

47. RECEIPT FOR DELIVERY OF OIL*

Roger S. BAGNALL

P.Vindob. G 13207 + 17803 13,5 cm × 20,5 cm 335 A.D.
 + 21645 + 28278 Plate 30
 Maximianoupolis

The papyrus as it is preserved and reconstructed from four fragments consists of a sheet which is torn at the top and left but preserves its original margins at right and bottom. The extant sheet is folded vertically into four panels, with the left-hand three about 3,5 cm wide each and the right-hand one 3 cm wide. The restorations at left will probably have occupied one panel as wide as the three larger ones here, and it is possible that a sixth panel of the narrower dimension provided a margin at the left. The text is written with the fibers. There is a *kollesis* at 6 cm from the left margin. The hand is a professional cursive, slanting to the right, somewhat uneven in size. The consular date is written in a slightly larger hand than the body, with the last word, λαμπροτάτων, particularly large. The subscription appears to be in the same hand as the body, but after the collector's name the hand gets gradually faster and faster. A similar process can be observed in, e.g., P.Col. X 278 (pl. 33). The Verso is blank.

- 1 [παρήνεγκ]ας ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐ[τοῦ]οπολείτου καὶ παραδέδω-
 2 [κάς μοι ?] ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Μαξιμιανοῦ πόλει εἰς τροφὰς ἐργατῶν
 3 [καὶ τεχνι]τῶν ἀπὸ δηληγατίωνος ἐνάτης νέας
 4 [ἦτοι κγ' ἰ]νδικτίωνος ἐλαίου ξ[έσ]τας πεντακοσίους
 5 [(γίνονται) ξ(έσται)] φ μόνο(ν) καὶ ἐξέδωκά σοι τήνδε τὴν ἀπο-
 6 [χὴν εἰς ἀσ]φάλειαν καὶ ἐπερ[ω]τηθεὶς ὠμ[ο]λόγησα.
 7 [Ἰ]ουλίῳ Κωνσταντίῳ πατρικίῳ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ
 8 [δεσπό]του ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίνου Ἀγούστου καὶ
 9 [Ῥουφί]ου Ἀλβίνου τῶν λαμπροτάτων. *vacat*
 10 [Αὐρήλ]ιος Πινουτίων ὁ προκ(είμενος) ἐξέδωκα τὴν ἀποχὴν
 11 [ξ(εστῶν)] πεντακοσίων ὡς πρόκ(εῖται), δι' ἐμοῦ Πλήνιος.

„[- - -] You have delivered from the same [- - -] Jopolite and turned over to me in the same Maximianoupolis, for provisions for workmen and craftsmen (?), from the assessment of the ninth new or 23rd (?) indiction, five hundred sextarii of oil, that is, 500 sextarii only;

* It is a pleasure to be able to give back to Hermann Harrauer at last one of the papyri he entrusted to me a decade ago, as a modest token of thanks both for his many kindnesses to me and for the enormous contribution he has made to papyrology both as scholar and as administrator. I am indebted to Klaas Worp for several suggestions.

and I have issued this receipt to you for your security and on being asked the formal question I acknowledged.

In the consulate of Iulius Constantius, patrician, brother of our master Constantine Augustus and of Rufius Albinus the most distinguished.

I, Aurelius Pinoution the aforesaid, issued the receipt for five hundred sextarii as aforesaid, through me, Plenis¹.

Aurelius Pinoution acknowledges to a collector the receipt of 500 sextarii of oil. The nearest parallel to the wording of this receipt is a contrareceipt (ἀντάποχον) or declaration given by an ἐπιμελητής to a διαδότης in Antaioupolis in 380, W.Chr. 423, but in that case, of course, the roles are reversed, and the verbs are in the first person rather than the second. The delivery here is stated to have taken place „in the same Maximianoupolis“, indicating that this place has already been mentioned in the lost beginning of the document. It must then have been named as part of the origin or title of one of the two parties. The oil is also said to have been delivered „from the same [- - -]opolite“, again presumably indicating previous mention of the nome in question, which cannot have been the Maximianopolite (because it is coming from the nome in question to Maximianoupolis). It is thus likely that the recipient of this receipt is the person whose original identification included the mention of the nome, while the issuer is the person whose identification included Maximianoupolis.

For these reasons, the issuer was probably a διαδότης of provisions for workmen and craftsmen serving a government purpose lost in the missing beginning of the text, and the recipient probably an ἐπιμελητής, with the nome as his circumscription. One could alternatively suppose that the issuer was an ἐπιμελητής and the recipient an ἀπαιτητής, as in (e.g.) P.Rain.Cent. 83 and SB XVI 12340 (a reedition of P.Cair.Preis. 34), but these two persons should normally (as in those texts) come from the same nome rather than different ones. This alternative is therefore much less likely.

In the case of W.Chr. 423, the διαδόται were collecting for the soldiers stationed in Philai. At Maximianoupolis (the old Kaine, modern Qeneh), a military purpose is also conceivable, as the *Notitia Dignitatum* shows units stationed there (Or. 31, 29, *Equites sagittarii indigenae*; Or. 31, 48, *Ala III dromedariorum*). The seeming mention of ἐργατῶν [καὶ τεχνι]τῶν in lines 2–3, however, indicates instead that the government purpose in question was the quarrying, probably for alabaster, known to have taken place there and mentioned (partly restored) in P.Panop.Beatty 2, 153 (see note ad loc. for references).

The find-place of the papyrus is not likely to have been Qeneh. Two pieces of evidence would suggest that the place of finding of the papyrus was the Hermopolite. One is the inventory number of the first fragment (G 13207), which belongs to a range in which the old E-inventory was renumbered (P.Rain.Cent., p. 63). As this inventory contained Hermopolite texts, there is a presumption that this fragment was from that source. Moreover, Πινουτίων, the issuer's name, is common in that nome. Against this may be set the fact that Ἑρμ]οπολείτου is rather short for the lacuna in line 1 (see note ad loc.), and the fact that consistency and accuracy were not uniform characteristics of Wessely's inventory practices. The Herakleopolite, which would fit the lacuna perfectly, is also a source of many Vienna papyri. This seems to me a plausible finding place. But it is also conceivable that the papyrus did not return to the place of origin of its recipient, in which case the nome to be restored in line 1 might be neither the Hermopolite nor the Herakleopolite.

1. The length of the lacuna appears to be suitable for restoring six letters, e.g., [Ἑρακλε]οπολίτου. But of course there could have been a space before the start, leaving other possibilities also. Before line 1 the text may have run something like the following:

Αὐρήλιος Πινουτίων διαδότης τῶν ἐν Μαξιμιανοῦ πόλει
μετάλλων θ ἰνδικτίωνος Αὐρηλίω Ν.Ν. ἐπιμελητῆ
ἐλαίου [- - -]ιοπολίτου νομοῦ θ ἰνδικτίωνος χαίρειν·

2. On Maximianoupolis see Calderini, Daris, *Dizionario* III 232 s. v. To the references there one may add P.Neph. 30, 3; P.Rain.Cent. 83, 9 and reeditions of P.Erl. 52 as SB XIV 12167 and of P.Cair.Preis. 34 as SB XVI 12340. The old name Kaine is still found in P.Panop.Beatty 2, 153 (February, 300); the earliest instance of the new is in P.Rain.Cent. 83 (311).

3. For the suggestion of [τεχνι]τῶν here, cf. SPP XX 244.

Delegatio is a very uncommon term in fourth-century papyri, and it is found relatively infrequently even later. The references are collected in Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, Diethart, *Lex.Lat. Lehn*, fasc. 2, 233–235, who remark that „Delegatio ist seit dem 4. Jh. Terminus technicus für den jährlich durch den Kaiser für das ganze Reich festgesetzten Steuerbetrag“. It is not likely that here it has the specific technical sense of final tax schedule as distinguished from the preliminary schedule, *praedelegatio*, that occurs later; see Bagnall, Worp, *CSBE* 22–23. For the usage here, cf. rather the use of the verb δηληγατεύω in W.Chr. 281, 3; 10 = P.Lips. 64 and the noun in line 17 of the same papyrus (oil collections and other taxes in Thebais, 368/9); also the counter-receipt cited in the introduction above, W.Chr. 423 = BGU III 974 (380): ἀπὸ δηληγατίωνος κανόνος τῆς ἐννάτης ἰνδικ(τίωνος). It is clear in particular from the expression in W.Chr. 281, 17 that it refers to the tax assessment, which in that case had not yet been received, leading to a decision to collect the taxes according to the previous year's assessment: συνάγετε λόγου ναύλου θαλασσίων πλοί(ων) ἰβ ἰνδικ(τίωνος) ἀπροκρίτως ἄχρις τῆς ἀποστελλομένης δηληγατίωνος κατὰ τὸν τύπον τ[ῆ]ς ια ἰνδικ(τίωνος). The earliest example of *delegatio* in the papyri is apparently P.Oxy. XXXI 2561 (293–305), an official letter with (as the editor observed) a high proportion of Latin vocabulary; there we find mention of αἱ δηληγατίωνες ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ διασημοτ[ά]του καθολικο[ῦ]. A second *delegatio* is mentioned in P.Oxy. XIV 1660, 2 (IV).

The 9th indiction is 335/6. An example of the dual numbering system restored here appears from this indiction cycle in SB XIV 11711, 7–8 (i–ii. 332; BASP 14 [1977] 96; cf. discussion in *CSBE* 33): ἔκτης νέας ἦτοι κ' ἰνδικτίωνος. For „new indictions“, see Bagnall, Worp, *CSBE* 30–35. This instance fits with the generalization offered there (p. 33), that „in the period up to 347 ... the use of νέα with an indiction is with one possible exception characteristic of situations where the writer wishes to make it clear that he is referring to the most recently begun cycle of numbered indictions“.

5. One would expect ξ(έστα) abbreviated, but the space seems to suggest that it was written in full; the same difficulty occurs in line 11. It is possible, however, that the abbreviation was written with a long diagonal stroke occupying space sufficient to have written the word in full. The survival of part of a diagonal stroke projecting from the lacuna in line 11 indicates that this is the most likely solution, and I have adopted it in the text in both cases.

7–9. For the consulate of Iulius Constantius and Rufius Albinus (A.D. 335), see Bagnall et al., *CLRE* 1987, 204–205. For more recently published texts, see P.Neph. 31, 14; P.Oxy. LXVI 4354, 1 and P.Kell. I Gr. 13, 12 (I owe this list to Klaas Worp). The formula here is that normal in the papyri of this year. No month or day is given in line 9, although there is space. The beginning of line 10, by contrast, will have been filled by the start of the issuer's name. The formula in W.Chr. 423 places the month and day after the consulate, not earlier in the document (of which the beginning is preserved). It appears therefore that the exact date was omitted.

11. There is a diagonal stroke projecting from the left edge of the papyrus which is probably to be taken as the abbreviation stroke in ξ(εστῶν); cf. note to line 5.

At the end of line 11, there is a filler stroke at the right margin.