

# PERSPECTIVES ON PANOPOLIS

AN EGYPTIAN TOWN FROM ALEXANDER THE GREAT  
TO THE ARAB CONQUEST

*Acts From an International Symposium Held in Leiden  
on 16, 17 and 18 December 1998*

(P. L. Bat. 31)

EDITED BY

A. EGBERTS, B. P. MUHS, J. VAN DER VLIET



BRILL  
LEIDEN • BOSTON • KÖLN  
2002

*Illustrations on the cover:* Papyrus drawing from: M.J. Raven, *Papyrus. Van bies tot boekrol* (1982), p. 24, and: Two zodiacs from the ceiling of the 'Zodiac Tomb' at Waninna, ancient Tripheion or Atripe, providing the horoscopes of Pamehit, born on 26/27 April 141 AD, and his brother Ibpmeny, born on 6/7 January 148 AD. From W.M. Flinders Petrie, *Athribis* (British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Egypt Research Account 14, London 1908), pl. 36. Zodiacs are a Hellenistic and Roman development in Egypt, first appearing in the late Ptolemaic period, and most dating to the Roman period. Examples occur in various temples in Upper Egypt, such as Dendera, Esna and Shanhûr, and perhaps Armant and Coptos, and in six coffins from the Soter Tomb in Thebes. There is however a concentration of zodiacs from the region of Panopolis, including one from the temple of Triphis and Pan in Panopolis itself, and six zodiacs from four tombs at El-Salamuni, as well as the two examples from Waninna. See O. Neugebauer and R.A. Parker, *Egyptian Astronomical Texts, III. Decans, Planets, Constellations and Zodiacs* (Providence 1969), p. 62-104 and especially 203-205.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available.

#### Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Perspectives on Panopolis : An Egyptian town from Alexander the Great to the Arab conquest. Acts of an international symposium held in Leiden on 16, 17 and 18 December 1998. Ed. by A. Egberts, B.P. Muhs, J. van der Vliet.  
– Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2002  
(Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava ; Vol. 31)  
ISBN 90-04-11753-9

ISSN 0169-9652  
ISBN 90 04 11753 9

© Copyright 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

ROGER S. BAGNALL

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND  
THE DOCUMENTATION OF ROMAN PANOPOLIS

The prominence of Panopolis in the papyrological documentation of Egypt in the time of the Tetrarchy and of Constantine and his family is a relatively recent phenomenon, essentially a matter of the thirty-five years since T. C. Skeat's publication of the texts found on the inside of the dismantled Chester Beatty codex, right up to the publication in 1998 of the Archive of Ammon (see Peter van Minnen in this volume). The last third of a century has also seen a great flourishing of studies of fourth century Egypt, so the starring role played by Panopolis has been well contextualized. It is now difficult for anyone of my generation or younger to realize just how small a place in papyrology Panopolis had before the 1960s, or even how limited and unbalanced a papyrological record it still has. Apart from the fourth-century family archives and the material sometimes attributed to the White Monastery (to which I shall return), in fact, the most abundant and distinctive element of Panopolite documentation has been the funerary material, above all mummy labels, from the Panopolite cemeteries (see Chauveau and Depauw in this volume).<sup>1</sup> The miscellaneous documents that we are so familiar with from the great papyrological strongholds are essentially lacking. For the whole of the Ptolemaic period, there are fewer than a half-dozen documents, none demonstrably actually found in Panopolis, and for the first two centuries of the Roman domination just two papyri, both almost certainly found elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Ptolemaic Panopolis is thus essentially a blank, and the process by which it became a Roman city equally absent up to the reign of Commodus. The absence of excavations of the town site at Achmim is presumably responsible, and the yield of papyri from the necropolis quarters has not been sufficient to fill the gap.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the general introductions to these materials in *P. L. Bat.* 19, 225-31 (M. THIEME and P.W. PESTMAN, on mummy linens) and 232-59 (J. QUAEGBEUR, on mummy labels).

<sup>2</sup> In chronological order: 244 BC, *BGU X* 1928, official correspondence (from Oxyrhynchos); IIa, *P.Cair.* 10331 (*Quaderni Ticinesi* 16 [1987], 167 f.), *P.Stras.* VIII 741 and 742 (mention in prescripts; provenance unknown); Ia, *SB X* 10616 (Demotic will); Iip, *P.Giss.* I 69 (dossier of Apollonios the strategos, from Hermopolis) and *P.Ryl.* IV 608 verso (letter written at Panopolis, perhaps found at Oxyrhynchos).

<sup>3</sup> See now A. MARTIN – O. PRIMAVESI, *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg* (Berlin – Strasbourg, 1998), 27-51 for the archaeological and cultural context of the exceptional find they publish there.

The body of documents I will discuss offers curious patterns. The most important is that virtually all of the material survived thanks to its reuse for different purposes.<sup>4</sup> The second is that it falls in two groups, one from the end of the second and start of the third century, the other from the end of the third century. Nothing from the three-quarters of a century between 218 and 293 has so far come to light.<sup>5</sup>

The first group of these texts to appear was the assemblage of documents from 197 subsequently reused for one or more codices, all made by pasting the written sides of the rolls together, then cutting the double-thickness rolls into sheets which were folded to make a codex. These were acquired ca. 1887 from material of unknown origin but often said to be from the White Monastery.<sup>6</sup> I shall refer to them below as the 1880s trove. The reuse may be displayed in tabular form:

Original	Contents	Reuse	Contents
<i>P.Achmim</i> 6	Land register	BN Copt. 135A	Exodus (Achmimic)
		<i>P.Achmim</i> 1 + <i>P.Bouriant</i> 3	Greek homily
<i>P.Achmim</i> 7	Liturgical lists	<i>P.Achmim</i> 1 + <i>P.Bouriant</i> 3	Greek homily
<i>P.Achmim</i> 8	Official correspondence	BN Copt. 135A	Exodus (Achmimic)
		BN Copt. 135B	Sirach (Achmimic)
<i>P.Achmim</i> 9	Land and tax register	<i>P.Achmim</i> 1 + <i>P.Bouriant</i> 3	Greek homily
<i>P.Bouriant</i> 41a	Liturgical lists	<i>P.Achmim</i> 1 + <i>P.Bouriant</i> 3	Greek homily
<i>P.Bouriant</i> 41b	Land register	<i>P.Achmim</i> 1 + <i>P.Bouriant</i> 3	Greek homily

<sup>4</sup> There are a couple of interesting exceptions. Apart from the handful of Göteborg papyri discussed below (n. 5), the most important is the roll containing a register of houses in Panopolis, to be dated ca. 315-330, and published as *P.Panop.Bork*. Part of this roll is preserved in Geneva, part in Berlin. The Geneva portions (inv. 108) were acquired by Naville between 1882 and 1907 (I am grateful to Paul Schubert for this information). The Berlin part (inv. 16365) seems to have been acquired in 1936. The roll's height, where preserved, was 24 cm.

<sup>5</sup> Two stray papyrus documents from this period should be mentioned, *P.Got.* 4 (an order to collect, dated 253) and 7 (a work contract, from ca. 250). These were acquired together with *P.Got.* 3, a surety document from 215-6, probably from a German private collection in the 1920s. *P.Got.* 3 is written on the back of *P.Got.* 113, an unpublished account. These appear to come to us by some route entirely different from that of the larger masses I am describing, but there is apparently no evidence for what that route was. The third century is also the period from which come two groups of ostraka from the Panopolite: *SB* X 10270, with 58 short orders from Edfa (ancient Itou, in the neighborhood of Sohag), dating to the period 221-229; and *P.Michael.* 63-124 and *SB* XVI 12984, another group of undated short orders for which the editor gives the provenance as Achmim without giving the basis for this attribution. Probably this group like the Edfa ostraka come from the nome rather than the city of Panopolis.

<sup>6</sup> For the history of this attribution, see MARTIN - PRIMAVESI (above, n. 3), 46; it is a hypothesis of U. WILCKEN, *AfP* 8 (1927), 302-8, resting in considerable part on the role of U. Bouriant. Tito Orlandi points out to me that the attribution is rendered problematic by the early dates of the manuscripts written on the reused papyrus, which far antedate the papyri from the library of the White Monastery. It is conceivable, however, that these pieces, often rather poorly preserved, come from Maspero's exploration of other parts of the monastery. Cf. generally T. ORLANDI, *Papiri copti di contenuto teologico* (MPER n.s. 9, Vienna, 1974), 17-20.

It can be seen easily enough that the original administrative rolls were not matched to specific codices, but formed a store of raw material. That they all were cut down to a uniform size before being made into codices was recognized by Jean Gascou in an important article of a decade ago; he described a Panopolitan standard, with leaves 25 cm high and 17.5-20 cm wide.<sup>7</sup> All of the codices listed above adhere to this standard, along with others still to be discussed.<sup>8</sup>

A second group of texts with material from this period appeared in the period after the second World War.

Original	Contents	Reuse	Contents
CPR XVIIIB 1-9	Cheirographa	left blank	
CPR XVIIIB 10-32	Cheirographa	left blank	
Unpublished	land register	<i>P.Bodmer</i> I 1-2	<i>Iliad</i> 5-6

The two rolls from CPR XVIIIB had original dates of 184/5 and 217/8, and both belonged to official rolls. They were evidently formed into a single codex, which was never used. This codex had a height of about 33 cm,<sup>9</sup> and thus was not trimmed to the Panopolitan standard described above. This codex was acquired by the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek from Adolf M. Hakkert in 1963; there is no indication how long Hakkert had it before that date. The land register in the Bodmer collection, now in the course of preparation for publication by Tomasz Derda, contains references to 208/9 and 216/7; it probably dates, according to Derda, from the latter year, as no indication is given that the regnal dates refer to a deceased emperor rather than the current one. It was not turned into a codex, but reused as a roll or perhaps as two rolls. The portion used for *Iliad* 6 accommodates about 40 lines per column, that used for *Iliad* 5 only 30 lines,<sup>10</sup> but this reflects differences in size of margins rather

<sup>7</sup> J. GASCOU, 'Les codices documentaires égyptiens', *Les débuts du codex*, ed. A. BLANCHARD (Bibliologia 9, Turnhout, 1989), 71-101. The original conference paper dates to 1985.

<sup>8</sup> GASCOU, 83 notes that BN Copte 315D also belongs to the Panopolitan standard, but that the publications about it are not unanimous about whether it is formed by doubling used papyrus. I am indebted to Mme Anne Boud'hors for examining the original and confirming that in fact it is a case of rolls pasted together and cut to form a codex. At her request, conservators in the Bibliothèque Nationale dismantled the leaves, discovering that the inner side (the original recto) is blank on both.

<sup>9</sup> The fragments of the first roll go up to 30.7 cm as they survive now, those of the second roll up to 32.7 cm.

<sup>10</sup> *P.Bodmer* I, introd. The entire register was written in a single hand (p. 8). *Iliad* 6 was written on a part of the register which originally stood before the part used for *Iliad* 5, and there may have been part of the register used for some other text not now surviving.

than a cutting of the papyrus to different sizes.<sup>11</sup> *P. Bodmer I* was published in 1954, and its acquisition presumably dates to the five or ten years preceding that date.<sup>12</sup>

Of this material, then, the part conforming to the Panopolitan standard for codex size all comes from the 1880s trove and was reused for literary texts in a Christian context. The remainder, which appears to have come to light and been purchased in the postwar period, was reused for other purposes and either not turned into a codex or not cut to the standard.

We turn next to the Tetrarchic period, with three items:

Original	Contents	Reuse	Contents
P. Ryl. 1 (front) <sup>13</sup>	Official correspondence	<i>P. Ryl.</i> I 1	Deuteronomy
<i>P. Panop. Beatty</i>	Official correspondence	<i>P. Panop.</i> 19	tax receipts
Unpublished	Official correspondence	<i>P. Münch.</i> II 34	LXX Psalms

All three of these are codices made by the reuse method. The first of these dates to 293; its leaves measure 10.3 x 11 cm in their present mutilated condition. It was probably (like the other material in this collection) bought in Egypt either by A. S. Hunt for Lord Crawford or directly for Mrs. Rylands around 1900, but no specific information is provided. The second dates to 298-300 and was Gascou's reference document for the Panopolite standard. It was perhaps acquired in the 1950s.<sup>14</sup> It was only partially used by the estate belonging to the sons of Alopex but clearly must have been found with the Alopex family papers now published in *P. Panop.* and *P. Dub.* The third dates to 302/3; the leaves measure 4.5 x 16.5 and 4.8 x 16.3 in their present condition, but the editor calculates that the written area will originally have occupied a space about 18 x 20 cm. No information about its acquisition is given, but the first decade of this century is likely.<sup>15</sup>

These three pieces rather complicate the picture that emerged from the earlier group. It seems entirely possible, given the date of acquisition, that the Rylands fragment of

<sup>11</sup> Derda believes that the supposed two rolls were actually one, containing two books, despite the format difference. It was about 30 cm high.

<sup>12</sup> I leave aside here the controversy about the degree to which the Bodmer and Chester Beatty literary papyri, along with other scattered items, come from a single find, and about what sort of ancient collection would have contained all of them. See MARTIN – PRIMAVERSI (above, n. 3), 46-47 for a summary and bibliography.

<sup>13</sup> Published by R. S. BAGNALL – J. B. RIVES, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000), 77-86.

<sup>14</sup> T. C. Skeat (letter of 3 June 1998) writes, "I am afraid I have no idea when Beatty acquired it - in the case of someone like Beatty one did not ask such questions. I have a feeling, but no more, that it may have been about 1956. But anyway, items like this may pass through many hands, and dates of acquisition mean very little". At all events, it clearly belongs to the postwar period (but pre-1957, see *P. Panop. Beatty*, p. vii).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the remarks on *P. Münch.* II 43 (p. 97, n. 1), with inventory number 329: The date of acquisition is not known, but it is before 1919 and probably from the 1906 Papyruskartell purchase. The Psalms piece is inv. 333. It is not mentioned by U. WILCKEN, *AfP* 1 (1901), 469 among the LXX fragments acquired in the first purchase for the Munich library.

Deuteronomy and the Munich fragment of Psalms come from the 1880s trove. The Chester Beatty codex, by contrast, must come from the same discovery as the rest of the Archive of Alopex and Pasnos, which seems to have been purchased in the 1950s and part of which Beatty obviously got along with the codex. But the Beatty codex has come through the same manufacturing process as the codices acquired as part of the 1880s trove. The association of the monastery with this manufacturing process and standard is therefore adventitious; moreover, the Beatty codex was in use for recording tax receipts by 339, too early a date for this monastery to be the place of manufacture.

Two other complexities also emerge. First, material from both the early group and the later group was used for theological works and could come from the 1880s trove; there is thus no division possible on the basis of the original group of rolls used. Second, the workshop(s) that produced the reused rolls turned into codices did not always apply the so-called Panopolitan standard, because the Vienna codex was left at a height of 33 cm. Nor did it always turn the reused rolls into a codex, as the Bodmer roll of *Iliad* 5 and 6 shows. One might venture the guess that both the Vienna codex and the Bodmer rolls were discovered together with the Alopex family papers (including the Chester Beatty codex) early in the 1950s. In short, it does not seem possible to align any of the possible discriminants with one another. Thus the 1880s trove or family papers, Panopolitan standard or not, Severan or Tetrarchic, literary or documentary, none of these matches up neatly with any other.

The one unifying element is the fact that we are almost entirely dependent on reused papyrus for our knowledge of the period from Commodus to Diocletian, and that this reused papyrus comes from official sources.<sup>16</sup> The reason is not obscure. Just as was the case with

<sup>16</sup> One possible exception should be noted, namely the Ascension of Isaiah in Akhmimic (with some individual traits). Part of this text was published by L.TH. LEFORT, *Muséon* 52 (1939), 8-9, from fragments acquired by C. Schmidt in 1936 and then part of the E. von Scherling collection in Leiden. More was published by P. LACAU, 'Fragments de l'Ascension d'Isaie', *Muséon* 59 (1946), 453-67, from a copy he had made when seeing the fragments in the hands of a Cairo dealer before World War I. The fragments all belonged to a roll, as Lacau noted: "Car il s'agit bien d'un rouleau et non d'un codex: c'est le verso d'un contrat grec qui a été utilisé pour transcrire notre texte copte". The pieces published by Lacau are now inv. 379 in the collection of the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale in Cairo, where I was able to examine them on 18 January 1999 thanks to the courtesy of Nicolas Grimal, then the Director, and Anne Minault-Gout, archivist. The original text on the recto was an account of the wine vintage of a year not indicated in the surviving fragments. This was turned over and upside down for the reuse for the Ascension of Isaiah; there is no double-thickness papyrus as in many other Panopolite texts. There is no direct evidence of date, but the hand is compatible with a late third century date. The account records a series of χωρία, giving amounts of wine (mainly in knidia). It used papyrus liberally, with top margins of 2.5 cm. and lines widely spaced. The only distinctive Panopolite element I could identify was a (fragmentary) mention of Apolinarias; too few personal names survive to indicate anything. I cannot see anything in this account to suggest that it was of official origin; as far as I know, no official would have had a reason to keep a record of the amounts of must and wine from a harvest, amounts for δαπά(νη), or amounts used for mixing, all of which occur in the fragments. Rather, this appears to be the account of a sizable personal estate with a considerable number of vineyard plots. LACAU, 454 estimated the original width of the Ascension as 1.8 meters, or around 12-15 columns of the account, but there is no way of knowing if the account was originally longer than that before reuse.

the Ptolemaic and early Roman funerary industry when it wanted large quantities of papyrus as a cheap material for mummy wrapping and stuffing, the workshop that produced these codices (and the Bodmer roll) wanted to buy its raw material wholesale rather than retail, in rolls rather than sheets. The one large potential source was the government, particularly the nome administration, to which all of the surviving texts could well have belonged. Most private individuals would not have enough surplus rolls to dispose of, and there is in any case abundant evidence for the reuse of rolls by private individuals, perhaps the most famous being the copying of the *Constitution of Athens* onto the back of a roll full of agricultural accounts. Even wealthy individuals found it worthwhile to reuse papyrus, as the letters of the archive of Heroninus show. The state, by contrast, had the resources and perhaps the rule to acquire fresh papyrus for its large consumption in the drafting of official registers and letter-books. An entrepreneur in search of a supply would necessarily look to public sources.

One consequence of this realization is that all statements about the pattern of Panopolite documentation for the principate are statements about deposition and preservation of records, not statements about the creation of documents. No conclusions can be drawn about the absence of any particular type of transaction, social group, or any other aspect of the documentation; the pattern of textual survival tells us nothing substantive about Panopolis, its society, or its economy. The dominance of public interests is not significant of a weak private sector. When Panopolis bursts onto our horizon with its fourth-century papyri, that is not a sign that the city has suddenly become important. It has only to do with how these rolls have come down to us.

A second consequence is equally important for the purposes of our collective inquiry into Panopolis itself. That is the following: for pre-Constantinian Panopolis, almost all of our surviving evidence comes from that sector of life least likely to show distinctive local traits. Although we know that the Roman administration did not seek to impose uniform structures and practices throughout the empire or even throughout any given province, neither did it leave these matters wholly to local initiative. For Egypt in the late second and early third centuries this is particularly true, because it is just at this time that the Egyptian metropoleis acquired city councils and made the decisive step into full management of their affairs. Up to the grant of councils in AD 200, almost all administrative decisions must have come from the level of the prefect and the epistrategoi, and we may therefore anticipate a high level of uniformity in the conduct of public business. The appointment of the strategoi of the nomes from outside the nomes they governed increased the tendency to suppress local differences. Even with the tetrarchic official correspondence we are dealing almost entirely with matters watched with intense closeness by the central administration, particularly the collection of taxes and military supplies and their distribution to the army.

In saying this, I do not of course mean to diminish the importance and interest of these texts. From the point of view of most Roman historians, the fact that the correspondence of



the strategos in *P.Panop.Beatty* is to a large degree generic is in no way a drawback.<sup>17</sup> In this way we have a better sense of the typicality and normality of his responsibilities, even if we also see that the prospect of an imperial visit made the volume of those duties much greater than usual. And some of the correspondence is explicit in singling out the Panopolite strategos for blame for poor performance compared to other strategoi.<sup>18</sup> But if Lykopolite or Apollonopolite were substituted for Panopolite throughout these texts, it would make little difference. Except for incidental information about administrative geography and the names of individuals, we do not learn much that concerns the Panopolite in any distinctive sense.<sup>19</sup> Much the same can be said for the very valuable information about village liturgical appointments and the ages and assets of the men appointed that we get from *P.Achmim* 7. Even in 1931 the editor was able to give a table (pp. 66-67) showing how the information given corresponds to that in papyri from elsewhere, particularly from Oxyrhynchos. Nor even is the exceedingly interesting official correspondence involving priesthods in *P.Achmim* 8 very specifically Panopolitan.

For our purposes, however, the distinctively Panopolitan is of more interest, or at least that which can be said to be in some way locally characteristic. And there are such aspects, of which I shall discuss three. The first is a peculiarity on the official recordkeeping side which can be discerned in the banker's rolls turned into the blank Vienna codex. I quote the editor's description of the entries in these rolls: "The writers on both rolls are diverse . . . Each entry appears to have been subscribed by the parties in person. It is therefore not a matter of copies, but of original documents. Since several entries are written per column, and since often a document runs over two columns, it is evident that we are not dealing with a τόμος συγκολλήσιμος. Whoever wished to conclude a contract came in person to the office of the person who kept the rolls, and his contract was written, entered, and subscribed on the spot, by a scribe of the office or, less likely (since the subscriptions hardly allow recognition of any writing routine) by the contracting parties themselves".<sup>20</sup> Sijpesteijn also points out that these contracts are drafted in the form of cheirographa, private documents.

<sup>17</sup> This is in part the source of the importance of the observations made by Keith Hopkins during the conference on the workings of the Roman government.

<sup>18</sup> See N. LEWIS, "In the World of *P.Panop.Beatty*", *BASP* 28 (1991), 163-78 for remarks on some aspects of the contents of these rolls.

<sup>19</sup> It is worth remarking that one item supposed distinctive is not. LEWIS, *BASP* 28 (1991), 164, states that "at Panopolis the title proedros appears [in place of prytanis] as early as ca 250 in *SB* VIII 9902, and *P.Panop.Beatty* 1 confirms that it had become the established title there before the end of the third century". The latter statement is just barely true, the correspondence register in question dating to 298, and the former (borrowed from A.K. BOWMAN, *Town Councils of Roman Egypt* [Toronto 1971], 59 with n. 17) is wrong. *SB* 9902 is the roll republished in 1975 as *P.Panop.Bork*, and now dated to the fourth century, probably ca 315-330. Since as Bowman notes the title proedros is in use at Lykopolis in 300, the appearance in *P.Panop.Beatty* 1 does not materially alter matters (the probably mid-third century attestation in *P.Got.* 7 is another matter).

<sup>20</sup> *CPR* XVIII, p. 3.

This is a truly remarkable combination of facts. I quote the passage of Hans-Julius Wolff's handbook on the practices of legal documentation in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, cited by Sijpesteijn: "The complexities (and perhaps also the costs, about which nothing precise is known) of the types of documentation described so far make the appearance of types of documents, the drawing up of which depended neither on the participation of witnesses nor on the cooperation of official or quasi-official offices (banks), understandable. One could abandon both from the outset thanks to an (at least in principle) well-ordered maintenance of files in the offices of the administration and of the tax and fiscal systems, if it was a matter of written recording of declarations".<sup>21</sup> In other words, the type of contract recorded here was attractive to parties precisely because it did *not* require them to go to a banker's office and have it drawn up on the spot; and yet that is precisely what is happening here, it seems. Why this should be, I do not know. The only parallel known to me is a small group of first-century Oxyrhynchite loan transactions made in a form described in the contracts as χειρόγραφον καὶ διαγραφή.<sup>22</sup> The editors, describing these in advance of publication, suggest that "the formulaic character of the χειρόγραφον and, in particular, the unambiguous mention of payment through the bank, suggest that the documents were prepared and written by an employee of the bank". There is, moreover, explicit mention of original documents having been invalidated and returned, something hardly possible in the case of contracts entered into the bank's own books as seems to be the case in Panopolis.

A second direction in which the Panopolite documents have been rewarding is that of onomastics, particularly of theophoric or other cult-related names. Panopolis's own triad of Min, Repit, and Kolanthes is well represented, but so also are cults from villages of the Panopolite nome and from neighboring cities like Lykopolis. This subject has been treated elsewhere, although a full investigation still awaits an author.<sup>23</sup> One aspect in which the Panopolite was most unusual was the extremely common use of women's names beginning in Σεν-, representing the Egyptian T3-šr.t-n, "The daughter of". Such names are of course found throughout Egypt, although sometimes with different transcriptions like Τσεν-, Θσεν-, Θιν-, and Θεν-.<sup>24</sup> But their commonness in the Panopolite is extraordinary. By way of crude measure, just 9 of 498 columns in Preisigke's *Namenbuch*, or 1.8%, are occupied

<sup>21</sup> H.-J. WOLFF, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens II* (HdA 5.2, Munich, 1978), 106.

<sup>22</sup> Described in T. GAGOS – L. KOENEN – B.E. MCNELLEN, 'A First Century Archive from Oxyrhynchos, or Oxyrhynchite Loan Contracts and Egyptian Marriage', in J.H. JOHNSON, ed., *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond* (SAOC 51, Chicago, 1992), 181-205 at 182-185.

<sup>23</sup> See the concise introduction given by J. QUAEGBEUR, *P. L. Bat.* 19, pp. 247-50, as well as notes to individual texts in that volume. For the range of cults that one city in this region might have, see my remarks in R.S. BAGNALL – B.W. FRIER – I.C. RUTHERFORD, *The Census Register P.Oxy. 984: The Reverse of Pindar's Paeans* (Papyrologica Bruxellensia 29, Bruxelles, 1997), 114-24 and R.S. BAGNALL, 'Cults and Names of Ptolemais in Upper Egypt', in *Egyptian Religion: The Last Thousand Years, Part II* (OLA 85, Leuven, 1998), 1093-1101.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., W. SPIEGELBERG, *Aegyptische und Griechische Eigennamen aus Mumienetiketten der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig, 1901), 29.

by Sen- names. In the index of personal names to *P.Achmim*, by contrast, about 118 of 635 individuals, or about 18.6%, have names beginning in Sen-: ten times the weight in Preisigke.

It is not just crude frequency that is interesting, however. The Sen- names found elsewhere, like their masculine equivalents beginning in Psen-, are heavily theophoric. One is the son or daughter of the god. Such names occur in Panopolis, too. But what Panopolis possesses distinctively is a large number of names formed with Sen- plus a personal, rather than divine, name. A few of these compounding elements are even Greek or Latin rather than Egyptian, as names like Senioulia, Senapollonia, and Seniorion show. The personal names in question may be either masculine or feminine, and the complete name with Sen- is not necessarily given a feminine ending: thus Senharmiusis, Senharsiesis, Senharuotes, Senhatres, Senkolanthos, Senonnophris, and so on have the masculine name exactly as we would find it when applied to a man.<sup>25</sup> On occasion, the woman in question is in fact the daughter of a man with the name (thus Senharyotes the elder, daughter of Haryotes, *P.Achmim* 9.147), but in *P.Achmim* 9 it is more common to find women whose grandfather bore the name: Senpsansnos daughter of Harsiesis, granddaughter of Psansnos (151), for example. The phenomenon also operated in the reverse direction. Names like Psensenharpaesis, Psensenonnophris, and Psensenpachoumis show that there was nothing out of place in recycling "the daughter of Harpaesis" for another generation as "the son of the daughter of Harpaesis". Even though some of the base names doubled as human and divine names, sometimes in the cult of divinized humans (see Smith, this volume), both the very large number of such names and the use of non-Egyptian elements in them make it impossible to suppose that all or even most of the human names are indicators of cults of divinized humans.<sup>26</sup>

What all this signifies, I do not know. But it is reasonable to suppose that it does signify something, whether about religion or about family relations.

There is another respect in which *P.Achmim* 9 can perhaps provide useful information: landholdings. Now the papyrus is extremely fragmentary, which perhaps accounts for the fact that it has been virtually ignored in the scholarly literature; and the train of argument I shall use has plenty of opportunities for uncertainty and error. All the same, the questions seem worth posing. The first piece has three columns, a first in which only the ends of some

<sup>25</sup> Senapollonios, with masculine termination, is described as "surprising" by J. QUAEGBEUR, *P. L. Bat.* 19, 40, p. 165. But it is entirely consonant with the practice in binding Sen- with Egyptian masculine names in the Panopolis papyri and needs no special explanation. Cf. also P.W. PESTMAN - J. QUAEGBEUR - R.L. VOS, *Recueil de textes* 19 (I, p. 127), with the suggestion that scribes using Ta- at the start of names sometimes thought of it not as part of the name but as meaning "daughter of". In the case of Sen- names, this seems an unnecessary hypothesis.

<sup>26</sup> On this subject see generally D. WILDUNG, *Egyptian Saints. Deification in Pharaonic Egypt* (New York, 1977) and J. QUAEGBEUR, 'Les "saints" égyptiens préchrétiens', *OLP* 8 (1977) 129-43. I thank Willy Clarysse and Mark Smith for discussing this matter with me.

names survive but almost all of the amounts, a second in which mainly complete entries are preserved, and a third with names partly preserved but no amounts. The second piece is similar but has been cut in a position slightly to the right of that of the first; only a few numbers survive in column i, and more of the names (but still no numbers) in column iii. As Paul Collart observed, the first number given after each name is evidently an amount of land, measured in arouras and in fractions based on powers of 2, down to 1/64. The second number is in drachmas, obols, and chalkoi. There is a highly consistent ratio between the two of 2 obols, 2 chalkoi per aroura. Collart argued that this should be seen as a tax on vineyard, and perhaps more precisely the *ναύβιον* tax levied for the maintenance of the irrigation system. As far as I know, this cannot be proven, but no evidence has come to light to refute Collart's proposal.<sup>27</sup> One may suppose that the category includes all land planted in tree crops rather than arable cultivation, i.e., orchards as well as vineyards.

Of the original register, we have names beginning in iota (only partly preserved), all of kappa and lambda, part of mu, and part of sigma. The number of preserved entries, omitting the *κληρονόμοι* from the kappas, compared to the total number of individuals in the index to *P.Achmim*, is as follows:

	<i>P.Achmim</i> 9	Index
iota	6+	13
kappa	38	62
lambda	1	5
mu	12+	15
sigma	55+	143
total	112+	635

The best index to use is probably kappa, which constitutes about 10 percent of the total entries in the index. The original register might then have had about 380 entries. Our four columns of names are therefore probably somewhat less than a third of the original total. The approximateness of such a calculation is evident, but it would be surprising if the original number of entries were not somewhere between 300 and 450.

<sup>27</sup> For bibliography on the *ναύβιον* *ἐναφεσίων*, see *BGU XV 2521* introd. The material on garden-land taxes, however, is largely Arsinoite, and the rate we know there is 3 ob. (or 150 bronze dr., the equivalent; see *P. Hamb. IV 250*) per aroura, plus additional charges of 20 percent or 4.8 chalkoi, which would be figured as 4 chalkoi or 5 chalkoi. Specific tax rates varied from nome to nome, however; for this reason both the rough similarity of rate to that for the *ναύβιον* *ἐναφεσίων* and the more precise difference may not be meaningful. I have found no mention of *P. Achmim* 9 in any of the literature on this tax, and it does not even figure in the index locorum to WALLACE, *Taxation in Egypt* (Princeton, 1938) given in *ZPE* 16 (1975), 82. As WALLACE, 47 observes, however, most land taxes in money are limited to garden land. Even if Collart's identification of the specific tax was incorrect, then, his general assertion that we are dealing with garden land is almost certainly right.

Of the surviving entries, 71 (only partly overlapping with the 112 above, because of the column with good numerical preservation but no names) give us usable numbers. These entries total about 638.6 arouras.<sup>28</sup> That is, the average holding is 9 arouras. To this one may readily compare the average holding of δένδριτική, a category evidently including orchard and vineyard, at the Arsinoite village of Philadelphia in 216/7,<sup>29</sup> which is 8.02 arouras.

But who are these people? What can this be the register for? It is certainly not the register of vineyard (etc.) for a village. The relatively large village of Philadelphia had only about 70 owners of such land (69 preserved, and the register is almost completely preserved). Nor is there any likelihood that any one village had this much vineyard and orchard, for we must suppose a total of some 3,000 arouras or more ( $380 \times 9 = 3,420$ ). One could imagine a list covering an entire toparchy, but I know of no reason to suppose that such registers, blurring distinctions of village, were in use. The likely candidate, then, is a list covering part of the metropolis, Panopolis itself. Are the numbers compatible with that hypothesis?

We do not, of course, know how much land of this type there was in the Panopolite nome. But we can try a ranging shot. At Philadelphia, orchard land amounted to about 7.5% of the total land area (this is a very approximate figure).<sup>30</sup> The Panopolite may have had something like 200,000 arouras of cultivable land.<sup>31</sup> It is unlikely that any valley nome had as high a percentage of vineyard and orchard as the Fayum did, and for that reason 15,000 ar. of such land is probably an upper limit. The percentage of such land owned by metropolitans rather than villagers is also a guess; at Philadelphia, it was perhaps about 40 percent.<sup>32</sup> That would give us a figure of 6,000 ar. in the Panopolite owned by metropolitans, again as a kind of upper limit.

Now our guess for what the total of the Panopolite register contained needs some refining, because the preservation of sigma has yielded a disproportionate number of women (59%) in the surviving part of the register (entries for which both name and amount can be established). If we correct for that bias by looking at the non-sigma entries, we find that

<sup>28</sup> Where only the money amount survives, I have calculated the surface area. The results are not likely to be wrong by any material amount. The few cases of double entries for the same person are aggregated.

<sup>29</sup> P.Yale inv. 296, now P.Yale III, 137. I am indebted to Paul Schubert for the use of his edition of the text, which marks a substantial advance over earlier manuscripts used in previous publications by me and others, in advance of publication.

<sup>30</sup> It is based on calculations suggesting that Philadelphia's total land area in this period may have been about 10,000 ar.

<sup>31</sup> See R.S. BAGNALL, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton, 1993), 334, calculating 208,725 from Butzer's figures for nome sizes.

<sup>32</sup> Because the entries for villagers are fairly complete, I have assumed that the discrepancy between the total stated amount and the sum of the preserved entries is largely to be made up by the missing metropolitan entries in the first column of the Yale papyrus. If this is wrong, the metropolitan figure might be only 35% or so of the total.

women make up just 27% of the holders. A calculation<sup>33</sup> then suggests a total of 140 women and 240 men in our hypothetical 380 holders. Women have considerably smaller average holdings than men, 5.9 ar. vs. 18.4 ar.<sup>34</sup> A weighted aggregate amount would then come to 5242 ar. ( $140 \times 5.9 + 240 \times 18.4$ ). Since we supposed that 6,000 ar. might be an upper limit for the total for the metropolis, this figure is broadly in line with that argument. In that case, women would own 15.8% of the total land in this category, a reasonable amount according to what we know otherwise.<sup>35</sup> A calculation of the Gini coefficient of inequality yields .702, compared to .669 at Philadelphia for its small number of metropolitans. The number is, however, not weighted for the high ratio of women in the surviving part of the register.

Despite the whole series of approximations and hedges, I believe that the register in *P.Achmim* 9 can be taken to show a situation with landholdings of vineyard and orchard land roughly in line with what we find elsewhere in Egypt, and that it should be seen as a list of the land of this type owned by residents of Panopolis throughout the nome. The percentage owned by women, however, would seem on almost any reckoning to be higher than their share of grainland owned by urban residents at Hermopolis in the fourth century, and to be closer to the pattern seen in villages.<sup>36</sup> Whether this pattern is simply to be ascribed to the fact that it is vineyard and orchard land that we are dealing with — perhaps a desirable holding for women of property who would be renting the properties out for income — or is in some way indicative of something distinctive about the situation of women in Panopolis, cannot be determined from the evidence at our disposition.

<sup>33</sup> Supposing 320 non-sigma entries at 27% women and 60 sigma entries at 92% women.

<sup>34</sup> It should be recorded that the latter figure is skewed upward by one case of a holder of 137.8 arouras. If he were removed, the average would drop to 11.8. But we have no way of knowing whether another such very large holder would occur in another sample of this size, so dropping him seems unjustifiable.

<sup>35</sup> That is, the percentage is roughly in line with some of the other estimates for various places. See BAGNALL, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, 93, 130.

<sup>36</sup> See R.S. BAGNALL, 'Landholding in Late Roman Egypt: The Distribution of Wealth', *JRS* 82 (1992), 128-49.