σοι β[ιβλιδίου] . . . ἀντίγραφον [ὑπόκειται]. A close parallel to the expression may be cited in *Berl. Leihg.* 10 (120 A. D.), ll. 2-3: οὗ παρεκόμισα σοι (?) Βουκό[λου τοῦ ἱερέως κα]ὶ ἀρχιδικαστοῦ χρηματισμοῦ τὸ ἀντίγρα(φον) ὑπόκειται.²¹⁶

²¹⁶ The τοι in this last text which, as Wilcken pointed out in *Archiv für Pap.* XI (1935), p. 140, makes no sense but for which he could offer no solution, I

L. 6: ἀκούλουθα. This should be corrected to ἀκόλουθα. I have followed Hanell's reading and translation; cf. Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 234.

Ll. 6-7: τὰ δ[ίκαια ἡμῖ]γ φυλαχθῆναι. Van Groningen, *Museum XLVII* (1940), 168 suggested τὰ δ[ίκαια ἡμῶν], but I think that ἡμῖν is preferable; cf. *P. Amh.* 72, ll. 10-11, φυλασσομένων μοι ἀπάντων ὧν ἔχω δικαίων. Wilcken suggested τὰ δ[εδομένα(?) ἡμῖ]ν, and Hanell had only τὰδ[ε.....]γ to fill the lacuna.

Ll. 7-8: The date of the petition to the strategos is August 7. 178 A.D.

L. 9: [ὑπετάχθη] is Wilcken's restoration. Hanell suggested in a note on l. 9 ἀνεγνώσθη to which Wilcken objected on the ground that it would imply legal proceedings.

ὑποκείμενον is used as in *P. Teb.* 16 (Mitteis, *Chrest.* 44) ll. 20-21 in which τὴν ὑποκειμένην προσαγγελίαν is not actually appended because the text was only a copy of the letter to which the προσαγγελία had actually been appended.

Ll. 9-10: ἐπι[στολίου] was suggested by Hanell in the note on ll. 9-10, but in his transcription he printed ἀγτ[ιγράφου]. Wilcken preferred ἐπι[στολίου]. It is possible, I believe, actually to read ἐπι[. Wilcken pointed out that the article τοῦ before ἐπιστολίου shows that a reference had been made to this letter in the lost beginning of the text. Perhaps there was a heading which summarized the documents which were included in the text.

L. 12: For ἐπενεκθέντος, read ἐπενεχθέντος.

Ll. 12-13: τοῦ ἐπενεκθέντος μο[ι ἐπὶ σφρα]γίσματος βιβλιδίου [ἐπὶ ὑπογρα]φῆς Οὐλπίου [. As Hanell pointed out, the word σφράγισμα does not appear in Preisigke's *Wörterbuch*. Hanell restores the phrase ὑπὸ σφρα]γίσματος, but "under seal" was commonly expressed by ἐπὶ σφραγίδων or ἐπὶ σφραγισμῶν, both in the sense of Versiegelung and Untersiegelung,²¹⁷ and I have therefore restored it as ἐπὶ σφρα]γίσματος.

L. 14: ἐξ [ὀνό]ματ[ο]ς ἱερέων καὶ πα[στοφόρων]. These are my restorations. Hanell suggested in the note on l. 14 ἀξιώματος instead of ἐξ ὀνόματος, but this does not fit into the sentence.

would read as σοι (see the photograph of the text; the σ was, I think, mistaken for τ because it is joined with the preceding α; cf. σ in l. 3, ἀρχιδικαστοῦ).

²¹⁷ Cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* II, 560-562, s. v. σφραγίς and σφραγισμός. The sealing of certified abstracts is discussed by L. Wenger, s. v. "Signum," *RE* IV A, 2434-2435.

Hanell read πο[λιτών] which Wilcken rejected, reading παιδῶν; cf. *BGU* 176 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 83), in which the παῖδες of the priests of an unidentified temple are forced to work on the dikes. I agree with Wilcken in reading an α after π rather than ο, but I have restored πα[στοφόρων] on the basis of XX, l. 1: ἐντυχόντων ἱερέων καὶ παστοφόρων, which introduced the account of the audience before the archiereus concerning the labor on the dikes.

Ll. 16-17: φυλα[χθήτω] is Wilcken's suggestion; Hanell's is φυλλάσσεται or φυλλαχθήσεται, which seems impossible. For φυλάσσω in the sense of "preserve," cf. *P. Oxy.* 237, Col. VIII, ll. 39-40.

L. 17: σονται δ is Hanell's reading. It is extremely difficult to read the first three letters, and Wilcken prefers εἰς (?) τὰ ἴδια.

L. 19: Wilcken prefers μετέλ(αβον) (with the λ written above) to Hanell's μετέ(δωκα). I myself have nothing to suggest for ll. 17-20, except that they probably contained a further order and the date.

Ll. 21-23: I have followed Wilcken's suggestion that these lines should be restored according to the beginning of XXII. His view is confirmed by the fact that *P. Yale* 348, which joins *P. Lund* 3 8, at l. 24, is a duplicate of XXII. Thus ll. 1-4 of XXII are identical with XXI (*P. Lund* 3 8), ll. 20-23.

L. 24: οὐδ' ἀνετείναμεν . . . , cf. the parallel expression in *P. Fouad* 26, ll. 5-10, and Wilcken, *Chrest.* 461, ll. 3-6.

Ll. 24-26: The beginning of these lines I have restored from XXII.

L. 26: δικαιοματ[ων] των καὶ ἐπισταλέτων σοι . . . The δικαιώματα were various documents which proved the claims of the priests.²¹⁸ They may have included the account of the audience before the archiereus in 171 (XX) and other written orders from officials.

It is curious that in this text των was inserted above the line while in the same phrase in XXII, l. 6 βιβλιδίου παρακειμένων was also inserted above.

Ll. 26-27: ὑπὸ τοῦ [τοῦ νομοῦ στρατηγοῦ]. This reading confirms the conjecture of Bataille in the note on l. 7 of *P. Fouad* 13 (XXII) in *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), p. 203. He omitted, however, the σοι which follows ἐπισταλέτων.

Ll. 27-29: . . . ὑπετάξαμεν ὅπως ὁ [πεξαιρεθῶμεν τοῦ σωμα]τικῶς ἀπεργά-

²¹⁸ See Preisigke, s. v. δικαίωμα, *Wörterbuch* I, 382-383.

ζεσθαι εἰς τ[ὰ χωματικὰ ἔργα]. This restoration is mine. In the corresponding passage in XXII, ll. 7-8 Bataille had read ὑπετάξαμεν σ[οι ?]. εντον σωματικῶς ἀπεργάζεσθαι ἱερέ[ις ? and Wilcken (*Archiv für Pap.* XIII [1939], p. 147 and n. 1) read ὑπετάξαμεν σ[οι ?]. εν του σωματικῶς ἀπεργάζεσθαι ἱερέ[ας? Wilcken referred in general to BGU 176 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 83) which also concerns the immunity of priests from labor on the dikes, but he did not specifically point out the parallel for XXII, ll. 7-9 in BGU 176, l. 4, which reads ὑπε]ξείρεθμεν τῆς ἀπεργασ[ίας] τ[ῶν χωμάτων].²¹⁹ On the basis of this, I made the restoration of ὑπεξαιρεθῶμεν in both XXI and XXII.

Ll. 29-30: Potamon is the strategos to whom the priests addressed XIX, their petition dated June 14, 171 A. D., asking that he order the ekboleus, who was appointed by the aigialophylax, to stop his insulting treatment of them. The letter of Potamon to the aigialophylax which is referred to here may have been concerned with an order from the archiereus regarding the privileges of the priests. Unfortunately we do not have the actual copy of it.

Ll. 31-32: [καὶ τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα ἡμῶ]γ. I have made this restoration on the basis of l. 35 below, καὶ τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα πάντων ἡμῶν. Some such phrase is needed here before the summary of the list, fifteen men and one minor. There is hardly room for πάντων, however.

Ll. 33-35: The space of one line is left blank between ll. 32-33. What follows is a summary, probably of what was appended to the preceding letter, since it corresponds to the items enumerated in the letter. [ὑπετάχθη] is used here as in l. 9.

XXII.

P. Fouad 13

8.5 x 11.5 cm.

178 A. D.

This fragment is an exact duplicate of XXI, ll. 20-29 (*P. Lund* 3 8, ll. 20-23 + *P. Yale* 348, ll. 1-6). It was first published without a photograph by Bataille in *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 202-203. Hanell, who saw this publication but presumably not a photograph, wrote an addendum to his publication in which he expressed the opinion that *P. Fouad* 13 was part of the same

²¹⁹ τ[ῶν χωμάτων] is my restoration; cf. XXI, l. 16: τῶν τῶν χωμάτων ἀπεργασίας.

document as *P. Lund* 3 8. When Bataille republished the text in *Papyrus Fouad* I, he included a photograph (Pl. II, no. 13). The handwriting of the two fragments, however, is not, in my opinion,²²⁰ the same and a joining is now proved impossible since *P. Yale* 348, a duplicate of *P. Fouad* 13, has been shown to belong to the same papyrus as *P. Lund* 3 8. Hanell was correct, however, in identifying *P. Fouad* 13 as part of the same text, though not of the same papyrus, since it is a duplicate of *P. Yale* 348. My transcription is based largely on that of Bataille. I have dotted several letters which are not clear in the photograph.

]ς ι[] . [

[Ἀπολλωνί]ωι βασιλικῷ γρα[μματεῖ] Ἀρσι[νοίτου] Ἡρακλ[είδου]
μερίδος
[παρὰ Σισοίε]ως Ὀρσενούφωος καὶ Ὁρου Πετεύρεως καὶ Π[ετεύ-
[ρεως Πετεύρε]ως τῶν γ ἱερέων σὺν ἑτέροις θεοῦ Σοκομβρ[αίσεως]
5 [κόμης Βακχιάδο]ς. οὐ ἀνετείναμεν τῷ κρατίστῳ ἀρχιερεῖ [Οὐλ-]
[πίῳ Σεργιανῶ] βιβλιδίου παρακειμένων(ν) δικαιωμάτων τινῶν καὶ
ἐπισταλέντων [ν σοὶ]
[ὑπὸ τοῦ τοῦ νομο]ῦ στρατηγοῦ τὸ ἀντίγραφον ὑπετάξαμεν ὁ[πως]
[ὑπεξαιρεθῶ]μεν τοῦ σωματικῶς ἀπεργάζεσθαι εἰς [τὰ]
[χωματικὰ] ἔργα.

Translation

To Apollonios, the basilikos grammateus of the meris of Herakleides of the Arsinoite nome, from Sisois, son of Orsenouphis, and Horos, son of Peteuris, and Peteuris, son of Peteuris, all three priests with the other (priests) of the god Soknobraisis of the village of Bacchias. We have attached below a copy of the petition which we presented to the archiereus, Ulpius Serenianus, together with certain documents sent to you by the strategos of the nome so that we may be freed from manual labor on the dikes . . .

Commentary

L. 2: I read Ἀρσι[νοίτου]; Bataille Ἀρσιν[οίτου]. I have restored the name of the basilikos grammateus according to XXI, l. 11.

L. 4: Σοκομβρ[αίσεως] was Bataille's restoration. See p. 183, nn. 12-13.

²²⁰ Bataille said that he thought that the hand-writing was the same. I cannot agree with him because there are certain striking differences; compare especially π in ὑπετάξαμεν in *P. Fouad* 13, l. 7 and in ὑπογραφή in *P. Lund* 3 8, l. 5; also καὶ in *P. Fouad* 13, ll. 3 and 6, and *P. Lund* 3 8, l. 9.

Ll. 5-6: [Οὐλίω Σεργιανῶ]. Cf. XXI, ll. 13-14 and 25.

L. 6: βιβλιδίου παρακειμένω(ν) is inserted above the line. σοι is my restoration; cf. XXI, l. 26.

Ll. 7-8: I have discussed my restorations in these lines in the note on XXI, ll. 27-29.

L. 9: Bataille did not indicate this line in his transcription. It is not certain whether this copy ended here or continued after a wide space (at least 2 cm.) in a part of the papyrus now lost.

XXIII.

P. Yale 350

6.3 x 5 cm.

178-179 A.D.

This fragment is light brown in color, and the handwriting is small and careful.²²¹ The writing is on the recto and the verso is blank. The fragment was apparently the lower left-hand corner of the papyrus which had a left margin of 1.5 cm. and a lower margin of at least 2 cm. It contains the last two lines of a document of uncertain content, with the signature of two priests and the date.

ένεσ-]

τῶτος θ (έτους) [
 τήν συνηθ[ῆ] α[
 Σισόις (έτων) μ[
 5 Ὄρος (έτων) νβ[
 (έτους) θ Αδρηλίων Ἀγ[τωνίου καί]
 Κομμόδου τῶν κ[υρίων]
 Σεβαστῶν Εὐσ[εβῶν]

Commentary

L. 4: See the discussion of Sisois in the notes on IV, l. 2 and XIX, ll. 2-3.

L. 5: Horos is probably the same priest who with Sisois and Peteuris, son of Peteuris, wrote the petitions in XXI and XXII.

Ll. 6-8: The date of this text is the nineteenth year of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (178-179 A.D.).

²²¹ Despite the difference in date, the handwriting looks rather like that of I (116 A.D.).

XXIV.

P. Fouad 14

16 x 10 cm.

First half of first century A.D.

This text was first published by Bataille in *Ét. de Pap.* IV (1938), pp. 203-205, with a photograph (Pl. V). The handwriting, as Bataille points out, is typical of the early Roman period, resembling Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol.* 12 (13 B.C.). In dating the text, I have followed a suggestion of M. Guéraud and Professor Welles that the "seventh year" in l. 1 is that of some ruler later than Augustus—perhaps Tiberius or Claudius. The papyrus is complete on the right, with a small margin of about .25 cm. It may also be complete at the top and bottom (margins of 1.5 and 2 cm.), but a portion which contained 14-17 letters is lost on the left. P. Lund 4 7, a well-preserved copy of the same document, fills the lacuna. See Knudtzon's recent edition of that text for a full commentary.

[έξ ὑποκειμένου ἐπισ]τρα(τηγία) καὶ ἄλλων εἰδῶν βασιλικ(ῆς) γρα-
 (μματείας) ζ (έτους) μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιστατικοῦ
 [ιερῶν κόμης Βακχ]ιάδος α τόμου κολ(λήματος) ξη Διεδώρου Ὄρου
 καὶ Ἀρθῶτου Ὄν-
 [νώφρεως <ιερῶν> Ἰσιδος κ] Κιαλίους Πέτεως ιερῶς Βουβάστεως
 καὶ Πετεύρε-
 [ως Μύσθου καὶ τῶν] λοιπῶν ιερῶν Σοκνοβράσεων καὶ Ὄρου Πασανίου
 5 [καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ιε]ρέων ἀργυρίου (δραχμαὶ) Ἄχνβ καὶ προσήχθη κγ
 (έτους) Καίσαρος θεοῦ
 [ἀργυρίου (δραχμαὶ) λα (δινόβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιον), (γίνονται)] (δραχ-
 μαὶ) Ἄχπγ (δινόβολος) (ἡμιωβέλιον), προσδ(ιαγραφόμενα)
 (δραχμαὶ) ρμγ (ἡμιωβέλιον), (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) Ἄωκς
 (τριώβολον).
 [έφ' ἧς ὁ κωμογρα(μματεὺς) ἐδήλ]ωσεν ὀφιλ(όμενα) ἀπειτιστε διὰ τῶν
 ἀπὸ τῆς κόμης παν-
 [τῶν ἐξ ἀλληλεγγύ]ης διὰ τὸ τοὺς ιερεῖς ἀπὸ πλῆθους εἰς ὀλίγους
 κατηντη-
 [κέναι καὶ μὴ δύνασθ]εὶ ἐντυχίν.

Commentary

L. 2: α τόμου κολ(λήματος) ξη, "volume one, sheet sixty-eight."
 For Διεδώρου, read Διοδώρου.



L. 4: For Σοκνοβράσεων read Σοκνοβράσεως.

καὶ τῶν] λοιπῶν ἱερέων. See the commentary on XIII, l. 7.

Ll. 4-5: Bataille called attention to the fact that the name Πασάνιος is not listed in Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, but that Πασένιος is found in *BGU* 1476 (from Elephantine, late Ptolemaic), l. 12. Guéraud suggests reading Πα<υ>σανίου.

L. 5: κγ (ἔτους) Καίσαρος θεοῦ, the twenty-third year of Augustus (8-7 B. C.).

L. 7: ἀπειστε. Bataille correctly explained the word as ἀπατεῖσθαι.

Ll. 8-9: διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀπὸ πλήθους εἰς ὀλίγους κατηντη[κέναι, "because the priests have decreased from a large number to a few." Bataille restored κατηντη[κότας?, but Wilcken's ²²² κατηντηκέναι is now proved correct. As Bataille pointed out καταντᾶω is the term regularly used to designate a decrease in population. He cited several examples of the use of the word in this sense, but did not point out the closest parallel to the phrase, found in *BGU* 903 (Mendes, 169-170 A. D.) ll. 12-13: τῷ δὲ ἀπὸ π[λ]είονος ἀριθμοῦ εἰς ὀλίγους κατηντηκέναι.

L. 9: For δύνασθαι read δύνασθαι.

XXV.

P. Yale 324 (Plates IV, V)

12 x 11.5 cm.

ca. 202-204 A. D.

This papyrus is light brown in color. It is the only one in the group which has writing on both the recto and the verso. It is complete at the top and on the left side (the recto has a top margin of 2.5 cm. and left of 2.2-2.9 cm., the verso an upper margin of 1.5 cm. and no right margin), but a portion of undetermined length is lost at the bottom, and the right side is incomplete and very unevenly torn off. Approximately one-fourth of the width of the papyrus is lost in the upper third, about half in the middle third, and about three-fourths in the lower third. It is very difficult to attempt any reconstruction because of the fragmentary state of the papyrus, especially since neither the text on the recto nor that on the verso contains stereotyped phrases like the γραφὴ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ. The hand of the recto is rather similar to Schubart, *Pap. Gr. Berol.* 26,

²²² Wilcken, *Archiv für Pap.* XIII (1939), p. 147.

b (185 A. D.). The ink is extremely clear in contrast to that on the verso, which is badly blurred. The formation of the letters in the hand-writing on the verso is similar to that of the writing on the recto, but the writing is somewhat larger and more careless.

The text on the recto is addressed to Kanopos Asklepiades, basilikos grammateus and acting strategos, from two priests of Soknobraisis. The details are extremely obscure, but it appears from ll. 7-8 that the priests declare that they have performed the ceremonies of the gods, and there is a reference in l. 9 to "those who have neglected . . ." (presumably the ceremonies). *Gnom. Id. Log.* (*BGU* V. 1) 74-75 shows that priests who neglected their duties were liable to fines, which accrued to the account of the idios logos.²²³ It is known from *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 184 that the priests of Soknopaios reported to the komogrammateus that they had performed their priestly duties. The komogrammateus, in turn, as *P. Lond.* 1219 (cf. Wilcken, *Chrest.* 72) shows, would inform the strategos whether a payment of fines was due to the account of the idios logos. Our document, addressed to the strategos from the priests, mentions the komogrammateus and "those who neglected . . ." It is not impossible that the priests protest against a charge of neglect made by the komogrammateus.

The text on the verso is an extract of an order of the same strategos taken from the βιβλιοθήκη δημοσίων λόγων. Unfortunately, the text is too illegible and fragmentary to give any idea of what this order concerned. The question arises which text was written first, and why the papyrus was found in the archives of the temple of Soknobraisis. I would suggest that the text on the verso was written first; that it contained an order in some way affecting the temple or its priests and that it was filed in the archives of the temple. The text on the recto is a report addressed to the strategos from the priests. Like the γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ (I-VI), it was probably a copy of an original document actually presented to the official by the priests. The copy was written on the back of the extract from the βιβλιοθήκη and the papyrus remained in the archives of the temple.

Recto

Κανόπῳ τῷ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου)

[Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος διαδεχ(ομένῳ)]

καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν στ[ρα]τηγία[ν]

παρὰ Ἀμμωνίου Ὀφρον [καὶ . . .] ..[..... ἱερέων]

²²³ See also the edict of the prefect, T. Haterius Nepos (*P. Fouad* 10).

Σοκνοβραΐσεως θεοῦ με[γάλου μεγάλου ἐν ?]
 5 κλήρω κωμογρα(μματεὺς ?) τῆς [κάμης Βακχιάδος]
 πρεσβυτερ() ἐν ἰδιωτικ[
 κριθέντα ταύτη ενακ[ἐπουρησά-]
 μεθα θρησκίας τῶν θεῶν]
 νου τοῖς τε ἐκλιποῦσι.]
 10 κατὰ τὰ τ. [...].] πα-]
 ρεθέμεθα []
 τηγοῖς καὶ . []
 ἐπιστῖλαι τ. []
 θαι μετασω. [προσευ-]
 15 καιρεῖν ἀμε[]
 Μάρκος Ἐρμ[]
 .. [...].]

Verso

[] .
 [] a
 [ἐκ βιβλιοθή]κης δημοσίων λόγων ἐκ προγρά(μματος) Φαῶφι
 [Κάνωπος ὁ καὶ Ἀ]σκληπιάδης βασιλ(ικὸς) γρα(μματεὺς) Ἀρσι-
 (νοίτου) Ἡρακλ(είδου) μερίδος
 5 [διαδεχ(όμενος) καὶ τὰ κα]τὰ [τή]ν στρα(τηγίαν) τῆς Ἡρακλ(είδου)
 μερίδος
 [] προσαγ[γέ]ματος ὑπὸ Γεμέλλου
 [] κώ(μης) Βακχιάδος ὀνόματος
 [] . εἰς πρεσβυτερ() . ντης
 10 [] . . . νιου. σ. . βαλ()
 [] σθεντο. αὐτοῖς εἶναι
 [] [] δ. . [] . .
 [] . καὶ εἰς
 [] ὑ]γιῶς καὶ πιστῶς
 15 [] ου
 []

Commentary

Recto

Ll. 1-2: Kanopos Asklepiades, basilikos grammateus, is also designated the acting strategos in XIII, dated July 29, 204. See the commentary on ll. 1-3 of that text.

L. 4: Probably the name of the official whose title follows was in the lacuna.

Ll. 4-5: ἐν ?] κλήρω κωμογρα(μματεὺς ?). Cf. BGU 792 (196-197 A.D.), l. 15. The term ἐν κλήρω indicates an official who was nominated for office, but whose appointment was not yet ratified. See Preisigke, *Fachwörter*, p. 110.

L. 6: The text is too fragmentary to determine whether reference is made to the temple or village presbyters. Nor is it clear why ἰδιωτικ[is mentioned in this text.

Ll. 7-8: ἐπουρησά]μεθα θρησκίας τῶν θεῶν, "we have performed the ceremonies of the gods." Cf. XIX, ll. 21-22: τὰς τῶν θεῶν θρησκίας ποιῆσθαι.

L. 9: τοῖς τε ἐκλιποῦσι, "those who have neglected . . ." Cf. *Gnom. Id. Log.* (BGU V. 1), 75: ἱερεὺς καταλειπὼν τὰς θρησκίας κατεκρίθη (δραχμῶν) σ ἐρεᾶ ἐσθῆτι χρησάμενος (δραχμῶν) σ συρσιστή (δραχμῶν) ρ παστοφό[ρο]ς (δραχμῶν) ρ.

Ll. 14-15: προσευ]καιρεῖν. Cf. *P. Oxy.* 487 (Mitteis, *Chrest.* 322) (156 A.D.), ll. 12-15: κελεῦσαι τῷ στρατηγῷ ἐπιναγκάσαι τὸν γραμματεῖα τῆς πόλε[ω]ς ἀ[λ]λον ἀν[τ'] ἐμοῦ κατασταθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀφελίκων ἐπιτροπῇ{ν} ὅπως δυνήθῃ τῇ γεωργίᾳ μου προσευκαιρεῖν. The word means here "to have time for." The context of the Oxyrhynchos text, an appeal for release from a duty, suggests that it may have been used more or less in the same way in our text. Cf. XIX, in which the priests ask to perform their labor on the dikes near home so that they can carry on the ceremonies of the gods.

Verso

Ll. 3-4: [ἐκ βιβλιοθή]κης δημοσίων λόγων ἐκ προγρά(μματος) Φαῶφι, "extract of an order issued in the month of Phaophi taken from the public accounting office." Extracts of documents taken from this office regularly open with a similar heading; cf. BGU 175, ll. 1-2: ἐκ βιβλιοθήκης δημοσίων λόγων ἐξ ἀπαιτησίμου κατ' ἄνδρα σιτικ(ών) . . .

I see no trace of a letter after Φαῶφι giving the day of the month.

Ll. 4-5: It appears from these lines that the πρόγραμμα referred to above was issued by Kanopos Asklepiades, basilikos grammateus and acting strategos ca. 202. BGU 18 (Wilcken, *Chrest.* 398, dated 169 A.D.) is a copy of an order issued by an earlier strategos similarly entitled πρόγραμμα.

INDICES

Emperors

- Augustus
Καίσαρ θεός XXIV, l. 5.
- Trajan
Τραιανός Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος I, ll. 7-8.
- Marcus Aurelius
Αὔρηλιος Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος II, ll. 7-8, 61-62; III, ll. 6-7; XIX, ll. 29-30.
- Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος XX, l. 12.
- Marcus Aurelius and Commodus
Αὔρηλιοι Ἀντωνίνος καὶ Κόμμοδος Καίσαρες οἱ κύριοι XXI, ll. 7-8.
Αὔρηλιοι Ἀντωνίνος καὶ Κόμμοδος οἱ κύριοι Σεβαστοὶ Εὐσεβεῖς XXIII, ll. 6-8.
- Commodus
Αὔρηλιος Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος VI, ll. 9-10.
Αὔρηλιος Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος Εὐτυχῆς Σεβαστός X, ll. 8-10.
Μάρκος Αὔρηλιος Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ VIII, ll. 11-12.
Μάρκος Αὔρηλιος Κόμμοδος Ἀντωνίνος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος V, ll. 31-32; IX, ll. 12-14; XI, ll. 13-15.
- Septimius Severus and Caracalla
Αὐτοκράτορες Καίσαρες Λούκιος Σεπτίμιος Σεβήρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηρικὸς Παρθικὸς Μέγιστος καὶ Μάρκος Αὔρηλιος Ἀντωνίνος Σεβαστοὶ XII, ll. 9-15.
- Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta
Λούκιος Σεπτίμιος Σεβήρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ καὶ Μάρκος Αὔρηλιος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβαστοὶ καὶ Πούβλιος Σεπτίμιος Γέτας Καίσαρ Σεβαστός XV, ll. 16-21.

Officials

- αἰγυλοφύλαξ XIX, l. 12. Σεραπίων XXI, ll. 31, 34.
- βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς I, l. 1; XIII, l. 15; XV, l. 14; XVI, l. 13; XVIII, l. 1. Ἀπολλώνιος XXI, ll. 11, 21; XXII, l. 2. Αὔρηλιος Ἰσίδωτος ὁ καὶ Ὀριγένης XVI, ll. 1-2. Ἐρμόφιλος X, ll. 1, 11. Κάνωπος ὁ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης, acting strategos, XIII, l. 1; XXV (recto), l. 1; XXV (verso), l. 4. Μόνιμος Γεμέλλος XIV, ll. 1, 11; XV, l. 1.
- βιβλιοφύλαξ τοῦ Ἀρσινότου. Ζώιλος XII, ll. 1, 16.
- βοηθός. Ἄρπoc() VIII, l. 13.
- ἐγλογιστής IX, ll. 1, 7.
- ἐκβολεύς XIX, l. 13.
- ἐξεταστής. αἰρέθεις ὑπὸ Κλωδίου [Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ] κρα(τίστου) πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ πρὸς [ἐξέτασιν χει]ρισμῶν τε καὶ προσόδων ἱερῶν [καὶ τῆς ἱερῶν ?] προστασίας VI, ll. 1-4.

- ἴδιος λόγος. Κλώδιος Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ κράτιστος πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ VI, ll. 1-2.
- κομογρα(μματεὺς) XXIV, l. 7; XXV (recto), l. 5.
- νομογράφος II, l. 60.
- παραλήμπτης βιβλίων ἐγλογιστοῦ IX, l. 1. Δίδυμος ὁ καὶ Πτολεμαῖος IX, ll. 10-11.
- στρατηγός VIII, l. 12; XI, l. 16; XX, l. 10; XXI, l. 27; XXII, l. 7. Ἀμμώνιος XI, l. 1. Ἀπολλώτας VIII, l. 1. Ποτάμων XIX, l. 1; XXI, ll. 30, 34. Φλαύιος Ἀπολλώνιος XXI, ll. 1, 10.
- ὑπηρέτης XXI, l. 19.

Gods

- Ἀφροδίτη VII, l. 9.
- Βούβαστις XXIV, l. 3.
- Ἔρμης VII, l. 2.
- Ἴσις V, l. 29; XXIV, l. 3.
- Ἡνεφερώς I, ll. 11, 45; II, ll. 9, 27; III, l. 8; IV, l. 8; V, l. 7.
- Σοκνοβραῖσις I, ll. 5, 43-44; II, ll. 4, 26; III, l. 3; IV, ll. 2-3, 7; V, ll. 4, 6-7; VI, l. 6; VIII, l. 5; IX, l. 4; X, ll. 4-5; XI, l. 5; XII, l. 4; XIII, ll. 7-8; XIV, l. 4; XVI, l. 6; XVIII, ll. 4-5; XXI, ll. 4, 24; XXII, l. 4; XXIV, l. 4; XXV (recto), l. 4.
- Σοκνόκωνις I, ll. 3, 9-10; II, ll. 3, 8; III, ll. 7-8.

Priestly Titles

- ἀρχιερεὺς XXI, l. 5. Οὐλλπιος Σεργιανός XX, ll. 8-9; XXI, ll. 13-14, 24-25; XXII, ll. 5-6.
- ἱερεὺς I, ll. 3, 6, 18, 51; II, ll. 5, 6, 13, 32; III, ll. 5, 12; IV, ll. 2, 5, 14; V, ll. 5, 12, 29; VI, ll. 4, 6-8; VIII, l. 9; IX, l. 8; X, l. 7; XI, l. 9; XII, l. 8; XIII, ll. 7, 12; XIV, ll. 4, 8; XV, ll. 5, 8; XVI, ll. 5, 11; XVII, l. 3; XVIII, l. 8; XIX, l. 4; XX, l. 1; XXI, ll. 3, 14, 23; XXII, l. 4; XXIV, ll. 3-5, 8; XXV (recto), l. 3.
- παστοφόρος XX, l. 1; XXI, l. 14.
- πρεσβύτερος ἱερῶν I, ll. 4-5; II, ll. 2, 4; III, l. 3; V, l. 3; VI, ll. 5-6; VIII, l. 4; IX, l. 3; X, l. 4; XI, ll. 4-5; XII, l. 4; XVIII, l. 4; cf. XXV (recto), l. 6, and XXV (verso), l. 8.

Personal Names

- Αἴνης (?) f. of Orsenouphis II, l. 39.
- Ἀμμώνιος I, ll. 32, 36; XI, ll. 1, 16.
- Ἀμμώνιος s. of Horos V, l. 25; XXV (recto), l. 3.
- Ἀμμώνιος s. of Onnophris V, l. 19; XIV, l. 3.
- Ἀμμώνιος s. of Peteuris V, l. 17.
- Ἀμμώνιος s. of Petis II, ll. 3, 59.
- Ἀμμώνιος f. of Horos V, l. 27.
- Ἀπολλόφιλος XX, l. 3.
- Ἀπολλώνιος XXI, ll. 11, 21, XXII, l. 2.

- Ἀπολλωτᾶς VIII, l. 1.
 Ἀρθώτης s. of Ὀν[νώφρις] XXIV, l. 2.
 Ἄρποκ () VIII, l. 13.
 Ἀυρήλιος Ἰσίδωτος ὁ καὶ Ὀριγένης XVI, ll. 1-2.
 Γεμέλλος XXV (verso), l. 6.
 Δίδυμος ὁ καὶ Πτολεμαῖος IX, ll. 10-11.
 Διόδωρος s. of Horos XXIV, l. 2.
 Ἐρμόφιλος X, ll. 1, 11.
 Ζωίλος XII, ll. 1, 16.
 Ἴρω () II, l. 60.
 Θεῦδης s. of Orsenouphis XV, l. 4.
 Θεούλης s. of Orsenouphis V, l. 20.
 Θεούλης s. of Peteuris V, l. 26.
 Ἐρανοῦπις s. of Peteuris V, l. 23; XVI, l. 4.
 Κάνωπος ὁ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης XIII, l. 1; XXV (recto), l. 1; XXV (verso), l. 4.
 Κιαλῆς (?) s. of Petis XXIV, l. 3.
 Κλώδιος Ἀπολλώνιος VI, ll. 1-2.
 Μάρκος Ἐρμ[XXV (recto), l. 16.
 Μόνιμος Γεμέλλος XIV, ll. 1, 11; XV, l. 1.
 Μύσθης fatherless, s. of Taorsenouphis II, l. 41.
 Μύσθης s. of Peteuris V, l. 22.
 Μύσθης f. of Peteuris II, l. 38; V, ll. 16, 28; XXIV, l. 4.
 Μύσθης f. of Peteuris and gdf. of Peteuris V, l. 14; VI, l. 5; VIII, l. 4.
 Νεφερώς f. of [. . .]s I, l. 30.
 Νεφερώς f. of [Ψενα]τύμις I, l. 29.
 Ὀννώφρις I, l. 31.
 Ὀννώφρις s. of Horos V, l. 29.
 [Ὀννώ]φρις s. of Psenamounis II, l. 25.
 Ὀννώφρις f. of [. . .]is II, l. 23.
 Ὀννώφρις f. of Ammonios V, l. 19; XIV, l. 3.
 Ὀν[νώφρις] f. of Arthotos XXIV, ll. 2-3.
 Ὀννώφρις f. of [Περε]σοῦχος II, l. 24.
 Ὀννώφρις f. of [Ψεν]αμοῦνις II, ll. 20, 22.
 Ὀρρε[νοῦφρις] I, l. 41.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις s. of Aines (?) II, l. 39.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις s. of Orsenouphis and younger b. of Petesouchos II, l. 45.
 [Ὀρσεν]οῦφις s. of Psenatumis and older b. of [Περε]ῆσις I, l. 24.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις s. of Horos II, l. 35; V, l. 18; XII, l. 3; XV, l. 3; XVIII, l. 3.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις s. of Horos, gds. of Peteuris V, l. 24.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of Theudis XV, ll. 4-5.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of Thoulis V, l. 20.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of Orsenouphis and Petesouchos II, l. 45.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of [Πετ]εῆσις and [Περε]ῆσις I, l. 25.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of Peteuris II, l. 44.
 Ὀρσενοῦφις f. of Sisois II, l. 34; IV, l. 16; V, l. 15; XIII, ll. 5-6; XIX, l. 3; XXI, ll. 2, 22; XXII, l. 3.

- Ὀύλιος Σερμηριανός XX, ll. 8-9; XXI, ll. 13, 25; XXII, ll. 5-6.
 Πα(κ)οσάνιος (?) f. of Horos XXIV, l. 4.
 Πε[] I, l. 53.
 Πετ[] I, l. 57.
 Πετ[] I, l. 58.
 Περε[] I, l. 39.
 Περε[] I, l. 40.
 Περε[] I, l. 56.
 Περεῆσις III, l. 14.
 [Περε]ῆσις s. of Horos II, l. 21.
 [Πετ]εῆσις s. of Orsenouphis and older b. of [Περε]ῆσις I, l. 25.
 [Περε]ῆσις s. of Orsenouphis and younger b. of [Πετ]εῆσις I, l. 26.
 [Περε]ῆσις s. of Psenatumis and younger b. of [Ὀρσεν]οῦφις I, l. 23.
 Περεσ[] I, l. 55.
 Περεσοῦχος s. of Orsenouphis and older b. of Orsenouphis II, l. 46.
 [Περε]σοῦχος s. of Onnophris II, l. 24.
 [Πετ]εσοῦχος s. of Petechon I, l. 21.
 Περεσοῦχος s. of Petesouchos I, ll. 3-4.
 Περεσοῦχος f. of Petesouchos I, l. 4.
 Περεχῶν f. of Petesouchos I, l. 21.
 Πέτις (?) f. of Ammonios II, l. 3.
 Πέτις (?) f. of Kiales (?) XXIV, l. 3.
 Πετεύρις s. of Mysthes II, l. 38; V, ll. 12, 28; XXIV, ll. 3-4.
 Πετεύρις s. of Mysthes, father of Peteuris V, l. 14; VI, l. 5; VIII, l. 3.
 Πετεύρις s. of Horos II, l. 40; V, l. 21.
 Πετεύρις s. of . . . X, l. 3.
 Πετεύρις s. of Orsenouphis II, l. 44.
 Πετεύρις s. of Peteuris II, ll. 36-37, 47; IX, l. 2; XI, l. 3; XIX, ll. 2, 27; XXI, ll. 3, 23; XXII, ll. 3-4.
 Πετεύρις s. of Peteuris, gds. of Mysthes V, l. 14; VI, l. 5; VIII, l. 3.
 Πετεύρις f. of Ammonios V, l. 17.
 Πετεύρις f. of Hieranoupis V, l. 23; XVI, l. 5.
 Πετεύρις f. of Horos XXI, ll. 2, 22; XXII, l. 3.
 Πετεύρις f. of Mysthes V, l. 22.
 Πετεύρις f. of Peteuris II, ll. 36-37, 47; IX, ll. 2-3; XI, ll. 3-4; XIX, l. 2; XXI, ll. 3, 23; XXII, l. 4.
 Πετεύρις f. of Thoulis V, l. 26.
 Πετεύρις f. of Horos, gdf. of Orsenouphis V, l. 24.
 Πετσείρις s. of Petseiris II, l. 43.
 Πετσείρις f. of Petseiris II, l. 43.
 Πνεφερώς f. of Psenamounis II, l. 18.
 [Πνεφ]ερώς m. of [Ψενανο?]ῆσις II, l. 19.
 Ποτάμιον XIX, l. 1; XXI, ll. 30, 34.
 Σεραπίον XXI, ll. 31, 34.
 Σισοίς XXIII, l. 4.
 Σισοίς s. of Orsenouphis II, l. 34; IV, l. 16; V, l. 15; XIII, l. 5; XIX, ll. 3, 28; XXI, ll. 2, 22.

- Ταορσενούφης m. of Mysthes II, ll. 41-42.
 Φαλοῦς f. of the younger I, l. 22.
 Φλαῖος Ἀπολλώνιος XXI, ll. 1, 10.
 Ψε[I, l. 34.
 Ψε[I, l. 42.
 Ψενα[I, l. 33.
 Ψενα[I, l. 37.
 Ψενα[I, l. 38.
 Ψεναμοῦνις I, l. 35; II, l. 17; III, ll. 16-17.
 [Ψεν]αμοῦνις s. of Onnophris II, ll. 20, 22.
 [Ψεν]αμοῦνις s. of Pnepheros II, l. 18.
 [Ψενα]μοῦνις s. of Psenamounis, younger b. of [. . .] . . . ος I, l. 28.
 Ψεναμοῦνις f. of [᾽Ορνῶ]φρις II, l. 25.
 Ψεναμοῦνις f. of [. . .] . . . ος and [Ψενα]μοῦνις I, l. 27.
 [Ψενανο?]ῆπις fatherless, s. of Pnepheros II, l. 19.
 [Ψενα]τύμις s. of Nepheros I, l. 29.
 Ψενατύμις s. of Psenatumis I, l. 2.
 Ψενατύμις f. of [Περε]ῆσις and [᾽Ορσεν]οῦφης I, l. 23.
 Ψενατύμις f. of Psenatumis I, l. 2.
 Ψοσνεῦς s. of]αλοντος II, ll. 2, 58.
 ᾽Ωρος XXIII, l. 5.
 ᾽Ωρος s. of Ammonios V, l. 27.
 ᾽Ωρος s. of Pausanios (?) XXIV, l. 4.
 ᾽Ωρος s. of Peteuris XXI, ll. 2, 22; XXII, l. 3.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Ammonios V, l. 25; XXV (recto), l. 3.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Diodoros XXIV, l. 2.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Onnophris V, l. 29.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Orsenouphis II, l. 35; V, l. 18; XII, l. 3; XV, l. 3; XVIII, l. 3.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Orsenouphis, s. of Peteuris V, l. 24.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of [Περε]ῆσις II, l. 21.
 ᾽Ωρος f. of Peteuris II, l. 40; V, l. 21.

Principal Greek Words

- ἄγειν XIX, l. 6; XXI, l. 15.
 ἀδελφός I, ll. 24, 26, 28; II, l. 46.
 αἰρέω VI, l. 1.
 ἀκόλουθος XXI, l. 6.
 ἀλληλεγγύη XXIV, l. 8.
 ἄλλος XIX, ll. 7, 14; XX, l. 7; XXIV, l. 1.
 ἀμφότερος II, ll. 4-5.
 ἀνάβασις XIX, l. 26.
 ἀνατείνειν XXI, l. 24; XXII, l. 5.
 ἀνήρ I, ll. 18, 51; II, ll. 13, 32; III, l. 12; IV, l. 14; V, l. 12; XXI, ll. 32, 35.
 ἀντίγραφον XXI, ll. 5, 10, 16, 27, 29; XXII, l. 7.
 ἀξιοῦν XIX, l. 15; XX, l. 6; XXI, ll. 6, 15.

- ἀξίωμα XXI, ll. 19-20.
 ἀπαιτεῖν II, l. 51; XXIV, l. 7.
 ἀπαρενόχλητος XX, l. 8.
 ἀπάτωρ II, ll. 19, 41.
 ἀπεργάζεσθαι XX, l. 5; XXI, l. 28; XXII, l. 8.
 ἀπεργασία XXI, l. 16.
 ἀποστάναι XIX, ll. 16-17.
 ἀποχή XVIII, ll. 10-11.
 ἀργύριον XXIV, l. 5.
 ἀρχή XXI, l. 33.
 ἀσημος XIX, ll. 27-28.
 ἀφήλιξ XXI, l. 32.
 βασιδίου VII, ll. 11-12.
 βασιλική γραμματεία XXIV, l. 1.
 βία XX, l. 10.
 βιάζων XIX, l. 13; XX, l. 4.
 βιβλίδιον XXI, ll. 4-5, 9, 13, 25; XXII, l. 6.
 βιβλιοθήκη δημοσίων λόγων XXV (verso), l. 3.
 βιβλίον IX, l. 1.
 βοηθεῖν XIX, l. 26.
 γεωργεῖν II, l. 57.
 γεωργός II, l. 49.
 γῆ II, l. 57.
 γίγνεσθαι XIX, l. 22; XX, l. 10.
 γόνυ II, l. 59.
 γράμμα II, l. 60.
 γράφειν XXI, l. 30.
 γραφή I, l. 6; II, l. 6; III, l. 5; IV, l. 4; V, l. 5; VI, l. 7; VIII, l. 8; IX, ll. 7-8; X, l. 6; XI, l. 9; XII, l. 7; XIII, l. 12; XIV, l. 7; XV, l. 8; XVI, ll. 9-10; XVII, l. 3; XVIII, l. 7.
 δεῖν II, l. 51.
 δεξιός II, ll. 58-59.
 δηλόω XXIV, l. 7.
 δημόσιος II, ll. 48, 57. τὸ δημ. II, l. 50.
 διαγράφειν I, ll. 19, 52; II, ll. 14, 33, 50; III, l. 13; V, l. 13.
 διαδέχεσθαι XIII, ll. 3, 15-16; XXV (recto), l. 1; XXV (verso), l. 5.
 διαμονή XIX, l. 22.
 δίκαιος, τὰ δίκαια XXI, ll. 6-7.
 δικαίωμα XXI, l. 26; XXII, l. 6.
 δίσκος I, ll. 16, 50; II, ll. 12, 30; III, l. 11; IV, l. 13; V, l. 11.
 διῶρυξ XIX, l. 8.
 δοκεῖν XIX, l. 16.
 δύνασθαι XIX, l. 18; XXIV, l. 9.
 ἔδαφος XIX, l. 10.
 ἔθος XIX, ll. 5, 14.
 εἰδέναι II, l. 60.
 εἶδος XXIV, l. 1.
 εἰκονίζων II, l. 60.



εἰπείν XX, ll. 3, 10.
 εἰσκριτικόν I, ll. 20, 52; II, ll. 14, 33; III, l. 13; V, l. 13.
 ἑκαστός I, ll. 15, 49; II, ll. 11, 29; III, l. 11; XIX, l. 20.
 ἐκλείπειν XXV (recto), l. 9.
 ἐπιστώναι I, l. 7; II, l. 7; III, l. 6; IV, l. 6; V, l. 6; VI, l. 8; VIII,
 l. 10; IX, l. 9; X, l. 8; XI, l. 12; XII, l. 9; XIII, l. 13; XIV,
 l. 10; XV, l. 11; XVI, l. 12; XVIII, l. 9; XXIII, l. 1.
 ἐνπεριλαμβάνειν II, l. 52.
 ἐντυγχάνειν XX, l. 1; XXIV, l. 9.
 ἐξέτασις VI, l. 3.
 ἐπάγειν V, l. 32; IX, l. 15; X, l. 11; XI, l. 17; XIV, l. 12; XV,
 ll. 15, 22.
 ἐπήρεια XIX, l. 17.
 ἐπικρίνειν I, ll. 19, 51; II, ll. 13, 32; III, l. 13; V, l. 12.
 ἐπιστατικόν XXIV, l. 1.
 ἐπιστέλλειν XXI, ll. 26, 34; XXII, l. 6; XXV (recto), l. 13.
 ἐπιστόλιον XXI, ll. 9-10, 29-30, 33.
 ἐπιστρατηγία XXIV, l. 1.
 ἐπιφέρειν XXI, l. 12.
 ἐργάζεσθαι XIX, ll. 15, 19.
 ἐργασία XX, l. 5.
 ἔργον II, l. 57; XIX, l. 7; XXI, l. 29; XXII, l. 9.
 ἕτερος XXI, ll. 3, 23; XXII, l. 4; XXIV, l. 1.
 εὐεργεῖν XX, l. 7.
 ἡμέρα XIX, l. 20.
 θεός I, l. 10; II, ll. 3-4; IV, l. 3; V, l. 4; VI, l. 6; VIII, l. 5; IX, l. 4;
 XI, l. 6; XII, l. 5; XIII, l. 7; XIV, l. 5; XVI, l. 6; XVIII,
 l. 5; XIX, l. 21; XXI, l. 23; XXII, l. 4; XXIV, l. 5; XXV
 (recto), ll. 4, 8.
 θρησκεία XIX, l. 21; XXV (recto), l. 8.
 θυμιατήριον I, ll. 14, 47; II, ll. 11, 28; III, l. 10; IV, ll. 9-10; V, l. 9.
 ἴδιος II, l. 55.
 ἰδιωτικός XXV (recto), l. 6.
 ἱερόν I, ll. 5, 8, 43; II, ll. 5-6, 8, 26, 55; III, ll. 4, 6-7; IV, ll. 5-6;
 V, l. 6; VI, ll. 3, 6; VII, l. 9; VIII, l. 10; IX, l. 9; XI, l. 11;
 XII, l. 8; XIV, l. 9; XV, l. 5; XVI, l. 5; XVIII, l. 9; XIX, l. 4;
 XX, l. 9; XXI, l. 3.
 ἱερός XIX, l. 25.
 ἴσος. τὸ ἴσον XV, l. 13.
 καθιστάται XIX, ll. 12-13.
 κανόνιον IV, l. 12; V, l. 10.
 καταχωρίζειν VIII, ll. 8, 13; IX, ll. 5-6; X, l. 6; XI, ll. 8, 16; XII,
 l. 7; XIII, ll. 11, 15; XIV, ll. 7, 11; XV, ll. 7, 14; XVI, ll. 9,
 13; XVII, l. 1; XVIII, l. 7.
 καταπνάν XXIV, ll. 8-9.
 κατέρχεσθαι XIX, l. 11.
 κελεύειν XIX, l. 16; XX, ll. 6-7; XXI, l. 6.
 κεφάλαιον II, ll. 53-54.

κλῆρος XXV (recto), l. 5.
 κόλλημα XXIV, l. 2.
 κράτιστος VI, l. 2; XXI, ll. 5, 14, 24-25; XXII, l. 5.
 κρίνειν XXV (recto), l. 7.
 κύων VII, l. 3.
 κόμη I, l. 6; II, ll. 5, 49, 52; III, l. 4; IV, l. 4; V, l. 4; VI, l. 7;
 VIII, l. 7; IX, l. 5; X, l. 5; XI, l. 7; XII, l. 6; XIII, l. 10;
 XIV, ll. 5-6; XV, ll. 6, 10; XVI, l. 8; XVIII, l. 6; XIX, ll. 5,
 9, 15, 20; XX, l. 2; XXI, ll. 4, 15, 24; XXII, l. 5; XXIV, ll.
 2, 7; XXV (recto), l. 5; XXV (verso), l. 7.
 λαογραφεῖν II, l. 56.
 λέγειν XIX, ll. 8-9.
 λεμησία II, l. 53.
 λόγιμος III, l. 4; VI, l. 7; XIII, l. 9; XXI, l. 3.
 λοιπός XIII, l. 7; XIX, ll. 3-4; XXIV, ll. 4-5.
 λυχνασία II, l. 54.
 λυχνία I, ll. 12, 46; II, ll. 10, 28; III, l. 9; IV, l. 9; V, l. 8.
 μακρόθεν XIX, l. 14.
 μέγας II, ll. 3-4; III, l. 4; IV, l. 3; V, l. 4; VI, l. 6; VIII, l. 6;
 XI, l. 6; XII, l. 5; XIII, ll. 8-9; XIV, l. 5; XVI, l. 7; XVIII,
 l. 5; XXV (recto), l. 4.
 μεταλαμβάνειν XXI, l. 19.
 μήν XX, l. 12.
 μήτηρ II, ll. 19, 41.
 μόνος XIX, l. 7.
 ναός I, ll. 9, 11, 44-45; II, ll. 8-9, 26; III, l. 8; IV, ll. 7-8; V, ll. 7-8;
 VII, ll. 2-3, 6-7, 9.
 νέος. νεώτερος I, ll. 22, 26.
 ξύλινος I, ll. 10-11, 15-16, 44-45, 48, 50; II, ll. 8-9, 12, 27, 29-30;
 III, ll. 8-11; IV, ll. 7, 12-13; V, ll. 7, 10-11; VII, ll. 2-3, 6-7, 9.
 ὀλιγός XXIV, l. 8.
 ὄνομα XXI, l. 14; XXV (verso), l. 7.
 οὐλή II, ll. 58-59.
 οὐσιακός II, l. 49.
 ὀφείλειν XXIV, l. 7.
 παρακείσθαι XXI, ll. 25-26; XXII, l. 6.
 παρακομίζειν XXI, l. 4.
 παρατιθέναι XXV (recto), ll. 10-11.
 παριστάται XX, l. 3.
 πενταφυλ() II, l. 53.
 περιχρυσούν I, ll. 10-12, 17, 44-45, 50; II, ll. 9, 12, 27-28, 30; III,
 ll. 8-9, 11; IV, ll. 7-8, 13; V, ll. 7-8, 11, VII, ll. 2-11.
 πέταλον VII, ll. 2, 4-11.
 πιστῶς XXV (verso), l. 14.
 πλήθος XXIV, l. 8.
 πλησιάζειν XIX, ll. 19-20.
 ποιεῖν II, l. 55; XIX, ll. 21-22; XXV (recto), ll. 7-8.
 ποτήριον I, l. 13; II, l. 10; III, l. 10; IV, l. 11; V, l. 9.

- πούς II, l. 58.
 πραγματικός XX, l. 4.
 πράσσειν XXI, l. 33.
 πρόγραμμα XXV (verso), l. 3.
 προκείσθαι II, l. 53; VIII, l. 9; XI, ll. 10-11; XIV, l. 9; XV, ll. 9-10.
 προνοεῖν XX, l. 10.
 προσάγγελμα XXV (verso), l. 6.
 προσάγειν XXIV, l. 5.
 προσδιαγράφειν XXIV, l. 6.
 προσευκαιρεῖν XXV (recto), ll. 14-15.
 πρόσσδος VI, l. 3.
 προστασία VI, l. 4.
 ῥήτωρ XX, l. 3.
 σαλπίγγιον I, ll. 47-48; II, ll. 11, 29, 31; IV, l. 11; V, l. 9.
 σαλπιγγωτός I, ll. 12, 46; II, ll. 10, 28; III, l. 9; IV, l. 9; V, l. 8.
 σημειοῦσθαι IX, l. 11; XII, l. 17.
 συναγορεύειν XX, ll. 4-5.
 συνήθης XIX, l. 18; XXIII, l. 3.
 συρίγγιον I, ll. 14-15; III, l. 10.
 σφράγισμα XXI, l. 13.
 σωματικῶς XX, l. 5; XXI, ll. 15, 28; XXII, l. 8.
 τελέα XIX, l. 25.
 τελεῖν II, l. 56.
 τόμος XXIV, l. 2.
 τόπος XIX, ll. 7, 14, 19.
 ὑδρεύειν XIX, l. 10.
 ὑδροστάσιον XIX, ll. 10-11.
 ὑγιῶς XXV (verso), l. 14.
 ὑπεξαιρεῖν XXI, ll. 27-28; XXII, l. 8.
 ὑπογραφή XXI, ll. 5-6, 13.
 ὑποκείσθαι II, l. 48; XXI, ll. 6, 9; XXIV, l. 1.
 ὑποτάσσειν XXI, ll. 9, 27, 29, 33; XXII, l. 7.
 φάναι II, l. 60.
 φίλος. φίλτατος XXI, l. 12.
 φυλάσσειν XXI, ll. 7, 16-17.
 φύλλον I, ll. 16, 49; I, ll. 12, 29; III, l. 11; IV, l. 12; V, l. 10;
 VII, l. 5.
 χαίρειν XXI, l. 12.
 χαλκίον I, ll. 17, 50; II, ll. 12, 30-31; III, l. 12; IV, ll. 10, 13; V, l. 11.
 χαλκός I, ll. 12-14, 16-18, 46-51; II, ll. 10-12, 28-31; III, ll. 9-12;
 IV, ll. 9-13; V, ll. 8-11.
 χειρισμός I, l. 7; II, l. 6; III, l. 5; IV, l. 5; V, l. 5; VI, ll. 3, 8;
 VIII, l. 9; IX, ll. 8-9; X, l. 7; XI, l. 10; XII, l. 8; XIII, ll. 12-
 13; XIV, l. 8; XV, l. 9; XVI, l. 10; XVII, l. 3; XVIII, l. 8.
 χῶμα XXI, l. 16.
 χωματικός II, ll. 56-57; XIX, l. 6; XXI, l. 29; XXII, l. 9.
 ὡσπερ XX, l. 7.
 ὡστε IX, l. 6.

Table of Papyri

		DATE	PAGE
I	(P. Yale 363)	Γραφή ἱερέων καὶ χειρισμοῦ	116 A. D. 207
II	(P. Yale 902 + 906)	"	171 215
III	(P. Lund 3 6)	"	171 222
IV	(P. Lund 3 5)	"	172 225
V	(P. Lund 4 2)	"	188 227
VI	(P. Lund 3 4)	"	184-192 228
VII	(P. Yale 378 + 379)	"	undated 230
VIII	(P. Fouad 11)	Receipt for γραφή	ca. 186 233
IX	(P. Yale 362)	"	187 235
X	(P. Lund 3 2)	"	188 236
XI	(P. Yale 361)	"	188 or 189 238
XII	(P. Lund 3 1)	"	199 239
XIII	(P. Yale 903)	"	204 241
XIV	(P. Fouad 12)	"	207 243
XV	(P. Yale 907)	"	209 244
XVI	(P. Yale 904)	"	212 246
XVII	(P. Lund 3 3)	"	end of second century 247
XVIII	(P. Yale 344)	Acknowledgment of a receipt	ca. 199 249
XIX	(P. Yale 349)	Petition	171 250
XX	(P. Yale 351)	Hearing before the archiereus	171 254
XXI	(P. Lund 3 8 + P. Yale 348)	Petition	178 or shortly after 258
XXII	(P. Fouad 13)	"	178 or shortly after 264
XXIII	(P. Yale 350)	Character uncertain	178-179 266
XXIV	(P. Fouad 14)	Account of temple finances	first half of first century 267
XXV	(P. Yale 324)	recto: Petition to the acting strategos verso: Πρόγραμμα of the acting strategos	ca. 202-204 268