THE OFFICIALS OF KARANIS (27 B.C.-337 A.D.): A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE

by

Margaret Elizabeth Larson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1954

Committee in charge:

Professor Arthur E. R. Boak, Chairman
Professor Clark Hopkins
Dr. Enoch E. Peterson, Director, Kelsey Museum of Archaeology
Professor Herbert C. Youtie

THE OFFICIALS OF KARANIS (27 B.C.-337 A.D.): A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN EGYPT UNDER ROMAN RULE.

By Margaret E. Larson

This dissertation attempts to describe the functions of the officials in the government of the village of Karanis in the Fayum area of Egypt from the time of Augustus down through the reign of Constantine. The most important aspect of this period of Egypt's history was that Rome drained the country of its resources in both money and grain, by a taxation system that demanded so much from the native population that the economy of the country declined rapidly and steadily during the whole period. Not only were the natives forced to pay high taxes, but they had to serve as tax collectors and then as other public officials as well, without salary, while incurring great expense and inconvenience to themselves. Moreover native tax collectors were held responsible personally for amounts that they could not collect. These abuses led frequently to the flight of persons from their native villages and the abandonment of property and crops. This view of Egypt's history is already well known, but it is further borne out by this dissertation. The offices that the natives were required to fill were called liturgies, and these are the offices with which this thesis deals on the village level.

The information concerning this period in Egypt's history comes largely from papyrus documents that have been preserved from Egypt. Many have been published, and these have served as source material for this study.

The officials whose functions have been described are: the village secretary, the village elders, the komarchs, the census officials, the police, the keepers of the granaries, the tax collectors, the boundary officials, and the guards of the canals and other public property. An appendix lists the persons who held these offices, by name as well as chronologically under the title of each office.

PREFACE

This work attempts to make a contribution to a larger body of research that is being carried on at the University of Michigan on Karanis. At the present time there are in progress studies in the administration of the village, the physical plan of the village, and the coin collections and artifacts recovered from Karanis. It is believed that when all aspects of life in Karanis will have been made public from the evidence we have, the picture that will be presented of this village will be more nearly complete than that of any other provincial community of Roman times.

The University of Michigan exacavated Karanis, now Kom Aushim, between the years 1924 and 1935. It had been plundered in areas, as have all the known ancient villages in Egypt, and excavated in part, but large parts of it were untouched. Finds of glass and papyri by local diggers warranted the belief that excavations would be richly rewarded by material illustrative of the life of the period.[1] The belief was justified, for in addition to valuable finds of pottery, wood, glassware, agricultural implements and other artifacts, papyrus documents numbering close to two thousand were brought to light, more than had ever before been discovered at any village site. In the village of Tebtunis, about which more

---

[1] A.E.R. Boak and E. E. Peterson, Karanis 1924-1928 (University of Michigan Humanistic Series XXV) Ann Arbor, 1931, pp. 1-2. For a description of the excavations see this volume and Boak, Karanis: Reports 1924-1931 (University of Michigan Humanistic Series XXX) Ann Arbor, 1933.

had been known than any other village prior to the excavation of Karanis, fewer than one thousand papyri had been found. In addition to the documents at Michigan which comprise the largest collection from Karanis, there are several hundreds of Karanis documents in other collections, chief of which are the Berlin collection and that of the Cairo Museum. The British Museum, Oslo, and Cornell University as well as several other collections contain Karanis documents. Of the Karanis papyri at Michigan fewer than half have been published, but those which contain information of most importance and which were most legible are published, and publication is continuing.

I wish to thank the members of my committee: Professor A.E.R. Boak, Professor Clark Hopkins, Dr. E. E. Peterson, and Professor H. C. Youtie, for their patient aid, which has enabled me to carry out my work. Dr. Elinor Husselman, Curator of Papyri at the University of Michigan, has given freely of her time also to offer many valuable suggestions.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	The Kōmogrammateus	12
II.	The Presbyteroi	27
III.	The Komarchs	36
IV.	The Laographoi	49
V.	The Archephodoi	53
VI.	The Sitologoi	57
VII.	The Praktores and Apaitētai	72
VIII.	The Horiodeiktēs	83
IX.	The Phylakes	87
X.	The Dēmosioi and Euschēmones	90
APPENDIX I		94
APPENDIX II		106
BIBLIOGRAPHY		121

INTRODUCTION

The provinces of the Roman Empire can be considered as belonging to two types politically: those which were assigned to the Roman Senate for administration by proconsular or propraetorian governors responsible to the Senate, and those assigned to the Emperor and ruled by his legates drawn from the senatorial class. The provinces under the rule of the Senate required no military establishment to secure them, while those assigned to the Emperor were frontier provinces, requiring Roman garrisons within their borders to control the populace.[1] Egypt belonged to the latter group of imperial provinces, but it had certain attributes which distinguished it. Like the other provinces, it was defended by the Roman army and administered by officials of the Roman civil service in the higher offices, and its revenues went to the central treasury to be used for the needs of the Empire. But Egypt occupied a strategic position geographically and possessed material wealth in grain upon which Rome depended largely for its food supply. Indeed one third of the grain consumed in Rome came from the rents and taxes of Egypt.[2] For these reasons

---

[1]H. I. Bell, Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest, (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1948), p. 65.

[2]U. Wilcken, Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, Vol. I, Pt. 1, (Leipzig-Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1912), p. 186.

Augustus developed in Egypt a special kind of administration, the purposes of which were to keep the country under the strict control of the Emperor and out of the hands of any possible rival and to exact as much revenue as possible from the land.

To insure his control Augustus appointed a man of equestrian rank as prefect of Egypt instead of a man of senatorial rank. The prefect was in command of the legionary army, the only official of his rank in the Empire who had such a command.[3] Senators and equites illustres were forbidden to enter the country without the Emperor's permission. The prefect was invested with proconsular powers and was the head of every branch of the government, financial, judicial, and military. In Egypt Augustus and his successors were regarded as the heirs of the Ptolemies and Pharaohs, and the prefect, who held his office at the pleasure of the Emperor, was considered his viceroy. As such he was accorded royal honors on visits to temples and, as was true of the Pharaohs of old, he was not permitted to journey on the Nile during its rise.[4] The total sum to be raised by taxation was determined at Rome, but the prefect was responsible for the collection. He held an annual court of assize in

---

[3] O. W. Reinmuth, The Prefect of Egypt, (Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935), p. 119.

[4] Ibid., pp. 1-3, 14, 24-40; Bell, "Egypt under the Early Principate" in the Cambridge Ancient History X, Ch. X, pp. 284-89; Bell, op. cit., p. 66; Wilcken, op. cit., pp. 28-32; J. G. Milne, A History of Egypt under Roman Rule, (London, Methuen and Company, 1898), pp. 122-23.

each of three judicial areas of Egypt, hearing both public and private cases. At this time a general survey of the local administration took place, with local officials submitting their accounts to him for audit.[5]

Egypt was divided into three main parts, with an epistrategos, formerly a civil and military official of the Ptolemies, at the head of each division, as a civil administrator appointed by the Emperor and responsible to the prefect.[6] The Romans kept the old Greek administrative units, the nomes, as the smaller subdivisions of Egypt. Each nome was headed by a strategos, who again was a military official under the Ptolemies, but whose functions now were purely civil. The strategoi, as well as the royal secretaries of the nomes, were selected by the prefect.[7] The functions of the strategoi extended to all civil branches of the government, including the police, the collection of taxes, and the appointment of officials to local offices. Aiding the strategos in his office was the royal secretary, who served as a deputy, and keepers of the public records. The center of government of the nome was the metropolis, which had its

---

[5]Milne, op. cit., p. 123; Bell, C.A.H. X, p. 288.

[6]Wilcken, op. cit., p. 36; V. Martin, Les Epistratèges, (Geneva, Georg and Co., 1911), pp. 83-84.

[7]Tait, "The Strategi and Royal Scribes in the Roman Period" in J.E.A. 8 (1922), p. 172; Biedermann, Studien zur Ägyptischen Verwaltungsgeschichte in Ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit: Der Βασιλικὸς Γραμματεύς, p. 6.

own local government comprised of magistrates responsible to the strategos.[8]

The villages formed the unit for taxation in Egypt. The village government was in the hands of the elders, who as a body assumed responsibility for the payment of village taxes, for the keeping of the peace, and the supervision of cultivation. Representing the state in the village was the village secretary, who gathered necessary information regarding persons and property for the purposes of taxation. Local police officials acted with the elders to keep order. In addition there were numerous villagers who acted as local tax collectors.[9]

For the purposes of taxation an elaborate register of land under cultivation was kept, by the aid of which village farmers were assessed. Special regard was paid to the annual inundation of the land by the Nile. If the Nile did not rise high enough to water the farmers' lands sufficiently or if it rose too high and the land became water-logged, the farmer could ask for abatement of taxes. Failure to keep canals cleaned properly and on time was a further cause of a lack of water and consequent crop failure.

---

[8]Milne, op. cit., pp. 126-69; Wilcken, op. cit., p. 37.

[9]Milne, op. cit., pp. 129-30.

Any change in tenure was reported immediately for purposes of assessment. Lists of the amounts due were drawn up by the village secretary and the taxes in kind were collected at the village granary and transported to the Nile and conveyed to Alexandria for export to Rome. Money taxes were of many kinds. The most important was the poll-tax, paid by all males between the ages of fourteen and probably sixty-two with the exception of certain favored groups of individuals.[10] The hellenized elements paid less than the native Egyptians. The poll-tax was based on a census of the population taken every fourteen years, whereby the head of each household declared the number of persons living in his household and the extent of his real property in the village.[11]

At first the result of the Roman reorganization of Egypt was an increase in trade and prosperity for the country. Egypt was secured against external attack, its internal unity was preserved, and improvements were made in the irrigation system that resulted in the stimulation of agriculture. Growth of trade eastward brought a new wealth to Alexandrian merchants.[12] But this prosperity was short-lived, for the Roman system of taxation worked to impoverish Egypt at a constantly increasing rate after the first few decades of

---

[10]The age limit of sixty-two is open to some uncertainty. See Reinmuth, op. cit., p. 72.

[11]Milne, op. cit., pp. 152-58; Wilcken, op. cit., pp. 205; 208-09.

[12]Milne, op. cit., pp. 24-25; Bell, "Roman Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian" in Chronique d'Egypte XIII, 1938, p. 348.

Roman rule. Although Egypt had been taxed heavily by the Ptolemies, the tribute remained within the borders of the country, but the Roman taxes in money and grain went out of the country, constituting a damaging loss to the Egyptian economy.[13] Even more burdensome than the amount of taxes collected was the Roman method of collecting taxes. The Ptolemies had employed professional bureaucrats as tax farmers, but the Romans slowly introduced a system whereby private individuals were appointed tax collectors, responsible personally for the amounts that were assigned to them to collect. Evidence of this system is found as early as the reign of Tiberius, and by the end of the first century it was widespread. Members of the collector's family or village were made personally responsible for taxes that the collector could not supply.[14] It was not long until members of a community who possessed certain qualifications, including a given amount of property (the εὔποροι) became liable for filling these offices, and in time almost all public offices in Egypt were filled in this manner. These offices, which persons possessing the necessary qualifications were required to fill, are known as liturgies, and those who filled the

---

[13]Bell, ibid., p. 352.

[14]Wilcken, op. cit., p. 214; Bell in C.A.H. X, p. 302; M. Rostovtzeff, "Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A. D." in The Journal of Economic and Business History I (1929), pp. 356-59; J. G. Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement" in the Journal of Roman Studies XVII (1927), p. 4.

offices are referred to as liturgists.[15] Liturgies became as great a burden to the propertied classes as high taxes were to the poor. In some cases appropriations were made to meet the expenses of office or to pay for services, but they were not enough. The only way in which residents of a village could escape the expense and inconvenience of holding an unpaid public office was to flee from their native town or village, and the documentary evidence from Egypt shows that the flight of tax-payers began in the first century. In fleeing these persons increased the burden on those who were left behind. Land that was left unattended by those who had fled was assigned for compulsory cultivation to other persons, and a special tax, the merismos anakechōrekotōn, was imposed on the villagers who remained behind, to make up for revenue lost when the fugitives left. Papyrus documents bear witness to the fact that terror of debtors' prison and maltreatment of those who fell behind in tax payments reached such proportions as to result in the desertion of entire villages.[16]

The situation was not improved when in the year 202, after a visit to Egypt by Septimius Severus, the Emperor decided to grant to the towns a larger measure of self-

---

[15]Wilcken, op. cit., pp. 341-42; F. Oertel, Die Liturgie, (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1917), pp. 4-7.

[16]Bell, Egypt, op. cit., p. 79; Lewis " ΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΑΝΑΚΕΧΩΡΗΚΟΤΩΝ : An Aspect of the Roman Oppression in Egypt" in J.E.A. XXIII (1937), pp. 63-75.

government, accompanied as always by an increase in the burden of responsibility that already weighed heavily upon the propertied classes. In the city of Alexandria and in the metropolis of each nome Severus provided for the establishment of a senate, the nucleus of which was formed by the magistrates already functioning in the town. The basis of choice for public office was broadened so that many town residents could become members of the senate. Thus the whole body of the wealthier citizens were made to assume public office. The senate supervised tax collection and acted as the guarantor of the payment of taxes to the state. In the villages at the same time the office of the village secretary was replaced by that of the komarchs, more powerful officials, who seem to have assumed the functions of the village elders as well. New controllers of taxation, the dekaprōtoi, were appointed by the senate of the nome to supervise collections throughout the nome. The extension of Roman citizenship to Egyptians by Caracalla in 212 brought no change in the status of the natives as tax-payers.[17]

In 297 Diocletian attempted to improve the administration of Egypt by assimilating it to the rest of the Empire. The prefect of Egypt lost his military power, and the country

---

[17]Milne, op. cit., pp. 141-44; Bell, Egypt, op. cit., pp. 91-92; Bell, "Egypt, Crete and Cyrenaica" in the Cambridge Ancient History XI, ch. XVI, pp. 656-57.

was divided into three separate provinces with the prefect heading only one of them. The functions of the officials of the nome in regard to the supervision of the village were assumed by officials of the pagus, a new administrative unit, smaller than the nome. New officials were created, and only a few of those who appeared in the first three centuries of Roman rule in Egypt remained. Membership in the senates became an hereditary obligation, and farmers and tradesmen alike were bound to their occupations. The tax system was changed and assessments were made on the basis of units of productivity. None of the innovations introduced by the emperors did anything to alleviate the basic economic weakness under which Egypt suffered, namely, the constant draining away of its wealth to support the Roman State. Impoverishment of the country went on, later under large landholders, until the time of the Arab conquest.[18]

The object of the present work is to examine the functioning of the Roman system of administration in Egypt in one village, Karanis, through a study of its officials and their duties, and in the light of information that we have on the officials in other villages. Karanis was chosen as a focus for study because of the wealth of papyrus documents

---

[18] Milne, op. cit., pp. 145-50; Bell, Egypt, pp. 99-102; Bell C.A.H. XVI, p. 657; W. Ensslin, "The Reforms of Diocletian" in C.A.H. XII, Ch. XI, pp. 390-92.

that survive from the Roman period in that village.

The village of Karanis lay in the Arsinoite nome, the Province of Fayum of today, a fertile depression west of the Nile, and about forty-five miles southwest of modern Cairo. Before the time of Ptolemy II a large lake, into which the Nile overflowed annually, covered the deepest part of the depression, but in that Ptolemy's reign much land was reclaimed, and the lake was reduced in size. At this time a number of villages sprang up in the newly reclaimed area, among them Karanis, Theadelphia, Euhemeria, and Bacchias. Most of these towns were abandoned in the fourth century, but Karanis, like Tebtunis in the south of the Fayum, was inhabited into the early Islamic period.[19]

The first chapter of this examination of the officials in the government of Karanis concerns the village secretary, the representative of the state in the village, whose functions touched every department of government. Next are treated the village elders, and then the komarchs, who in the third century replaced both the secretary and the elders. There follows a brief chapter on the laographos, the census officer, and chapters on the other departments: the head of the police and the police department, the keepers

---

[19]B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, D. G. Hogarth, and J. G. Milne, Fayum Towns and Their Papyri, (London, Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900), pp. 1, 17-18, 23; Caton-Thompson and Gardner, "Recent Work on the Problem of Lake Moeris," in The Geographical Journal LXXIII (1929), pp. 20-60; Boak, "The Ancient Topography of the Fayum and the Problem of Lake Moeris," in The Geographical Review XVIII, (1928), pp. 152-154.

of the granary and their assistants, and tax collectors of all kinds and minor officials. Finally the appendices contain a list of all the village officials to whom reference is made in the Karanis papyri that have been examined. The officials are listed 1) alphabetically by name and 2) chronologically for each office.

CHAPTER I

THE KŌMOGRAMMATEUS

The kōmogrammateus, or village secretary, was the highest official in the village government. He was the representative of the state in the village, and, since the most important function of the village in the framework of Roman rule was to send its quota of taxes to the state, the kōmogrammateus concerned himself above all with this aspect of government. We do not know whether or not this office was a liturgy. It was usually filled by a resident of the village, or in some cases, when the province of the village secretary included more than one village, by a resident of the chief village. The term of office was usually one year.[1] There is evidence that a fund collected from the taxpayers of the village was diverted to the use of the secretary as a salary. This sum was called the ὑποκείμενα κωμογραμματεία or φιλάνθρωπον κωμογραμματέως .[2]

It was the duty of the village scribe, as his title indicates, to prepare all of the documents necessary to the assessment of taxes and rents. He compiled each year, sometime before the harvest, lists of the parcels of land comprising the total area of his village, recording the character of the tenure of each lot, the crops planted, and the

---

[1]P. Jouguet, La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine, (Paris, 1911), pp. 213-214 and N. Hohlwein, L'Égypte romaine, (Brussels, Hayez, 1912), p. 305.

[2]Preisigke, Friedrich, on the Kōmogrammateus, in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. XI (1922), Col. 1281-84.

revenue each parcel might be expected to yield. Later in the year after the harvest, on the basis of information supplied by the sitologos, he was required to draw up a preliminary account of tax receipts for the year. The royal secretary of the nome, who was the custodian of all the village records regarding lands and crops, audited the account of the kōmogrammateus.[3] The praktores collected the grain and money taxes and took them directly to the state granary (θησαυρός) and bank (τράπεζα). The kōmogrammateus thus had nothing to do with the handling of the money and grain.[4] He kept a register of expenses of his office, which he sent in to the central administration. The kōmogrammateus made loans of seed to the farmers and kept an account of these. He received birth and death notices and notices of emigration and immigration of inhabitants, to and from the village, and at the fourteen-year census (κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή) he received a declaration of the number of inhabitants from the head of each household.[6] He received

---

[3]Harper, "Menches, Kōmogrammateus of Kerkeosiris" in Aegyptus XIV (1934), pp. 18-22. Menches lived in Ptolemaic times, but the duties of his office survived in large part unchanged under Roman rule.

[4]Jouguet, ibid, p. 314; Hohlwein, ibid., p. 306; Preisigke, ibid.; Oertel, Die Liturgie, p. 157.

[5]Hohlwein, ibid., pp. 306-307.

[6]Preisigke, ibid.

petitions from those persons whose property had been rendered unproductive since the assessment, so that they were unable to pay the taxes for which they had been assessed. These petitions were sent to his superiors.[7]

Another prime function of the office of kōmogrammateus was in connection with the recommendation of persons for liturgical offices in the village. Annually the kōmogrammateus submitted to the strategos a list of liturgists and of persons to fill the corvée (labor on dikes and canals). Appointments to the various offices and services were determined by the degree of wealth of the individual. It was within the power of the village secretary, also, to designate a wealthy man to fill a larger liturgy outside the village.[8]

In the absence of the kōmogrammateus or in case of his inability to perform his duties, his functions were taken over by the presbyteroi, acting as a body. The office of the kōmogrammateus disappears from the records toward the middle of the third century, along with that of the presbyteroi. At the same time the office of the komarchs begins to appear in connection with some of the functions formerly associated with the village secretary; it is likely

---

[7]Hohlwein, ibid., p. 307.

[8]Jouguet, ibid., pp. 225-227.

that the komarchs replaced the kōmogrammateus.[9] The last mention of a kōmogrammateus at Karanis is in 214 A. D.[10] and the earliest datable mention of a komarch is 274 or 279 A. D.[11] leaving a space of over sixty years in which we have no information concerning the chief official in the village government.

The greatest number of references to the village secretary among the Karanis papyri occurs in a series of documents of the type known as apographai. These were the declarations concerning persons and property that villagers were required to submit to the officials of the government.[12] There are fourteen apographai κατ' οἰκίαν , declarations regarding persons and their residences, submitted once every fourteen years for the census but only eleven of these mention the village scribe.[13] The usual form of such a document, turned in by the head of each household, included

---

[9]Preisigke, ibid. See also Jouguet, ibid., p. 391.

[10]A. E. R. Boak, Annales de Service XXIX, 3 (S.B. 7360).

[11]O. Mich. 234.

[12]On the apographai see Wilcken, Grundzüge, p. 202 ff.; Avogadro, "Le ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΑΙ di proprietà nell'Egitto greco-romano", in Aegyptus XV (1935), pp. 131-206.

[13]M. Hombert and C. Préaux, P. Lugd. Bat., V, 173, list fourteen documents. Eleven are treated in the present chapter on the kōmogrammateus. The other three (B.G.U. 154, P.Oslo 25a, and P. Lond., 182 b) are treated in the chapter on the Laographoi below.

the address to the strategos of the nome, the royal secretary of the nome, the village secretary, and the laographoi (census officials), followed by the name and place of residence of the declarant. In all returns dated after the second half of the first century there followed a statement that the return was being made in pursuance of the decree of the prefect. Then there began a description of the property occupied by the declarant and his dependents, including slaves and tenants, and a description of the members of the family and an enumeration of the slaves and tenants. There followed a subscription, or group of signatures of persons through whose hands the document passed including the declarant, the village secretary, and the census officials.[14] The Karanis documents do not always follow this form. Two of them are addressed to the kōmogrammateus alone and are not signed.[15] The officials are not always named in the address, so that it is not possible in some cases to identify the office and position of the persons whose names appear in the subscription. It is noteworthy that we have documents from each of the six successive fourteen-year censuses between 147 and 217 A. D., for the fourteen returns cover those dates, with at least one document every twelve to fourteen years. From

---

[14]Youtie and Pearl, P. Mich. Vol. VI, p. 18.

[15]B.G.U. 54 and 58, both 161 A. D.

147 A. D. we find a census return addressed to the strategos and the royal secretary of the Herakleides division of the Arsinoite nome and to Ὀρσενούφι κωμογραμματ(εῖ) Καρανίδος καὶ Διοσκόρῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς λαογράφοις τῆς αὐτῆ(ς) κώμης. .[16] It bears the signature of the declarant and another person whose name is not mentioned previously in the document, probably one of the census officials. It follows the usual form for the apographai. B.G.U. 524, dated 159/160 A. D., is similar in form, except that the single signature cannot be read. The village secretary addressed is Ἀρφαῆσις ,[17] the same person, or at least bearing the same name, as the village secretary named in B.G.U. 54 and 58, both dating from 161 A.D. (Ἀρφα[ή]σι κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) Καρανίδος and Ἀρφαήσι [κωμογράμματεῖ Καρανίδος]).[18] In the two declarations last cited, the komogrammateus is the only official addressed and there are no signatures. B.G.U. 59 follows the regular form, although the village secretary is not named (κωμογρ(αμματεῖ Καρανίδος),and the subscription is lacking. The body of the document refers to the census year, 173/174, and the

---

[16] B.G.U. 95, 3-4.

[17] l. 2-3: Ἀρφαήσι κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) Καρανίδος.

[18] B.G.U. 54, 1 and B.G.U. 58, 1.

return itself is dated 174/175 A. D.[19] B.G.U. 447 (26) is similar in its address(κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) κ]ώμης Καρανίδος).[20] It bears the signature of the declarant and is witnessed by two persons whose names do not appear in the body of the declaration. The document bears the date of November 26, 175 A. D. B.G.U. 60 and 430 are both addressed as customary to the nome officials, the laographoi, and the village scribe of Karanis, and both date from the same census, B.G.U. 60 from 187/188 and B.G.U. 430 from 188/189 A. D. B.G.U. 60 is complete except for the subscription, but of B.G.U. 430 only the prescript remains in which the village scribe is addressed by the name of Ptolemaios. The name of the village scribe is not mentioned in B.G.U. 60. P. Mich. 370 is another regular return, dated August 9, 189 A. D. The kōmogrammateus is not named in the address (κωμογρα(μματεῖ) κώ(μης) Καρανίδος),[21] but the first signature in the subscription is the name of the village secretary addressed in B.G.U. 430, above, Ptolemaios. Below this are the signatures of three other persons, assumed to be laographoi. This declaration, P. Mich. 370,

---

[19] Returns were made as a rule in the year following the census year. See S. Wallace, Taxation in Egypt, (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938), p. 395.

[20] 1.2.

[21] 1.4.

is a part of the family archive of Gemellus, also called Horion. Its discovery with other official family records shows that the apographai were kept as proof that the census report had been filed.[22] B.G.U. 97 and B.G.U. 577, the last two documents in this series, dating from 201/202 A.D., are regular in form, but do not name the village secretary. They both bear two endorsements, those of the kōmogrammateus and one laographos.[23] It is evident from these documents that the process of taking the census in Karanis was lengthy, since for those censuses for which we have two or more documents, the declarations cover up to two years. In the Fayum, declarations were always made in the second year following the promulgation of the edict of the prefect.[24] We may conclude from the relatively large number of these documents surviving that they were important to the household and were carefully preserved.

There are seven apographai of γῆ ἄβροχος , returns of unwatered or uninundated land, in the Karanis papyri, if we include returns from residents of Karanis addressed to the village secretaries of the neighboring villages of Ptolemais Nea and Kerkesoucha. These apographai were submitted annually in the first half of the year by order of the prefect. They

---

[22]Youtie and Pearl, in Volume VI of the Michigan Papyri, p. 18.

[23]Hombert and Préaux, ibid. p. 95.

[24]Op. cit., p. 78.

were usually addressed to the strategos, the royal secretary, and the kōmogrammateus, and endorsed by all of these officials. They mentioned the prefect's order, and specified the tenure, location, administrative classification, and area of the land unwatered for the current year.[25]

P. Osl. 26 a, 163/164 A. D., contains two of these apographai, both of which are addressed to the kōmogrammateus alone (Σοκμῆνι κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) κώμης Καρανίδος and Σοκμ[ῆνι κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) κώμης Κ[αρανίδος).[26] The first of these is signed by the declarant and another person whose signature is illegible, and the second bears no subscription. P. Mich. 366, 168 A. D., is addressed to the kōmogrammateus of Ptolemais Nea alone (Κάστορι κωμογρα(μματεῖ) Πτολεμαίδο(ς))[27] by a resident of Karanis and bears no subscription. The land concerned was near the village of Ptolemais Nea. A similar document is P. Mich. 367, 168 or 169 A. D., concerning land near Kerkesoucha. It is addressed to the strategos, the royal secretary, and the kōmogrammateus (Αἰλίῳ Εὐδαίμονι στρ[α(τηγῷ) Ἡρακλ(είδου)] μερίδος καὶ Σερήνῳ βα[σιλ(ικῷ) γρα(μματεῖ)] τῆς αὐτῆς μερίδος καὶ Α[± 6] κωμογρα(μματεῖ) Κερκεσούχων),[28] but

---

[25]Boak, Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 29, p. 52; Youtie and Pearl, P. Mich. VI, pp. 8-9; Eitrem, P. Osl. I, p. 56; Wilcken, Grundzüge, p. 203, Avogadro, op. cit., Aegyptus XV (1935), pp. 131-206.

[26]Col. I, 1 and Col. II, 1.

[27]l. 1

[28]l. 1-4.

carries no endorsement. The three remaining declarations of unwatered land all date from the early years of the third century. B.G.U. 139 is a completely regular document, dating from 201/202 A. D. It carries the proper address to the nome officials and the village secretary. The village secretary is not named, but his name appears in his endorsement of the declaration (Ἐριεύς κωμογρα(μματεὺς) ἔσχον τούτο(υ) τὸ ἴσον εἰς ἐξέτασιν.),[29] along with the endorsements by the strategos and royal secretary. B.G.U. 108 dates from 203/204 A. D., and is addressed to the royal secretary alone, but it is endorsed by the kōmogrammateus (Ἐριεύς κωμογρ(αμματεὺς) ἔσχον τοῦτον τὸ ἴσον εἰς ἐξέτασιν.).[30] The last of the group dates from March 5, 214 A. D., and is addressed to the kōmogrammateus only (Κόπρῃ κωμογραμματεῖ κώμης Καρανίδος).[31] The declarant lists three plots of land inherited from his grandfather that have been taxable in money, since one produced olives and another was an orchard. He asks that these lands, now grain land, be transferred to the category of land taxable in grain. Then he declares that another plot of land is covered with sand, and should be removed from the list of taxable land. The document is unsigned.

---

[29] l. 21-22.

[30] recto, l. 5.

[31] Boak, Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 29, No. 3 (S. B. 7360).

A declaration of a different type dates from 112 A. D., and is the earliest datable Karanis papyrus referring to the village secretary. It is a memorial by a resident of Karanis attesting to the fact that the writer's father has died, and asking that his father's name be entered on the register of the deceased. It is addressed to the kōmogrammateus alone (Πτολεμαίῳ κωμογρα(μματεῖ) Καρανίδος), and it is endorsed by him (κατεχω(ρίσθη) κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) τ[ε]τελε[ ]η).[32]

B.G.U. 915, late first or early second century, is an official document, parts of which are missing, probably relating to the sale of government land. The activity of the village scribe is not made clear in the document, but a note by Wilcken[33] refers to an analogous document, P. Amh. 68, in which the kōmogrammateus orders a survey of the land to be made, upon orders from his superiors in the nome.

In B.G.U. 457 (Wilcken, Chrest. 252) 132/133 A. D. the village secretary hands over to the praktores (tax-collectors) a prosgraphon, a supplementary report correcting an earlier apaitēsimon or list of taxes owed. In this instance the village secretary is the author of the document addressed to a praktor, (Ἀρείῳ [πρ]άκτορι σιτικῶν πα[ρ]ὰ Εὐδ[αί]μον[ο]ς κωμογρ(αμματέως) Καρανίδος καὶ ἄλλων π[ε]δίων).[34]

---

[32]Boak, ibid., No. 2 (S.B.7359), ll. 1 and 16.

[33]Archiv für Papyrusforschung II, 138-139.

[34]ll. 2-4.

The document deals with a shift of property from one landholder to two (possibly his brothers) and tells the amount that each of the new owners should pay.

In B.G.U. 983, a petition to the epistratégos regarding restitution of property during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161), reference is made in line 17 to the boundary inspector's term of office as lasting through three terms of office of the kōmogrammateus. (οὗτος ἤδη τριῶν κωμογραμματέων).[35]

Reference is made in two papyri to the power of the kōmogrammateus to nominate persons to liturgies. In a private letter of indefinite date, sometime in the second century, a man writes from Alexandria to a friend in Karanis, and at the end of the letter asks that if the recipient knows that the village secretary has put the writer into a liturgy, he inform the writer into what kind of liturgy he has been put.[36] In a document dated sometime before March 3, 197 A. D., a man complains before the strategos of a liturgy that has been assigned to him while he was absent from home and unable to protest in time.[37]

The kōmogrammateus is subjected to an interrogation on a matter concerning the honesty and impartiality of his

---

[35]See also Chapter Seven on the horiodeiktes, below, for a discussion of this document.

[36]P. Mich. 492.

[37]P. Osl. 81.

administration, in a document dating from the end of the second or beginning of the third century.[38] A group of men contend before the strategos that the village secretary, Zoilos, was in the habit of releasing men from police custody during the night, that he allowed a certain bricklayer who had done some work for him exemption from rent, that he had cut wood from the public land and the royal estates, and that he had received money from the laographoi. All these accusations were denied by the kōmogrammateus. The document is incomplete.

P. Mich. 423-424, a petition to the strategos concerning trespass, states that the presbyteroi of Karanis, exercising also the functions of the village secretary (διαδεχο[μ]ένων καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν κωμωγραμματείαν),[39] and an assistant witnessed the acts of trespass in question. This is a proof of the fulfilling of the duties of the kōmogrammateus by the elders of the village in the absence of the former.

One more aspect of the office of the village secretary is revealed by B.G.U. 616, dating from the late second or early third century A. D. Here a man who has purchased land in the district around Karanis asks that the kōmogrammateus come with the boundary official and make a

---

[38] Frisk, Aegyptus IX, No. 3. (S.B. 7368).

[39] 1. This document is dealt with at greater length in the chapter on the presbyteroi, following.

survey of the area, so that his neighbors will not encroach on his land. ἀξιῶ ἐ[π]ιτα[γ]ῆναι [τῷ τ]ῆ[ς] κώμης κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) γενέσθα[ι] ἐπὶ τοὺ[ς] τόπους σὺν τῶ ὁριοδίκ(τῃ).).[40]

P. Fay. 195 verso is a fragment, referring to the supervision of caravans by the village secretary. It dates from the late second or early third century, and its text reads in its entirety: ... ἡγούμ(ενος) πρὸς Ἀντώ(νιον) κωμογρ(αμματέα), ὅτε ἔλεγές μοι ὅτι εἶπε[ς] τῷ στρ(ατηγῷ) ὅτι μεταφέρω τὰ καμήλια τῆς Καρανίδ[ος] ἀπὸ Καρ(ανίδος) καὶ κατάγωσι εἰς [.....] τὸν πύρον .
The ἡγούμενος mentioned is an ambiguous title.

P. Athen. S. A. 37 mentions the kōmogrammateus probably as a witness or as giving his approval to a transfer of property from one category to another. Dating from the years between 138 and 161 A. D., it is a request to the strategos for the confirmation of a transfer. The function of the village scribe in this document is too uncertain to be defined any further.

The line (Κεφάλων κωμωγρα(μματεὺς) Κερκεσούχ(ων))[41] appears in the tax rolls from Karanis under the date of 172/173 A. D. In P. Mich. 381, from the latter half of the second century, a ledger recording work on the embankments,

---

[40] ll. 5-6.

[41] P. Mich. 224, l. 3976.

the word kōmogrammateus appears in the margin of the record. Its connection here is not clear, but we know that the kōmogrammateus was the official who turned in the lists of workers for the corvée.[42]

In a single ostrakon, dating from sometine in the second century, the village secretary appears as the probable recipient of grain paid as a fine (ἀπὸ κατακριμάτων Θ (ἔτους) Νεῖλος Ἀπολλωνίου γενάμενος κωμογραμματεὺς Καρανίδος (πυροῦ ἀρτάβας . . .).[43]

The documents here treated, ranging from 112 to 214 A. D. illustrate the large variety of functions fulfilled by the kōmogrammateus. They also indicate that an individual was allowed or asked to serve for more than one year in this office.

---

[42]See Oertel, op. cit., p. 73.

[43]O. Mich. 1053.

CHAPTER II

THE PRESBYTEROI

The village elders, or presbyteroi, were the most important officials in the village government after the kōmogrammateus, or village scribe. The πρεσβύτεροι τῆς κώμης of Roman times had their origin in a group of officials that existed under the Ptolemies called the πρεσβύτεροι τῶν γεωργῶν, representatives of the cultivators. Although we have no information about this group of officials during the first fifty years of Roman rule, papyri of the first half of the first century A. D. show that the institution of the presbyteroi was in full function, and doubtless had been inherited from the Ptolemies. But the Romans had made certain innovations concerning the institution, for its designation reappears as πρεσβύτεροι τῶν δημοσίων γεωργῶν or elders of the cultivators of state land. The presbyteroi of Roman times represented not only tenant farmers on the state land, but all those who lived on state land, including proprietors and holders of catoecic land. The Romans enlarged the functions of the presbyteroi; under the Ptolemies they had been assistants to government officials, but now they were administrators, in accordance with the Roman policy of placing more responsibility for government on the shoulders of the governed. The peasants became responsible at this time for the cultivation of all excess second-rate land, and it was the presbyteroi who rented out the land

for them and collected payments from it. The presbyteroi were also delegated to collect certain taxes on behalf of the state, so that they stood in a position of intermediaries between the central government and the cultivators. They had the duty of supervising the condition of the canals, and they could intervene in disputes arising from questions concerning the canals or touching agriculture.

As the office of the presbyteroi evolved, the maintenance of order within the village became a part of the concern of its members, and they were often called upon along with the police to take action in matters affecting the peace. In the course of the first century B. C. the name of the πρεσβύτεροι τῶν δημοσίων γεωργῶν was changed to πρεσβύτεροι τῆς κώμης , or in a shortened form πρεσβύτεροι , partly as a result of the assimilation which occurred among the different types of public land at that time and the fact that the presbyteroi intervened in matters concerning private land.[1]

The presbyteroi were drawn from among the wealthiest inhabitants of the village, and the office was a liturgy of one year's duration. They were appointed by the strategos of the nome from a list of available persons sent to him by the kōmogrammateus. They held office as a group or collegium,

---

[1]Tomsin, "Étude sur les πρεσβύτεροι des villages de la χώρα égyptienne" (Bulletin de l'Academie royale de Belgique, Lettres et sciences politiques, Vol. XXXVIII, 1952), pp. 467-502.

and the group may have been divided for different tours of duty. Their number is known to have varied according to the size of the village. It is likely that the office of secretary of the elders which appeared in the second century, was also a liturgy.[2]

The presbyteroi were regular collectors of certain taxes, such as those on sheep, pasturage, and beer. They served in an advisory capacity to the kōmogrammateus, and at times filled his functions, probably in his absence from the village.[3]

We find in a statement directed to the strategos of the Arsinoite nome, dating from August 22, 130 A. D.,[4] that two of the elders of Karanis (Φαῆσις Ζηνᾶ καὶ Σύρος Κάστορος οἱ δύο πρεσβύτεροι κώμης) join with a surgeon of the village in testifying about a case of assault upon an inhabitant of the village. Their testimony was recorded by a nomographos, a notary, and sent on to the strategos. It is likely that the presbyteroi were asked to attest to the condition of the victim as an exercise of the office they held.

---

[2]Jouguet, op. cit., pp. 219-222; Oertel, op. cit., p. 146.

[3]Hohlwein, op. cit., p. 378.

[4]B.G.U. 647.

A document that gives us a great deal of information about the office of the presbyteroi in Karanis dates from 136 A. D.[5] It lists by name ten presbyteroi and refers to "the rest", so that we know the size of the group at this time was at least ten, and almost certainly more.[6] The men named (Σοκμῆνις Σοκμήνεως κ[αὶ] Ἀπίων Ἡρακλείδου [καὶ] Ἀτρῆς Πεθέως κ[αὶ] Ἀπολλώνιος Διοδώρου κ[αὶ] Πασόξις Ἥρατος κ[αὶ] Ὡρίων Ὡρίωνος κ[αὶ] Πτολλίων Χαιρήμονος κ[αὶ] Ἄρων Καλλίου κ[αὶ] Ἄρων Ἡρακλείδου κ[αὶ] Σαραπᾶς Μύσθου) are the authors of the document, which is a certificate issued to one of the ten mentioned, Horion, son of Horion, stating that this man, appointed by them as their deputy for the collection of the beer tax (ζυτηρά) and sheep tax (φόρος προβάτων) has performed this duty properly up to date and paid the sums collected into the proper banks. Three of the elders' names are signed to the document.

The presbyteroi appear again as collectors of the sheep tax in a receipt issued by them under the date of May 23, 206 A. D. (... Διέγρ(αψαν) πρεσβ(ύτεροι) κώ(μης) Καρανίδος ... φό(ρου) π[ρ]οβ(άτων)...)[7] and as collectors of the tax on pasturage (μονοδεσμία χόρτων)in another

---

[5] P. Lond. 255.

[6] The number of presbyteroi varied from village to village with as many as twelve mentioned at Theadelphia. The number within a given village seems to have remained constant. Tomsin, op. cit. pp. 514-515.

[7] B.G.U. 382. 11 6-8.

receipt of indefinite date, in the second or third century (Ἀφροδισί[ῳ] πρεσβυτέρῳ κώμης Καρ(ανίδος) Ἀγχώφις ὑπὲρ μονοδεσμ(ίας) χόρτων).[8]

A census return of July 24, 147 A. D.,[9] is certified on the verso by one of the presbyteroi, unnamed (Ἀπογραφαὶ ἰ-κονισ(μοῦ) | . . . τοῦ πρεσβ(υτέρου)). But the verso is not clear and reading is difficult; this evidence cannot be accepted as positive therefore. The document is addressed, as was the custom, to the census officer (laographos) and the village secretary.

In the Michigan papyri the presbyteroi appear in two petitions by an inhabitant of the village of Karanis, one Gemellos by name, who was afflicted with blindness. This man, because of his affliction was frequently the victim of unscrupulous men who wished to take advantage of him, according to his written testimony, for the Michigan papyri contain four petitions by him concerning wrongs committed against his person and property.[10] The first petition in which the presbyteroi are mentioned is dated May 22, 197 A. D.[11] In it Gemellos complains to the strategos of the Herakleides division of the Arsinoite nome about trespasses and ravages on his property by another man. Two of the presbyteroi, referred to in the document also as δημόσιοι, Petesouchos

---

[8] B.G.U. 334. 11 1-3.

[9] B.G.U. 95.

[10] P. Mich. 422-426.

and Ptollas, went with him to the scene to witness the acts of trespass, "exercising also the functions of the village secretary" (διαδεχο[μ]ένων καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν κωμωγραμματεί[αν]). This is the only case in the papyri relating to Karanis where it is specifically stated that the presbyteroi exercised the functions of the kōmogrammateus. The circumstances are similar to those in B.G.U. 647, concerning the victim of assault, mentioned above, and the presbyteroi might have been performing the duty of the village secretary in B.G.U. 647 as well.

The other petition referring to the presbyteroi dates from 199/200 (?) A. D.,[12] and is directed to the epistrategos. In this document Gemellos states that the presbyteroi, "men without the least scruple, with their habitual violence and arrogance", nominated him to the office of presbyteros under a false name, ignoring the fact that he was an Antinoite and therefore subject to liturgical offices only in his own city. Here is an instance in which the presbyteroi executed one of the most important duties of the village secretary, that of nomination to liturgies. The presbyteroi here seem actually to have nominated Gemellos instead of merely advising the kōmogrammateus to nominate him, for no appeal is made to the kōmogrammateus, and in fact, his name is not mentioned at all. According to Jouguet[13] the performance of the offices

---

[11] P. Mich. 423-424.

[12] P. Mich. 426.

[13] La vie municipale..., p. 222. See also Preisigke on the Kōmogrammateus in Pauly-Wissowa XI, (1922), Col. 1283.

of the village secretary by the presbyteroi was an exceptional occurrence, and yet in the relatively few documents extant from Karanis concerning the presbyteroi we find them taking the place of the kōmogrammateus in two cases, although in P. Mich. 426 this is not made a matter of record. Since the circumstances of the Berlin document concerning assault resemble those in P. Mich. 423-424 it is possible, too, as stated above, that here is a third case of the same substitution of functions, some seventy years earlier. It seems possible to infer that in Karanis the presbyteroi exercised the functions of the village secretary with some frequency, or perhaps their functions and those of the kōmogrammateus were so similar in some instances that they were indistinguishable.

In a receipt issued sometime in the late second or early third century[14] the secretary of the elders of Karanis (grammateus presbyterōn) named Chairemon states that he has received salary and expenses for the year. The receipt is made out to Horos, one of the presbyteroi. This is the only instance in the papyri from Karanis in which the office of the secretary of the elders is mentioned.

There are two references among the Karanis papyri to the hegoumenos, who appears to be chief of the village elders, and one to the prostatēs, who probably held the same

---

[14] P. Mich. 371.

position.[15] The hegoumenos appears in the first century in two unpublished petitions to the strategos.[16] P. Mich. Inv. 5524, January/February, 66 A. D., states that certain persons had made an attack on cattle belonging to the petitioner, a cultivator of Karanis, driving off a calf. The petitioner asks that a written order be sent to the hegoumenos of the village to make an investigation with him ([δ]ιὸ ἀξιῶ γραφῆναι τῷ τῆς Καρ[αν]ίδος ἡγουμένῳ ἀναζητῆσαι σὺν ἐμοί).[17] In similar fashion in P. Mich. Inv. 5549, September 14, 98 A. D., the petitioners, three brothers, who state that they have paid a certain amount of wheat to the account of their brother, who has disappeared, ask that the strategos direct the hegoumenos to make a search for him in order that he may discharge his debts, and the petitioners might obtain relief. The person who has disappeared in all probability was one of those who fled their villages to avoid responsibility and payment of debt.

The role of the prostatēs in P. Cairo Boak 22, about 296 A. D., is similar to that of the hegoumenos in the above documents. Here again is a petition to the

---

[15]P. Meyer in P. Hamb. 35 states: "Single presbyteroi were occasionally designated as ἡγούμενοι κώμης). In an Oxyrhynchos document of the first century there occurs a προστάτης κώμης ; he is perhaps identical with the later ἡγούμενος συνόδου κώμης in P. Grenf. II 67, whom I interpret to be the chief of the college of elders."

[16]These two documents were put at my disposal by Dr. E. M. Husselman, who is editing them.

[17]ll. 14-16.

strategos, but here the petitioners, two women seeking to regain their rightful property from their brother, have already appealed to the prostatēs without result, and they ask that the strategos command that the property be turned over to them. (... προσήλθαμεν δὲ καὶ τότε τῷ γενομένῳ προστάτῃ τῆς κώμης Σερήνῳ τῷ καὶ Ἁρπ[ο]κρᾶ καὶ ἐκε[λ]ευσεν αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ καταλιφθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμῶν πατρὸς ταῦτα ἡμῖν πα[ρα]σχεῖν ...).[18]

Nine papyri have been found that refer to the presbyteroi in Karanis. They date from the years between 130 A. D. and 206 A. D. The names of sixteen persons who held the office are given, with the name of one secretary.

With the disappearance of the presbyteroi from the papyri in the third century, their functions were assumed by the komarchs. In Karanis the first komarch of whom we have record served in 274 or 279 A. D.,[19] leaving a period of almost three-quarters of a century from the time the last presbyteros is mentioned.[20]

---

[18] 11. 9-11.

[19] O. Mich. 234.

[20] B.G.U. 382, 206 A. D.

CHAPTER III

THE KOMARCHS

The komarchs in the beginning of the third century replaced both the village secretary and the elders in the village government. In a few instances the kōmogrammateus and presbyteroi survived, but in such cases they served entirely in an advisory capacity.[1] There were two innovations in the government of Egypt at the beginning of the third century: 1) the creation of the boulē or council, in the cities, which now assumed many of the responsibilities formerly carried on by the central government, and 2) the granting of citizenship by Caracalla, which extended to the villagers.[2] The komarchs, like the members of the boulē in the cities, were given more responsibility than their predecessors had possessed, although they did not administer alone as the heads of the village. In the fourth century they were associated with the ephor, or quadrarius, the tesserarius, and with three others who had no title, to form a council of the village.[3] The number of liturgical offices was increased, too, in the third century, and more responsibility was put upon liturgical officials. The

---

[1]Preisigke, on the Komarch, in Pauly-Wissowa, X (1922), col. 1129-31; Oertel, Die Liturgie, p. 153; Jouguet, La vie municipale, p. 391.

[2]Jouguet, ibid., p. 395.

[3]Ibid., p. 393.

sitologoi, keepers of the public granary, became liturgical officials, and helped the komarchs in the administration of taxes. The office of the komarch was itself a liturgy, and the komarchs nominated their own successors. By thus putting more responsibility upon the villagers through liturgies the Roman government incorporated them more closely in its administrative system.[4]

Outside of designating men to fill offices the most important function of the komarchs was tax allotment and collection, in which they were assisted by the sitologoi. The komarchs kept accounts for the central government, and issued receipts for taxes paid. They disbursed seed grain to the farmers, looked after the safeguarding of the harvested grain, and leased public land for cultivation. The komarchs were responsible for keeping order in the village. They had to make arrests and produce evidence to the nome police, chief of whom in this period was probably the beneficiarius.[5] They also listed expenditures of the village court for the central government. Nothing is known of the police at this time. The archephodos, or head of the police, disappears from the documents after 244 A. D.,[6]

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 394-397.

[5]The beneficiarii were soldiers of long and meritorious service who were exempted from regular duties and attached to the staff of officials with military authority, such as provincial governors. In Egypt they were appointed by the prefect and were directly responsible to him. Beneficiarii with the rank of decurions acted in the third and fourth centuries as chiefs of police in the nomes. Cf. Boak and Youtie in Aegyptus XXXI (1951), pp. 322-323.

[6]Jouguet, op. cit., p. 397.

although an undated papyrus from Karanis and some undated Michigan ostraka which mention the archephodos are thought to date from the late third or early fourth century.[7] It is possible that these documents are dated incorrectly by as many as fifty years, and if that were so, the komarchs must have assumed the functions of the archephodos as well as those of the village secretary and elders.

Komarchs held office for one year, and the term was renewable. In the documents names of komarchs regularly appear in pairs. There may have been only two in office at one time; or the komarchs could have constituted a larger body divided into pairs, who served in rotation. It may be that the village elders disappear from the documents in the third century for the reason that they became komarchs, for they reappear later in Byzantine documents.[8]

The earliest datable document from Karanis bearing on the office of the komarch is O. Mich. 234, December 23, 274, or December 24, 279, mentioned above. It is a receipt given by the collectors of hay to the komarchs (Αὐρήλιοι Ἄριος καὶ Ἡρωνῖνος ἀμφότεροι ἐπιμεληταὶ χόρτου κωμάρχαι κώμης Καρανίδος Σαταβοῦτι καὶ Μέλανι χαίριν. παρελάβαμεν παρ' ὑμῶν χρότου κ.τ.λ. ...).[9] Probably komarchs

---

[7]H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, 287 f. (S.B.7368); O. Mich. 258, 342, 615.

[8]Jouguet, ibid., pp. 392, 394-5.

[9]11. 1-5.

here are turning over the village quota to the epimeletai.

There are two documents bearing on the office of the komarchs from 298 A. D.[10] The first is a tax receipt issued to a komarch of Karanis, Aurelios Ptollarion, by supervisors of the pallia (requisitions of clothing for the army). The writers state that they have received one pallion from the komarch on behalf of the village. Three months later a horse trainer from the city serving the state horses issued a receipt to the two komarchs of Karanis, the Aurelioi Alexandros and Aphrodisios, for one whip-bearer for the service of the horses.

A land survey of 302 A. D.[11] gives insight into details of Diocletian's system of taking the census in Egypt for land tax purposes. The census was instituted in accordance with an imperial decree (θεία πρόσταξις), issued by order of the catholicus (κατὰ κέλευσιν). Landowners and landholders declared to the censitor all the taxable land held by them. Next the surveyor checked the land that was declared dry or tenantless just as in pre-Diocletianian times he checked land that was subject to change in productive capacity during the year. In the document under consideration the owner of the land, accompanied by three

---

[10] P. Mich. Inv. 5056 a, June 15, and 5065 b, September 16, both unpublished. These papyri were put at my disposal by Dr. E. M. Husselman, who is editing them.

[11] P. Cornell 20.

surveyors, a boundary official, the headman and the komarch (παρόντων Ἄβουτος ὁριοδίκτου καὶ Ἀᾶτος Ἀβού[κε]ως μίζονος τῆς κώμης καὶ Ὀλκανολ κωμάρχου), measured the land, which was near Ptolemais Nea, and declared what parts could be transferred from the category of dry or tenantless land to the category of royal or private seed land, with a consequently higher tax.[12] The headman (μίζων) mentioned here does not appear in other documents of this period although he does appear frequently in papyri of the Byzantine period. He was one of the important men of the village, and seems to have been on a par with the komarchs and the boundary commissioner.[13]

A document dated 307/8 from Karanis[14] is an important one for this study because it is the only example from that village of a nomination of officials by either the komarch or kōmogrammateus. In this document the two komarchs designate their own successors. The document includes the address (here to the praepositus pagi, head of the division formerly known as the toparchy and after 307-310 as the pagus), the names of the writers, the purpose of the nomination, the names of the nominees, the subscription of the komarchs, the signature of the scribe, and the date.[15]

---

[12]Westerman, P. Cornell, pp. 108-109.

[13]Ibid., note p. 134.

[14]Boak, "The date of the establishment of the office of praepositus pagi in Egypt" in Memoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale (Mélanges Maspero II), 125 f. (S.B. 7757).

[15]Boak, ibid., p. 126.

The qualifications of the office are not mentioned, but the term of one year is specified. ([Αὐρη]λίῳ Ἡρακλε[ί]δῃ πραιπ[οσίτῳ] παρὰ Αὐρηλίων Ἰσιδώρ[ου] Σαραπίωνος καὶ Ἀ-ειώνεως Συρίωνος, ἀμφοτέρων κωμ[α]ρχῶν κώμης Καρανίδος. Δίδωμεν καὶ ε[ἰ]σαγγέλλωμεν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἡμῶν κι[ν]δύνῳ τοὺς ἐξῆς ἐνγεγραμμένο[υς] κωμάρχας τοῦ εἰσιόντος ἐξ(ἔτους) καὶ ὄντας εὐπόρους καὶ ἐπιτηδίους καὶ [ἱ ἐπι]τελοῦντας τὴν ἐκχριστῖσαν αὐ[τοῖ]ς φροντίδα ἐπὶ τὸν τεταγμέν[ον] ἐνιαύσιον χρόνον ὑγιῶς καὶ πιστ[ῶς] εἰσὶ δέ. Ἰσί-δωρον Πτελεμαίου, μητρὸς Ἡρωίδος (ἐτῶν)μ Πτελεμαῖον Πανισάτεως, μητρὸς Σαραπιάδος (ἐτῶν)λ ...).[16] It is evident that after the establishment of the pagus, which replaced the toparchy for purposes of administration, it was the praepositus pagi instead of the strategos who represented the central government to the villagers.[17]

There are two complaints against the komarchs in the early years of the fourth century, which also bear on the relations of the komarchs and the praepositus pagi. One of these, dated 314, is a petition to the prefect of Egypt by the tesserarius and the quadrarius of Karanis.[18]

---

[16] 11. 1-16.

[17] Boak, ibid., p. 126.

[18] Boak, "Tesserarii and Quadrarii as Village Officials in Egypt of the Fourth Century", P. R. Coleman-Norton, Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson, pp. 322-335, No. 2.

It is believed that the tesserarius was a civilian village official appointed primarily to supervise the collection of certain public imposts levied upon the villages, particularly perhaps the levies imposed to meet the needs of the military establishment. It is certain that he worked with the komarchs, even joining in recommendation for appointments on occasion in the Oxyrhynchite nome, and at Bouto in the Memphite nome joining with the komarchs and another officer of the village in recovering runaways who had sought refuge at Karanis. In the latter case it was the tesserarius of Karanis who, acting alone, received from them the receipt for the delivery of these runaways.[19] The quadrarius was also concerned with village taxation. Both of these officials appear only in the first half of the fourth century, immediately after Diocletian's reorganization of Egypt.[20] If, as Jouguet states,[21] the quadrarius was a member of a council that ruled with the komarchs at this time, along with the ephor and three others, then the tesserarius must have been one of the three nameless officials. In the present document these officials ask legal action against the two komarchs and the praepositus pagi, who work together to conduct a regime of terror and oppression

---

[19]Boak, ibid., No. 1.

[20]Boak, ibid., pp. 332-4.

[21]Op. cit., p. 393. He cites B.G.U. 21 and P. Cairo Goodspeed 12.

(Ἰ[ουλίῳ] Ἰουλιανῷ [δι]ασημοτάτῳ ἐπάρχῳ Αἰγ[ύπ]του παρὰ Αὐρηλίων Ἰσ]ιδώρου Πτολεμαίου Θεσσαλαρίου καὶ Παλήμ[ονος Τιβερίνου κουαδραρίου ἀμφοτέρων ἀπὸ κώμης Καρανίδος τοῦ Ἀργινοίτου νομοῦ χαίρειν. ἡ[μεῖς ἐλάτ]-τωναις ἄγροικοι τὰ δινὰ πάσχομεν ὑ[πὸ τ]ε τοῦ πραι-ποσίτου τοῦ πάγου Θεοδώρου καὶ τῶν κωμάρχων . .).[22]
They charge that the men against whom they are complaining have levied taxes at their pleasure and concealed the use of the money. In addition they claim certain tax money was known to have been diverted to their private use, and that the praepositus appropriated to himself a number of animals belonging to the villagers, and sold one of them to one of the petitioners. Finally it is asserted that the praepositus impressed the villagers' pack animals to transport beans to his house.[23]

The other complaint, undated, but written after the time of the establishment of the pagus[24] (307-310), deals with the unjust allotment of taxes by the komarchs in collusion with the praepositus. The criticism, oddly enough, is attached to a list of the tax quotas assigned to the village for reallotment to individuals by the komarchs, and it was found among the papers of Aurelios Isidoros, himself a komarch at one time. The author states

---

[22]11. 1-3 In l. 3. ἐλάτ]τωναις = ἐλλάτονες.

[23]Boak, ibid., pp. 325-326.

[24]Boak, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LI, No. 3.

that the komarchs assign the quotas as they please, without consulting the tesserarius or quadrarius, without cooperating with the secretary, without making use of lot, and without common justice (καθὼς βούλονται οἱ κωμάρχοι μερίζουσιν, οὔτε τεσσαλαρίων ἢ κουαδραρίων πυντάνονται δι'ὅτι συνδυάζουσιν μετὰ τοῦ πραιποσίτο(υ), οὔτε γραμματέως οὔτε κλήρω οὔτε τω δικαίω φρ[ο]ντίζουσιν, ἀλλ' ὡς βούλονται πράσσωσιν).[25] The point of the complaint is that the komarchs used no regular principles in allotting the taxes. The secretary at this time was probably an official assisting the komarchs, who would keep lists that would aid in the fair distribution of taxes.[26]

In an account of the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century[27] the komarchs of Karanis address the strategos of the nome, reporting money that they have taken out of the bank (τράπεζα) to pay for expenses of their office. The document contains the phrase κατὰ κέλευσιν , which would indicate that the komarchs made this report in accordance with the demand of their superiors. Whether this was a regular yearly or periodical report or whether this was a special occasion is not clear. Since the report shows that the komarchs were allowed to draw money out

---

[25] 11. 8-11. The original reading has been revised by H. C. Youtie.

[26] Boak, ibid., p. 49.

[27] B.G.U. 620 (Wilcken, Chrestomathie I, 186). Goodspeed, Classical Philology I, No. 10 (S.B. 4421) seems to be a partial copy of the same document.

of the treasury, a privilege that apparently did not exist in the time of the kōmogrammateus, there may be some connection between this privilege and the accusations, treated above, that the komarchs appropriated tax money for their own use.

A series of three receipts[28] trace the passage of a special shipment of barley from Karanis, where it was collected by the komarchs, to Alexandria, where it was destined for the use of Hephaistion, who was chief of the Blues at Alexandria.[29] The komarchs received the order to deliver the grain, and they had to collect it from the landholders of the village. They could have purchased it or requisitioned it at the government rate. The latter seems more likely.[30] The komarchs here are komarchs for the third indiction, i.e., 314 A. D., and possibly for the following year, since the two later receipts issued to them in 315 are addressed to them as komarchs without qualification of any specific year, indicating that they were currently in office.[31]

The barley was first delivered to one Herakleios,

---

[28]Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, No. 1, a and b, and No. 2.

[29]A new reading by H. C. Youtie reveals Hephaistion's position.

[30]Boak, ibid., p. 44.

[31]Ibid., p. 45.

an official without title, probably the ἐπιπλόος [32] who issued the first receipt for the grain to the komarchs, (Παρήνεγκαν Γερμανὸς καὶ Ἀρίστων κωμάρχαι κώμης Καρανίδος ἐν μὲν πλοίῳ Παῦσιρίου κριθῆς χωρούσης Ἡραιστίων ...).[33] Then it was delivered by Herakleios to Kollouthos, a ship-captain, who issued a second receipt, similar to the first. Finally, the komarchs issued a receipt to Herakleios for money paid them for the barley, in conformity with government orders (ἠριθμήθημεν παρὰ σοῦ ἀκολούθως τοῖς κελευσθείσης ὑπὸ τῆς ἡγεμονείας ὑπὲρ τιμῆς ἧς παρεσχήκαμεν κριθῆς ...).[34]

We have a receipt without date issued by one Atio, whose official position is not given, for a delivery of wood to the same komarchs.[35] The wood was credited to the account of the village and contributed to the cellarium, allowance of wood for heating and cooking for the soldiers of the Empire[36] (παρήνεγ(καν) Ἀρίστων καὶ Γερμανὸς κώμαρχοι κώμης Καρανίδος εἰς κελλάριον ξύλα ... Ἀτίῳ ἔγραψα τὰ ὅλα).[37]

---

[32]The ἐπίπλοοι were supervisors accompanying ships transporting grain to Alexandria. The office was a liturgy in the villages. Hohlwein, op. cit., pp. 236-237.

[33]ll. 13-16, No. 1a.

[34]ll. 6-9, No. 2.

[35]Ca. 315, P. Cairo Boak 34.

[36]Boak, ibid., p. 58.

[37]ll. 3-6.

A pittakion account of the early fourth century[38] includes a listing of a payment made through the komarch (Ἅρπαλος Σερήνου ἐνδεήμ(ατος) (τάλαντα) γ (ὧν) ἐπὶ πόλεως δι(ὰ) τοῦ κωμάρχου ...).[39]

The Michigan ostraka mention the komarchs four times. Two of the ostraka, assigned by the editors to the late third or early fourth century, contain the phrase δι(ὰ) τῶν κωμαρχῶν (O. Mich. 339) or δι(ὰ) κωμαρχῶ(ν) (O. Mich. 340), in connection with lists of caravans and donkey drivers. Probably the komarchs designated these caravans and drivers. A third ostrakon of this period includes the phrase Ἀιῶν κωμάρχ(ης)[40] in a list of eight liturgical workers, and the last, placed in the fourth century, appears to be a receipt for a payment of an uncertain nature (Πετῶλ καὶ Ει[..... κωμάρ(χαις) κώμης Κ[αρανίδος).[41]

The eighteen documents here treated depict the varied functions of the komarchs, as they assumed office in the third century, replacing the village secretary and the village elders, both of whose duties they performed. From

---

[38] P. Cairo Boak 38. The note accompanying the document, p. 66, explains that pittakion was the name of a special form of tenure of government land, which came to be applied to such leaseholds themselves. The person who held a pittakion was known as a pittakiarch. He managed the property and was responsible to the state for the public obligations of the pittakion. The present document is a list of payments and arrears charged to the cultivators of a pittakion.

[39] 11. 10-11.

[40] O. Mich. 939, l. 7.

[41] O. Mich. 260.

Karanis our information about the komarchs ranges in date from 274 or 279 to the early fourth century, with the last definite date in 315. The names of sixteen komarchs appear in these papyri.

CHAPTER IV

THE LAOGRAPHOI

The laographoi headed the office of the census in the village. Once every fourteen years the head of each household made a declaration (ἀπογραφή) concerning his property, family and tenants (See Ch. II, p.14). One copy of the declaration was addressed to the laographoi, and as a rule the document was sent also to the strategos, the royal secretary of the nome, and the village secretary. These officials endorsed the document before returning it to the declarant. The laographoi prepared a list for the poll-tax from the census returns. Most villages had one laographos, but large ones had more than one. The office was a liturgy.[1]

Among the Karanis papyri there are a total of seven apographai addressed in the regular manner to all four of the officials mentioned above: B.G.U. 95, 524, 59, 447, 430 and 577 and P. Mich. 370. These are treated in Chapter I, on the Kōmogrammateus, above, pp.14-16, along with two apographai, B.G.U. 54 and 58, which are addressed to the kōmogrammateus alone. There is in addition one apographē addressed to the laographoi alone, B.G.U. 154, July 20, 161 (λαογρ(άφοις) [κ]ώμης Καρανίδος) and one addressed to

---

[1]Preisigke, "Laographos," in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. XII (1925), Col. 734-735. Oertel, op. cit., p. 179; Wallace, op. cit., p. 99; Hombert and Préaux, P. Lugd. Bat. v, 40-147.

the strategos, royal secretary of the nome, and the laographoi, omitting the kōmogrammateus (P. Osl. 25, 217 A. D.). We have seen above, Chapter I , that the apographai treated there cover five successive censuses from 147 to 201/202 A. D. P. Osl. 25 brings the total successive censuses to six, ending with the one in 217 A. D. B.G.U. 154 carries no endorsement, but P. Osl. 25 bears three signatures. Which name belongs to which of the officials addressed, strategos, royal scribe, and laographai, is not certain. B.G.U. 154, concerning the census of 159/60, is the only document we have from Karanis that is addressed to the laographoi alone. P. Lond. 182 b, dated between 162 and 175 A. D., is the only known example from Karanis of a part of a census list, prepared by the laographoi for the census of 159/60.

In the examination of a kōmogrammateus before the strategos,[2] considered above in Chapter I, p. 24, the village secretary is accused, among other charges, of receiving 1000 drachmas from the laographoi. These officials denied giving the kōmogrammateus any money (ὁ στρ[ατηγὸς τοῖς] λαογράφοις ἔφηι δεδώκα[τε ταῦτα τῶι κωμογραμ]ματεῖ; εἰπόντων μηδὲ ἔν δ[εδωκέναι . .).[3] There is no indication

---

[2] H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX (1928), 287 f., No. 3.

[3] 11. 40-42.

of the basis of the alleged bribery of the kōmogrammateus by the laographoi.

The eleven documents that tell about the activities of the laographoi come from the years between 147 and 217 A. D. They reveal the names of five laographoi.

CHAPTER V

THE ARCHEPHODOI

The archephodoi were the chief police officers of the village. In the smaller villages there was only one official of this title. The office was an annual liturgy. The archephodoi posted police edicts and enforced order, following the directions of the prefect. They arrested wrongdoers and were charged with the preliminary investigation of crimes in the village, but they served as executive agents only, and had no judicial powers. They protected taxation officials and issued orders for payment of salaries to the various guards who assisted them. There is evidence that the archephodoi may have received a salary, perhaps in kind. The archephodoi were usually cultivators or members of the artisan class, as were the guards who assisted them.[1]

The earliest reference to an archephodos in the Karanis papyri occurs in a petition written during the reign of Claudius (41-54).[2] The document may have been addressed to the prefect, the strategos, the chief of police of the nome, or the centurion at this period; the address is lost.[3] The petitioner states that thieves had stolen

---

[1]Jouguet, op. cit., pp. 217-220; Hohlwein, op. cit., pp. 112-113.

[2]P. Mich. 421

[3]Youtie and Pearl, ibid, VI, pp. 115-116.

two donkeys from him and escaped to Bacchias, a neighboring village, pursued by the petitioner and the archephodos of Karanis, Pancrates, to whom he had appealed. (καὶ ὑπερ τούτων ἐπέδωκα τῷ τῆς ⟨Καρανῖδος⟩ ἀρχ[ε]φόδωι Πανκράτηι ὑπόμνημα. . .).[4] At Bacchias the archephodos of that village, apparently in collusion with the thieves, took the pursuers prisoner and beat and robbed them. The village secretary and elders of Bacchias after three days intervened to release the prisoners. The petitioner asks for assistance, presumably to recover his donkeys.

The document shows that the archephodos of Karanis took an active part in the maintenance of law and order, even personally pursuing the thieves in the present case. Ordinarily the jurisdiction of the archephodos did not extend beyond the area of his village; therefore Pancrates may have been exceeding his authority in attempting an arrest in Bacchias.[5]

P. Mich. Inv. 5688, unpublished, 120-124 A.D.,[6] is a petition to the prefect by a widow concerning an attack made on her two children and her property left to her by her husband. Her husband's brother made the attack, laying claim to the property and carrying off movable property from the house by night. The petitioner states that she

---

[4] 11. 9-10.

[5] Youtie and Pearl, P. Mich. VI, p. 116.

[6] This document has been made available to me through the kindness of Dr. E. M. Husselman who is editing it.

brought in the archephodos of the village who made a written deposition of the aforesaid (ἐβάσταξε [κα]ὶ τὸν ἀρχέφοδον [τῆς κ]ώμης [ἀνήγ]αγον ὅς ἐχ[ειρ]ογράφη[σε τὸ]ν [π]ρο[κ]είμενον. . . .[7]

In the Michigan tax rolls from Karanis (172-173 A. D.) the name of Ἰσχυρᾶς ἀρχέφοδος appears twice.[8]

In an examination of a village secretary before the strategos in H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, 287 f., No. 3 treated above, Ch. I, p. 22 the archephodoi are asked to produce before the strategos those who accused the kōmogrammateus of wrong-doing in office (ὁ στρατηγὸς ..εἰλα[τ]ο το[ῖ]ς τῆς κώμης ἀρχεφόδοις τούτους παραστῆσαι).[9] Perhaps the archephodoi had already listened to the complaints of these accusers, as a part of their duty of hearing preliminary evidence concerning wrongdoers. But there is no indication anywhere among the papyri that they had authority to hear evidence against their superiors, and such the kōmogrammateus would be. Probably in this instance the archephodoi are acting merely as officials of the court, assisting in the carrying out of the routine of the hearing. It is likely that the hearing was instituted by means of a petition on the part of the accusers to the

---

[7] ll. 23-26.

[8] P. Mich. 224, ll. 3418 and 5493.

[9] ll. 11-12.

prefect or the epistrategos, as happened in other cases.

There are two documents in the Berlin papyri (376, assigned by the editors to the second and third century, and 374, assigned to the third century),[10] addressed to the archephodoi of Karanis. B.G.U. 376 reads: Ἀρχεφόδοις καὶ εὐσχήμοσι κώμης Καρανίδος. Ἀναπέμψατε Σεουηριανὸν υἱὸν Πτολεμαίου Σατύρου καὶ Τάσευς γυνὴ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἐνκαλουμένου [sic] ὑπὸ Ζωσίμου Λεωνίδου ἑξαυτῆς.
and 374 reads [Ἀρ]χεφόδοις κώμης Καρανίδος. Ἑξαυτῆς ἀναπέμψατε [.....] Διδύμου καὶ τὴν τοῦτου γυναῖκα Ταμάρωνα ἐνκ[α][λουμένους ὑπ]ὸ Αὐρηλίου Σερήνου Σαραπίωνος. The authors of the documents are officials in the nome administration, possibly the strategos, asking the archephodoi and the euschēmones[11] to "send up" (to Arsinoe) the persons named. The nature of the offense, if any, that these persons have committed is not stated, but the document shows that one of the duties of the archephodoi was to act upon the orders of the officials of the central government of the nome to apprehend individuals.

Two lists of caravans and donkey drivers in the Michigan ostraka, dated late third or early fourth century, contain names of archephodoi. O. Mich. 342 ends with the phrase Νεῖλος ἀρχ(έφοδος) and O. Mich. 615 with δι(ὰ) Νεῶς ἀρχεφόδου. . These phrases, following lists of liturgical

---

[10] B.G.U. 147 is obviously a partial copy of 376.

[11] On the euschēmones see Chapter Nine, below.

workers, sometimes contained the names of komarchs (e.g., O. Mich. 339, 340, 939), and apparently constituted official authorizations or endorsements. O. Mich. 258, in the same period, is a receipt issued to an archephodos for the delivery of doors and a tablet (παραδέδωκι Τιβερῖνος ἀρχέποδος θύρας ια καὶ πτυχὴ μία Πενοῦ καὶ Σώτας.).

From the documents that survive concerning the archephodoi in Karanis we are able to trace various activities of these officials from about 50 A. D. to about 300.[12] Only five of the archephodoi are known by name.

---

[12]The latter date may be inaccurate. Jouguet, op. cit., p. 395, says that the archephodos disappeared from records after 244.

CHAPTER VI

THE SITOLOGOI

The sitologoi were officials in charge of the thēsauros, the granary for collections in kind, of both rent and taxes. Up until the third century the sitologoi assisted the kōmogrammateus, who alone was responsible for the allotment of taxes, and after the middle of the third century, with the advent of the komarchs, the sitologoi became administrative officials, aiding the komarchs in the apportionment of taxes. They were designated by the komarchs at this time, along with other administrative officials.[1] It is questionable whether the office of sitologos was a liturgy prior to the advent of the komarchs,[2] but it certainly was a liturgy after that time. It was the duty of the sitologoi to remeasure grain brought into the granary by the collectors of taxes in kind, to issue receipts for taxes paid, to lend seed grain to the farmers in the fall of the year and collect it at the harvest in the spring, and to send daily reports to the strategos on grain collected, as well as reports covering five days, ten days, one month, four months, and a year.[3] It appears that there were often many sitologoi

---

[1]Jouguet, La vie municipale, pp. 394, 397; Oertel, Die Liturgie, pp. 250-51.

[2]Jouguet, loc. cit., believes it was not. Zaki Aly, "The Sitologia in Roman Egypt", Journal of Juristic Papyrology IV (1950), p. 298, says that it was a liturgy.

[3]Youtie and Pearl, "Notes on Papyri", in A.J.P. 63, (1942) p. 294.

in office at once.[4]

The sitologoi dealt with transportation officials who took the grain to the Nile ports.[5] From the river ports the grain was sent to Alexandria and on to Rome, or used by the military establishment in Egypt.[6]

In the course of the third century the sitologoi were replaced by dekaprōtoi, nome officials, assigned to activity in specific toparchies, who acted in collegia of two or four. The tenure of the dekaprōtoi has not been fixed, but there is evidence that there was a four or five-year tenure in some instances. The dekaprōtoi were municipal officers by election, but they played no part in purely municipal administration. They appear to have been appointed from men of high quality, who had prosperous careers in their own towns. Appointment was by election in local senates on the basis of nomination by an outgoing officer. The principal work of the dekaprōtoi was the collection of taxes, both in kind and in money. Their services were most required at the village granary, where they collected grain and in the Fayum issued certificates to persons engaged in transporting the grain from the granaries to the river harbors.

---

[4]Oertel, op. cit., p. 251.

[5]O. Mich. 927, 930, 1079-1081 are receipts issued by the sitologoi of Karanis for transportation of grain from the granary to the Nile ports of Leukogion and Kerke.

[6]Aly, ibid., pp. 301-02.

They supervised the loading of the grain for transport down the Nile, took a receipt from the nauklēroi and addressed lists of their accounts to the strategoi. They acted in close cooperation with the strategos on matters concerning lands and taxes.[7] The last datable document referring to the sitologoi before the advent of the dekaprōtoi is P.S.I. 1121, 236/37 A. D. The earliest reference to the dekaprōtoi is in January, 247. At the beginning of the fourth century the dekaprōtoi disappeared, and the sitologoi reappeared. P. Leips. 84 shows that the dekaprōtoi disappeared after December, 301. The sitologoi are known to have reappeared in August, 303, in the same functions as before. O. Mich. 499 and 501 place the change between March 24 and June 21, 302,[8] while O. Mich. 900 and 906,[9] dated 296 and March 14, 297 (?) respectively, both of which mention the sitologoi, show that the sitologoi had begun to resume their former duties before the office of the dekaprōtoi was terminated.

The papyri and ostraka surviving from Roman Egypt

---

[7]Turner, "Egypt and the Roman Empire: The ΔΕΚΑΠΡΩΤΟΙ ", in J.E.A. XXII (1936) pp. 2-19.

[8]Aly, ibid., pp. 304-06; J. Schwartz, "Le Nil et le ravitaillement de Rome", Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale XLVII (1928), p. 192.

[9]Nos. 499 and 501 were published in Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection by L. Amundsen, Ann Arbor, 1935. Nos. 900 and 906 were published in Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis (P. Mich. VI), by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl, Ann Arbor, 1944.

that bear on the activities of the sitologoi are numerous. There are many more references to these officials than to any other. The documents from Karanis may be divided into five main groups: receipts issued by the sitologoi for rent and taxes, receipts issued by the sitologoi for the delivery of grain from the granary to the harbor, receipts issued by cultivators to the sitologoi for the loan of seed grain, receipts issued by the sitologoi for the repayment of seed grain, and accounts or summaries of taxes and rents. There are also a few miscellaneous documents that do not fall into these groups.

The earliest receipt for rent and taxes in kind was issued in 139 A. D. to cultivators from Karanis by the sitologoi of Ptolemais Nea.[10] The rent was for revenue and domain land, evidently located near Ptolemais Nea and also at Kerkesoucha (Μάρων καὶ οἱ μέτοχ(οι) σιτολ(όγοι) Πτολ(εμαίδος) Νέας μεμετρή(μεθα) ἀπὸ γενήμα(τος) τοῦ αὐ(τοῦ) ἔτους προσόδ(ου) δι(ὰ) τῶν ἀπὸ Καρανίδος .... καὶ .... Κερκ(εσούχων) δη(μοσίων) διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ Καρανίδο(ς)...).[11] From 153 A. D. we have a receipt for the rent of domain land near Straton, issued by the sitologoi of Karanis (Σαραπίω(ν) καὶ (μέτοχοι) σιτολ(όγοι) κώ(μης) [Κα]ρα(νίδος) μεμετ[ρή(μεθα) [±11 letters] ..τ( )ἀπὸ γενή(ματος) τ(οῦ) ἀ(υτοῦ) ι5 (ἔτους) Στρά(τωνος) δη(μοσίων)).[12]

---

[10] P. Mich. 391.

[11] 11. 5-8; 15-16.

[12] P. Mich. 392, 11. 3-7.

P. Mich. 394, January 3, 163, was issued by the sitologoi of Karanis for dues on an epibolē of Psenarpsenesis (Κάστωρ Ὀννώφρεως καὶ οἱ (μέτοχοι) σιτολ(όγοι) κώμης Καρα- (νίδος) ἐμετ(ρήθημεν) ἐν θησ(αυρῷ)τῆς προκ(ειμένης) κώμης ἀπὸ γενή(ματος)τοῦ διεληλ(υθότος) β (ἔτους) πυροῦ μ[έτρῳ δ]η(μοσίῳ) ξυσ[τ]ῷ ἔπαιτον Ψεν(αρψενήσεως) ἐπιβολ(ης)).[13] By the device of the epibolē small sections of domain land, assessed at the usual high rate of rental, were assigned for obligatory cultivation to the owners of private land.[14] A similar receipt is P. Mich. 395, 183 A.D., issued by the sitologoi of Karanis, Petheus son of Pasion and his associates, for rent of private (catoecic) land at Kerkesoucha, for dues on epibolē, for extra charges, and for dues on private land at Psenarpsenesis. The same form is used in P. Mich. 397, June 9, 204, by the sitologoi of Kerkesoucha, Χαιρήμων Ἀσκλᾶ and his associates. Here the receipt is issued to Horion son of Apolinarius, from Karanis, for dues on catoecic land at Kerkesoucha. Three years later, October 31, 207, the sitologoi of Karanis, Ptolemaios son of Ptolemaios, Dioskoros son of Musthes, and their associates, issued a receipt to the same man, for catoecic dues at Karanis.[15] Another receipt for tax on catoecic land was

---

[13] ll. 3-6.

[14] Wallace, op. cit., p. 20.

[15] P. Mich. 398.

issued at Karanis by the sitologoi Aurelios Longinos, Zosimos son of Leonides, Ktesias, Polydeukes, and their associates, in September/October, 215.[16] There are no further receipts issued by the sitologoi of Karanis for rents and taxes in kind until 306/07, following the period of the dekaprōtoi, although there are a number of receipts on ostraka for the transportation of grain to the ports. In 306/07 the sitologoi of Karanis (Ἰσίδωρος Ἡρᾶ καὶ Ἀνοῦπις Μασκουλλεί[νου] καὶ [.... Α]ἰώνεως καὶ Παν̣τ̣ῆ̣λ̣.. καὶ Πρίσκος καὶ Σαραπίων .... [...] οἱ ἐξ σιτολό[γο]ι κώμης Καρανίδος).[17] attest to the payment of taxes in wheat by a resident of Karanis. The document bears the signature of one of the sitologoi (Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἰ[σί]δω(ρος) σεση(μείωμαι)).[18] The last receipt we have for charges in kind dates from 324 A. D.[19] The payments are for transport charges, instead of rents or taxes on land, as the other receipts heretofore examined have been, and the payment is partly in kind and partly in money (11 1/3 artabas of barley and 3000 silver drachmas): Ἰσίδωρο(ς) Παύλου καὶ Καλῶν(ιος) Οὐεναφρίου καὶ Ἀτρῆς Ἀχιλλᾶς καὶ οἱ κυνοὶ σιτολόγοι κωμητῶν Καρανίδος ... ἔσχαμεν παρὰ σοῦ ὑπὲρ ναῦλα κριθῆς ἀποστελλομένου ἐν Χαιρέ̣ου ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς τρισχιλείας τριακοσίας, (δραχμὰς) Γτ',

[16] P. Hamb. 43.

[17] A.E.R. Boak, "Early Byzantine Tax Receipts from Egypt", Byzantion XVII, pp. 16 f., No. 2. Revised reading by H. C. Youtie.

[18] l. 8.

[19] Ibid., No. 5, II, (a).

καὶ κριθῆς ὁμοίως ἀρτάβας ἕνδεκα τρίτον, (ἀρτάβας) ια γ".[20]

The naulon or naula, was a shipping charge levied on taxes paid in kind, to defray the expense of their transportation from the point of delivery to some other destination.[21]

O. Mich. 167, November 10, 301, and O. Mich. 246, November 11, 301, are the only receipts we have for taxes or rents in kind issued by the dekaprōtoi. The dekaprotōs in both instances is Gerontios, and he appears as the receiver of grain and of beans, respectively.

Among the large number of receipts recording the transportation of grain from the granary to the harbor in the collection of Michigan ostraka the following twenty-nine were issued by the sitologoi of Karanis: O. Mich. 900, 296 A.D. 906, March 14, 297 (?); 881, 3rd century; 872, late 3rd century; 880, late 3rd century; 884, late 3rd century; 867, late 3rd or early 4th century; 397, late 3rd century; 375, 3rd century; 501, July 2, 302; 923, June/July, 302; 502 and 503, October 23, 302; 924, July 23-August 8, 302; 925, Sept. 8 (?), 302; 1077, Sept. 12, 302; 504, Sept. 12/Nov. 12, 302; 505, Sept. 16, 302 and Jan. 9, 303; 509, August 19-November 29, 303; 1078, August 2, 303 (?); 926, 303 A. D.; 512, 305/06 A. D.; 511, January 30, 306; 519, Dec. 14, 310; 523, March 1, 311; 529, December 19, 312; 530, December 20, 312; 543, early 4th century; 1082, January 3, 313.

---

[20] 11. 12-14; 17-21.

[21] Ibid., p. 27.

There are fifty-nine such receipts issued by the dekaprōtoi: O. Mich. 402, April 13, 283; 411, October 1, 287 (?); 419, March/April 289; 430, May 14, 292; 431, May 16, 292, 434, December 7, 292; 435, December 21, 292; 437, 438, 439, and 440, all March 29, 293; 1065, June/July, 293; 446, October 10, 293; 447, April 6, 294; 448, May 28, 294; 449, June 2, 294; 450 and 451, 293/294; 452, 292/294; 454, February 26, 296; 899, March 1, 296; 465, December 27, 298; 466 and 913, January 19, 299; 94, January 23, 299; 467, January 25, 299; 469, February 16, 299; 470, February 17, 299; 471, February 18, 299; 472, February 22, 299; 474 and 915, February 27, 299; 916, March 1, 299; 477, 298/299; 478, September 30, 299; 479, November 17, 299; 380 and 381 late 3rd century; 480, January 4, 300; 481, March 9 and 17, 300; 1073, March 15, 300; 482, 300; 483, April 12, 300; 917, May 25, 300; 485, February 21, 301; 486, February 23, 301; 490, April 22, 301; 919, 301 A. D.; 1074, 300/301; 498, March 21, 302; 499 and 1076, March 24, 302; 1072, late 3rd or early 4th century. O. Mich. 147 records a payment in money to the dekaprōtoi in the third century, and O. Mich. 329, late third century, is a list of caravans, signed by the dekaprōtoi Kastor and Satabous.

In addition to the ostraka listed above, there are a large number of them in which the name or office of the official issuing the document does not appear, but which are the same in form as the ones listed, and were probably issued by the sitologoi or the dekaprōtoi. O. Mich. 1058, dated in

the middle or late fourth century, mentions the collection of grain (sitologia) but does not mention the officials issuing the receipt.

The ostraka usually record the amounts of grain delivered in terms of sacks or of donkeys σιτολ(όγων) Καρ(ανίδος) γενή(ματος) δ (ἔτους) Καρ(ανίδος) σάκ(κου) [γ], (πυροῦ ἀρτάβαι) θ, διὰ Σαβίνου Ἰνν(αρῶτος)... διὰ σιτολόγων μετέβαλεν Οὐενᾶφρις Παήσης ὑπ(ὲρ) γενή(ματος) ιη (ἔτους) καὶ ιξ (ἔτους) καὶ ι (ἔτους) πυροῦ ὄνους πέντε γ(ίνονται) ὄν(οι) ε ..... .[22]

Advances of grain for seed were distributed by the sitologoi in the fall of the year, to the farmers of public land, who gave receipts to the sitologoi for the grain received. The farmers were usually given one artaba per aroura of land. The grain was repaid in the spring following the harvest, at a rate of interest that approximated twenty-three per cent of the original loan, and the sitologoi issued receipts to the farmers upon repayment. A register of the amounts of seed grain distributed was kept by the sitologoi.[23] Among the papyri from Karanis there are 103 receipts issued by farmers to the sitologoi for the loan of seed grain. Ninety-one of these receipts are treated by Goodspeed in

---

[22] O. Mich. 881 and 924.

[23] Goodspeed, E., Chicago Studies in Classical Philology 3 (1902), p. 1; Kenyon, Greek Papyri in the British Museum, I, pp. 88 and 95; Viereck, Hermes XXX, p. 108.

Chicago Studies in Classical Philology 3 (1902), including the following documents from the Berlin collection: B.G.U. 31, 104, 105, 107, 160, 167, 170, 171, 172, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 262, 263, 278, 279, 280, 284, 285, 294, 331, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 516, 517, 626, 701, 720, and 721, all of which are a part of the same find of papyri. These documents date from the year 158/159, with the exception of Nos. 6, 154/55 (B.G.U. 202); 36, 156/57 (B.G.U. 171); 42, 156/57 (B.G.U. 701); 43, 153/54 (B.G.U. 201); 46, 151/52, and 5, 10 and 42, which are undated. There are nine more receipts from the same group in P. Cairo Goodspeed:[24] Nos. 16-24. Here again the date is 158/59, with the exception of No. 17 (144/45). Belonging to this group, also is P. Aberdeen 49, dated 158 A. D. and probably P. Got. 2 (153/54). None of these receipts names the sitologoi, but addresses them as a body, and all use the following general formula or a shorter variation of it: Σιτολ(όγοις) Κ(α)ρανίδ(ος) . Ἔσχον προ(χρείαν) χειρόγρα(φον) σπερμάτ(ων) κβ (ἔτους) Ἀντωνείνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου β̄ κληρ(ουχίας) Μύσθης Πεθέως Καρ(ανίδος) βασιλ(ικῆς) ... .[25] In the shortened form of the document the address to the sitologoi is omitted. The last datable

---

[24]E. Goodspeed, Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum together with Papyri of Roman Egypt from American Collections (University of Chicago Decennal Publ.). Chicago, 1902.

[25]P. Cairo Goodspeed 16.

receipt for the loan of seed, P. Hamb. 66, is dated either Oct./Nov. 164 or as late as Oct./Nov. 196. In each receipt the area of land for which the loan is taken is mentioned, in terms of cleruchies or subdivisions of land in the territory of and surrounding Karanis. This land area included the villages of Kerkesoucha, Ptolemais Nea, Psenarpsenesis, and Patsontis.[26] P. Cairo Boak 39, 309 A. D., is a receipt of a different type issued by a farmer to the sitologoi of Karanis for a loan of wheat. Here it appears that the wheat is not to be used for seed, since the transaction occurred after the season for seeding, and the rate of interest agreed upon is fifty per cent of the loan. Probably this is an instance in which a delinquent taxpayer resorted to the sitologoi for a loan,[27] and it is the only such instance to be found among the papyri from Karanis.

In contrast to the large number of receipts from Karanis issued to the sitologoi for the loan of grain, there is only one receipt issued by the sitologoi for the repayment of grain, B.G.U. 188, May 13-August 15, 186 A. D. This document records in detail the repayment on several different dates, of grain from different cleruchies.

---

[26]P. Viereck, Hermes XXX, pp. 116-123, discusses the outlying areas and their relationship to Karanis. Turner in P. Aberd, p. 50, believes the second part of the formula should read "Εσχον προσφ(ώνησιν) χειρογρα(φήσας) σπερμ(άτων) to be translated "having put my hand to a declaration on oath."

[27]P. Cairo Boak 39, note.

Apparently as each area was harvested the loan for the seed used in that area was repaid. The document follows the usual form of a receipt by the sitologoi.

The earliest account we have from the area of Karanis is one written by the sitologoi of Ptolemais Nea and Pharbaitha, dated sometime in the second century.[28] It is a tax roll, a summary of payments from different cleruchies in or near the villages of Ptolemais Nea and Pharbaitha, credited to the sitologoi in the other villages within the area. The system functioned in the following fashion. For the collection of taxes on natives of a certain village (which we will designate "A", who have moved into another village area ("B"), the tax collectors in village A assessed the collectors in village B for the amount. The collectors of village B collected the amount and delivered it to their own granary to be credited to the accounting of village A. Village A also collected amounts owing to the collectors of village B from village B natives residing in the area of A. B.G.U. 835 (216/217 A. D.), is an example from Karanis of this practice. In this document, an account, the sitologoi of Karanis report taxes collected for the villages of Hiera Severos and Kerkesoucha. At the end of a year the accounts of the villages were compared and any difference was rectified by carrying the excess grain from one village to the

---

[28] P. Mich. 375.

other. All the collections of a granary were reported to the nome officials.[29]

From the early third century there are four monthly accounts issued by the sitologoi of Karanis to the strategos.[30] Following the address to the strategos in each of these documents there is a list of the amounts measured into the granary for different taxes and rents in kind. There is also one account in the form of a short annual summary.[31] There is one account among the Michigan ostraka.[32] It is a record of a payment of a tax in money to Dioskoros, sitologos, by Markos, also a sitologos. Another type of account is a report by four sitologoi of Karanis, Aurelioi Antonios, Isidoros, Ouenaphreos, and Harpalos, December 5, 312 A.D., on arrears in grain collections from the previous year, together with arrears carried on the books of the sitologoi from earlier harvests.[33]

Among the miscellaneous documents concerning the sitologoi there are two receipts issued by the ἀποδέκται πιστικίου (collectors of an extraordinary wheat tax) to

---

[29]Preisigke, Girowesen im greichischen Ägypten, pp. 91-92.

[30]B.G.U. 534, Oct.-Nov. 216; 529, May/June, Apr./May, and July, 216; 64, Jan./Feb. 216; 835, Jan. 7, 217.

[31]B.G.U. 716.

[32]O. Mich. 706.

[33]Boak, in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LI, pp. 35-60.

the sitologoi Aurelioi Isidoros, Kopres, and Neas, August 14 and November 10, 309 A.D.[34] In a private receipt for rent, 312 A.D.,[35] the writer gives credit to the man paying the rental for a certain amount of wheat paid during the year to the sitologoi from the land rented. Presumably the owner was responsible for this amount owed to the treasury, in rent or taxes, and deducted it from the rent of the tenant. B.G.U. No. 621 is a receipt issued by the canal guards (ὑδροφύλακες) to the sitologoi of Karanis, between 174 and 176 A.D., for salary due them. This is the only example we have in which the sitologoi appear as disbursers of state funds for services. P. Cairo Goodspeed 30, dated 191-192 A.D., an account of expenditures of a resident of Karanis, lists payments to the sitologoi three times.

In addition to the documents discussed above that concern the sitologoi, there are a number of late third century and early fourth century documents in the Cairo Museum, many of them unpublished, that throw light on the career of Isidoros, about the time that he served as sitologos. Some of these documents will soon be brought together by A.E.R. Boak in The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology in an article entitled "Politai as Landholders at Karanis in the Time of

---

[34] P. Cairo Boak 24 and 25.

[35] P. Cairo Boak 20.

Diocletian and Constantine." Not all of them concern Isidoros in his capacity as a sitologos, but, since the record of his career is the most nearly complete of any villager who held office in Karanis, and is therefore of especial interest, it is not out of place to mention those documents concerning Isidoros that will be dealt with in Professor Boak's article.

The article discusses two reports of grain collections submitted by Isidoros and his fellow sitologoi of Karanis for the year 308 to superior officials examining their accounts. One of these reports, partially published (Boak, H.S.C.P. LI (1940) 34-60, No. 4), dated 312, has been mentioned above, page 69. It is a summary of returns of grain from different categories of land. The other report, Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57033, unpublished, lists collections in more detail.

The other documents mentioned are receipts for payments of rent issued by citizens of nearby towns, holding land in Karanis, to Isidoros, who rented or leased the land from them. These include P. Cairo Boak 13 and 26, 296 A.D; 4, 300 A.D.; 27, 304 A.D.; 19, 309 A.D.; 2 and 7, 312 A.D.; and 30, 314-315 A.D. and the following unpublished documents: Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57692, 306 A.D. and 57035, 309 A.D.

CHAPTER VII

PRAKTORES AND APAITĒTAI

Praktores as tax collectors in the Arsinoite nome appear as early as the first century A.D. They replaced an earlier tax system under which taxes were farmed by the Romans to telōnai. The telōnai were retained as collectors of indirect taxes, such as customs duties and sales taxes, after the praktores became the official collectors of direct taxes. The praktores mentioned without any qualifying title in the Fayum documents of the second century can be identified with the praktores argurikōn, collectors of taxes in money, although their full title is not always given. The praktores or praktores argurikōn collected the poll-tax, the dike-tax, various assessments for guards, land taxes in money, nomarchic taxes, taxes on animals, taxes paid by priests and temples, various assessments of a general nature, phoroi (charges for rental of state property and rights) the syntaximōn, the arithmetikon katoikōn (tax for the maintenance of a register of catoecic land), occasionally certain trade taxes, and sundry miscellaneous taxes. The increasing use of extraordinary levies of crown taxes required special collectors (praktores stephanikōn).[1] Praktores sitikōn collected certain grain

---

[1]Wallace, op. cit., pp. 288; 306-07. The syntaximōn was a term applied to a method of paying the high poll-tax, plus certain minor taxes, and additional charges, to the central government. It was often paid in installments. Wallace, ibid., p. 123.

taxes, and the collection of money for the settlement of claims decided in court was in the hands of the praktores xenikōn. The praktores argurikōn had a number of assistants: cheiristai, boēthoi and grammateis. The duration of the term of office of the praktores was not fixed; some praktores seem to have served for more than a year.[2] The praktores were the most important tax-collecting officials in the village. They were aided by the apaitētai, who were collectors of arrears, as well as of certain current taxes.

The papyri from Karanis contain thirty receipts issued by the different praktores between the years 103 or 104 and 219/20 or 223/24. There are examples of payments of many types of taxes among them. The earliest, from 103 or 104 A.D., is a receipt for a payment of a tax on chick-peas (εἰς λόγον δαπάνης κρίου...) issued by Sambas, praktōr argurikōn of Karanis or of Theoxenos.[3] P. Mich. 383, 106-109 A.D., is a series of six receipts for different taxes. In three of them the payments are stated to have been made through Ptolemaios, praktōr argurikōn of Karanis. In Column I the charges are for syntaximon (poll-tax), phylakon (tax for support of the

---

[2]Hohlwein, op. cit., pp. 375-76.

[3]P. Jand. 29. The quotation is from line 4. See Wilcken, Archiv VI, 297.

guards), balaneion (tax for upkeep of the public baths), epikephalion (any tax imposed per capita), and desmophylakon (tax for support of prison guards). In Column II, l. 17, the charges are for syntaximon, and phylakon, and in the same line Ptolemaios is mentioned a second time, here as the recipient of phylakon and balaneion. In the same document, Column II, line 20, the cheiristai Kastor and Apion are named as the recipients of syntaximon, and in Column II, line 25, it is stated that garden taxes are paid through these two men.

Horion and his associate praktores of Karanis issue a receipt for oikopedon (a tax on building sites) on August 26, 131.[4] From 145 A.D. there is a receipt issued by Psenesis and his associate praktores argurikon for the payment of the camel tax.[5]

B.G.U. 273, 148 (?) A.D., is a receipt issued to the praktores of Karanis, doubtless by a bank, although it is not stated who is issuing the receipt. B.G.U. 991, 151 A.D., is a receipt addressed to Dion χειριστής (assistant) by the praktōr Isidoros of Karanis, for money received from collections. The dike-tax (χωμάτων) is mentioned in B.G.U. 391, November 1, 154, issued by Socrates and his associate praktores argurikōn of Karanis, and shipping charges (naulon)

---

[4]B.G.U. 761 and Preisigke, Berichtigungsliste I, 64.

[5]Grenfell, Greek Papyri, Series II, 52.

in B.G.U. 645, June 25, 157, where the names of the praktores argurikōn of Karanis are missing, since the papyrus is torn.

The Michigan papyri contain a series of receipts for garden taxes (eidē) from 172 to 186 A.D., issued by praktores argurikōn. In P. Mich. 384, 172-? A.D., it is stated that the payments were made to Eudaimon and his associate praktorès argurikōn of Kerkesoucha. In the same document there are two incomplete receipts by different hands, and the names Ptolemaios and Herakl- appear to be the names of the persons to whom payment was made. The titles of the officials are missing, but they are probably praktores argurikōn also. P. Mich. 385, 182-185 A.D., line 36 and P. Mich. 386, 186 A.D., line 3, contain the name of Σώρος as the praktōr argurikōn issuing two receipts for garden taxes. P. Mich. 385, which is a series of several receipts, contains the partial name Σ-ρ-, in two other receipts,[6]

B.G.U. 342, September/October 184 A.D., is a receipt for arithmetikon katoikōn (a tax for the maintenance of a register of catoecic land), issued by Kastor and his associate praktorès argurikōn of Karanis. In 188 A.D., there is an example of a receipt issued by praktores argurikōn of Karanis for the crown tax.[7] This transaction took place before special collectors of the crown tax were instituted.

---

[6] ll. 2, 24.

[7] P. Mich. 387.

At Karanis these special collectors (praktores stephanikōn) appear first in B.G.U. 452, 220 A.D.

In addition to the receipts for eidē mentioned above, there are several later receipts for eidē. One was issued April 28, 200 A.D., for the preceding year by Herakleides and his associate collectors of the money taxes perhaps of Ptolemais Nea (B.G.U. 215 and Berichtigungsliste I, 26), and another one, undated, by a man of the same name, designated "praktōr" of Ptolemais Nea.[8] A receipt for garden taxes dated second or third century was issued by Dionysios and Leilas and their associate praktores argurikōn of the same village.[9]

B.G.U. 791 contains two receipts for the syntaximon, one dated December 15, 205, and the other December 26, 205. The receipts were issued by Polion and his associate praktores argurikōn of Karanis. O. Mich. 126, 219/20 or 223/24 (?), is a receipt issued to Aurelios Serenos, collector of money taxes of Karanis, for payment for rent of a palm grove (φόρος φοινίκων).

There are two documents which contain receipts issued by praktores stephanikōn. The first, B.G.U. 62, contains one issued by Loukios and his associates, from Ptolemais Nea, dated September 24, 199. The other document, B.G.U. 452, contains a list of payments made to Aurelios Ptolemaios

---

[8] B.G.U. 65.

[9] B.G.U. 779

from Karanis, dating from December 4, 220, to September 2, 222.

P. Mich. 390, 215 A.D., is a receipt for the payment of the annona of cheap wine, issued by Ptollarion and his associate praktores of Karanis.

In addition to these receipts there are several issued by the cheiristai and the grammateis, both assistants of the praktores. P. Mich. 382, 87-90 and 102/103 (?) A. D., contains three receipts by the cheiristēs for syntaximon (poll-tax). In the first (col. i, l. 3), the official's title is restored and his name not given. In the other two (col. ii, l. 10 and col. vi, l. 32), the incomplete name Πτολ( ) χειριστής is given. In P. Mich. 383, mentioned above in connection with the praktores, there are two receipts issued by the cheiristai Kastor and Apion. In the first (column II, line 20), the tax is the syntaximon. In the second (column III, line 25), the payment is for garden taxes. P. Hamb. 42, January/February, 216, is a receipt issued by the grammateus of the collectors of money taxes of Karanis, Gaios Aurelios son of Melas, for payment of the sheep tax, and B.G.U. 222, April 17, 215, was issued by Aurelios Zosimos, holding the same official title, for payment of prosodos, rent of revenue land.

A number of other documents bear upon the activities of the praktores of Karanis. B.G.U. 457, 132/33 A.D., discussed above, Chapter I, page 22, is a notification by the

village secretary of Karanis to the praktōr sitikōn Areios, that a certain property has changed hands. It specifies the amounts of taxes or rental for which the new owners are responsible. The document shows that in this period it was the kōmogrammateus who determined the amounts of taxes or rental to be exacted, and charged the praktores with the collection. In B.G.U. 330, January 31, 153, the kōmogrammateus also sends to the praktores information relative to the collection of a certain tax.

In B.G.U. 970, March 28, 177, following a long account of an attempt to recover money placed as a bond in court by a resident of Karanis, the praktōr xenikōn is mentioned. Apparently the writer had appealed to this official for help, but the document is partly illegible in this passage, and the exact meaning is elusive (Ἀχ-[ρι] δὲ οὗ [ἄν? τὰ?] ἐξῆς ἐπιτελῶ διὰ τοῦ ξενικῶν πρακτ[ο-ρος]..... ἡ παρεκόμισα ενεχυ[ρ..).[10]

B.G.U. 72, February 22, 191, is a petition to the strategos by Sabinos son of Zosimos, praktōr, for help against a certain unknown person who by night damaged his crops. There is no apparent reason for the damage, and the writer acts as any private citizen in this instance to petition for restitution.

---

[10] 11. 25-26.

On May/June 2, 193, a resident of Karanis complains against the two praktores sitikōn, their secretary and their assistant, who invaded his property when he was unable to pay the small amount remaining on taxes he owed, and stole his mother's robe while he was in the field. (Ἕνεκα οὖν τῆς λοιπῆς ἀρτάβης μιᾶς, ἐμοῦ ἐ[ν] ἀγρῷ ὄντος, ἐπε[ι]-σῆλθαν τῇ ο[ἰ]κίᾳ μου οἱ πράκτορες τῶ[ν σ]ιτικῶν. Πετε.[..]-.τ.ελῶ [κ]αὶ Σαραπίων Μάρωνος καὶ ὁ τούτων γραμματεὺς Πτολε-μαῖος σὺν καὶ ὑπη[ρ]έ[τ]ῃ Ἄμμων[ί]ῳ [κ]αὶ ἀφήρπα[σαν] τὸ τῆς[μη]τρός μου ἱμά[τι]ν ...).[11]

Again, in August, 198, a petition is directed to the strategos against Kastor the cheiristēs, who is accused of having attempted extortion against the petitioner and assaulted him and his mother.[12]

In B.G.U. 261, second or third century, a private letter, a man writes to his brother among other matters to give the praktores of Kerkesoucha a certain amount of money.

P. Cairo Boak 1, 297 A. D., is an edict of the prefect of Egypt, which put into effect the edict of Diocletian for the reorganization of the tax system of Egypt. A part of it embodies a warning to the praktores to work to the best of their ability, under the threat of capital punishment for disobedience (ᾧ [ν]αμιμην[ήσ]κονται δὲ καὶ

---

[11] B.G.U. 515 ll. 11-20

[12] P. Mich. 425.

οἱ πραικτῆιες ἑκάστου εἴδους πάσῃ δυνάμι παραφυλάττειν [εἰ] γάρ τις παραβὰς ὀφθείη κεφαλῇ κινδυνεύσι).[13] It would seem from this document and the complaints that we have against the praktores and their assistants that these officials did not always work in the public interest, but used their offices frequently for extortion. It may be that in the case of the destruction of one praktōr's crops (B.G.U. 72) mentioned above, p. 78, that this action was taken as a means of revenge for what the offender considered injustice done him by the praktōr.

The grammateus appears in two documents other than the receipts mentioned above. It is impossible to be sure in either of them whether or not this official is the assistant to the praktores or to some other official. He is referred to simply as the "grammateus". In O. Mich. 1004, first century, Kastor, grammateus, writes an order to one Marres (another grammateus), (Μαρρῆ (τι)) (ὁμοίως)) to pay to Thoteus, a granary guard, a certain amount of wheat. O. Mich. 1053, third century, is a record of the delivery of a camel: Πτολεμαῖος γραμ(ματεὺς) κάμηλ(ος) εἷς . There is no indication of the position of the official issuing the document.

In the petition to the strategos concerning trespass, treated above, Chapter II, page 32, (P. Mich. 423-24) the

---

[13] 11. 18-20.

petitioner states that the acts of trespass were made known through the praktores sitikōn, this in all probability because the damage done to the crops by the trespassing would have caused the petitioner difficulty in paying the usual assessment for his property.

In the Michigan tax rolls, 172-74 A.D., payments to the praktores are listed on seven occasions.[14] P. Cairo Goodspeed 30, 191-92 A.D., an account of a man of affairs, lists one payment made to the praktores katoikōn of Karanis.[15]

There are several documents relating to the ἀπαιτηταί, among the Karanis papyri. One is dated February 10, 181 A.D., and includes two receipts for the payment of arithmetikon katoikōn to the apaitētai of Karanis Διέγρα-ψε) Ἥρωνι καὶ μετ[ό]χ(οις) ἀπαιτ(ηταῖς)Καρ(ανίδος) Ἀπί-ωνι Πολυνείκου ἀριθ(μητικοῦ) κ(ατ)οί(κων) εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ... καὶ εἰς Πεθέα Ἀφείους ὁμοίως ἀριθ(μητικοῦ) [κ(ατ)οί(κων) ...).[16] Two of them from the Isidoros archive are reports of chaff collections.[17] One of the documents, P. Cairo Boak 23, 314 A.D., is a report of Aurelios Isidoros and Aurelios Seuthes, two former apaitētai achyrōn, who assumed the office in 311 A.D., to a high official who is

---

[14] P. Mich. 224, ll. 6332, 6333, 6341, 6343, 6388, 6402, 6417.

[15] Col. xxi, l. 18.

[16] B.G.U. 342, ll. 2-5; Berichtigungsliste I, 40.

[17] Isidoros was a resident of Karanis who held several village offices. His papers comprise the most complete record we have of the life and activities of any village official in Egypt under the Roman Empire.

inspecting their records of collections and deliveries. This report lists chaff collected by the two apaitētai together. P. Cairo Boak 21, on the other hand, which appears to be a companion to this document, lists collections for the year 311 made to one or the other of the two apaitētai individually, and to other persons who appear to have been their agents. This chaff was collected for shipment to Alexandria. There are two receipts in the Isidoros collection issued by apaitētai kreōs (collectors of meat).[18] The apaitētai naulōn issued receipts in the same group for money taxes, of which two were general taxes,[19] one was on chaff,[20] and one was on wood and boat repair.[21] The naulon or naula was a shipping charge levied on taxes paid in kind to defray the expense of their transportation from the point of delivery, where the payer received the receipt, to some more distant destination.[22] The apaitētai also issued two receipts in this group for an assessment of an uncertain nature termed telē basilika.[23]

---

[18]A.E.R. Boak, "Early Byzantine Tax Receipts from Egypt", Byzantion XVII, pp. 16-28, Nos. 3 and 4 (b).

[19]Ibid., Nos. 4(a) and 5, 11(B).

[20]Ibid., No. 5, III.

[21]Ibid., No. 5, IV.

[22]Boak, ibid., p. 27.

[23]Ibid., Nos. 5, I, ll 1-8 and 5, I, ll. 8-11.

CHAPTER VIII

THE HORIODEIKTĒS

The horiodeiktēs was the village official in charge of regulating boundaries. Together with the kōmogrammateus, and later with the gnōstēr of the village, who kept a list of tax-payers, and with the geōmetrēs (a surveyor, a nome official), he undertook the delineation of both private and public property. He also kept a land register. His office was probably a liturgy of the propertied class in the village. We have evidence that it existed from the second to the fourth centuries, and that more than one person could serve at one time as boundary commissioner in the same village area.[1]

The first example of a document mentioning the horiodeiktēs in Egypt dates from the time of Antoninus Pius (138-161 A.D.) and comes from Karanis (B.G.U. 983). The document is a petition to the epistrategos, and the horiodeiktēs is accused of holding office illegally for six years, instead of the usual maximum term of three years.[2] (κἀθολικῶς, κύριε, δια[ταχθέντος πλέον τρι]ετίας (?) μὴ [ὁ]ριοδικτεῖν, οὗτος ἤδη τριῶν κωμογραμματέων [ca. 15 letters missing] ... ἐξαετε[ῖ] χρόνῳ ὁριοδείκτης τυγχάνει παρὰ τὰ ἀπειρημέν[α] .[3]

---

[1] Oertel, op. cit., pp. 181-182.

[2] According to P. Meyer, P. Giss. 58, 2f, the liturgy itself was for one year, but it was customarily extended up to a period of three years.

[3] ll. 16-18.

Dating from the second century, too, are the Michigan tax rolls from Karanis, which list the name of one Sabinos, horiodeiktēs, three times (P. Mich. 223, l. 2711, 172-173 A.D., P. Mich. 224, l. 2389, 172-173 A.D., P. Mich. 225, l. 2929, 173-174 A.D.).

In B.G.U. 616, treated above in Chapter I on the kōmogrammateus, a landholder of Karanis asks that the village scribe come to measure his land together with the horiodeiktēs, in order that his neighbors may not encroach on his property (... ἀξιῶ ἐ[π]ιτα[γ]ῆναι [τῷ τ]ῆ[ς] κώμης κωμογρ(αμματεῖ) γενέσθα[ι] ἐπὶ τοὺ[ς] τόπους σὺν τῷ ὁριοδίκ(τῃ) καὶ ἀναμετρῆσαι[τ]ὴν πᾶσα [sic] γῆν καὶ ἑκάστῳ τὸ ἴδιο[ν] ἀπ[ο]καταστήσῃ).[4] This document is undated, and it is placed by the editors in the late second or early third century.

The next appearance of the boundary commissioner among documents from Karanis occurs about a century later, in O. Mich. 1007, October 29, 295 (?), a receipt for grain, issued to the horiodeiktēs by the collectors of the annona for the area of Karanis (κριθ(ῆς) ἀννων(ικῆς) ε̄ ἐπιγρ(αφῆς) ὁριοδικ(τίας) Καρανίδ(ος) δι(ὰ) Παν( ) ὁριοδ(είκτου) ἀρτ(άβαι) ἕνδεκα ...).[5]

---

[4] 11. 5-8.

[5] 11. 1-4.

A group of documents in P. Cairo Boak deals with the horiodeiktēs.[6] There are three declarations of land, all of about the same date,[7] and all mentioning the name of the same boundary inspector, Pannes or Panous. In these documents the measurements were taken and witnessed by surveyors, iuratores (nome officials) and dekaprōtoi, along with the horiodeiktēs.

In P. Cornell 20, 302 A.D., on the other hand, the boundary commissioner was accompanied by the komarch and the headman of the village. This document contains eleven separate declarations of land which was located in the area of Ptolemais Nea, near Karanis. Two of the declarants are residents of Karanis, four of Arsinoe, one of Ptolemais Nea and one of an undetermined place. In each case it is stated that the resident and three surveyors in the presence of Abous the boundary official (παρόντων Ἄβουτος ὁριοδίκτου) and the headman (μίζων) and komarch measured the land and made the declaration.[8]

The horiodeiktēs appears from these documents to have been an important official, without whom property disputes and ownership of land for taxation purposes could not have been settled. He is treated whenever he appears

---

[6]Besides the three documents dealt with here, the following mention the horiodeiktia, in the sense of the sphere or area of the activity of the boundary official: P. Cairo Boak 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, and 30, 296-315 A.D.

[7]P. Cairo Boak 8, Sept. 11, 299; 9, 299; 10, Sept. 11, 299.

[8]See also chapter III p. 39 above, "The Komarchs", for a discussion of this document.

as an official who ranked with the other leading officials of the village, the village scribe, komarch and headman.

CHAPTER IX

THE PHYLAKES

The phylakes, or guards, were of many types, and functioned under the archephodos and later under the eirenarch, to keep the peace and to protect property. It is not always possible to tell whether some guards are village officials, for their jurisdiction in some instances seems to have extended beyond the limits of the village, and probably officials of similar titles existed in both villages and towns.[1] Service as a guard was probably a liturgy, and we have evidence that there was a tax collected to support the guards, so they may have been paid for their work.

In Karanis documents guards are mentioned a number of times. The Michigan tax rolls contain many brief references to phylakon (the tax for support of the guards). (P. Mich. 223, 172-173 A.D., l. 1058 margin, 1072, and 1103), and the Michigan ostraka, contain references to the guards. O. Mich. 976, late third or early fourth century, a list of names and amounts, includes, line 4, the word φύλαξ followed by an amount of money. O. Mich. 147, third century, an account of payments, refers to a payment τῷ φύλ⟨α⟩κι τῶ̃(ν) καν θηλ(ίων) (to the guards of the donkeys), and

---

[1] Oertel, op. cit., p. 270.

O. Mich. 102, early fourth century, the same kind of list, contains the three following references:... τοῖς φύλαξ(ι) ὄι(νου) α ...(line 9), τῷ φύλακι καὶ οτανγαρα ... (line 13), and Τούρβονι φύλα(κι) ... (line 18). The phrase δι(ὰ) Ἰσιδώρου π]εδιοφύλαξ [sic] (guard of the fields) appears at the end of a list of donkey drivers and caravans in the late third or early fourth century (O. Mich. 356. An account of payments in money from the early fourth century, O. Mich. 102, lists a payment to the balaneiophylax (guard of the public baths) and a payment to his assistant (boēthos).

The guards of the water or canals (hydrophylakes) appear in two documents. In B.G.U. 621, 174 to 176 A.D., four of the guards issue a receipt to the sitologoi of Karanis for money paid them.[2] In H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, No. 3, dating from the end of the second or beginning of the third century, an examination of the village scribe before the strategos for alleged wrongdoing, one of the hydrophylakes is called before the strategos, along with other men, but the document does not tell why he is summoned.[3]

The lēstiopiastēs seems to have been in an office similar to that of the guards. The office was a liturgy, but perhaps not a village liturgy. It was the duty of

---

[2]See also Chapter VI, p. 70 above, "The Sitologoi" for a discussion of this document.

[3]See also Chapter One, p. 24 above, "The Kōmogrammateus," for a discussion of this document.

this official to apprehend criminals. He served as an intermediary between the dēmosioi[4] and the strategos.[5] P. Oslo 20, third century, is an order for arrest issued by a lēstiopiastēs of Karanis (Προστῶτος λῃστοπιάστῃς κώμης Καρανίδος. 'Ανάπεμψον 'Ατῖσις 'Ακιάλως ἐνκαλούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ πράκ(τορο)ς ἀργυρι(κῶν) κώμης Φιλοπάτορος, ἤ αὐτὸν ἤ δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα ...).[6] O. Mich. 102, early fourth century, lists two payments made by a lēstiopiastēs.

---

[4]See Chapter X, p. 90, below, "The Dēmosioi and Euschēmones" on the functions of the dēmosioi.

[5]Jouguet, op. cit., p. 265.

[6]ll. 1-4. See also Chapter VII, p. 78 above, "The Praktores and Apaitētai" for a discussion of this document.

CHAPTER X

DĒMOSIOI AND EUSCHĒMONES

The term dēmosioi was used to describe the officials who filled offices in the village government through which government functions were carried out. The euschēmones were those persons who possessed enough property to be included in the group that must fill village offices, and therefore, who were eligible to be called dēmosioi.[1] These two terms appear several times among documents from Karanis.

In B.G.U. 275, dating from the early second century, a resident of Karanis states that vandalism had been committed against him by certain unknown persons who invaded his courtyard by night and destroyed a machine that belonged to him. This deed he reported to the dēmosioi of the village (ὅπερ φανερὸν ἐποίησα τοῖς τῆς κώμης δημοσίοις).[2] It is likely that at this time he would have reported wrongdoing to the archephodos or the village elders, both of whom were concerned with the maintenance of law and order, rather than to all of the village officials. It is possible then, that the term dēmosioi was used rather loosely to designate any one or more than one of the important officials of the village.

---

[1] Oertel, op. cit., p. 150.

[2] ll. 12-13.

In P. Mich. Inv. 5437, unpublished,[3] dating from 187/188 A.D., a similar statement is made. This document is a petition to the strategos about a mare that had disappeared, while being led to water. The petitioner immediately reported the disappearance to the dēmosioi (... ὅπ[ερ εὐ]θέως [φα]νερὸν ἐποίη[σ]α τ[οῖ ς] τῆς κώμης δ[η]μοσίοις).[4] The similarity in phraseology used in these two documents suggests a regular procedure for reporting wrongdoing and losses. Perhaps it was required that such a report be made to the dēmosioi before an appeal was made to any higher authority.

This procedure is followed in P. Mich. 423-424, May 22, 197 A.D.,[5] a petition to the strategos by one Gemellos, a blind man, on whose property certain persons had trespassed, apparently resorting to a form of magic as well as theft to ruin his crops. Here the dēmosioi, which include the presbyteroi acting in the capacity of the village scribe, and an assistant, accompany Gemellos to witness the acts of trespass. Then the dēmosioi made the acts a matter of public record. (... πα[ρό]ντων Πετεσούχου καὶ Πτολλᾶ πρεσβυτέρων κώμης Καρανίδος διαδεχο[μ]ένων καὶ

---

[3]This document was put at my disposal through the kindness of Dr. E. M. Husselman, who is editing it.

[4]ll. 12-14.

[5]See also Chapter I, "The Komogrammateus", p. 24 and II, "The Presbyteroi", for a discussion of this document.

τὰ κατὰ τὴν κομμωγραμματείαν καὶ Σωκρᾶ ὑπηρέτου, καὶ τῶν δημοσίων παρόντων τὸ βρέφος ὁ Ἰούλιος συνκομισάμενος τὰ περιγενόμενα ἐκ τῶν ἐδαφῶν γένη ἀπηνέγκατο εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἅπερ φανερὰ ἐποίησα διά τε τῶν αὐτῶν δημοσίων καὶ πρακτόρων σιτικῶν τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης ... ,

"in the presence of Petesouchos and Ptollas, elders of the village of Karanis who are exercising also the functions of the village secretary, and of Sokras the assistant, and while the officials were there, Julius, after he had gathered in the remaining crops from the fields, took the brephos away to his house. These acts I made matters of public record through the same officials and the collectors of grain taxes of the same village."[6]

The phrase δημ(όσιος) Πτολεμαῖος appears at the end of a list of caravans and donkey-drivers from the late third or early fourth century (O. Mich. 344, line 10).

The euschēmones are addressed, along with the archephodoi of Karanis, in two similar documents sent from the officials of the nome demanding the arrest of certain individuals.[7] The charges against these individuals are

---

[6] 11. 18-23.

[7] B.G.U. 376, second or third century, and B.G.U. 374, same date. See also Chapter V, "The Archephodos", p. 55, for a discussion of these documents.

B.G.U. 376 11. 1-3.

B.G.U. 147, 11. [illegible]

not stated, but it is asked that they be sent to Arsinoe (Ἀρχεφόδοις καὶ εὐσχήμοσι κώμης Καρανίδος. Ἀναπέμψατε Σεουηριανὸν ... ἐνκαλουμένου [sic] ὑπὸ Ζωσίμου Λεωνίδου ..[8] and Ἀρχεφόδοις καὶ εὐσχήμοσι κώμης [Σεουηριανὸν... ἐνκαλουμένου ὑπὸ Ζωσί[μου ..).[9] Here it is the euschēmones instead of the dēmosioi who are called upon to help with the preservation of law. It seems that the euschēmones are addressed as if they are office holders rather than persons merely qualified for officeholding. The parallel in the functions of these two officeholding groups in the village, in fact, suggests that perhaps the two terms, dēmosioi and euschēmones were used interchangeably.

---

[8] B.G.U. 376 11. 1-3.

[9] B.G.U. 147, 11. 1-3.

APPENDIX I

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF OFFICIALS

Ἀᾶς Ἀβούκις	μίζων (New Ptolemais)	P. Cornell 20, 302
Ἄβους	ὁριοδίκτης (New Ptolemais	P. Cornell 20, 302
Αἰῶν	κωμάρχης	O. Mich. 939, late III/early IV cent.
Αὐρήλιος Ἀλεχάνδρος	κωμάρχης	P. Mich. Inv. 5065 b, Sept. 16, 298
Ἀμμώνιος	κωμογραμματεῦς	B.G.U. 330, Jan. 31, 153
Ἀνοῦπις Μασκουλλείνου	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion, XVII, 2, 306/307
Ἀντώνιος	κωμογραμματεῦς	P. Fay, verso, 195, late II/early III cent.
Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίου	σιτολόγος	P. Cairo Boak, 24 Aug. 14, 309
Ἀντώνιος Ἀντωνίου	κωμάρχης	Goodspeed, Class. Philol. I, 10, III cent.
Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίου Ἀντωνίου	κωμάρχης	B.G.U. 620, III cent.
Ἀπαιῶγος Σύρίωνος	κωμάρχης	Boak, Melanges Maspero II, 125 f., 307/8
Ἀπίων	χειριστής	P. Mich. 383, 106-109
Ἀπίων Ἡρακλείδου	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ἀπολλώνιος Διοδώρου	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ἀρείος	πράκτωρ σιτικῶν	B.G.U. 457, 132/3
Ἀρίστων Σερήνου	κωμάρχης	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 1, Aug. 18-Sept. 11, 315
		Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 2, Sept. 16, 315

Ἀρίστων Σερήνου	κωμάρχης	P. Cairo Boak, 34, ca. 315
Αὐρήλιος Ἄρπαλος	σιτολόγος	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4, Dec. 5, 312
Αὐρήλιος Ἄρπαλος Σαραπίωνος	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 534, Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216
		B.G.U. 835, 216/217 Jan. 7, 217
		B.G.U. 64, Jan./Feb. 217
		B.G.U. 716, June 16, 24, 224
Ἀρτεμίδορος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	O. Mich. 1001, July 19, 292
Ἀρποκρᾶς	προστάτης	P. Cairo Boak, 22 296
Ἀρφαῆσις	κωμογραμματεῦς	B.G.U. 524, 159/160
		B.G.U. 54, July 7, 161
		B.G.U. 58, 161
Ἀτρῆς	κωμογραμματεύς	P. Athen S.A. 37, reign of Antoninus (138-161)
Ἀτρῆς Πεθεῦς	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ἀτρῆς Ἀχιλλᾶς	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5, 11 a, 324
Ἀφ...	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 434, Apr. 15, 169
Αὐρήλιος Ἀφροδίσιος	κωμάρχης	P. Mich. Inv. 5065 b, Sept. 16, 298
Ἀφροδίσιος	πρεσβύτερος	B.G.U. 334, II/III cent.
Γαΐος Αὐρηλίου Μέλανος	γραμματεύς πρακτόρων ἀργυρικῶν	P. Hamb. 42, Jan./Feb. 216

Γέμελλος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Mich. 426, 199/200 (?)
Γερμανός Σερήνου	κωμάρχης	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 1, Aug. 18-Sept. 11, 315
		Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 2, Sept. 16, 315
		P. Cairo Boak, 34, ca. 315
Δίδυμος	λαογράφος	B.G.U. 524, 150/160
Διονύσιος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 779, June 16-July II/III cent.
Διόσκορος	λαογράφος	B.G.U. 95, July 24, 147
Διόσκορος		O. Mich. 1029, Nov. 20, 296
	σιτολόγος	O. Mich. 706, III cent.
		O. Mich. 1082, Jan. 3, 313
	ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως	Boak, Byzantion, XVII 3, 313
Διόσκορος Μύσθου	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 398, Oct. 31, Nov. 8, 207
Εἰ.....	κωμάρχης	O. Mich. 260, IV cent.
Ἕκις	ἀπαιτητὴς ναύλων	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 III, 324
Ἐριεύς	κωμογραμματεῦς	B.G.U. 139, 201/202
		B.G.U. 108, 203/204
Εὐδαίμων	κωμογραμματεῦς	B.G.U. 457, 132/133
Εὐδαίμων	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 434, Apr. 15, 169
		P. Mich. 384, 172
Αὐρήλιος Εὐδήμων Δούλου	ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως	Boak, Byzantion, XVII, 3, 313

Ζωῖλος	κωμογραμματεύς	S.B. 7368 (H. Frisk Aegyptus IX, 287 f) late III/early IV cent.
Ζώσιμος Λεωνίδου	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 222, Apr. 17, 215
	σιτολόγος	P. Hamb. 43, Sept./Oct. 215
		B.G.U. 534, Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216
		B.G.U. 835, 216/217 Jan. 7, 217
		B.G.U. 64, Jan./Feb. 217
		B.G.U. 529, May/June 216; 215/216; Apr./May; July 216
Ἡρακλείδης	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν (Ptolemais Nea)	B.G.U. 215, 198/199
		B.G.U. 65, Mar. 22 n.y.
Ὅρων	ἀπαιτητής	B.G.U. 342, 179/180; Feb. 10, 181
Ὅρων Ἡρακλείδου	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ὅρων Καλλίου	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ὅρων Κόπρητος	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 835, 216/7 Jan. 7, 217
		B.G.U. 64, Jan./Feb. 217
Ἰσίδωρος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 991, Oct./Nov.; Dec. 10, 151
Ἰσίδωρος	λαογράφος	P. Mich. 370, Aug. 9, 189
Αὐρήλιος Ἰσίδωρος	σιτολόγος	Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57030 (Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4) 308
		P. Cairo Boak, 24, Aug. 14, 309

Ἰσίδωρος	σιτολόγος	P. Cairo Boak, 25 Nov. 10, 309
		O. Mich. 543, early IV cent.
Ἰσίδωρος	ἀπαιτητὴς ἀχύρου	P. Cairo Boak, 31, 311
Ἰσίδωρος	πεδιοφύλαξ	O. Mich. 356, late III/early IV cent.
Ἰσίδωρος	σιτολόγος	P. Cairo Boak 13 and 26, 296;
		P. Cairo Boak 4, 300;
		P. Cairo Boak 27, 304;
		Cairo, Journal d'entree 57692, unpubl., 306;
		Cairo 57033, unpubl., 309;
		P. Cairo Boak 19, 309;
		Cairo 57035, unpubl. P. Cairo Boak 2 and 7, 312;
		P. Cairo Boak 30, 314-315
Ἰσίδωρος Ἡρᾶ	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion, XVII, 2, 306/307
Ἰσίδωρος Παῦλου	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion, XVII, 5, 11 a, 324
Ἰσίδωρος Πτολεμαίου	ἀπαιτητὴς ἀχύρου	P. Cairo Boak, 23, 314, and 31, 311
	τεσσεράριος	Boak, Byzantion, XVII 1 and 2, 314
Αὐρήλιος Ἰσίδωρος Σαραπίωνος	κωμάρχης	Boak, Mélanges Maspero II, 125 f. 307/8

Ἰσχυρᾶς	ἀρχέφοδος	P. Mich. 224, 172-173
Καλώνιος Οὐεναφρίου	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion, XVII, 5, 11 a, 324
Κάστωρ	γραμματεύς	O. Mich. 1004, 1 cent.
Κάστωρ	χειριστής	P. Mich. 383, 106-109
Κάστωρ Ὀννωφρέως	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 394, Jan. 9, 163
Κάστωρ	κωμογραμματεύς	P. Mich. 366, 168
Κάστωρ	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 342, Sept./ Oct. 184
Κάστωρ	χειριστής	P. Mich. 425, Aug., 198
Κάστωρ	ἀπαιτητὴς ναύλων	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II b, 324
Κάστωρ Σαβείνου	κεφαλαιωτής	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI 1, 315
Κεφάλων	κωμογραμματεύς Κερκεσούχα	P. Mich. 224, 172-173
Κοπρῆς	κωμογραμματεύς	Boak, Annales de Service, 29, 3, Mar. 5, 214
	σιτολόγος	O. Mich. 519, Dec. 14, 310 and 523, Mar. 1, 311
	σιτολόγος	P. Cairo Boak, 25 Nov. 10, 309
Κτησίας	σιτολόγος	P. Hamb. 43, Sept./ Oct. 215
Λειλᾶς	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν (Ptolemais Nea)	B.G.U. 779, II/III cent. June 16-July

Αὐρήλιος Λογγῖνος	σιτολόγος	P. Hamb. 43, Sept./Oct. 215
		B.G.U. 529, May/June 216; 215/216; Apr./May; July 216
		B.G.U. 534, Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 217
		B.G.U. 835, 216/217; Jan. 7, 217
		B.G.U. 64, Jan./Feb. 217
Λούκιος	πράκτωρ στεφανικῶν (Ptolemais Nea)	B.G.U. 62, Sept. 24, 199
Μάρων	σιτολόγος (Ptolemais Nea)	P. Mich. 391, 139 A. D.
Μέλας	κωμάρχης	O. Mich. 234, Dec. 23, 274 or Dec. 24, 279
Μέλας	σιτολόγος	O. Mich. 519, Dec. 14, 310
Αὐρήλιος Μιστίας	ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 4B
		O. Mich. 582, late III/early IV cent.
Μύσθης Σατύρου	ὑδροφύλαξ	B.G.U. 621, 174-176
Αὐρήλιος Νέα	σιτολόγος	P. Cairo Boak, 25, Nov. 10, 309
	ἀρχέφοδος	O. Mich. 342, late III/early IV cent.
Νεῖλος Ἀπολλωνίου Νεῶν	κωμογραμματεύς	O. Mich. 153, II cent.
	ἀρχέφοδος	O. Mich. 615, late III/early IV cent.
Ὀλκανολ	κωμάρχης	P. Cornell 20, 302
Ὀρσενοῦφις	κωμογραμματεύς	B.G.U. 95, July 24, 147
Αὐρήλιος Οὐαλέριος Σαβεῖνος	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 716, June 16, 24, 224

Αὐρήλιος Οὐενάφριος	σιτολόγος	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4, Dec. 5, 312
Πα . ..	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2, 306/307
Αὐρήλιος Παλήμονος Τιβερίνου	κουαδράριος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Παμοῦς	σιτολόγος	O. Mich. 543, early IV cent.
Παν	ὁριοδείκτης	O. Mich. 1007, Oct. 29, 295 (?)
Πανκράτης	ἀρχέφοδος	P. Mich. 421, Reign of Claudius
Αὐρήλιος Πανοῦς	ὁριοδείκτης	P. Cairo Boak, 8, 9, and 10, Sept. 11, 299
Αὐρήλιος Παπεεῖς	ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 4b, 324
Πασίων Ἀκουσιλάου	ὑδροφύλαξ	B.G.U. 621, 174-176
Πασόξις Ἥρατος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Πεθεύς	ὑδροφύλαξ	S.B. 7368 (H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, 287 f. late III cent./early IV cent.
Πεθεὺς Πασίωνος	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 395, 183
Πελήνιος	κωμάρχης	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI 3, early IV cent.
Πενοῦς Πτολεμαίου	κωμάρχης	Goodspeed, Class. Philol. I, 10, III cent. (S.B. 4421)
		B.G.U. 620, III cent.
Πετεσοῦχος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Mich. 423-424, May 22, 197
Πετε....τ.ελος	πράκτωρ σιτικῶν	B.G.U. 515, May/June 2, 193
Πετωλ	κωμάρχης	O. Mich. 260, IV cent.

Πολυδεύκης	σιτολόγος	P. Hamb. 43, Sept./ Oct. 215
Πόλιος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 791, Dec. 15 and 26, 205
Πρίκος	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2, 306/307
Προστῶτος	ληστοπιάστης	P. Osl. 20, I, III cent.
Πτολ	χειριστής	P. Mich. 382, 87-90 102/103
Πτολε	πράκτωρ	P. Mich. 383, 106-109
Πτολεμαῖος	κωμογραμματεύς	Boak, Annales de Service (S.B. 7359) betw. Oct. 28 and Nov. 27, 112
Πτολεμαῖος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	P. Mich. 384, 172-?
Πτολεμαῖος	κωμογραμματεύς	B.G.U. 60 (430), 188/ 189
	λαογράφος	P. Mich. 370, Aug. 9, 189
	γραμματεύς	B.G.U. 515, May/June 2, 193
Αὐρήλιος Πτολεμαῖος	πράκτωρ στεφανικῶν	B.G.U. 452, July/Aug. 221/222
Πτολεμαῖος	γραμματεύς	O. Mich. 1053, June 26 III cent.
Πτολεμαῖος	δημόσιος	O. Mich. 344, late III/ early IV cent.
Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρακλείδου	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 188, May 13- Aug. 15, 186
Αὐρήλιος Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρακλήου	ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 3, 313
Πτολεμαῖος Πτολεμαίου	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 398, Oct. 31, Nov. 8, 207

Πτολεμαῖος Τεῶτος	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 393, Aug. 9, 158
Πτολλαρίων	πράκτωρ ἀννώνας ὄξου	P. Mich. 390, 215
Αὐρήλιος Πτολλαρίων	κωμάρχης	P. Mich. Inv. 5065 a, June 15, 298
Πτολλᾶς	πρεσβύτερος	P. Mich. 423-424, May 22, 197
Πτολλίων Χαιρήμονος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Πωλίων	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 791, Dec. 15 and 26, 205
Σαβεῖνος Ζωσίμου	πράκτωρ	B.G.U. 72, Feb. 22, 191
Σαβῖνος	ὁριοδείκτης	P. Mich. 223, 224, 225, 172-174
Σαμβᾶς	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	P. Jand. 29, ca. 103 or 104
Σαραπάμμων Πτολεμαίου	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 188, May 13-Aug. 15, 186
Σαραπᾶς Μύσθου	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond, 255, 136
Σαραπίων	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 330, Jan. 31, 153
	σιτολόγος	P. Mich. 392, 153
		P. Mich. 393, Aug. 9, 158
Σαραπίων	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2, 306/307
Σαραπίων Σωσικόσμος	ὑδροφύλαξ	B.G.U. 621, 174-176
Σαραπίων Μάρωνος	πράκτωρ σιτικῶν	B.G.U. 515, May/June 2, 193
Σαταβοῦς	κωμάρχης	O. Mich. 234, Dec. 23, 274 or Dec. 24, 279
Σεουῆρος Ἀντωνείνου Παρθικοῦ	σιτολόγος	P. Hamb. 43, Sept./Oct. 215

Σερῆνος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	O. Mich. 126, 219/20 or 223/24 ?
Σερῆνος	προστάτης	P. Cairo Boak, 22, 296 ?
Σεύθης Ἥρα	ἀπαιτητὴς ἀχύρου	P. Cairo Boak, 31, 311
		P. Cairo Boak, 23, 314
Σοκμῆνις	κωμογραμματεύς	P. Osl. 26a, 163/164
Σοκμῆνις Σοκμηνέως	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Σουχάμμων	λαογράφος	P. Mich. 370, Aug. 9, 189
Σύρος	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	P. Mich. 385, 182-185
		P. Mich. 386, 186
Σύρος Κάστορες	πρεσβύτερος	B.G.U. 647, Aug. 22, 130
Σωκρ	χειριστής	P. Mich. 383, 106-109
Σωκράτης	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	B.G.U. 391, Nov. 1, 154
Τιβερῖνος	ἀρχέφοδος	O. Mich. 258, late III/ early IV cent.
Τούρβονος	φύλαξ	O. Mich. 102, early IV cent.
Φ ..... .ωναφριος	σιτολόγος	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2, 306/307
Φαῆσις Ζηνᾶ	πρεσβύτερος	B.G.U. 647, Aug. 22, 130
Χαιρήμων	γραμματεὺς πρεσβυτέρων	P. Mich. 371, late II/ early IIIcent.
Χαιρήμων	πράκτωρ	B.G.U. 273, 150
Χαιρήμων	σιτολόγος (Karanis?)	P. Cairo Goodspeed 30 191-192

Χαιρήμων	ἀπαιτητὴς ναύλων	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 IIb, 324
Χαιρήμων Ἀσκλᾶ	σιτολόγος (Kerkesoucha)	P. Mich. 397, June 9, 204
Ψενῆσις	πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν	P. Grenf. II, 53, 145
Ὡρίων	πράκτωρ	B.G.U. 761, Aug. 26, 131
Ὡρίων	σιτολόγος	O. Mich. 529, Dec. 19, 312 and O. Mich. 530, Dec. 20, 312 ?
Ὡρίων Ὡρίωνος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Lond. 255, 136
Ὡρίων Μάρωνος	σιτολόγος	B.G.U. 64, Jan./Feb. 217
		B.G.U. 534, Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216
		B.G.U. 835, 216/217; Jan. 7, 217
Ὧρος	πρεσβύτερος	P. Mich. 371, late II/ early III cent.
.. κλας Μέλανος	ὑδροφύλαξ	B.G.U. 621, 174-176

APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF VILLAGE OFFICIALS

ἀπαιτητής Ὕρων	179/180; Feb. 10, 181	B.G.U. 342
Ἀντιούρις	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5I, 5IV
Παλήμων	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5I, 5IV
ἀπαιτητὴς ἀχύρου		
Ἰσίδωρος Πτολεμαίου	311	P. Cairo Boak, 31
	314	P. Cairo Boak, 23
Σεύθης Ὕρα	311	P. Cairo Boak, 31
ἀπαιτητὴς κρέως		
Αὐρήλιος Διόσκορος	313	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 3
Αὐρήλιος Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρακλήου	313	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 3
Αὐρήλιος Εὐδήμων Δούλου	313	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 3
Αὐρήλιος Μιστίας	314	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 4b
Αὐρήλιος Παπεεῖς	314	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 4b
ἀπαιτητὴς ναύλων		
Ὗκις	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5III
Κάστωρ	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II b
Χαιρήμων	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II b
ἀρχέφοδος		
Πανκράτης	Reign of Claudius	P. Mich. 421

ἀρχέφοδος		
not named	120-124	P. Mich. Inv. 5688
Ἰσχυρᾶς	172/173	P. Mich. 224
not named	late III/early IV cent.	S.B. 7368 (H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, 287f.
not named	II or III cent.	B.G.U. 376
not named	III cent.	B.G.U. 374
Νεῖλος	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 342
Νεῶν	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 615
Τιβερῖνος	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 258
βαλανειοφύλαξ		
not named	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 102
βοηθός		
not named	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 102
γραμματεύς		
not named	early IV cent.	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI 3
γραμματεὺς πρεσβυτέρων	late II/early III cent.	P. Mich. 371
δημόσιος		
Πτολεμαῖος	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 344
not named	early II cent.	B.G.U. 275
not named	187/188	P. Mich. Inv. 5437
not named	May 22, 197	P. Mich. 423-424
not named	II/III cent.	B.G.U. 376
not named	II/III cent.	B.G.U. 147

ἡγούμενος		
not named	Jan./Feb., 66	P. Mich. Inv. 5524
not named	Sept. 14, 98	P. Mich. Inv. 5549
κατοράριος		
Αὐρήλιος Παλήμονος Τιβερίνου	314	Boak, Johnson Studies, 322-335, No. 2
κωμάρχης		
Μέλας	Dec. 23, 274 or Dec. 24, 279	O. Mich. 234
Σαταβοῦς	Dec. 23, 274 or Dec. 24, 279	O. Mich. 234
Αὐρήλιος Πτολλαρίων	June 15, 298	P. Mich. Inv. 5065a
Αὐρήλιος Ἀλεξάνδρος	Sept. 16, 298	P. Mich. Inv. 5065b
Αὐρήλιος Ἀφροδίσιος	Sept. 16, 298	P. Mich. Inv. 5065b
Αἰῶν	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 939
Ὀλκανολ	302	P. Cornell 20
Ἀπαιῶνγος Συρίωνος	307/208	Boak, Melanges Maspero II, 125 f. (S.B. 7757)
Αὐρήλιος Ἰσιδώρου Σαραπίωνος	307/308	Boak, Melanges Maspero II, 125 f. (S.B. 7757)
Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίου Ἀντωνίου	III cent.	Goodspeed, Class. Philol. I, 10 (S.B. 4421)
Πενοῦτος Πτολεμαίου	III cent.	B.G.U. 620
	III cent.	Goodspeed, Class. Philol. I, 10 (S.B. 4421)
not named	314	Boak, Johnson Studies 322-335 No. 2
Γερμανὸς Σερήνου	Aug. 18, Sept. 16, 315	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 1
	315	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 2
	ca. 315	P. Cairo Boak, 34

κωμάρχης		
not named	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 339
not named	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 340
not named	early IV cent.	P. Cairo Boak, 38
Πελήνιος	early IV cent.	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 3
Εἰ.....	IV cent.	O. Mich. 260
Πετῶλ	IV cent.	O. Mich. 260
κωμογραμματεύς		
Κάστωρ	I cent.	O. Mich. 1004
Πτολεμαῖος	betw. Oct. 28 & Nov. 27, 112	Boak, Annales de Service XXIX, 2 (S.B. 7359)
not named	late I or early II cent.	B.G.U. 915
Εὐδαίμων	132/133	B.G.U. 457
not named	Reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161)	B.G.U. 983
Ὀρσενούφις	July 24, 147	B.G.U. 95
Ἀμμώνιος	Jan. 31, 153	B.G.U. 330
Ἀρφαήσις	159/160	B.G.U. 524
	July 7, 161	B.G.U. 54
	161	B.G.U. 58
Ἀτρῆς	betw. 138 and 161	P. Athen. S.A. 37
Σοκμῆνις	163/164	P. Osl. 26a
Κάστωρ	168	P. Mich. 366
not named	168 or 169	P. Mich. 367

κωμογραμματεύς Κεφάλων	172/173	P. Mich. 224
not named	173/174	B.G.U. 59 and 447
not named	187/188	B.G.U. 60
Πτολεμαῖος	188/189	B.G.U. 430
γραμματεύς	May/June 193	B.G.U. 515
not named	Aug. 9, 189	P. Mich. 370
not named	May 22, 197	P. Mich. 423-424
not named	latter half II cent.	P. Mich. 381
Νεῖλος Ἀπολλωνίου	II cent.	O. Mich. 153
not named	II cent.	P. Mich. 492
Ζωῖλος	late II/early III cent.	S.B. 7368 (H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, 287 f.
Ἀντώνιος	late II/early III cent.	P. Fay. 195 Verso
not named	late II/early III cent.	B.G.U. 616
not named	201/202	B.G.U. 97
not named	201/202	B.G.U. 577
Ἐριεύς	201/202	B.G.U. 139
	203/204	B.G.U. 108
Κοπρῆς	Mar. 5, 214	Boak, Annales de Service XXIX, 3 (S.B. 7360)
Πτολεμαῖος	III cent.	O. Mich. 1053
not named	early IV cent.	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 3
λαογράφος		
not named	159/160; 145/146; July 20, 161	B.G.U. 154
Διόσκορος	July 24, 147	B.G.U. 95

λαογράφος		
Διδύμος	159/160	B.G.U. 524
not named	betw. 162 and 175	P. Lond. 182b
not named	173/174	B.G.U. 59 and 447
not named	188/189	B.G.U. 430
Σουχάμμων	Aug. 9, 189	P. Mich. 370
Πτολεμαῖος	Aug. 9, 189	P. Mich. 370
'Ισίδωρος	Aug. 9, 189	P. Mich. 370
not named	late II/early III cent.	S.B. 7368 (H. Frisk Aegyptus IX 287 f.
not named	Apr. 21 201/202	B.G.U. 577
not named	217	P. Osl. 25
ληστοπιαστής		
Προστῶτος	III cent.	P. Osl. 20
not named	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 102
μίζων (New Ptolemais)		
'Αᾶς 'Αβούτις	302	P. Cornell 20
not named	138-161	B.G.U. 983
Σαβῖνος	172-173	P. Mich. 223 and 224
	173-174	P. Mich. 225
not named	late II/early III cent.	B.G.U. 616
not named	Oct. 29, 295 (?)	O. Mich. 1007
Πανοῦς	Sept. 11, 299	P. Cairo Boak, 8, 9, 10
"Αβους	302	P. Cornell 20
πεδιοφύλαξ		
'Ισίδωρος	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 356

πράκτωρ		
Πτολε	106-109	P. Mich. 383
Ὡρίων	Aug. 26, 131	B.G.U. 761
not named	172-173	P. Mich. 224
Χαιρήμων	150	B.G.U. 273
Κάστωρ	Sept./Oct. 184	B.G.U. 342
Σαβεῖνος Ζωσίμου	Feb. 22, 191	B.G.U. 72
not named	II/III cent.	P. Mich. 505
not named	II/III cent.	B.G.U. 261
not named	297	P. Cairo Boak, 1
πράκτωρ ἀννώνας ὄξου		
Πτολλαρίων	215	P. Mich. 390
πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν		
Σαμωᾶς (Karanis ?)	ca. 103 or 104	P. Jand. 29
Ψενῆσις	145	P. Grenfell II, 52
Ἰσίδωρος	Oct. Nov.; Dec. 10, 151	B.G.U. 991
Σωκράτης	Nov. 1, 154	B.G.U. 391
not named	June 25, 157	B.G.U. 645
Σαραπίων	Jan. 31, 153	B.G.U. 330
Εὐδαίμων	172-?	P. Mich. 384
Πτολεμαῖος	172-?	P. Mich. 384
Σῦρος	182-185	P. Mich. 385
	186	P. Mich. 386
Κάστωρ	Sept./Oct. 184	B.G.U. 342
(name lost)	188	P. Mich. 387
Ἡρακλείδης (Ptolemais Nea)	198/199 Mar. 22, ?	B.G.U. 215 B.G.U. 65

πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν		
Διονύσιος	June 16-July II/III cent.	B.G.U. 779
Λειλᾶς	June 16-July II/III cent.	B.G.U. 779
Πωλίων	Dec. 15 and 26, 205	B.G.U. 791
Αὐρήλιος Ζωσίμου Λεώνιδου	April 17, 215	B.G.U. 222
Γαΐος Αὐρήλιου Μέλανος	Jan./Feb. 216	P. Hamb. 42
Σερῆνος	219/220 or 223/224 ?	O. Mich. 126
Ἀρτεμίδορος	July 19, 292	O. Mich. 1001
πράκτωρ ξενικῶν		
not named	Mar. 28, 177	B.G.U. 970
πράκτωρ κατοίκων		
not named	191-192	P. Cairo Goodspeed 30
πράκτωρ σιτικῶν		
Ἀρείος	132/133	B.G.U. 457
Πετε....τ.ελος	May/June 2, 193	B.G.U. 515
Σαραπίων Μάρωνος	May/June 2, 193	B.G.U. 515
not named	May 22, 197	P. Mich. 423-424
πράκτωρ στεφανικῶν		
Λούκιος (Ptolemais Nea)	Sept. 24, 199	B.G.U. 62
Αὐρήλιος Πτολεμαῖος	Dec. 4, 220 - Sept. 2, 222	B.G.U. 452
πρεσβύτερος		
Φαῆσις Ζηνᾶ	Aug. 22, 130	B.G.U. 647
Σῦρος Κάστορες	Aug. 22, 130	B.G.U. 647
Ἀπῖων Ἡρακλείδου	136	P. Lond. 255
Ἀπολλώνιος Διοδώρου	136	P. Lond. 255
Ἀτρῆς Πεθέως	136	P. Lond. 255

πρεσβύτερος		
Ἥρων Ἡρακλείδου	136	P. Lond. 255
Ἥρων Καλλίου	136	P. Lond. 255
Πασόξις Ἥρατος	136	P. Lond. 255
Πτολλίων Χαιρήμονος	136	P. Lond. 255
Σαραπᾶς Μύσθου	136	P. Lond. 255
Σοκμῆνις Σοκμηνέως	136	P. Lond. 255
Ὡρίων Ὡρίωνος	136	P. Lond. 255
not named	July 24, 147	B.G.U. 95
Πετεσοῦχος	May 22, 197	P. Mich. 423-424
Πτολλᾶς	May 22, 197	P. Mich. 423-424
Γέμελλος	199/200 (?)	P. Mich. 426
Ὧρος	late II/early III cent.	P. Mich. 371
Ἀφροδίσιος	II/III cent.	B.G.U. 334
not named	May 23, 206	B.G.U. 382
προστάτης		
Σερῆνος	ca. 296 (?)	P. Cairo Boak, 22
σιτολόγος		
Μάρων (Ptolemais Nea)	139	P. Mich. 391
Σαραπίων	153	P. Mich. 392
not named	151/152	Goodspeed, C.S.C.P. III, 46
	153/154	Goodspeed, C.S.C.P. III, 43
	154/155	Goodspeed, C.S.C.P. III, 6
	156/157	Goodspeed, C.S.C.P. III, 36, 42

σιτολόγος	158/159	Goodspeed, C.S.C.P. III, 1-5, 7-35, 37-41, 44-45, 47-91 P. Cairo Goodspeed 16-24 B.G.U. 104, 105, 169, 172, 263, 279, 280, 284, 294, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 720
Κάστωρ Ὀννωφρέως	Jan. 9, 163	P. Mich. 394
not named	Oct./Nov. 164 or Oct./Nov. 196	P. Hamb. 66
not named	Betw. 174 and 176	B.G.U. 621
Πεθεὺς Πασίωνος	183	P. Mich. 395
Πτολεμαῖος Ἡρακλείδου	May 13-Aug. 15, 186	B.G.U. 188
Σαραπάμμων Πτολεμαίου	May 13-Aug. 15, 186	B.G.U. 188
Χαιρήμων	191/192	P. Cairo Goodspeed 30
not named (Ptolemais Nea)	II cent.	P. Mich. 375
not named	II cent.	B.G.U. 701
Χαιρήμων Ἀσκλᾶ (Kerkesoucha)	June 9, 204	P. Mich. 397
Διόσκορος Μύσθου	Oct. 31, Nov. 8, 207	P. Mich. 398
Πτολεμαῖος Πτολεμαίου	Oct. 31, Nov. 8, 207	P. Mich. 398
Κτησίας	Sept./Oct. 215	P. Hamb. 43
Ζώσιμος Λεωνίδου	Sept./Oct. 215	P. Hamb. 43
	May/June 216; 215/216; Apr./May; July 216	B.G.U. 529
	Apr./May; July Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216	B.G.U. 534

σιτολόγος Αὐρή	216/217; Jan. 7, 217	B.G.U. 835
	Jan./Feb. 217	B.G.U. 64
Αὐρήλιος Λογγῖνος	Sept./Oct. 215	P. Hamb. 43
	May/June 216; 215/216; Apr./May; July 216	B.G.U. 529
	Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216	B.G.U. 534
	216/217; Jan. 7, 217	B.G.U. 835
	Jan./Feb. 217	B.G.U. 64
Πολυδεύκης	Sept./Oct. 215	P. Hamb. 43
Σεουῆρος Ἀντωνείνου Παρθικοῦ	Sept./Oct. 215	P. Hamb. 43
Αὐρήλιος Ἅρπαλος Σαραπίονος	Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216	B.G.U. 534
	216/217; Jan. 7, 217 A.D.	B.G.U. 835
	Jan./Feb. 217	B.G.U. 64
	June 16, 24, 224	B.G.U. 716
Ὡρίων Μάρωνος	Oct. 216; 215/216; Nov. 7, 216	B.G.U. 534
	216/217; Jan. 7, 216	B.G.U. 835
	Jan./Feb. 217	B.G.U. 64
Ἥρων Κόπρητος	216/217; Jan. 7, 217	B.G.U. 835
Αὐρήλιος Οὐλέριος Σαβεῖνος	June 16, 24, 224	B.G.U. 716
Ἰσίδωρος	296	P. Cairo Boak 13, 26
not named	296	O. Mich. 900

σιτολόγος		
not named	Mar. 14, 297	O. Mich. 906
not named	III cent.	O. Mich. 375,881
Διόσκορος	III cent.	O. Mich. 706
not named	late III cent.	O. Mich. 872, 880, 397
not named (Kerkesoucha)	late III cent.	O. Mich. 884
not named	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 867
Ἰσίδωρος	300	P. Cairo Boak, 4
not named	June/July 302	O. Mich. 923
not named	July 23-Aug. 8, 302	O. Mich. 924
not named	July 2, 302	O. Mich. 501
not named	Sept. 8 (?), 302	O. Mich. 925
not named	Sept. 12, 302	O. Mich. 1077
not named	Sept. 12/Nov. 12, 302	O. Mich. 504
not named	Oct. 23, 302	O. Mich. 502, 503
not named	Sept. 16, 302 and Jan. 9, 303	O. Mich. 505
not named	Aug. 2, 303	O. Mich. 1078
not named	Aug. 19-Nov. 29, 303	O. Mich. 509
notnnamed	303	O. Mich. 926
Ἰσίδωρος	304	P. Cairo Boak, 27
not named	305/306 (?)	O. Mich. 512
not named	Jan. 30, 306	O. Mich. 511
Ἰσίδωρος	306	Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57692, unpubl.
Ἰσίδωρος Ἡρᾶ	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2

σιτολόγος Ἀνούπις Μασκουλλείνου	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Φ ..... .ωναφριος	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Πα . ..	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Πρίκος	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Σαραπίων	306/307	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 2
Ἰσίδωρος	308	Cairo Journal d'entrée 57030 (Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4.)
Αὐρήλιος Ἀντωνίου	Aug. 14, 309	P. Cairo Boak, 24
Αὐρήλιος Ἰσίδωρος	Aug. 14, 309	P. Cairo Boak, 24
	Nov. 10, 309	P. Cairo Boak, 25
Αὐρήλιος Κοπρῆς	Nov. 10, 309	P. Cairo Boak, 25
	Dec. 14, 310	O. Mich. 519
	Mar. 1, 311	O. Mich. 523
Αὐρήλιος Νέα	Nov. 10, 309	P. Cairo Boak, 25
not named	309	P. Cairo Boak, 39
Ἰσίδωρος	309	Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57033, unpubl., and P. Cairo Boak, 19
Μέλας	Dec. 14, 310	O. Mich. 519
Αὐρήλιος Οὐενάφριος	Dec. 5, 312	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4
Αὐρήλιος Ἅρπαλος	Dec. 5, 312	Boak, H.S.C.P. LI, 4
Ὡρίων	Dec. 19, 312	O. Mich. 529
	Dec. 20, 312	O. Mich. 530 (?)

σιτολόγος		
Ἰσίδωρος	312	Cairo, Journal d'entrée 57035; P. Cairo Boak, 2, 7
not named	312	P. Cairo Boak, 20
Διόσκορος	Jan. 3, 313	O. Mich. 1082
Ἰσίδωρος	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 543
	314, 315	P. Cairo Boak, 30
Παμοῦς	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 543
Ἰσίδωρος Παῦλου	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II a
Καλώνιος Οὐεναφρίου	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II a
Ἀτρῆς Ἀχιλλᾶς	324	Boak, Byzantion XVII, 5 II a
τεσσεράριος		
Ἰσίδωρος	314	Boak, Johnson Studies 322-335 No. 1 and 2
ὑδροφύλαξ		
Μύσθης Σατύρου	174-176	B.G.U. 621
Πασίων Ἀκουσιλάου	174-176	B.G.U. 621
Σαραπίων Σωσικόσμος	174-176	B.G.U. 621
.. κλας Μέλανος	174-176	B.G.U. 621
Πεθεύς	late II/ early III cent.	H. Frisk, Aegyptus IX, No. 3 (S.B. 7368)
φύλαξ		
not named	III cent.	O. Mich. 147
not named	late III/early IV cent.	O. Mich. 976
not named	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 102
Τούρβονος	early IV cent.	O. Mich. 102

χειριστής Πτολ	87-90 and 102/103	P. Mich. 382
Ἀπίων	106-109	P. Mich. 383
Κάστωρ	106-109	P. Mich. 383
Σωτηρ	106-109	P. Mich. 383
Κάστωρ	Aug. 198	P. Mich. 425

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

General reference works for papyrology

Preisigke, Freidrich. Berichtigungsliste der griechischen papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten. Berlin and Leipzig, Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher verleger, 1922. Continued by F. Bilabel.

_____. Namenbuch enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen... menschennamen, soweit sie in griechischen urkunden... Ägyptens sich vorfinden. Heidelberg, selbstverlag des herausgebers, 1922.

_____. Sammelbuch griechischer urkunden aus Ägypten. Strassburg, K. J. Trubner, 1913- .

_____. Wörterbuch der griechischen papyrusurkunden. Berlin, Selbstverlag der erben, 1925-31.

Wilcken, Ulrich (ed.). Archiv für Papyrusforschung. Leipzig and Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1901-1941.

Historical works

Bell, H. I. Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1948.

Biedermann, E. Studien zur Ägyptische Verwaltungsgeschichte in ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit: Der Βασιλικὸς Γραμματεύς . Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913.

Boak, A.E.R. Karanis, The Temples, Coin Hoards, Botanical and Zoological Reports, Seasons 1924-31. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1933.

Boak, A.E.R. and Peterson, E.E. Karanis, Topographical and Architectural Report of the Excavations during the Seasons 1924-28. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1931.

Grenfell, B. P., Hunt, A. S., Hogarth, D. G., and Milne, J. G. Fayum Towns and Their Papyri. London, Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900.

Hohlwein, N. L'Égypte romaine. Brussels, Hayez, 1912.

Johnson, A. D. Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian. Vol. II of An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by Tenney Frank. 6 Vols. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933-40.

Jouguet, Pierre. La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine. Paris, Fontemoing et compagnie, 1911.

Martin, V. Les Epistratèges. Geneva, Georg and Co., 1911.

Oertel, Friedrich. Die Liturgie. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1917.

Milne, J. G. A History of Egypt under Roman Rule. Vol. V of A History of Egypt. Edited by W. M. F. Petrie. 6 vols. London, Methuen and Co., 1898-1927.

Paulus, Franz. Prosopographie der Beamter des Ἀρσινοΐτης νομός in der Zeit von Augustus bis Auf Diokletian. Borna-Leipzig, R. Noske, 1914.

Preisigke, Friedrich. Girowesen im griechische Ägypten. Strassburg im Elsass, Schlesier and Schweikhardt, 1910.

Reinmuth, O. W. The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935.

Rostovtzeff, Mikhail. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1926.

Wallace, S. Taxation in Egypt. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938.

Wilcken, Ulrich. Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde. Vol. I, Part I. Leipzig-Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1912.

Articles

Aly, Zaki. "The Sitologia in Roman Egypt," Journal of Juristic Papyrology, IV (1950), 289-307.

Avogadro, Sandra. "Le ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΑΙ di proprietà nell'Egitto greco-romano," Aegyptus, XV (1935), 131-206.

Bell, H. I. "Egypt under the Early Principate," The Cambridge Ancient History, X (1934), Chapter X.

_____. "Egypt, Crete, and Cyrenaica," The Cambridge Ancient History, XI (1936), Chapter XVI.

Boak, A.E.R. "The Ancient Topography of the Fayum and the Problem of Lake Moeris," The Geographical Review, XVIII (1928), 152-154.

_____. "The Date of the Establishment of the praepositus pagi in Egypt," Mélanges Maspero, II , 125-129.

_____. "An Egyptian Farmer of the Age of Diocletian and Constantine," Byzantina Metabyzantina, I (1946), Part I, 39-53.

_____. "Politai as Landholders at Karanis in the Time of Diocletian and Constantine," Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, in press.

_____. "Tesserarii and Quadrarii in Egypt of the Fourth Century," in Coleman-Norton (ed.). Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1951, pp. 322-335.

Calderini, Aristide. "Θησαυροί , Ricerche de topografia e di storia della pubblica amministrazione nell'egitto greco-romano," Accademia scientifico-letteraria in Milano Studi della Scuola papirologica, IV, Part III (1924).

Caton-Thompson, Gertrude, and Gardner, E. W. "Recent Work on the Problem of Lake Moeris," The Geographical Journal, LXXIII (1929), 20-60.

Ensslin, W. "The Reforms of Diocletian," The Cambridge Ancient History, XII (1939), Chapter XI.

Harper, G. M. "Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris," Aegyptus, XIV (1934), 14-32.

Hombert, Marcel, and Préaux, Claire. "Le Recensement dans L'Égypte romaine," P. Lugd. Bat. V, 40-147.

Husselman, E. M. "The Granaries of Karanis," Transactions of the American Philological Association, LXXXIII (1952), 56-73.

Johnson, A. C. "Roman Egypt in the Third Century," The Journal of Juristic Papyrology, IV (1950), 151-158.

Lewis, N. "ΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΑΝΑΚΕΧΩΡΗΚΟΤΩΝ : An Aspect of the Roman Oppression in Egypt," The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXIII (1937), 63-75.

Milne, J. G. "The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement," The Journal of Roman Studies, XVII (1927), 1-13.

Preisigke, Friedrich. "Κωμάρχης," in Pauly-Wissowa (edd.). Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XI (1922), columns 1129-31.

_____. "Κωμογραμματεύς," in Pauly-Wissowa (edd.). Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XI (1922), Columns 1281-84.

_____. "Λαογράφος," in Pauly-Wissowa, (edd.). Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, XII (1925), columns 734-35.

Rostovtzeff, Mikhail. "Roman Exploitation of Egypt in the First Century A.D.," The Journal of Economic and Business History, I (1929), 337-364.

Schwartz, J. "Le Nil et le ravitaillement de Rome," Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, XLVII (1948), 179-200.

Tait, J. G. "The Strategi and Royal Scribes in the Roman Period," Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, VIII (1922), 166-173.

Tomsin, A. "Étude sur les πρεσβύτεροι des villages de la χώρα égyptienne," Bulletin de l'Academie royale de Belgique Lettres et Sciences Politiques, XXXVIII (1952), 467-502.

Turner, E. G. "Egypt and the Roman Empire: The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXII (1936), 7-19.

Viereck, Paul. "[illegible]ungen aus dem Dorfe Karanis uber [illegible]lieferung von Sa[illegible]rn," Hermes, XXX (1895), 107-123.

Youtie, H. C., and Pearl, O. M. "Notes on Papyri," American Journal of Philology, 63 (1942), 294-307.

Collections of Documents

B.G.U. Aegyptische Urkunden aus den koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden, Vols. I-LX. Berlin, 1895-1937.

Boak, A.E.R. "Select Papyri from Karanis," Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, XXIX (1929), 47-63.

_____. "Some Early Byzantine Tax Records from Egypt," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LI (1940), 35-60.

_____. "Early Byzantine Tax Receipts from Egypt," Byzantion XVII (1944-45), 16-28.

Frisk, Hjalmar. "Vier Papyri aus der Berliner-Sammlung," Aegyptus, IX (1928), 281-295.

Goodspeed, E. "Karanis Papyri," Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, 3 (1902), 1-66.

O. Mich. I, Nos. 1-699 =Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection, Part I, edited by Leiv Amundsen, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1935.

O. Mich. II, Nos. 700-971=Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis, pp. 143-199, edited by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1944.

O. Mich. III, Nos. 972-1111=Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis, Second Series, pp. 165-209, edited by H. C. Youtie.

P. Aberd.=E. G. Turner, Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri and Ostraca in the Possession of the University of Aberdeen. Aberdeen University Studies, No. 116, 1939.

P. Amh.= B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, The Amherst Papyri, Parts I-II. London, 1900-1901.

P. Athen. S. A.=G. A. Petropoulos, Papyri Societatis Archaeologicae Atheniensis, Πραγματειαι τῆς Ἀδαημιάς Ἀθηνῶν 10, Athens, 1939.

P. Cairo Boak=A.E.R. Boak, "Early Byzantine Papyri from the Cairo Museum," Études de Papyrologie, II (1934), 1-22; III (1936), 1-45; V (1939), 85-117; VII (1948), 35-71.

P. Cairo Goodspeed=E. Goodspeed. Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum together with Papyri of Roman Egypt from American Collections. University of Chicago Decennal Publications, Chicago, 1902.

P. Cornell=W. L. Westermann, and C. J. Kraemer, Jr. Greek Papyri in the Library of Cornell University. New York, 1926.

P. Giss.= E. Kornemann, O. Eger, and P. M. Meyer, Griechische Papyri im Museum des oberhessischen Geschichtsverein zu Giessen, Vol. I. Leipzig and Berlin, 1910-1912.

P. Got.=H. Frisk. Papyrus grecs de la Bibliotheque Municipale de Gothembourg. Goteborgs Hogskolas Arsskrift, 35 (1929).

P. Hamb.= P. M. Meyer, Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Vol. I. Leipzig and Berlin, 1911-1924.

P. Iand.= K. Kalbfleisch and others, Papyri Iandanae, fasc. I-VIII. Leipzig, 1912-1938.

P. Lips.= L. Mitteis, Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig. Leipzig, 1906.

P. Lond.= F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue with Texts, Vols. I-V. London, 1893-1917.

P. Lugd. Bat.=C. Leemans, Papyri graeci musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, Vol. I-VI, Leiden, 1843-1950.

P. Mich. III, Nos. 131-121=Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection, Miscellaneous Papyri, edited by J. G. Winter and others. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1936.

P. Mich. IV, Part I, Nos. 223-225=Tax Rolls from Karanis, Part I, edited by H. C. Youtie, V. B. Schuman, and O. M. Pearl. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.

P. Mich. IV, Part II, Nos. 357-363=Tax Rolls from Karanis, Part II, edited by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1936.

P. Mich. VI, Nos. 364-428=Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis, pp. 1-142, edited by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1944.

P. Mich. VIII, Nos. 464-521= Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis, Second Series, pp. 1-164, edited by J. G. Winter and H. C. Youtie. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1951.

P. Osl.= S. Eitrem and L. Amundsen, Papyri Osloensës, fasc. I-III. Oslo, 1925-1936.

P. S. I. Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto: Papiri greci e latini, edited by G. Vitelli, M. Norsa, and others, Vols. I-XII, i; XIII, i. Florence, 1912-1949.

Wilcken, Ulrich. Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde. Vol. I, Part II. Leipzig-Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1912.