

ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR
PAPYROLOGIE UND EPIGRAPHIK

herausgegeben

von

*Werner Eck, Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Hagedorn
Rudolf Kassel, Ludwig Koenen und Reinhold Merkelbach*



BAND 52

1983

DR. RUDOLF HABELT GMBH · BONN

TWO FOURTH-CENTURY PAPYRI IN BOLOGNA¹⁾

1. P.BON. 39

The three pieces of papyrus published under this number are all part of a single account, which occupies both fronts and backs of these sheets and originally may have occupied others. It is to be noticed that piece *a* has the same hand on both front and back; piece *b* again has the same hand on both front and back, but that hand is not the same as that on *a*; and in *c* again, the hand is the same on both sides but different from that of both *a* and *b*. These indications suggest to us that the original format was a codex rather than a roll.

The original editor proposed a date of fifth century for the text, on the grounds that "la menzione dell'anno 35 ... ci obbliga ad arrivare fino a Teodosio II e Valentiniano II (425-450^P: però gli anni di Teodosio si computano dal 408)." She noted, however, that the handwriting would instead be attributed to the later third or fourth century. H. Cadell (*Cd'E* 48 [1973] 332-33) has pointed out that the mention of a year 35 with letters following it before the month name indicated a multi-numeral date, and she proposed 35-17-8: posthumous count by Constantine I plus regnal years of Constantius II and Constans, hence 340/1.²⁾ Our rereading of the papyrus shows that this year number appears repeatedly, dating the text to June/July, A.D. 341. There are references (lines 2, 10, 41, 54, and 88) to the 11th, 12th, and 13th indications in connection with amounts due, referring thus to 337/8, 338/9, and 339/40. Our rereading indicated at the same time that the text could be improved on a number of points aside from the information about the date, and we have therefore thought it useful to provide a new text.

The editor expressed uncertainty about the public or private character of the account. A variety of facts, taken together, seem to us to decide the matter definitely for private. These are:

(1) The land is not arranged by locality, like a public land or tax register, but by farmer, with several different villages represented even on one sheet; and the format is not characteristic either of any public records which might be arranged by persons (e.g. *P.Herm.Landl.*).

(2) For any particular parcel, payment is normally made in one form (lines 6-8 are an exception); that is, for one plot of land there are sums either in wheat or in barley or in money. In a tax register one would normally find one tax collected (or in the case of the *sitologoi*, perhaps wheat and barley in one account and on each parcel).

1) We thank Giovanni Geraci and Lucia Criscuolo for their cordial help in our preparation of this article, both in providing photographs and in making it possible for Bagnall to see the original papyri during a visit to Bologna in May, 1981.

2) See our *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Stud. Amst. 8 (Zutphen 1978) 37-38.

(3) The division of several parcels into two parts, one of which pays in grain, the other of which is planted in hay and pays in cash, is reminiscent of lease provisions for the alternation of crops and payments, but not of the fairly rigid taxation procedures of the fourth century.

(4) The terminology is characteristic of the world of private leases: the mention of the kleros, the use of the verb γεωργέω (γεωργός being the technical term for lessee in opposition to γεοῦχος, landlord; cf. Preisigke, *WB I* s.v., for examples).

Since the state of preservation is very partial, it is impossible to describe accurately the scope and organization of the account. It consists mainly of entries with the following information: (a) name of lessee and village of origin; (b) the phrase ὀφείλει ὑπὲρ ὧν γεωργεῖ, (c) the name and location of the kleros in which the land is situated, (d) the amount of land, broken down where appropriate by crop, (e) the rate of rent, (f) the total rent, (g) in cases of grain, often a surcharge of a tenth (see note to line 14), (h) a statement of what three-quarters of this total comes to (cf. note to line 6 for this item), (i) the date, and (j) a statement of the source of information on the transaction, generally διὰ λόγων Χωοῦτος αἱ προκείμεναί.

The landowner whose holdings are enumerated here was evidently a member of the wealthy class of Oxyrhynchos; the presence of some members of the bouletic class among his or her lessees is interesting. We see only part of the holdings in the preserved portions, and some figures are lost. A few estimates still are better than nothing.

Kleros	Village	Total arouras
Demetrios and others (5)	Ibion Ammoniou	3 1/4 (? or 10 1/4)
Sosthenes (12,18,23,26,60)	Kosmou	13 1/4 ++
Philonikos (32)	unknown	unknown
Attinos (35,44,59)	Dositheou	8 5/32
Hera[and Kastor (46)	unknown	4 1/2
Onesimos (56)	Dositheou	ca 1
]inoos (61)	unknown	half-interest in 16
Asklepiades (68)	unknown	ca 8?
]mos (72)	S.[3+?
? (51)	unknown	2 1/4
? (75)	unknown	10

The total seems to be between 60 and 70, which is a fairly large figure, and of course a good deal is evidently missing. The yields, where preserved, are also fairly good, though not exceptional.³⁾ We find

wheat: 6 art./ar. + 10% (19)

3) Cf. D. Foraboschi, *Scritti in onore di O. Montevecchi* (Bologna 1981) 155-61.

barley:	6 art./ar. + 10% (13,23)
	4 1/2 art./ar. + 10% (37)
	3? art./ar. (63)
beans:	3 art./ar. (53?, 63)
hay:	8 T. 2000 dr./ar. (15, 29)
	16 T.? (49)

In general, then, we find a sizable estate consisting of separate plots but roughly concentrated in a manageable area, rented out on varying terms on leases which at least in some cases involved alternation of cereal and legumes. One may compare the case of the archive of the descendants of Laches in the second century, in an Arsinoite environment.⁴⁾

The following will indicate the translation of a typical entry in the account (lines 17-21):

"Papnouthis son of Amounis, grandson of Kophos, from Texi, owes for the land which he leases from the kleros of Sosthenes in the field of (the village of) Kosmou, ar. 3 1/2, of which 1 3/4 ar. in wheat at the rate of 6 art., (makes) 10 1/2 art., plus the four-choinix supplement, 1 art. 2 ch., (makes) 11 1/2 art., 2 ch., 3/4 of which is 8 1/2 art., 7 ch. In hay, 1 3/4 ar. at the rate of 8 tal. 2000 dr., (makes) 14 tal. 3500 dr., 3/4 of which is 10 tal. 5600 dr. Year 35-17-8, Epeiph, through the accounts of Choous, the aforesaid sums."

Oxyrhynchite Nome

vi-vii 341

a: Recto

- 1 [] traces ? []
 2 θ[έσ]εως ια[ς] / καὶ ιβ / ἰνδικ(τιόνων) χρό[ν]ων Πινουτρίωνος[ς]
 3 πυρῶν (ἀρτ.) ε, κριθ(ῆς) (ἀρτ.) γὰ χ(οίνικες) β, ἀργ(υρίου) (τάλ.) ιε.
 4 Σεργήνος Σαρᾶ ἔρξ(ας) 'Οξ[υρυγ]χιτῶν ὀφίλ(ει) ἑπ(έρ) ὧν γεωργ(εῖ) ἐκ το(ῦ)
 5 Δημητρίου καὶ ἑλλω[ν κλ]ήρου πεδ(ιάδος) 'Ιβ[ι]ῶνος 'Αμμωνίου
 6 (ἀρουρῶν) ἰγὰ ἀποτάκτου πυρ[ο]ῦ (ἀρτ.) ιε, τὸ ε[λ] (ἀρτ.) ιαδ
 7 κριθ(ῆς) (ἀρτ.) ιε τὸ ε[λ] (ἀρτ.) ιαδ
 8 ἀργυρίου (τάλ.) μ τὸ δ (τάλ.) λ
 9 λε[ς] ι[ξ]ῆς / δι(ὰ) λ[όγ]ων ἑωυτοῦ ἀργ(υρίου) (τάλ.) λ.
 10 θέσεως ιγ[ς] ἰνδικ(τιόνος) πυρῶν (ἀρτ.) β, κριθ(ῆς) (ἀρτ.) ιβ
 11 κριθ(ῆς) ρμγ

Plate VIII b

a: Verso

- 12 Λόγγος ἀπὸ ἐποικ(ίου) Δ[ι]δὸς ὀφίλ(ει) ἑπ(έρ) ὧν [γε]ωργ(εῖ) ἐκ το(ῦ) Σωσθέ-

4) See D. Foraboschi, *P.Mil.Vogl.* VII, introd.

- 13 // νους κλήρ(ου) πεδ(ιάδος) Κόσμου (άρουρ.) ς ὦν κριθ(ῆς) [(άρουρ.)] γ ἀν[ἀ] (άρτ.) ς
(άρτ.) ιη,
- 14 (τετρα)χοι(νικίας) (άρτ.) αϛ χ(οίνικες) β, (άρτ.) ιθϛ χ(οίνικες) β, τὸ ϛ̄ (άρτ.) ιθϛ
χ(οίνικες) δ,
- 15 χόρτου (άρουρ.) γ ἐκ (ταλ.) η (δρ.) 'Β, (τάλ.) κε, τὸ ϛ̄ (τάλ.) ιη (δρ.) Δφ.
- 16 (ἔτους) λεϛ [ι]ϛ ς ης// 'Επεὶφ διὰ λό[γω]ν Χω[ο]ῦ[τ]ο[ς] αὶ προκ(εῖμεναι).
- 17 Παπνοῦθις Ἀμοῦνιος Κώφους ἀπὸ Τεξῑ ὀφ(είλει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ)
- 18 // ἐκ το(ῦ) Σωσθένου[ς] κλήρ(ου)] π[ε]δ(ιάδος) Κόσμου (άρουρ.) γς/ ὦν πυρῶ
- 19 (άρουρ.) αϛ ἀ[ν(ἀ)] (άρτ.) ς, (άρτ.) ις//, (τετρα)χοι(νικίας) (άρτ.) α χ(οίν.) [β]
(άρτ.) [ι]αϛ χ(οίν.) [β, τὸ ϛ̄] (άρτ.) ης χ(οίν.) ζ,
- 20 χόρτω (άρ.) αϛ ἐκ (ταλ.) η (δρ.) 'Β, (τάλ.) ιδ (δρ.) Ϝφ, τὸ ϛ̄ (τάλ.) [ι] (δρ.) 'Εχ.
- 21 (ἔτους) λεϛ ιϛ ς ης// 'Επεὶφ δι[ι]ὰ λόγων Χωοῦτος τὰ προκ(εῖμεναι).
- 22 Διονύσιος μη(τρὸς) Ταειῶτος ἀπὸ κώμης Κόσμου ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ)
- 23 // ἐκ το(ῦ) Σωσθένους κλήρ(ου) πεδ(ιάδος) Κόσμου κριθ(ῆς) (άρουρ.) β ἀνὰ (άρτ.) ς, [(άρτ.)
ι]β,
- 24 (τετρα)χοι(νικίας) (άρτ.) α χ(οίν.) η, (άρτ.) ιγ χ(οίν.) η, τὸ ϛ̄ (άρτ.) θ χ(οίν.) λς.
- 25 (ἔτους) λεϛ ιϛ ς ης// 'Επεὶφ δι[ι]ὰ λόγων Χωοῦτος αὶ προκ(εῖμεναι).
- 26 Εὐλόγιος ἀπὸ ἐποικ(ίου) Διδὸς ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ) [ἐ]κ το(ῦ) Σωσ-
- 27 θένους κλήρ(ου) χόρτω (άρουρ.) αϛ, κριθ(ῆς) ἐν ἄλλω τόπ(ω) .[
- 28 κριθ(ῆς) (άρτ.) ς, (τετρα)χοι(νικίας) (άρτ.) L χ(οίν.) δ, (άρτ.) ςL χ(οίν.) δ,
- 29 // χ[όρτ]ω (άρουρ.) αϛ ἐκ (ταλ.) η (δρ.) Β, (τάλ.) ιδ (δρ.) Ϝφ.
- 30 (ἔτους) [λε]ϛ ιϛ ς ης// 'Επεὶφ διὰ λόγων Χωοῦτος [τὰ προκ(εῖμεναι).]
- 31 [..]ων Πινουτίνως ἄρξ() 'Οξυ[ρυγ]χιτ[ῶν] ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ) ἐκ το(ῦ)]
- 32 [Φ]ιλονίκου κλήρ(ου) traces [
- 33 Traces

12 Λογ' γος pap. 21 τα, τ corr. from α

b: Recto (2nd Hand)

- 34 Traces
- 35 ἀπὸ κώμ]η Κόσμου ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ)] ἐκ τ(οῦ) ['Α]ττίνου κλήρ(ου)
- 36] . . . ου ἀπὸ (άρουρ.) ς ἀφ' ὦν γεωργῖται ὑπὸ[υ] Δίου Διδύμου
- 37] τῶν λοιπ(ῶν) (άρουρ.) δϛ [ις] λο ἀνὰ (άρτ.) δς// [καϛ χ] (άρτ.) καϛ χ(οίνικες) ς
- 38] (άρτ.) κδ χο(ίν.) δ, τὸ ϛ̄ (άρτ.) ιη χο(ίν.) γ
- 39 διὰ] λόγων Χωοῦτος κριθ(ῆς) (άρτ.) ιη χο(ίν.) γ.
- 40 [(ἔτους)] λ[ε] ιϛ ς ἐνδ(ικτίονος) χρόνων Πινουτίνως κριθ(ῆς) (άρτ.) δϛ,
- 41 δ]ι(ἀ) λόγων ιγς ἐνδ(ικτίονος) κριθ(ῆς) (άρτ.) γ.
- 42 [(ἔτους)] λεϛ ιϛ ς ης// 'Επεὶφ διὰ λόγων Χωοῦτος αὶ προκ(εῖμεναι).
- 43] Διδύμου Σαλῆτος ἀπὸ κώμης Δωσιθέου ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὦν γεωργ(εῖ)
- 44 [ἐκ το(ῦ)] 'Αττίνου κλήρ(ου) κριθ(ῆς) (άρουρ.) α η λο ἀν[ἀ] (άρτ.) ε (άρτ.) ϛ̄ χ(οίν.) β,
(τετρα)χοι(νικίας) (άρτ.) L χ(οίν.) γ,

- 45]ε τὸ εἰ (ἀρτ.) δὲ χ(οίν.) α
 46]ρος ἀπὸ κώμης Κόσμου ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὧν γεωργ(εῦ) ἐκ το(ῦ) 'Ηρα-
 47]...[Κ]άστορ[ο]ς κλήρο(υ) χόρτου κοπ(ῆς) (ἀρουρ.) §/ χόρτο(υ) βρώ[σ]εως
 48 σκωλ]ηκοβρωθὲν (ἀρουρ.) δ' []
 49] ἐκ (ταλ.) ἰς (τάλ.) .[.]', τὸ εἰ[]
 50 δια] λόγων Χω[οῦτος

At upper left, a small fragment which does not belong where it is mounted 42 line evidently inserted later, crowded between 41 and 43 43 Σαλητ' pap. 44 Ατ'τινου pap.

b: Verso

- 51 ...[] // τὸ (ἡμισυ)/ (ἀρουρ.) βα.
 52 (ἔτους) λε§ ιζ§ η§/ 'Επειφ' δι(ὰ) λόγων Χωοῦτος .. προκ(εῖμεν-)
 53 φακοῦ (ἀρουρ.) β ἀνὰ (ἀρτ.) γ
 54 δ α(ὐτὸς) σπορᾶς ιβ// ἰνδικ(τίονος) κριθῆς []
 55 'Αφοῦς ἀπὸ Τεξι καταμ(ένων) ἐν ἐποικ(ίῳ) Πρεμένου[ς] ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὧν γεωργ(εῦ) ἐκ το(ῦ)]
 56 'Ονησίμου κλήρο(υ) πεδ(ιάδος) Δωσιθέου χόρ[του] (ἀρ.)
 57 (τάλ.) ι (δρ.) 'Βφ.
 58 'Αφοῦς Κεραμέως ἀπὸ Κόσμου ἐποικ(ίου) ὀφίλ(ει) ὑπ(ἐρ) ὧν γεωργ(εῦ) ἐκ το(ῦ)]
 59 'Αττίνου κλήρο(υ) πεδ(ιάδος) Δωσιθέου κριθ(ῆς) (ἀρουρ.) α[] καὶ
 60 ἐκ το(ῦ) Σωσθένου κλήρο(υ) πεδ(ιάδος) Κόσμου χόρ[του] (ἀρουρ.) καὶ ἐκ το(ῦ) --]
 61 ἰνδ(ίου) κλήρο(υ) ἀπὸ (ἀρουρῶν) ἰς κοι(νῶν) πρὸς 'Απολλῶ[νιο]ν .[]
 62 [ἀρ]ξ(αντ-) 'Οξυρυχιτῶν κατὰ τὸ (ἡμισυ) (ἀρουρ.) η/ ὧν [ἀν]ὰ χ[όρτου]
 63 [κρ]ιθ(ῆς) (ἀρουρ.) (ἡμισυ)// <ἀνὰ> (ἀρτ.) γ φακοῦ (ἀρουρ.) γ ἀνὰ (ἀρτ.) γ[] α.[]
 64 [] traces ι χ(οίν.) β (ἀρτ.) ι[] ..[]
 65 [] traces []

59 Ατ'τινου pap.

c: Recto (3rd Hand)

- 66 προστασίας ..[]
 67 Παῦλος καὶ Πανοῦφ[ις]
 68 ἐκ το(ῦ) 'Ασ[κλ]ηπιάδο[υ]
 69 ἐδάφους κρομβύω[ν] (ἀρουρ.)
 70 ὑπὸ 'Ερμῆν ἀπὸ ἐπ[οικίου]
 71 (ἀρτ.) μθ§// λαχάνου []
 72 μου κλήρο(υ) πεδ(ιάδος) Σ.[]
 73 ἀνὰ (ἀρτ.) γ (ἀρτ.) α χ(οίν.) ε, κο []
 74 (ἀρτ.) εἰ καὶ πρὸς τῶν []

75 // λαχάνου (ἀρουρ.) υ// .χη [
 76 γί(νοντα) πυρῶν (ἀρτ.) νγδ δ.[
 77 λαχάνου (ἀρτ.) δα [
 78 χ[ό]ρτων (ἀρτ.) } υς [
 79 .[] traces

 To right of main fragment are two small strips (one pasted to larger fragment) which seem not to belong to it but which were written in the same hand. They are not transcribed here.

75 χη, η corr. from ς? Ḳ pap.

c: Verso

80].{// (ἀρτ.) νε
 81].γ χ(οίν.) ε
 82] αL χ(οίν.) ς
 83] (τάλ.) νδ (δρ.) 'Δσ
 84] traces
 85] traces
 86].ad χ(οίν.) ζ, κριθ(ῆς) (ἀρτ.) α, λαχ(άνου) (ἀρτ.) ε χ(οίν.) γ
 87].ad χ(οίν.) β
 88]. ια/ ινδικ(τίονος) χρόνων θε[ο]ου
 89] ιση σιππ(ίου) δέ(σμαι) σLη
 90] γ (δρ.) 'Δφ
 91] traces

 84-85 There is tape over these lines, and it is not clear how much was written in this space originally.

2: θέσις here and in line 10 seems to refer to a payment on account of arrears for past periods; the use of ἔκθεσις for a list of arrears is comparable. Indiction 11 is 337/8, 12 is 338/9. We do not know if Pinoution is to be seen as a former overseer, so that the two indictions in question are called "the period of Pinoution," or if χρόνων goes with what precedes, and Pinoution is a lessee. Cf. lines 40 and 88. The situation in line 40, where the collocation of ἰνδικτίων with the regnal years is quite extraordinary for this period (cf. CSBE 2-4 for earlier in the century), may point to the first explanation, if one assumes that an indiction number has been omitted; to the second if one does not.

4: 'Οξυρυγχιτῶν without τῆς preceding it, let alone πολέως following, is remarkable. A similar phrase occurs in BGU IV 1064, see D. Hagedorn, ZPE 12 (1973) 288.

5: For the kleros, cf. P. Pruneti, *Aegyptus* 55 (1975) 172-73. For the villages here and throughout the papyrus, see now P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinichite*, Pap.Flor. 9 (Firenze 1981).

6: The τὸ ε notation throughout is of uncertain significance. It is most likely that the

landowner to whom these accounts pertain had only a $3/4$ interest in the plots where this appears, and that this computation thus proceeds from the total due to this person's share. The use of a half in lines 51 and 62 may refer to a similar situation involving half-shares.

The rent for this parcel is not a per aroura figure but a fixed total of 15 art. each of wheat and barley and 40 T. in cash. The damage to the number of arouras in line 6 makes an evaluation of the rent uncertain.

9: Year 35-17-8 = 340/1, cf. introduction. For Choous' role cf. line 2.

10: Indiction 13 = 339/40.

11: There is no indication to what the figure of 143 art. of barley pertains. Perhaps it is carried forward from previous pages; or it may be an unusually large payment of arrears.

12f.: The kleros of Sosthenes is known only from this papyrus, cf. Pruneti's works cited in the note to line 5.

14: We do not find (τετρα)χοι(νικία) (written δχοι) elsewhere; but it may be compared to the δχοινικία charge of earlier times, for which see S.L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt* (Princeton 1938) 361 n.10 and T. Kalén, *P.Berl.Leihg.* I, pp. 305ff. Four choinikes, calculated on a 40-choinix artaba, is a tenth, which is a well-known amount of surcharge on wheat payments in the fourth century, though they are usually expressed either as ἑκατοσταί or δεκάτη. See for references and discussion *P.Cair.Isid.* 45.7n. If they are correctly interpreted as transport charges, it is not surprising to find lessees paying them here; for such payment of transport charges by lessees see J. Herrmann, *Studien zur Bodenpacht* (München 1958) 123.

27-28: The scribe has somewhat misordered his material. Instead of proceeding in line 27 to set out the rent on the $1\frac{3}{4}$ ar. in hay, he passes on to the acreage in barley and its taxes, only then returning to the rent on the land in hay.

32: For the kleros of Philonikos, see Pruneti (5n. supra) 204-05.

35: For the kleros of Attinos, see Pruneti (5n. supra) 170-71, where it is recorded as Ατ.νου. An error of omitting the sigma on the end of κώμης seems out of keeping with this scribe's habits, but we have not found a better explanation of the eta here.

37: 21 $9/10$ art. is an approximation for 21 $51/64$.

40: cf. note to line 2 on the date.

45: Presumably one is to restore [(ἀπτ.) ςδ χ(οίν.)] ε, i.e. a principal sum of 232 ch., plus the 10 per cent in the previous line (23 ch.) yields 255 ch. ($6 \times 40 + 10 + 5$).

46: Pruneti (5n. supra) 180 records Kosmou as the location of the kleros of Hera[. But there is no justification for this. Kosmou is the home of the lessee, but that means nothing: of four lessees from the kleros of Sosthenes in Kosmou in lines 12-30, only one is from Kosmou himself. It seems possible that the kleros had a double name (e.g. Herakleides and Kastor) as so many kleroi in Pruneti's list do.

47: For the various uses of hay (here distinguished between that for cutting, i.e. for storage and use as dried fodder, and that for current grazing, βρώσις), see T. Reekmans, *P.*

Iand. inv. 653.

48: For σκαληκοβρωθέν see *Aegyptus* 58 (1978) 159 n.5 ad line 43.

52: We cannot tell if αὖ προκ. or τὰ προκ. was intended.

53-54: These lines may have been written later than the surrounding text.

55: We have not found this epoikion elsewhere, cf. Pruneti, *I centri abitati* (5n. supra).

56: For the kleros, Pruneti (5n. supra) 194-95.

56-57: It seems likely that the rate for hay applied in lines 15 and 29 was also in use here, viz. 8 T. 2,000 dr. per aroura. In this case one would restore line 56 as χόρ[του (δρ.) ad ἐκ (ταλ.) η (δρ.) 'B,], yielding a correct computation.

68: For the kleros, Pruneti (5n. supra) 170-71.

69: Read κρομμύων; or this is the abstract κρομμυών, found in *P.Bon.* 46 (see Bagnall's reedition [forthcoming]).

72: Perhaps [Ἀριστοδῆ]μου κλήρο(υ) πεδ(ιάδος) Σο[ύεως, cf. Pruneti (5n. supra) 170-71.

73: The payment of 1 art. 5 ch. (45 ch.) at a rate of 3 art. (120 ch.) per aroura, indicates a land area of 3/8 ar. (1/4, 1/8 as it would have been given), which no doubt stood in the missing part of line 72.

88]: If the letter was a sigma, one might restore θέσεω]ς or τῆ]ς; but gamma or epsilon also seem possible (the latter could be part of a regnal year date 32-22-14-5, referring back to 337/8).

2. P.BON. 40

Both sides of this papyrus are occupied by accounts. That on the recto (*P.Bon.* 41) was merely described by the editor because of the "scrittura molto svanita e ormai illeggibile," while that on the verso (*P.Bon.* 40) was published in full, being well-preserved. Two anomalous features of *P.Bon.* 40 led us to a reexamination of the original, first by Bagnall's inspection during a visit to Bologna and secondly by means of a photograph: (1) an apparent personal name appearing in three spellings within three lines: Εἰνᾶ, Ἴνᾶ, and Ηἰνᾶ;⁵ and (2) amid a series of relatively trivial amounts, a whopping 640 artabas of vegetable seed in line 9. The new text below sets out our attempt to make sense of it and eliminate these difficulties. As a result, it should be noted that the following names are to be deleted from Foraboschi, *Onomasticon*: Ἡἰνᾶ, Εἰνᾶς, Ἴνᾶ(), Σ.μότης, Ταπη[.]ριος, Παλεῦτος, Μεψ.

λόγος Νόνα Κούει

ε ἰνδ(ικτίονος) κρ(ιθῆς) (ἀρτάβας) δ, φακ(οῦ) (ἀρτάβην) α

ἐκτης ἰνδ(ικτίονος) κρ(ιθῆς) (ἀρτάβας) ε

⁵ The editor supposed these to be "varianti grafiche, dovute a iotacismo," but η- strains credibility.

4 ζ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) κρ(ιθῆς) (ἀρτάβας) ε
 καὶ ἀπὸ λόγου τιμ(ῆς) χόρτου
 ἔσχεν παρὰ Σεμτοῦ ταπηταρίου
 (δηνάρια) βφ καὶ Παύλου τοῦ μελιτα()

8 (δηνάρια) χ
 η ἰνδ(ικτίονος) λαχανοσπέρμου (ἀρτάβης) ς χ(οίνικες) β

1: Nóna seems to us to be simply a one-nu form of Nónna, for which see NB 236; we prefer thinking that we have nominative where genitive would have been proper to supposing that this is a genitive form of an unattested name. We take Κούει as short genitive of the name variously spelled Κούεις, Κούις, or Χούεις.

2: Assuming that this account was composed in (or after) the last indiction mentioned, the eighth, the earliest possible date is 319/20; 334/5 and 349/50 would also be possible. After 352, however, one would not find figures of money expressed in amounts of denarii less than a myriad. For practical purposes, therefore, we may date the papyrus to 320-350.

6: We think that Σώτου cannot be read.

7: We do not find a suitable word to expand this abbreviation, but we suppose that some occupation related to honey is intended: μελιτάριος, perhaps?

Columbia University
 University of Amsterdam

Roger S. Bagnall
 K.A. Worp