

Gonis, Nikolaos

Oxyrhynchite villages, men, and money

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 35, 93-97

2005

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Nikolaos Gonis

OXYRHYNCHITE VILLAGES, MEN, AND MONEY

A FRAGMENT OF A TAX REGISTER recording Oxyrhynchite villages listed under toparchies, with numbers of men and amounts of money (levied upon them?). It may be assigned to the third century on palaeographical grounds. The fragment comes from the lower part of a column; we have the conclusion of the listing of villages of the Middle toparchy, followed by the totals for the toparchy, and after that the beginning of the listing for the Thmoisepho toparchy. Unfortunately, all figures are lost. The original document must have occupied three or more columns. A very close parallel is *P. Wash. Univ.* II 81, also of the third century (not part of the same papyrus: the hand is different). All in all, our text offers nothing new, but confirms known patterns in the administrative geography of the Oxyrhynchite nome. For this type of document, see the extensive, if inconclusive, discussion in *P. Wash. Univ.* II 81 introd.

According to a notice by A. S. Hunt, the papyrus was bought by W. M. F. Petrie in 1924;¹ there is no clear information on when it entered

¹ I came across a photograph of this papyrus in a box with miscellaneous material stored in the Papyrology Rooms, Sackler Library, Oxford, in 2001. In 2003, I was given permission to publish it by Prof. R. DAVID, former Curator of Egyptology in the Manchester Museum, whom I thank. After the article was written, in October 2005, I found a transcript of this same papyrus by A. S. HUNT, bound with HUNT's copy of *P. Oxy.* x, kept in the Sackler Library (shelfmark: 303 G.108); HUNT noted: 'Ox. Papyrus bought by Petrie 1924'. (The placement of the transcript in this volume is due to the affinities of the text with *P. Oxy.* x 1285; HUNT's marginalia there include references to 'P. Petrie'.)

The Manchester (University) Museum, but presumably it came through the British School of Archaeology in Egypt,² of which Petrie was the director.³

My edition was based on a photograph.

Text

Manchester Museum
inv. 10893

4.6 cm x 14.4 cm

Third century

- Πλελω [.
 Ἀρταπάτου [.
 [Ψ]ώβθεως [.
 4 Σενοπόθε[ωσ
 Τακοκίλεω[ς
 Πετενούρεω[ς
 Μαστιγγοφό[ρου
 8 Σενω [.
 Σενεπτα [.
 Θώλθεως [.
 Νεμέρων [.
 12 (γίνονται) τῆς τοπ(αρχίας) ἄν[δρες n
 ἀργυ(ρίου) (τάλαντα) [n

² For inv. nos. 10892–5, the Museum's main register indicates no source, but according to another register they were presented by the *Egypt Exploration Fund*. This probably does not hold, even if inv. no. 10892 = *P. Oxy.* III 614; so far as I know, the *EEF* did not distribute unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri. Two other papyri in the Manchester Museum, inv. nos. 7441–2, which cannot be located, are said to have as source the 'British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1923–4; bought at Oxyrhynchus'; perhaps this applies to 10893–5 too (10894 comes from Oxyrhynchus), unless 7441–2 are the same as two of the papyri in the 10893–5 series. (For information I am grateful to Dr C. RIGGS, Curator of Egyptology in the Manchester Museum, and to Dr F. LANDUYT, sometime researcher for the *Gazeteer of Papyri in British Collections*.)

³ *P. Thomas 15* is another papyrus from Oxyrhynchus which came to a British museum (Hancock Museum, Newcastle-upon-Tyne) in 1924 through its subscription to the BSAE. If the Manchester papyrus was bought in 1924, as HUNT's note states, *P. Thomas 15* may not be one of those papyri purchased by PETRIE at Oxyrhynchus in 1922 (see *P. Thomas 15* introd.); it would also follow that PETRIE revisited Oxyrhynchus in 1924, but I am not aware of any other evidence that would support this hypothesis.

Θμοισεφω τ[οπ(αρχίας)
 Τήεω [
 16 Παώμεω [
 Παλώεω [
 Σεφω [
 Κεσμούχεω[

7 μαστιγ'γοφο[ρου

Translation

Plelo ...
 Artapatou ...
 Psobthis ...
 Senopthis ...
 Takolkilis ...
 Petenouris ...
 Mastigophorou ...
 Sento ...
 Senepta ...
 Tholthis ...
 Nemera ...
 Total for the toparchy: men ...
 talents of silver ...
 Thmoisepho Toparchy:
 Teis ...
 Paomis ...
 Palosis ...
 Sepho ...
 Kesmouchis ...



Commentary

iff. All the villages mentioned in this text are known from elsewhere; see the relevant entries in P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchite. Repertorio toponomastico* = *Pap. Flor.* IX, Firenze 1981, and in (A. Calderini & S. Daris, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano* and *Suppl.* I–III.

I–II. Twenty-three villages of the Middle toparchy are listed in *P. Oxy.* x 1285.

Μαατιγγοφό[ρο]υ. Spelled *Μαατιγγοφόρου* in *P. Oxy.* xvii 2142. The note there corrects the reading in *P. Oxy.* x 1285.14: 'this is evidently the partially read name which occurred in 1285.21, 114; in the latter place, however, the remains of the fourth letter certainly suggest τ rather than σ'. On p. 235 of his copy of *P. Oxy.* x (see above, n. 1), Hunt pencilled the following note: 'It looks like *Μαστ*, not *Μασσ*, after which *ιγγ* is all right, but the vestige following γ is very high for ο : it suggests *-ιγγιφ'* or possibly *-ιγν[ο]φ'* (July 1927)'.
 It is worth recording another unpublished suggestion of Hunt's: in *P. Oxy.* x 1285.96, perhaps read Θ[μ]οιϛε[ψ]ώβθεωσ in place of Θ[.]. . . . [(we expect a reference to a village of the Eastern toparchy, in which Thmoinepsobthis lay).

14. *Θμοιςεφω τ[οπ(αρχ)ίας]*. This was the smallest toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome; see J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt*, Oxford 1996, pp. xiv (map) & 14; cf. also the statistics in B. E. Nielsen, 'Early Fourth Century Tax Bases in the Oxyrhynchite Nome', *Pap. Congr.* XXI = *APF. Bbft.* 3, Stuttgart – Leipzig 1997, p. 759 n. 9. *P. Oxy.* x 1285.122–7 (III) and xiv 1659.86–96 (218–221) mention only six villages (Paomis, Tholthis, Kesmouchis, Sepho, Teis, Palosis), while *P. Oxy.* xxiv 2422.72–9⁴ (290) refers to five (Teis, Paomis, Tholthis, Sepho, Kesmouchis). Here an entry on Tholthis must have followed in the next column, now lost.

15ff. The order by which the villages are listed may represent their relative size (from bigger to smaller), their topography (from south to north), or be entirely fortuitous. The mention of Teis in the first place probably reflects the fact that it was by far the largest village in the toparchy (and one of the largest in the nome). Teis occupies the same position in *P. Oxy.* xiv 1659.86, 93, 1747.47 (III/IV), xxiv 2422.72, and, with reference to the 8th *pagus*, in *P. Giss.* II5.II.3 (IV), *P. Oxy.* xlvi 3307.3 (early IV), and xii 1448.2 (c. 318); but contrast *P. Oxy.* x 1285.122 and xliv 3170.233 (III), in which Teis is not the village listed first among others of the same toparchy.

⁴ On this text see NIELSEN, 'P. Oxy. xxiv 2422 Revised: Report of a Collection of Meat', *BASP* 36 (1999), pp. 105–21.

The sequence Teis/Paomis/Palosis is also attested in *P. Oxy.* 1659.86–88; and in *P. Giss.* 115.11.3–5, *P. Oxy.* 3307.3–5. We find Teis/Paomis in *P. Oxy.* 1747.47–48 and *P. Oxy.* 2422.72–74.

Nikolaos Gonis

Wolfson College

Oxford OX2 6UD

UNITED KINGDOM

e-mail: *nikolaos.gonis@classics.ox.ac.uk*