

Four Papyri from the Archive of the Temple of Soknobraisis in Bacchias

[Preprint]

The documents edited here concern priests of the temple of Soknobraisis in the Arsinoite village of Bacchias (Kom el-‘Atl). Several texts relating to this temple are housed in the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library and were published by E. H. Gilliam, *The Archives of the Temple of Soknobraisis at Bacchias* (YCS 10; New Haven 1947) = P.Bacch.¹ The published documents, dating from the second and early third centuries CE, consist almost exclusively of official declarations (especially γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειριζοῦ and associated texts) and petitions by priests to government authorities. In contrast, three of the documents below are of a private or fiscal nature: **1** is a loan contract by three priests, while **2–3** are tax receipts, the first apparently issued to all the priests of the temple jointly; only **4**, a petition addressed to the prefect of Egypt, conforms to the typology of the texts hitherto published. **1–3** therefore may not belong to the archive as such and perhaps only attest related figures, or else the definition of the scope of this archive (or ‘dossier’) should be expanded to include a wider variety of documentary types.²

According to the online catalogue of the Beinecke Library, all four papyri were ‘purchased by Michael Ivanovich Rostovtzeff and Charles Bradford Welles in Egypt, 1931 before 10 February, with funds donated by Edward Stephen Harkness and Horatio McLeod Reynolds’, **1–2** from Maurice Nahman in Cairo, **3–4** from a certain ‘Izabi (in Faiyum)’.³

¹ For additional texts and an overview of the archive, see <www.trismegistos.org/archive/235> with the associated PDF by W. Clarysse, ‘Temple of Soknobraisis’, TM ArchID 235, Version 2 (2013). Other pieces are divided between the collections of Cairo, Florence, Lund, and Michigan. Most of the papyri in P.Bacch. were republished as SB VI 9319–9339.

² Besides the lists of priests and temple furniture (and related documents like their cover letters and receipts) and the petitions, isolated items believed to belong to the archive include a record of proceedings before the Chief Priest of Egypt (P.Bacch. 20 = SB VI 9329) and a tax record in duplicate copies (P.Bacch. 24 = P.Fouad 14 with BL X 76 ~ P.Lund. IV 7). P.Lund. IV 9 = SB VI 9346 (an acknowledgment of the delivery of *byssos*-linen for the burial of the Apis bull by priests of Souchos and Ammon in Bacchias) and P.Lund. IV 11 = SB VI 9348 (an account of expenses of a cultic association of the Dioscuri) are not certainly part of the archive. On the (controversial) terminological distinction between ‘archive’ and ‘dossier’, see K. Vandorpe, ‘Archives and dossiers’, in R. S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford 2009) 216–55, esp. 218–19.

³ See <<http://beinecke.library.yale.edu/research/library-catalogs-databases/guide-yale-papyrus-collection#Acquisition>>.

They thus share the same acquisition history as the papyri published by Gilliam in P.Bacch.,⁴ which strengthens the impression that they belong to the same group. If the tax receipts **2–3** belong to the archive, SB XXII 15629 = P.CtYBR inv. 908 (Bacchias; 176) should probably be added as well.⁵ It is a receipt for a *μερίκιμός* issued to individuals with names suggesting attachment to the priesthood of Soknobraisis, and it was part of the same purchase as **3–4**. Other unpublished items in the collection with a provenance in Bacchias and a similar acquisition history are P.CtYBR invv. 392 and 909, but they do not seem to relate in any obvious way to the rest of the archive.⁶

Images of all papyri but **3** are available online via <http://brbl-legacy.library.yale.edu/papyrus/> (search for inventory number).⁷

⁴ From Nahman: P.CtYBR invv. 324a, 324b, 344, 348, 349, 350, 351qua, 361, 362, 363. From Izabi: P.CtYBR invv. 902qua, 903, 904, 907.

⁵ Consult the corrected version of the text by Dieter Hagedorn on the Papyrological Navigator: <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb;22;15629>.

⁶ Inv. 392 is an incomplete account of grain dating from the 11th year of an emperor, while inv. 909 (being prepared for publication by another scholar according to the online record) is a receipt for 16 artabas of wheat dating from 28 September 200.

⁷ I am grateful to Tasha Dobbin-Bennett of the Beinecke Library for facilitating work on these papyri and to Graham Claytor and Klaus Maresch for commenting on a draft of this article. I also thank Ruth Duttenhöfer for initially drawing my attention to some of these papyri.

- 15 πυ[ρο]ῦ νέου καθαροῦ ἀδόλου ἀρταβῶν δεκα-
 [π]έν[τε, ἀ]ρ[γ(υρίου)] (δραχμῶν) ἑκατόν, ὧν ἀμφοτέρων [τ]ὴν ἀπόδο-
 σιν ποιησόμεθα μηνὶ Παυνι τοῦ ἐνεστῶ(τος)
 ἔτους, τὸν δὲ πυρὸν ἐν τῇ προκειμένη κώμῃ
 [c.10 Ἡρακ]λείδης . . [.]ως ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ
 20 [αὐτῶν ἀγραμμάτων.] *vac.*

2, 4, 14, 16 ἀργ^ς 2, 14 l. τιμῆς 4 l. -χοινίκῳ 5 γ^ςυ 10 l. ἔγγυοι, ἔκτιςιν, ἐγγύου 11 l. -τιςιν 17
 ενεστ^ω 18 l. προκειμένη

‘ ... principal of three hundred silver drachmas and the rest of the price of fifteen artabas of new, pure, unadulterated wheat at the *dromos* measure of four choenices, (that is) one hundred drachmas, total 400 dr., both of which they will return in the month Pauni of the present year, the wheat in the aforementioned village.’

(Second hand) ‘We, Peteuris, son of Mysthes, and Peteuris, son of Peteuris, and Oresenouphis, son of Peteuris, the four (*sic*) mutually liable for payment, with as guarantor for payment Hieranouphis, son of Peteesis, son of Pateus, priests of the god of the village of Bacchias, have received from N.N. ... , son of Tourbon, the three hundred drachmas of coined(?) silver and the rest of the price of fifteen artabas of new, pure, unadulterated wheat, (that is) one hundred drachmas, both of which we will return in the month Pauni of the present year, the wheat in the aforementioned village ... I, Heraclides, son of N.N., wrote on their behalf as they are illiterate.’

2 λ[οι]πὸν τιμῆς πυροῦ. An unusual formulation. The apparent implication is that the priests had previously received part of the price for the wheat and are now receiving the remainder of it. This description may be a legal fiction intended to conceal a high interest on the loan and a low actual price, especially since neither the prior receipt of the other part of the price nor interest on the loan are mentioned. I suspect the debtors in reality received only 300 drachmas as a loan and were required to pay the equivalent of 100 drachmas of wheat as interest on the loan. The 100 dr. was the whole price of the 15 artabas and the notional ‘rest’ of the price was never paid. The implied $6\frac{2}{3}$ drachmas per artaba that would result from such an arrangement would be at the low end of wheat prices attested in the second century and significantly lower than the average price of 12.02 dr./art. calculated for that century; see J.-H. Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians* (St. Katharinen 1991) 14–16, 20. The transaction would be

comparable to loans of money with repayment of interest in kind from Late Antiquity, which are discussed by K. Blouin, 'An Arsinoite loan of money with interest in kind', *BASP* 47 (2010) 93–109, esp. 101–9. For money loans that calculate interest with the principal, see the classic article by P. W. Pestman, 'Loans bearing no interest?', *JJP* 16–17 (1971) 7–29.

An alternative and more straightforward reading would be that the debtors received the full 400 drachmas as a loan and were required to repay 300 drachmas in cash and 100 in wheat. In that case, the second part of the transaction would be more akin to a 'sale on delivery', and the low price (assuming the 100 dr. was in fact the whole price for the 15 art. of wheat) perhaps substituted for the lack of interest on the loan.

3–4 μέτρον δρόμω τετραχοιγείῳ. On this common Arsinoite measure, see P.Leid.Inst. 25.8–9 n.

6 μηνὶ Παγγ[ι] = 26 May–24 June, the typical month for repayments in kind, shortly after the beginning of the harvest.

8–11 For a prosopography of priests in Roman Bacchias, see E. J. Knudtzon, P.Lund. IV pp. 83–93 ('Exkurs 1. Die Priesterfamilien in Bakchias'). As Gilliam 190 notes, 'it is difficult to distinguish individual priests from one another in many cases because they often have identical names', especially the name Peteuris. Thus, there are over ten distinguishable priests by the name of 'Peteuris son of Peteuris' in Knudtzon's prosopography and five by the name of 'Peteuris son of Mysthes'. An Orsenouphis son of Peteuris apparently occurs in P.Lund. III 5.2, 16 = SB VI 9336 (172) as corrected in P.Lund. IV 2.12 n. (no. 40 in Knudtzon's list). A Hieranouphis son of Peteesis is unattested.

9 οἱ δ̄. The scribe seems to count the co-guarantor Hieranouphis with the three debtors in anticipation. The phrase would fit better before ἱερεῖς in line 12. It is rather unusual that the three debtors are both mutually liable for the loan *and* have an additional co-guarantor.

11 Πατέωρ. A rare name; cf. in the same case O.Ont.Mus. II 240.9 (Thebes; Imperial period), SB XIV 11533 i.14, ii.14 (Ars.; 104). The nominative is presumably Πατεύς (www.trismegistos.org/name/4946).

12 ἱερεῖς θεοῦ κόμης Βακχιάδος. The god is either Soknobkonneus or Soknobraisis. On these two principal gods of Bacchias and the question whether they shared the same temple, see S. Pernigotti, *Gli dèi di Bakchias e altri studi sul Fayyum di età tolemaica e romana* (Imola 2000) 23–5, and id., 'Il dio del tempio C', in I. Rossetti, *Il tempio C di Bakchias* (Imola 2008) 81–4. The names of the priests here suggest attachment to Soknobraisis; see 8–11 n. and cf. 2 introd. and the documents cited there.

ἔχομεν. What I take to be a sigma is only a tiny bump between epsilon and chi and may be illusory. Perhaps the scribe wrote only ἔχομεν.

13 π[αρὰ] . ρα . . α[. Either π[αρὰ] ροῦ Α . . α[or π[αρ]ᾶ Οὔα . . α[. After alpha probably λλ (or at any rate λ .) or μ. If π[αρ]ᾶ Οὔα- is preferred, the creditor perhaps bears a Latin name beginning in Οὔαλλα- (a veteran?); cf. the spelling Οὔαλλαρίων (l. Οὔαλερίων) in O.Wilck. 113.1 (Eleph. or Syene; 119) and the hypocoristic form Οὔαλλᾶς in P.NYU I 12.18, 38, 50 (Ars.; 321/2).⁸ What follows is highly uncertain.

[. .]ον. Perhaps τ[οῦ] if Tourbon is the creditor's grandfather. [νί]ον is less likely, for in the Roman period the word usually appears in formal contexts only when the father is qualified by the title of a municipal office; see D. Hagedorn, 'Zur Verwendung von νίος und θυγάτηρ vor dem Vaternamen in Urkunden römischer Zeit', *ZPE* 80 (1990) 277–82.

Τούρβωνος. I owe the reading of this name to Graham Claytor.

14 τ[. . .] . . . [. .]. Perhaps something like τοῦ ἐπιτήμου (Claytor), but the traces are difficult to reconcile with specific letters.

16 ἀμφοτέρων. The epsilon is hardly distinguishable in the ligature between tau and rho.

19 In the lacuna at the beginning of the line supply e.g. ἀνυπερθέτως, 'without delay'.

⁸ Οὔαλλᾶτο(c) in O.Wilck. 1467.2 (Thebes; 182 or 214) was tentatively corrected to Ἀπελλᾶτο(c) in BL II 112, a reading adopted in the republication of the ostrakon in O.Petr.Mus. 402.

2. Receipt for Dike-Tax

P.CtYBR inv. 345

10 (w) x 13.1 (h) cm

19 Feb. 174

A collective receipt for the dike-tax issued by Aphrodisius, the collector of money taxes at Bacchias, to about fifteen individuals. They were presumably all priests to judge from their personal names, which recur frequently in the priestly families of the temple of Soknobraisis. The number of payers is consistent with the total number of priests listed in the γραφαὶ ἱερέων καὶ χειριζοῦ of this temple in the second half of the second century: 14 priests in 171 (P.Bacch. 2 col. ii = SB VI 9320, counting the presbyter Ammonius in col. i.3) and 16 in 188 (P.Bacch. 5 = P.Lund. IV 2 = SB VI 9338); cf. also the 15 priests and one minor mentioned in P.Bacch. 21.32 = SB VI 9339 (178), and see the discussion by Gilliam 186–8, to which add BGU XIII 2215 ii.7–9 (113/14). The priests of the temple of Soknobkonneus were fewer (12 in 171 according to P.Bacch. 2 col. i), and they have a different onomastic profile. Because most names in **2** are incomplete and P.Bacch. 2 col. ii does not specify mothers' names except in the case of an ἀπάτωρ, it is difficult to establish secure identifications; but see the notes below for some prosopographical links between the two documents, which are only three years apart.

On the capitation tax commonly known as χωματικόν, which was introduced under Augustus to cover the maintenance of dikes and canals, see S. R. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938) 140–43, K. Maresch, *Bronze und Silber: Papyrologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Währung im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten bis zum 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Opladen 1996) 164–72 (with further bibliography on p. 164 n. 1), 217–35 (chronologically and geographically arranged list of instances), and F. Reiter, P.Köln. IX 376 introd. The tax was paid throughout Egypt at a uniform annual rate of 6 drachmas and 4 obols. The higher sum of 7 drachmas 4 obols 2 *chalkoi* (i.e. 7 dr. 4.25 ob.) in this receipt includes both the surcharges of 3.25 obols called προδιαγραφόμενα and the three-obol fee for the issue of the receipt (συμβολικόν), as often in the Arsinoite nome; see Maresch 170–72.

A number of petitions from 171 onwards reveal that the priests of Soknobraisis repeatedly petitioned state authorities for partial or total exemption from physical labour on

dikes; see Gilliam 199–202 (cf. also P.Mich. XI 618). This raises the contentious question whether payment of the *χωματικόν* could dispense one from such labour, or whether it was a separate impost additional to the standard five-day *corvée*; see the literature cited in Reiter, P.Köln IX p. 143 n. 2 (where it is noted that most scholars favour the latter view), and L. Capponi, *Augustan Egypt: The Creation of a Roman Province* (New York & London 2005) 75–6, 142. In any case, the fact that the priests of Soknobraisis petitioned the Chief Priest of Egypt again in 178 (P.Bacch. 21) implies that they were unsuccessful in their previous bid(s) for exemption, and presumably in 174 they both paid the *χωματικόν* and performed the dike *corvée* (whether rightly or wrongly).

Top, right, and apparently lower margins are partially preserved. The writing runs along the fibres, and the back is blank. Since abbreviations and symbols are numerous, I have not reported them in the apparatus; they are all standard and can be checked on the image of the papyrus.

- [(ἔτους) ἰδ̄ Αὐτοκράτ]ορ[ος Μάρκου Α]ὔρηλίου Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος
 [Σεβαστοῦ Ἀρμενιακ]οῦ [Μηδ]ικοῦ Παρθικοῦ Γερμανικοῦ
 [μεγίστου, Μεχει]ρ κ̄ε. *vac.* διεγρ(άφη) Ἀφροδ(ίσιος) καὶ οἱ μέτοχ(οι) πράκ(τορες)
 ἀργυ(ρικῶν)
 [Βακχιάδος Πετ]εῦρις Μύσθου τοῦ Πετεύρεως μητρὸς
 5 [N.N.] . ὑπ(ὲρ) χωμάτων τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτου
 [ἔτους (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ Πετεῦρι]ς υἱὸς μητρὸς
 Ταορκενούφε(ως)
 [ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ] Πετεῦ(ρις) Π[. .] . ρου
 μητρὸς Ταψάϊτ(ος) ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 [καὶ N.N.]ιος μητ[ρὸς] Ταπε[τ]εύρεως ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον)
 χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 [καὶ N.N.] Πετεύ(ρεως) τ[οῦ] Πτεῦ[ρεως] μητ(ρὸς) Θενατύ(μιος)
 10 [ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ -]νουπις υ[. .] .
 μητρὸς[. . .]τ() ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 [καὶ N.N.]ουχ[. .] . . . [. . . Τα]πετεύ(ρεως) ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ
 (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 [καὶ N.N. (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς N.N. ὄμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον)]

- χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ Ἀμμώ-
 [νιος (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς N.N. ὁμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ] (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 καὶ Θεῶλις
 [(υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς N.N. ὁμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ
 N.N. (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς] . . [. . .] . ς ὁμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ
 (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β,
 15 [καὶ N.N. (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρ]ὸς Θενατ(ύμιος) ὁμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον)
 χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ
 [N.N. (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς] . . ὁμ(οίως) (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ
 [N.N. (υἱὸς) N.N. μητρὸς N.N. ὁμ(οίως)] (δραχμὰς) ζ (τετρώβολον) χ(αλκοῦς) β, καὶ
 [-----]
 [-----]

3 l. Ἀφροδίῳ καὶ τοῖς μετόχοις πράττορε

‘Year 14 of Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Caesar Augustus Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus Germanicus Maximus, Mecheir 25. Was paid to Aphrodisius and his fellow collectors of money taxes at Bacchias:

Peteuris, son of Mysthes, son of Peteuris, mother N.N., for the (tax on) dikes for the fourteenth year, 7 drachmas 4 obols 2 *chalkoi*; and

Peteuris, his son, mother Taorsenouphis, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

Peteuris, son of –rus, mother Tapsais, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of –is, mother Tapeteuris, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of Peteuris, son of Peteuris, mother Thenatumis, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

–nouphis, his son, mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of –ouch–, mother Tapeteuris, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

Ammonius, son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

Thoulis, son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of N.N., mother Thenatumis, likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and

N.N., son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and
N.N., son of N.N., mother N.N., likewise 7 dr. 4 ob. 2 *ch.*; and (...)’

3 διεγρ(άφη) Ἀφροδ(ίσιος) κτλ. This is the beginning of Formula V in G. Nachtergaele’s study of the tax receipts from Bacchias and Hephaestias, ‘La fusion de Bakchias et d’Hèphaistias d’après les reçus de taxes de l’époque romaine’, in M. Capasso and S. Pernigotti (edd.), *Stadium atque urbanitas: Miscellanea in onore di Sergio Daris* (Galatina 2000) 297–310, at 304. After the date, the aorist passive singular verb διεγράφη is followed by the name of the collector and his associates in the nominative, the name(s) of the taxpayers also in the nominative, the nature of the tax, and the sum paid in the accusative.

3–4 Ἀφροδ(ίσιος) καὶ οἱ μέτοχοι πράκ(τορες) ἀργυ(ρικῶν) [Βακχιάδος. Aphrodisius has been previously attested in the same role in P.Cair.Preis.² 24 (Bacchias; 23 Feb. 173), a receipt for an uncertain tax written in an apparently different hand.

4 τοῦ Πετεύρεως. The scribe rarely identifies payers by their papponymic; cf. also line 9, 7 n., and P.Turner 27 introd. Perhaps he does so only when there is potential for confusion between homonymous payers. The individual here is probably identical to Peteuris son of Mysthes in P.Bacch. 2.38 and P.Bacch. 5.16 (see n. ad loc.), who was aged 54 in 171.

6 Πετεῦρι[c] υἱός. I.e. son of the preceding. Of the three individuals named Peteuris son of Peteuris listed in P.Bacch. 2.36, 37, 47, only the last (aged 22) could qualify as the son of Peteuris son of Mysthes (aged 54). The other two are aged 41 and 46 respectively.

7 Πετεῦ(ρις) Π[. .] .που. Apparently not identifiable in P.Bacch. 2 col. ii. The latter does list a Πετεῦρις Ὠρου (40, aged 69), and one might consider reading here Πετεῦ(ρις) τ[οῦ] Ὠρου, but the article would be unusual before the father’s name. Alternatively, if space permits the restoration of a name in the lacuna, the entry could have run N.N.] Πετεύ(ριος) τ[οῦ] Ὠρου.

9 N.N.] Πετεύ(ρεως). There are three sons of a Peteuris in P.Bacch. 2.36, 37, 47, all likewise named Peteuris; for the likely identity of the last see above, 6 n. This is presumably one of the other two.

10]γουνις. Ὁρσέ]γουνις or Ἱερά]γουνις. The former, however, is a relatively uncommon variant spelling of the name Ὁρσένουφις, and in line 6 the scribe writes the female version Ταορσένουφις with a phi. Three priests bear this name in P.Bacch. 2.35 (son of Horus, aged 40), 39 (son of Aines, aged 64), 45 (son of Orsenouphis, aged 64). A Hieranouphis does not occur in that document, but a Hieranouphis son of Peteuris, aged 29, appears in P.Bacch. 5.23 and P.Lund. IV 3.1 = SB VI 9341 (188), and another (possibly the same man) in P.Bacch.

16.4–5 = SB VI 9326 (216; BL IX 256). What follows is presumably υἱ[ό]ς, but the trace before the break is smudged and does not seem *prima facie* to be compatible with iota: read υ(ι)ός?

11]ουχ[. Presumably a name based on the crocodile god Souchos. A Πετεκούχος aged 69 is listed in P.Bacch. 2.46 as the brother of Orsenouphis son of Orsenouphis. He may be the father of the present priest (was he dead by 174?).

] . . . [. . . Τα]πετεύ(ρεως). μητρός will have preceded the name, but the traces are too unclear on the image to reconcile with specific letters.

12–13 Ἀμμώ[νιος. The only priest of this name in P.Bacch. 2 is Ἀμμώνιος Πέτεως (aged 29), who acts there as presbyter (ll. 3–4, 59). This is presumably the same man.

13 Θούλις. Not in P.Bacch. 2, but the name recurs among the priestly families of Soknobraisis in P.Turner 28.3 (134?) and P.Bacch. 5.20, 26 (188). Thoulis son of Peteuris in P.Bacch. 5.26 is aged only 14 in 188 and so cannot be identical to the priest here. The one in P.Turner 28, son of another Thoulis, is 32 years old in 134 and could have been still alive in 174 (aged 72), but the fact that he does not recur in P.Bacch. 2 of 171 suggests that he had died in the interim. It is therefore possible that Thoulis here is identical to the one in P.Bacch. 5.20, son of Orsenouphis, who was aged 34 in 188. He would have been 20 years old in 174 and so may well have entered the priesthood between 171 and 174.

18–19 The traces at the end of these lines are too abraded and indistinct to make out on the image. The lines could have accommodated entries for two additional payers.

3. Three Receipts for Various Money Taxes

P.CtYBR inv. 910

18 (w) x 22.5 (h) cm

8 Jan. 187–188/9

A sheet of papyrus preserving at least three tax-receipts for three successive years for the benefit of Horus, son of Ammonius, who was probably the son of a priest of Soknobraisis (see 3–4 n.). The receipts concern various capitation taxes; for such ‘Sammelquittungen’, which begin to be attested in the early second century, cf. D. Hagedorn, P.Münch. III 110 introd. The document provides the latest exactly datable instance of the guard tax as well as the highest attested rate for it (see 6 n.). Another peculiarity is that it includes only the poll tax (λαογραφία) in the συντάξιμον, without the usual supplementary minor taxes and charges (see 4 n.). The rate for the pig tax also seems to differ slightly from the usual rate of 1 drachma and 1 obol (see 18 n.).

Top and left margins are preserved, but the papyrus is mostly incomplete at the right and foot. Traces of five vertical folds and at least one horizontal fold are visible. The upper layer in the rightmost part of the papyrus has been stripped off, leaving only scattered traces of ink on the remaining surface. The writing runs along the fibres, and the back is blank. Since abbreviations and symbols are numerous, I have not reported them in the apparatus; they are all standard and can be checked on the image of the papyrus.

ἔτους ἑβδόμ[ο]υ καὶ εἰκοτοῦ Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Κομ[μό]δ[ου]
Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς, Τυβι ιγ. διεγρ(άφη) Δ[c.6]
καὶ μετόχ(οις) πράκ(τορσι) ἐν κλ(ήρῳ) ἀργ(υρικῶν) Βακχιάδος Ὡροσ
Ἀμμων[ίου]
τοῦ Ὀννώφρεως μη(τρὸς) Ταφαλοῦτος, συνταξίμου τ[ο]ῦ [αὐτ(οῦ)] (ἔτους)
5 (δραχμὰς) ἑξήκοσι τέσσαρες, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) κδ, Φαμενωθ β (δραχμὰς)
δῶδεκα, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) ιβ, [Φαμενωθ]
κ (δραχμὰς) τέσσαρες, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) δ, Φαρμουθι ιβ . φυλάκ(ων) (δραχμὰς)
τρῖς (τριώβολον), (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) γ [(τριώβολον), Παχων?]
ια μ . . . () (δραχμὰς) τρῖς (τριώβολον), (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) γ (τριώβολον),
Παυνι ιδ [(δραχμὰς)] τέσσαρες, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) δ, Ἐπειφ .
(δραχμὰς) τέσσαρες, <(γίνονται)> (δραχμαὶ) δ, Μεσορη κβ (δραχμὰς) τέ[ε]σσαρες,

- (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) δ, [Θ]ϰθ̄ ϛ̄ .[c.3]
 (δραχμαὶ) τρεῖς (τριώβολον), (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) γ (τριώβολον). *vac.*
vac.
- 10 (m.2) ἔτους ὀγδόου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Μάρκ[ου Αὐρηλίου]
 Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίου [ν]ου Σεβαστοῦ [τοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς,]
 Ἄθουρ ε. διεγρ(άφη) .[. . . . καὶ με]τόχ(οις) πράκ(τορσι) ἀργ(υρικῶν) Βακχιάδος]
 Ὡρος Ἀμμωνίου τοῦ Ὀννώφρεως μη(τρὸς) Ταφαλοῦτος,
 συνταξί(μου) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους) (δραχμαὶ) n, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) n, - - - -]
- 15 διὰ Μώρω (δραχμαὶ) ἐπτὰ (τριώβολον), (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) ζ (τριώβολον),
 - - - -]
 (δραχμαὶ) τέσσαρες, (γίνονται) (δραχμαὶ) δ, κδ̄ (δραχμαὶ) [n, (γίνονται)
 (δραχμαὶ) n, - - - -]
 Παχ(ων) κδ̄ θ̄ . . . () (δραχμαὶ) τρεῖς - - - -]
 Θωθ̄ ζ̄ ὑικῆς (δραχμῆ) ᾱ .[- - - -]
vac.
- (m.3) ἔτους ἐνάτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίου
 Σεβαστοῦ]
- 20 Εὐσεβοῦς, Φα[- n, N.N. καὶ μετόχ(οις) πράκ(τορσι) ἀργ(υρικῶν) Βακχιάδος]
 Ὡρος Ἀμμωνίου τοῦ Ὀννώφρεως μη(τρὸς) Ταφαλοῦτος, - - - -]
 ε̄ . . κρ̄[.] .[- - - -]

5, 6, 7, 8 l. τέσσαρες 6, 7, 9 l. τρεῖς 15 l. Μώρου

‘Twenty-seventh year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Tybi 13. Was paid to D— and his fellow nominee collectors of money taxes at Bacchias by Horus, son of Ammonius, son of Onnophris, mother Taphalous: for the *syntaximon* for the same year twenty-four drachmas, total 24 dr., on Phamenoth 2 twelve drachmas, total 12 dr., on Phamenoth 20 four drachmas, total 4 dr.; on Pharmouthi 12 for the guard-tax three drachmas three obols, total 3 dr. 3 ob.; on Pachon(?) 11 for ... three drachmas three obols, total 3 dr. 3 ob., on Pauni 14 four drachmas, total 4 dr., on Epeiph n, four drachmas, (total) 4 dr., on

Mesore 22 four drachmas, total 4 dr.; on Thoth 6 for ... three drachmas three obols, total 3 dr. 3 ob.’

(Second hand) ‘Twenty-eighth year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Hathyr 5. Was paid to N.N. and his fellow collectors of money taxes at Bacchias by Horus, son of Ammonius, son of Onnophris, mother Taphalous: for the *syntaximon* for the same year *n* drachmas, total *n* dr., ... through Morus seven drachmas 3 obols, total 7 dr. 3 ob., ... four drachmas, total 4 dr., on the 24th *n* drachmas, total *n* dr., ... on Pachon 24 for ... three drachmas ... , on Thoth 7 for the pig tax one drachma ...’

(Third hand) ‘Twenty-ninth year of Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Pha– *n*. Was paid to N.N. and his fellow collectors of money taxes at Bacchias by Horus, son of Ammonius, son of Onnophris, mother Taphalous ...’

1–2 ἔτους ἑβδόμ[ο]υ καὶ εἰκοστοῦ (...) Τυβί ιγ. 8 January 187.

2 διεγρ(άφη) κτλ. I restore *exempli gratia* Nachtergaele’s common Formula III (διεγράφη τῷ δεῖνι καὶ μετόχοις πράκτορι ὁ δεῖνα + tax + sum in accusative), but since the name and title of the tax collectors are abbreviated, nothing formally excludes Formula V (identical except that the tax collectors appear in the nominative); see 2 3 n.

Δ[c.6]. On 20 May 186, a Dioscorus was πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν in neighbouring Hephaestias according to P.Fay. 41, and he is similarly said to be ἐν κλήρῳ. But although Bacchias and Hephaestias formed a single administrative unit in this period and shared the same collectors for most taxes, the two villages seem to have had separate πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν; see Nachtergaele, loc. cit. 300–301, 308–9.

3 πράκ(τορι) ἐν κλ(ήρῳ) ἀργ(υρικῶν). The phrase ἐν κλ(ήρῳ) means that D– and others were nominated to be selected by lot by the *epistrategus* for the liturgical office of πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν. Since the new term of office had begun in Thoth before one or more of them was officially appointed, they all acted temporarily in office. The process of selection and appointment could be lengthy and face considerable delays, so that these πράκτορες-elect might serve for several months after their nomination, as is clearly the case here (if the identification with Dioscorus in P.Fay. 41 is upheld, the delay would have been even longer, perhaps improbably so). For a discussion of the expression, see N. Lewis, ‘Leitourgia Studies’, in *Pap. Congr. IX* 233–45 (esp. 234–42) = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1995) 81–93; on the procedure of nomination by lot, see also J. D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Vol. II: The Roman Epistrategos* (Opladen 1982) 69–74, and N. Lewis, *The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt* (2nd ed., Firenze 1997) 84–6.

3–4 Ὡρος Ἀμμων[ίου] τοῦ Ὀννώφρεως. A priest of Soknobraisis named Horus son of Ammonius is attested in P.Lund. IV 2.27 = P.Bacch. 5 = SB VI 9338 and P.Lund. IV 3.27 = SB VI 9341, but he cannot be identified with this man since he was only 13 years old in 188 and thus would not have qualified yet as a taxpayer. An Ammonius son of Onnophris occurs in P.Lund. IV 2.19 (188), where he is aged 45, and in P.Fouad 12.3 = P.Bacch. 14 (207). The payer in **3** may be his son, in which case he was not (yet?) a priest in 188 since he is not listed in P.Lund. IV 2.

4 Ταφαλοῦτος. This woman's name is new, but the male name Φαλοῦς from which it derives is well attested (www.trismegistos.org/name/613); a father of a priest of Soknobkonneus is so named in P.Bacch. 1.22 = SB VI 9319 (116). The prefix Τα- is the Egyptian feminine possessive pronoun ('she of ...').

συνταξίμου. Cf. also 14. This tax usually combines the poll tax (λαογραφία) of 40 drachmas and smaller taxes and surcharges of 4 drachmas and 6 *chalkoi*, amounting to an annual charge of 44 drachmas and 6 *chalkoi*; see Wallace, *Taxation* 121–6, C. Gallazzi, O.Pad. I pp. 4–14, and D. Hagedorn, P.Münch. III 111 introd. It 'was occasionally paid in a lump sum, but more often it was paid in instalments of 4, 8, or 12 drachmae, if necessary in eleven monthly instalments of 4 drachmae each' (Wallace 123). Horus paid it in three instalments of 24, 12, and 4 drachmas respectively, totaling 40 drachmas. His contribution thus seems to have included only the λαογραφία proper, without the usual supplementary charges of 4 drachmas and 6 *chalkoi*. BGU III 791 col. i (Karanis; 206; BL I 67) may also imply an annual συντάξιμον payment of only 40 dr., but its interpretation and relation to col. ii is uncertain; see Wallace 125–6, who also points to tax receipts from other Arsinoite villages dating from the late second and early third centuries for the λαογραφία of 40 dr. alone. He suspects that it is 'possible that the minor taxes had been remitted at the end of the second century as not worth the trouble of collection, for the regular imposition of the crown-tax in this period would more than have made up for the loss of that insignificant revenue' (126). In that case, the word συντάξιμον in **3** and possibly BGU 791 col. i would be merely a fossil of the old fiscal terminology, which continued to be occasionally used by force of habit when in fact λαογραφία alone was meant. The same would have to be presumed of later examples of συντάξιμον in which the sums preserved do not permit any inference about the total annual rate: P.Bodl. I 22 (Karanis; 198; BL XII 40) [8 dr.], SB VI 9128 (Karanis; 215 [HGV]) [60 dr., presumably including arrears or additional taxes], P.Münch. III 111 (Bacchias; 222–35) [16 dr.]; cf. also the restoration of BGU XI 2103.6 (Soknopaiou Nesos; 199).

5 Φαμενωθ β̄. 26 February 187.

5–6 [Φαμενωθ] κ̄. 16 March 187.

6 Φαρμουθι ιβ̄. 7 April 187.

. Apparently ὑπ(έρ), abbreviated ὑ), but the expression ὑπὲρ φυλάκων seems to be attested only in tax receipts from Upper Egypt.

φυλάκ(ων). On this capitation tax, which was introduced under Nero to cover the salary of local public guards, see the full treatment by C. Homoth-Kuhs, *Phylakes und Phylakon-Steuer im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des antiken Sicherheitswesens* (APF Beiheft 17; München-Leipzig 2005) 149–92. The exact annual rate of the tax is unknown, and it likely fluctuated from year to year and perhaps from place to place. This receipt now provides the highest known rate for it; the next highest is 3 drachmas and 2 *chalkoi* in SB XVI 12293 from Soknopaiou Nesos (139) (cf. Homoth-Kuhs 181). This is also the latest precisely datable instance of the tax; cf. the lists in Homoth-Kuhs 150–55, 175–7, where the latest example with an exact date is P.Mich. IV 225 + 359 (Karanis; 175). P.Tebt. II 638r descr. is datable to 180–92 and could theoretically postdate 3.

6–7 [Παχων?] ιᾱ. 6 May 187. The restoration of [Παυνι] ιᾱ (5 June) is theoretically also possible, since the next payment occurs on 14 Pauni.

7 μ . . . (). Although difficult, it may be just about possible to read μαγδ(ώλων) or μαγδ(ωλοφυλακία) (‘watch-tower (guard) tax’), but this tax usually consisted of only a few obols or drachmas; see Wallace, *Taxation* 149–50, C. A. Nelson, BGU XV p. 157, and cf. Homoth-Kuhs, *Phylakes und Phylakon-Steuer* 189–92. The four instalments paid by Horus up to line 8 amount to 15 drachmas and 3 obols. If one includes the payment in line 9 (which may, however, relate to a different tax whose name is lost in the lacuna at the end of line 8), the total would be 19 drachmas. A number of late second-century receipts also record unusually high payments for μαγδωλοφυλακία: 7 dr. and 3 ob. in BGU XV 2512.4–5 (Ars.; 178/9; see n. ad loc.), 7 dr. in P.Lond. III 845b.6 p. 34 (Soknopaiou Nesos; 187; BL X 100), 8 dr. in P.Bour. 32.10 (Attinu, Ars.; 187/8; BL VIII 68), 6 dr. 1/2 ob. or 7 dr. in P.Tebt. II 353 = W.Chr. 269 (Heracl.; 188–92). In the latter receipt (relating to the neighbouring Heracleopolite nome), the payment is for ὀψωνίου μαγδωλοφυλ(άκων) καὶ ἄλλων μερικμ(ῶν), which suggests that the term μαγδῶλων/μαγδωλοφυλακία came to cover other small taxes (μερικμοί) in this period by way of shorthand; cf. BGU 2513 introd. and Homoth-Kuhs 191.

I have also considered restoring μερικμ(ῶν), an umbrella term covering ‘various minor taxes which were distributed in equal assessments among the members of a community’ (BGU XV p. 156); see Wallace, *Taxation* 135–69, Nelson, BGU XV 2533–2540 introd. It is rare, however, as a global term in Arsinoite tax receipts in contrast to those from the Thebaid; cf. SB XXII 15629 (Bacchias; 176), a tax-receipt ὑ(πὲρ) μερικμοῦ λημ() (or χωμ(ατικῶν) or κωμ(ητικῶν)) probably from the same archive (see above, general introd.), where the annual rate is 1 dr. 5 1/2 ob. It would be difficult, furthermore, to identify the final trace (an upturned curve) as part of a rho.

Παυνι ἰδ̄. 8 June 187.

Ἐπειφ̄ . If the reading of the month name is correct, 25 June–24 July 187.

8 Μεσορη κβ̄. 15 August 187.

[Θ]ωθ̄ ξ̄. 4 September 187 (this year has 6 epagomenal days). This month belongs to the following (28th) regnal year, so that this must be an arrears payment. The difficulty with restoring ὑἰ[κῆς] at the end of the line (cf. 18 with n.) is that the sum at the beginning of the following line does not correspond to the standard rate for the pig tax (1 dr. 1 ob.).

10–12 ἔτους ὀγδόου καὶ εἰκοτοῦ (...) Ἄθυρ ε̄. 2 November 187.

15 (δραχμᾱς) ἐπτὰ (τριώβολον). If the reading of the sum is correct (the symbol for τριώβολον at least is not in doubt), this would be a highly unusual instalment for the συντάξιμον, which is typically paid in multiples of 4 drachmas. Possibly the mention of a new tax intervened at the end of line 14, which would imply that the συντάξιμον in that line was paid as a lump sum.

17 Παχ(ων) κδ̄. 19 May 188.

θ̄ . . (). This is presumably the name of a tax, but its reading is very difficult, despite the fact that there are relatively few taxes beginning with the letter theta.

18 Θωθ̄ ζ̄. 4 September 188. Cf. 8 n. The payment of the pig tax in arrears after the end of the regnal year in which it was due is paralleled elsewhere; see Wallace, *Taxation* 123.

ὑκῆς. On the pig tax, see Wallace, *Taxation* 143–5, D. Hagedorn, P.Köln. II 95 introd. and O.Heid. 165 introd., D. Montserrat, P.Oxy. LXXV 5053 introd. The standard annual rate in the Arsinoite nome is 1 drachma and 1 obol. In SB XVI 12293.14 (Soknopaïou Nesos; 139), however, the rate is 1 dr. 3 ob., and in P.Tebt. II 354.8, 15 (186–8) it is 1 dr. 4 ob. (cf. Wallace 144). Here the trace after (δραχμῇ) α is certainly incompatible with the symbol for one obol, so that we must be facing a slightly aberrant rate (perhaps including a fine for late payment?).

19–20 ἔτους ἐνάτου κ[αὶ εἰκοτοῦ (...)] (...) Φα[-. Either Φα[ωφι (28 September–27 October) of 188, Φα[μενωθ (25 February–26 March) of 189, or Φα[ρμουθι (27 March–25 April) of 189. The first possibility is the likeliest, since tax payments typically begin to be made at the beginning of the regnal/fiscal year (compare the other two receipts).

4. Petition by Two Priests to the Prefect

P.CtYBR inv. 905 qua

9.7 (w) x 30.1 (h) cm

217–18

A petition addressed to the prefect of Egypt Iulius Basilianus by two priests of Bacchias. Since only line beginnings are preserved for most of the document, except for the last few lines, it is difficult to follow its tenor. The priests' narrative culminates with the claim that they have suffered physical or figurative 'violence' from some individuals and by implication have been prevented from staying in their temple and fulfilling their religious obligations. This is very probably another petition in which priests complain against forced labour on the irrigation system; see 12–13, 25, 32 nn. and cf. 2 introd.

4 is now the latest document from the archive of the temple of Soknobraisis, a year or so later than P.Bacch. 16 = SB VI 9326 (216; BL IX 256).

The papyrus is complete at the top, left, and foot, and also at the right for the last 9 lines. In the first 29 lines only line beginnings are preserved. The writing runs along the fibres. Breaks are visible along two vertical folds, and there appears to be the trace of a *kollesis* at the left margin of the front. The traces of ink visible on the left of margin are just offset traces resulting from the superimposition of this part of the papyrus on the column of text when the papyrus was folded. The back contains some ink traces, but appears to have been blank.

Ἰουλίῳ Βασι[λιανῷ ἐπάρχῳ]
vac. Αἰγ[ύπτου. vac.]
παρὰ Αὐρῆ[λίων c.8]
ος Ὁρου κα[ὶ Ν.Ν. c.10]
5 .ω . ἱερέων [c.7 κόμης]
Βακχιάδος [τῆς Ἡρακλείδου]
μερίδος τοῦ [Ἀρσινοΐτου. ἐπι-]
ετάμενοι ν .[c.10 δι']
ἦν ἔχικ[ος πρ[ὸς τοὺς θεούς]
10 εὐέβιαγ π .[c.12]

	π .[. . .]βον[	c.12	]
	τυχεῖν τῇ[	c.11	]
	εργασίας c .[	c.12	]
	εις[.]α .ε . . .[	c.12	]
15	καιου μηδ[ε	c.7	ἀλλα-]
	χόσε απας[	c.12	]
	ειεν τοι . . .[	c.12	]
	ταις τῶν [	c.12	]
	εχολάζει[	c.12	]
20	ρια χρ .[	c.14	]
	ει προ[	c.14	]
	κινδυ[	c.14	]
	λευειν τιν[	c.12	]
	λα .πηγε[	c.12	]
25	θρύου τετα .[	c.11	ἔ-]
	κατα ημε[	c.12	]
	διασεΐειν .[	c.12	]
	οὐδέπω τ .[	c.12	]
	τῇ εἰςπορᾷ η . .[	c.8	-βε]
30	βλημένων . . ἐπιστῆναι.		
	κινδυνεύσαν[τ]εσ ὑπὸ τῆς		
	ἐκείνων βίας ἀξιοῦμεν		
	διὰ ἱερᾶς σου ὑπογραφῆς κε-		
	λευσθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀποστῆναι		
35	τῆς πρὸς ὑ[μ]ᾶς ἐπελεύσεως,		
	ἵν' ἐν τοῖς ἱε[ρο]ῖς ἐνμένον-		
	τες τὰς ἐθίμ[ους] θ[υ]ρίας δυνηθῶ-		
	μεν ἐπιτελεῖν. διευτύχι.		

1 ἱουλιω 5 ἱερεων 9 l. ἔχεις 10 l. εὐσέβειαν 29 l. εἰςφορᾷ 30 l. ἐπιστῆναι 35 l. ἡμᾶς 36 l. ἐμμέ- 38 l. διευτύχει

‘To Iulius Basilianus, *prafectus Aegypti*, from Aurelii N.N., son of Horus, and N.N., son of N.N., elder(?) priests of the temple(s) (*or* god(s)) of the village of Bacchias in the division of Heraclides of the Arsinoite (nome).

‘Knowing ... because of the piety you have towards the gods ... help(?) ... to obtain ... right and not ... to elsewhere ... have leisure ... danger ... of rush ... each ... to extort ... not yet ... for the impost ... having been cast ... to stand over. Having been endangered by these men’s coercion, we request that you order them through your holy subscription to refrain from the assault against us, so that we may remain in our temples and be able to perform the customary sacrifices. Farewell.’

1–2 Ἰουλίῳ Βασιλιανῷ ἐπάρχῳ Αἰγυπτου. On the short-lived prefecture of Iulius Basilianus from (probably) April 217 to June 218, see G. Bastianini, ‘Lista dei prefetti d’Egitto dal 30^a al 299^p’, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 308, and id., ‘Lista dei prefetti d’Egitto dal 30^a al 299^p: aggiunte e correzioni’, *ZPE* 38 (1980) 86 n. 5. No new instances have come to light since. According to Cassius Dio 78.35.1–3, he fled Egypt for Italy in the summer of 218 at news of the death of emperor Macrinus and was then captured and killed.

5 .ω . Perhaps πρεσβυτέ[[ρω]. In the lacuna restore e.g. ἱεροῦ/θεοῦ or ἱερῶν/θεῶν, depending on whether the two priests represent the same temple or the two temples of Soknobraisis and Soknobkonneus respectively (see 1 12 n.); for the latter possibility, cf. P.Bacch. 3.3–4 = SB VI 9337 (171), P.Bacch. 15.5 = SB VI 9325 (209).

8 ν .[. νῦ[v?

8–10 δι’] ἦν ἔχις πρ[ὸς τοὺς θεοὺς] εὐεβία. καθ’ is an alternative possibility at the end of 8. For this standard phrase in petitions, cf. e.g. UPZ I 39.5–6 (Memph.; 161 BCE), P.Medin. Madi 2.14–15 (Ars.; III).

11 βον[θ-?

12–13 τυχεῖν τῇ[c c.11]εργακίας. The parallel of P.Bacch. 21.16 = SB VI 9339 (178) [ἐπὶ] τῇ τῶν χωμάτων ἀπεργακίαν, a petition by priests of Bacchias requesting exemption from corvée labour on dikes, would support restoring τῇ[c τῶν χωμάτων (ἀπ)]εργακίας. The preserved conclusion of the petition does not confirm that it concerns irrigation work, but it is not incompatible with such a complaint (see 32 n. and cf. also 25 n.). Alternatively, the verb τυχεῖν might suggest the restoration of τῇ[c ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐ]εργακίας (l. εὐεργεσίας), cf. P.Lond. III 846.14–16 p. 131 = W.Chr. 325 (Ars.; 140) ἵνα τύχω τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐεργεσία[c], P.Amh. II 77.33 = W.Chr. 277 (Ars.; 139) τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐεργεσίας, etc.; but the assumption of a scribal mistake is awkward, and the phrase is commonly found at the end of petitions.

15 [δι]καίου?

20 χρ[ι]. Or χε[ι].

21 ή] | cή?

23 ἐπέ]λευσιγ? Cf. 35 τῆς πρὸς ὑ[μ]ᾶς (l. ἡμᾶς) ἐπελεύσεως.

25 θρόου. The mention of rushes here reinforces the hypothesis that the priests' complaint relates to irrigation work, for rushes and reeds were often used to fortify dikes; see M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten* (München 1925) 39–40, and cf. D. Bonneau, *Le Régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* (Leiden 1993) 36.

τεταρ[τ- or τεταχ[μέν-.

26 E.g. ἡμε[ίς, ἡμε[ῖν (l. ἡμῖν), ἡμε[ρ-, ἡ με[. ἡμε[τερ- is less likely, since we would expect it to be preceded by a definite article.

29 εἰσπορᾷ (l. εἰσφορᾷ). For the relatively infrequent phonetic interchange of pi and phi in the papyri, see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Vol. I: Phonology* (Milano 1976) 87. The word is spelled similarly in P.Lond. III 1249.6 p. 227 (Herm.; 346; BL I 290).

30 . . . Possibly μή.

ἐπιστῆναι (l. ἐπιστῆναι). For the common doubling of sigma before a stop, see Gignac, *Grammar* I 159.

32 βίαις. For the use of this and related terms in connection with forced labour on dikes, cf. P.Bacch. 19.12–15 = SB VI 9328 (171) ὁ (...) ἐκβόλεις βιάζεται ἡμᾶς (...) ἐργάζεσθαι, P.Bacch. 20 = SB VI 9329 (171) 4–5 οἱ πραγματικοὶ βιάζονται τοὺς συνηγορουμένους σωματικῶς ἀπεργάζεσθαι (l. -ζεσθαι) τὰς ἐργασίας, 10 ὁ στρατηγὸς προνοήκει βίαν μὴ γίνεσθαι. For the range of meanings of the word in the papyri, see W. Dahlmann, *Ἡ βία im Recht der Papyri* (diss. Köln 1968).

37 τὰς ἐθίμ[ους θ]υε[ίαις. Cf. e.g. P.Oxy. XXXVI 2782.6–8 (after 217; BL X 150) ἐπιτε[λο]υμέν[η τὰ]ς συνη[θ]ε[ί]ας [θ]υε[ίαις, P.Giss.Univ. I 16.3 (280–82) τῆς συνηθ[ο]υς θυε[ίαις. ἔθιμος is a two-termination adjective.

Amin Benaissa

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford OX2 6QA, United Kingdom

amin.benaissa@classics.ox.ac.uk