



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 5, 1990

1990





**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 5

1990



Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johann Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme
Georg Rehrenböck, Walter Scheidel, Hans Tacuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgesendet werden. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II²2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490 und P. Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1990 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

INHALT

| | |
|---|-----|
| Guido Bastianini (Milano), Una dichiarazione di un cammello. SPP XXII 97 riconsiderato (Tafel 1) | 1 |
| Guido Bastianini (Milano) e Claudio Gallazzi (Milano), Dati per un oroscopo. O.Tebt. NS inv. 89/1 (Tafel 2) | 5 |
| Björn Forsén (Helsinki), A Rediscovered Dedication to Zeus Hypsistos. EM 3221 (Tafel 3) | 9 |
| Claudio Gallazzi (Milano) e Guido Bastianini (Milano), Dati per un oroscopo. O.Tebt. NS inv. 89/1 (Tafel 2) | 5 |
| Dorottya Gáspár (Budapest), Eine griechische Fluchtafel aus Savaria (Tafel 4) | 13 |
| Ulrike Horak (Wien), Eine alphabetische Steuerliste und ein Grundkataster aus byzantinischer Zeit (Tafel 5, 6) | 17 |
| Mika Kajava (Helsinki), A New City Patroness? (Tafel 7, 8) | 27 |
| Johannes Kramer (Siegen), Lateinisch-griechisches Glossar (Tafel 2) | 37 |
| Johannes Kramer (Siegen), Zwei neue Augustalpräfekten auf einem lateinischen Protokoll (Tafel 9) | 41 |
| Dirk-Joachim Kukofka (Heidelberg), Waren die Bundesgenossen an den Land- verteilungen des Tiberius Gracchus beteiligt? | 45 |
| Leslie S. B. MacCoul (Washington), φιλοτιμία in Byzantine Papyrus Docu- ments | 63 |
| Brian McGing (Dublin), Melitian Monks at Labla (Tafel 10–12) | 67 |
| Peter van Minnen (Leiden) and Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam), A New Edition of Ostraka from Akoris | 95 |
| Rosario Pintaudi (Firenze), Oxyrhynchos e Oxyrhyncha. P.Vat. Gr. 65: Lettera di Dionysodoros ad Asklepiades (Tafel 13) | 101 |
| Genç Pollo (Tirana), Die Germanicus-Inschrift aus Buthrotum (Tafel 14) | 105 |
| Athanasios Rizakis (Athen), La <i>politeia</i> dans les cités de la confédération achéene (Tafel 15) | 109 |
| Ralf Scharf (Heidelberg), Der <i>comes sacri stabuli</i> in der Spätantike | 135 |
| Wido Sieberer (Innsbruck), Zur Lokalisierung des homerischen Ithaka | 149 |
| Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), Five Byzantine Papyri (Tafel 16–19) | 165 |
| Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), Liste mit Getreide-, Öl- und Geldzahlungen (Tafel 20, 21) | 171 |
| Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), A Dedication to Isis. SEG XXXI 1532 Re- dated | 175 |
| Johannes Triantaphyllopoulos (Athen), Zu Corpus Papyrorum Raineri XIV (Griechische Texte X) | 177 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam) and Peter van Minnen (Leiden), A New Edition of Ostraka from Akoris | 95 |
| Bemerkungen zu Papyri III <Korr. Tyche 28 – 34> | 179 |
| Buchbesprechungen | 183 |
| Massimo Pallotino: <i>Etruskologie. Geschichte und Kultur der Etrusker</i> , Basel 1988 (193); A. Valvo: <i>La „Profezia di Vegeia“</i> , Roma 1988 (183); <i>La formazione della città in Emilia Romagna</i> , Bologna 1988 (184); <i>Celti ed Etrusci nell'Italia centro-settentrionale dal V secolo a. C. alla romanizzazione</i> . Atti del Colloquio Internazionale. Bologna 1987 (186); Gilda Bartoloni [u. a.]: <i>Le urne a capanna rinvenute in Italia</i> , Roma 1987 (187); M. Milanese: <i>Scavi nell'oppidum preromano di Genova (Genova-San Silvestro)</i> , Roma 1987 (188); Luciana Aigner Foresti — St. Leontsini: <i>Die Prostitution im frühen Byzanz</i> , Wien 1989 (189; Johannes Diethart) — A. Rengakos: <i>Form und Wandel des Machtdenkens der Athener bei Thukydides</i> , Stuttgart 1984 (190); Appian v. Alexandria: <i>Römische Geschichte</i> , 2. T., übers. O. Veh, Stuttgart 1989 (191); J. Buckler: <i>Philip II and the Sacred War</i> , Leiden 1989 (191); H. H. Brouwer: <i>Bona Dea</i> , Leiden 1989 (192); R. v. Haehling: <i>Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerkes</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (193); Th. Schäfer: <i>Imperii insignia. Sella curulis und fasces</i> , Mainz 1989 (194); G. Alföldy: <i>Die Krise des römischen Reiches</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (194); J. D. Minyard: <i>Lucretius and the Late Republic</i> , Leiden 1985 (195); J. Hahn: <i>Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (196); H. E. Herzig, R. Frei-Stolba: <i>Labor omnibus unus. G. Walser zum 70. Geburtstag</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (196); G. F. Hertzberg: <i>Die Geschichte Griechenlands unter der Herrschaft der Römer</i> , Nachdruck Hildesheim 1990 (197; Gerhard Dobesch) — R. Pintaudi [u. a.]: <i>Papyri Graecae Wessely Pragenses (P. Prag. I)</i> , Firenze 1988 (199; Bernhard Palme) — P. Garnsey: <i>Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World</i> , Cambridge 1989 (202); P. Garnsey, R. Saller: <i>Das römische Kaiserreich. Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft und Kultur</i> , Reinbek 1989 (203; Walter Scheidel) — G. Dragon, D. Feïssel: <i>Inscriptions de Cilicie</i> , Paris 1987 (204; Peter Siewert) | |
| Corrigendum zu Tyche 4 (1989), 160 | 206 |
| Indices: Johannes Diethart | 207 |

Tafel 1 – 21

BRIAN C. MCGING

Melitian Monks at Labla*

(Tafel 10–12)

I. Introduction

In 1890 A. H. Sayce published two fine Byzantine documents, deeds of, apparently, the sale of two Melitian monasteries at Arsinoe (Sayce 1890, 131–144)**. He said that they had been found the year before by Flinders Petrie at Hawara, just a few miles from Arsinoe, but gave no indication that there were in fact three documents. During the 1889 excavations at Hawara, in the remains of a basilica just to the north-west of the pyramid (for a plan see Flinders Petrie 1889, pl. 25), Petrie made the following discovery:

“Three papyri of the Vth or VIth century were found in a curious manner. They are deeds of the sale of monastic property; each was rolled up separately; the rolls were then bound round, along with slips of reed, to prevent their being bent or broken; then tied up in a linen cloth; next in a large lump of old tattered woollen embroidery; and the bundle placed in a big jar sunk in the ground. They were thus perfectly preserved until we took them out.” (Flinders Petrie 1890, 21).

For reasons that will be discussed, it seems highly probable that the third of these documents is an unpublished papyrus in the possession of Trinity College Dublin, presented here as document 3. Sayce's editions of the other two, which are now to be found in University College London, are what we would today find rather inaccurate, but he was, of course, working in the early days of papyrology, when the parallels were not known and standard procedures not yet established. The texts were transferred to the *Sammelbuch* I 5174 and 5175, with only the smallest of changes, and in spite of some corrections by Turner 1952, 132–133, they remain highly unsatisfactory. So it seems an opportune moment to reedit them, and thus reunite all three.

In this introductory section, discussion will centre on one general problem concerning the documents; that is, a matter of terminology, revolving around the words *δρος* and *μοναστήριον*. What exactly is the property that Eulogios is ‘selling’ in documents 1 and 2? (On the character of the transaction, which at least in document 1 is almost certainly not a real sale, see below p. 72). What is Aιουλιος' *μοναστήριον* in document 3? And what is the nature of the monastic settlement at Labla? The problem may be highlighted

* I am very grateful to Dr. Walter E. H. Cockle for finding SB I 5174 and 5175 for me in University College London; for having them photographed and for checking up some details I had overlooked. Dr. J. David Thomas of Durham University has, as always, been very generous with comments and suggestions — my special thanks to him.

** For abbreviated literature see the bibliography at the end of this article.

by drawing attention to the description of the property being sold in document 2: it is called a 'monastery in the said monastery of Labla' (ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ μοναστηρίῳ Λάβλα μοναστήριον — l. 5; 19). What can be meant by a 'monastery in a monastery'?

In document 1 Eulogios sells a μοναστήριον he owns in the ὄρος called Labla (ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ ὄρει τῷ καλουμένῳ Λάβλα μοναστήριον, l. 5), which we are told lay in the district of Arsinoe (τῆς Ἀρσινουτικῆς ἐνορίας, l. 2; 15–16). The purchaser is a Melitian priest called Pousis, who also lives 'in the said ὄρος called Labla' (l. 4). Eulogios had formerly lived there himself when he too was a Melitian, but he had converted to orthodoxy, and now lived in the μοναστήριον called Μικροῦ Ψουον, situated in the outskirts of Arsinoe (προαστίων τῆς αὐτῆς Ἀρσινουτῶν πόλεως, l. 3). Eulogios' μοναστήριον is being sold with all its cells (κελλία), with what is called its ἄπλωμα (for the meaning see document 1, 5 commentary) in front of the cells, and with all rights pertaining to the building (l. 5–6; 16). The boundaries of the site are: to the south, the μοναστήριον of the late Andreas, priest — there was also desert in this direction (τὸ ὄρος, l. 7: the meaning here is clear), perhaps to the south-east, as the eastern boundary is described solely as 'desert'; to the north the μοναστήριον of the priest Naaraos; and to the west a public road running in front of the μοναστήριον of the deacon Peter. The price agreed and handed over in the presence of the witnesses is 8 gold *solidi* and 1200 myriads of *denarii*.

Less than a year later, in a very similarly worded deed (document 2), the same Eulogios sells what appears to be the same property to two different people, Parnouthios son of Isak and Ioulios son of Aranthios. The price is 10 gold *solidi*. This time, as noted above, Labla is described slightly differently, and more puzzlingly: Eulogios sells ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ μοναστηρίῳ Λάβλα μοναστήριον (l. 5; 19), and throughout, Labla is called μοναστήριον rather than ὄρος. It is, however, well known that ὄρος and μοναστήριον are sometimes used synonymously (see especially Cadell and Rémondon 1967, 347), so there need be little significance in the different terminology (although we are still left with the curious description of a μοναστήριον within a μοναστήριον). Superficially more important is that now this establishment of Labla is described as being 'in the outskirts of Arsinoe' (Parnouthios and Ioulios are Melitian monks μοναστηρίου καλουμένου Λάβλα προαστίων τῆς αὐτῆς Ἀρσινουτῶν πόλεως, l. 3–4), whereas in document 1 it was only 'in the district of Arsinoe' (τῆς Ἀρσινουτικῆς ἐνορίας, l. 2; 15–16). Although ἐνορία and προάστια can mean much the same thing, the use of different words does seem to imply an intended contrast. Labla, where Eulogios used to live, was in the ἐνορία of Arsinoe (I take it that Ἀρσινουτικός here must refer to the town of Arsinoe, rather than the nome), while his new dwelling place at Μικροῦ Ψουον was in the προάστια of the town. But as Labla in document 2 is located in the προάστια of Arsinoe, it is clear that τῆς Ἀρσινουτικῆς ἐνορίας and προαστίων τῆς Ἀρσινουτῶν πόλεως do in fact mean the same. The alternative that there were two places called Labla, one an ὄρος in the ἐνορία of Arsinoe, the other a μοναστήριον in the town's προάστια, is absurd.

That it is in fact the same place and the same monastic establishment being sold in both documents, is the only convincing conclusion to be drawn from the descriptions of the boundaries of the property. For in document 2 the boundaries to the north and west are exactly the same as in document 1 — respectively, the μοναστήριον of the priest Naaraos, and a public road running in front of the μοναστήριον of the deacon Peter; the boundary to the east is the same 'desert', except that we are given the additional

information that the entrance and exit are located here also (document 1 makes no reference to the entrance and exit); and the only apparently different boundary is that to the south — a deserted (ἔρημον) μοναστήριον instead of the μοναστήριον of the late Andreas, priest. Although Hengstenberg 1935, 357, had already suggested that SB I 5174 and 5175 concerned the same property, Abbot 1937, 37, saw no difficulty in identifying two different monasteries. Barison 1938, 70, exaggerated the difference between the eastern boundaries, recognised a problem with the north and west, but still concluded that there were two separate, but contiguous monasteries, the ‘deserted monastery’ of document 2 being the one Eulogios had sold in document 1. The southern boundaries, the μοναστήριον of Andreas in document 1 and the deserted μοναστήριον of document 2 are quite conceivably the same, and indeed necessarily so, given that the boundaries to the north, east and west are the same. The two transactions undoubtedly concern the same property (the consequences of this for the nature of the transactions are discussed below p. 72).

Lastly, document 3 is endorsed on the back as an agreement between Aioulios and Eulogios, ‘Melitian monks in the ὄρος of Labla’ (μονάζοντες Μελιτιανοὶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα, l. 14–15; for the reading see below p. 91). The agreement specifies various conditions on which Aioulios’ μοναστήριον, in which they both live, will devolve upon Eulogios. Of the six witnesses, two are ‘Melitian priests of the holy Catholic church in the ὄρος of Labla’ (πρεσβύτεροι ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας Μελιτιανοὶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα, l. 10); a third also appears to be a Melitian (l. 11, see commentary); and, perhaps more surprisingly, three are ‘orthodox priests in the ὄρος of Labla’ (πρεσβύτεροι ὀρθόδοξοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα, l. 11–12).

In relation to the nature of the establishment of Labla, and of the μοναστήρια of Eulogios and Aioulios, there seem to be two slightly different ways of interpreting this material. First of all, Eulogios’ property is an independent monastery within a larger enclave of monasteries known as Labla. So too with Aioulios’ μοναστήριον. Cadell and Rémondon 1967, 348, note that among the various meanings which the term ὄρος can bear, one is ‘une zone où se concentrent les monastères.’ Husson 1967, 190, comes up with a similar but perhaps slightly more ambiguous translation, ‘un ensemble de plusieurs installations monastiques’ (are these ‘monastic installations’ independent monasteries, or are they separate units that go to make up one monastery?). So in document 1 Eulogios sells an actual monastery within the enclave of monasteries called Labla. The purchaser Pousis also lives in one of the monasteries of this enclave, but it is not specified which one, and although it might be a natural assumption that he lives in the one he is, apparently, buying from Eulogios, this is neither stated nor clear. The monastery is sold with all its cells (κελλία) and a ἕπλωμα in front of the cells, but there is no firm indication of the size of the establishment. Of the other monasteries mentioned in the deed, Mikrou Psuon is specifically not part of the monastic enclave of Labla, but presumably those of Andreas, Naaraos and Peter, which border Eulogios’ property, do belong to it.

In document 2 Labla is, as we saw, called a monastery, but it may easily be supposed that the word μοναστήριον has been used instead of ὄρος, with no intended difference of meaning: Eulogios’ sale of ‘a monastery in a monastery’ is really the sale of a monastery within the enclave of monasteries known as Labla. And in document 3, Aioulios owns another of the monasteries within the same enclave. We also hear that there is a Melitian church in it, and, interestingly, that the establishment is not exclusively a Melitian preserve:

orthodox priests live there too (Husson 1967, 190, maintained that because Labla was exclusively Melitian, Eulogios had to change residence when he converted to orthodoxy).

This is a coherent picture of a series of presumably small, independent monasteries close to each other, forming a sort of monastic zone to which the collective name Labla has been applied, and comprising at least part of the *προάστια* of the town of Arsinoe. It would seem to be the meaning implied by Cadell and Rémondon 1967, 348, and by Husson 1967, 190 ('le μοναστήριον qui est vendu est une sorte de petit monastère individuel comprenant plusieurs pièces, à l'intérieur d'un ensemble monastique plus vaste').

This interpretation is not without problems. In document 2 the only thing to make us wonder whether Labla might be something other than a monastery is Eulogios' sale of a *μοναστήριον* in this very monastery. Elsewhere in the document there is no difficulty in translating the word *μοναστήριον* as 'monastery': in l. 2–3, for instance, Eulogios, orthodox monk of the monastery of Mikrou Psuon, sells his property to Papnouthios and Ioulios, Melitian monks of the monastery of Labla: Mikrou Psuon is one monastery, Labla another. Our interpretation of Labla as a monastic enclave depends on that meaning of the word *ἄρος* applied to Labla in document 1, and the interchangeability of *ἄρος* and *μοναστήριον* in document 2. The problem, however, is that this does not appear to be a two-way interchange: *ἄρος* can stand for *μοναστήριον*, but only to mean 'monastery'. It is by no means clear that *μοναστήριον* can stand for *ἄρος* in the latter's other meanings, such as 'monastic enclave' (*μοναστήριον* obviously, for instance, cannot mean 'desert', the way *ἄρος* does in the phrase *νότου τὸ ἄρος* or *ἀπηλιώτου τὸ ἄρος*). But even if we allow this, it seems strange that so many monks in these documents are described in such a non-specific manner. They are simply monks in the zone of monasteries called Labla: the particular monastery to which they belong is not specified. So in document 1, for instance, Eulogios is now living in the monastery called Mikrou Psuon, whereas he used to live in an apparently unspecified monastery in the monastic zone called Labla. It is difficult to avoid feeling that the *ἄρος/μοναστήριον* of Labla does, in fact, have some sort of corporate identity.

Returning to document 2 and the *μοναστήριον* within the *μοναστήριον* of Labla, if we take it that Labla is in fact a monastery, rather than a monastic zone, what is the *μοναστήριον* that Eulogios is selling? It has long been pointed out (see, for instance, Steinwenter 1930, 6) that the original meaning of the word *μοναστήριον* was 'cell', the dwelling place of a hermit (*μονάζων*). This seems to lead to a more satisfactory interpretation of the material. Eulogios' property in documents 1 and 2 would then be one of the cell units that go to make up the probably loose-knit monastery of Labla. Aioulios in document 3 owns another of these units. What this amounts to is that Labla is an establishment of the *laura* type, the *laura* representing the development of the Antonian eremitic life into something with a more communal nature, which still preserved part of the hermit's independence (see Rousseau 1978, 33–49). There is no mention of a superior or *οἰκονόμος*, nor any other strong indications of a coenobitic organization at Labla, and it has usually been thought of as a *laura* (Steinwenter 1930, 6; Abbot 1937, 38; Barison 1938, 70; Ballini 1939, 79–80). Indeed Hengstenberg 1935, 357, made the rarely noticed suggestion that the name Labla is derived from *laura*, that the place got its name from the type of establishment it was. One might cite in support the name Cellia. Chitty 1966, 13, describes a *laura* as follows: 'a row or cluster of solitary cells round a common centre,

including a church or bakehouse where the ascetics would assemble for Saturdays and Sundays, spending the rest of the week in their cells.' This might be what came to be recognised as the canonical form of the *laura*, but the structure could be considerably looser (Evelyn-White 1932, 182), and different eremitic communities developed in different ways (Walters 1974, 7–13). Although the Melitian monks at Labla, and indeed at Hathor, seem to live and behave in neither pure Pachomian nor pure Antonian fashion (see below p. 77), it still seems best to regard the establishment at Labla as a *laura*, or something very like it.

The specification of Eulogios' property as a *μοναστήριον* with all its cells (*κελλία* in document 1, 5; 16; *μνήματα* in document 2, 5; 19) poses no problem, as both *κελλίον* and *μνήμα* can just mean 'room' (Husson 1983, 142–147 [*κελλίον*]; 163–164 [*μνήμα*]). While a cell might be a simple, single room, it could certainly be more extensive: at the monastery of Nitria, for instance, there were about fifty cells and anywhere between 3000 and 5000 monks, who, we are told, lived in larger or smaller groups, or even in pairs and singly (Evelyn-White 1932, 172). There must have been some cells with many rooms. Even a single monk in an isolated hermitage at Cellia might have several rooms at his disposal (Daumas 1967, 438–440). Indeed the excavations at Cellia and Esna show well the different forms and sizes of cell that existed (Sauneron *et al.* 1972; Daumas and Guillaumont 1969; Kasser 1967, 1972, 1983). In the case of Eulogios' cell we do not know whether the purchasers Pousis, Papnouthios and Ioulios lived in it with him, but in document 3 both Aioulios and Eulogios certainly live in the one unit which forms the object of the agreement, and probably Isak too. So while these cells were apparently able to accommodate two or three people, we cannot tell if they were much larger or not.

When it comes to the boundaries of Eulogios' unit in documents 1 and 2, the 'monasteries' of Andreas, Naaraos and Peter would, on the suggested interpretation, also be cells in the *laura* of Labla, not entirely separate and independent monasteries located in a part of Arsinoe called Labla, where there happened to be a concentration of monasteries. Admittedly this is a fine distinction, as it is perfectly clear that Eulogios and Aioulios have complete control over their property, and thus in effect run independent establishments. The important point is that even if privately owned and administered, they are still part of a larger monastic organization, the *laura* known as Labla. They do not just stand on their own.

It might be regarded as a problem that, as document 3 shows, within what I am suggesting could be a single, if loosely structured, monastery of Labla, there are both schismatic Melitians and orthodox monks living side by side. But this situation can be paralleled. For a time in the 6th century some Melitians formed part of the congregation of the monastery of Scetis (they were eventually expelled — see below p. 91); and at Cellia there were both orthodox and Monophysite monks each with their own church (Evelyn-White 1932, 222–223). So it would be neither particularly surprising nor problematic to find both orthodox and Melitians in the monastic establishment of Labla.

II. Documents 1 and 2

Editions: Sayce 1890, 131–144; SB I 5174; 5175.

Corrections: Kapsomenakis 1938, 84 n. 1; Turner 1952, 132–133 = BL III 173–174; Teodorsson 1976, 248 = BL VII 186; Diethart and Worp 1986, 36.

Literature: Steinwenter 1930, 5–7; Hengstenberg 1935, 357; Abbot 1937, 37–38; Barison 1938, 62; 69–72; Ballini 1939, 79–81; Montevecchi 1941, 105–106; 117–118; Husson 1967, 190–191; Montevecchi 1973, 210; Husson 1979, 193–195; Timm 1985, 1481–1484.

Both documents are apparently deeds of sale, expressed in the expected formulaic terminology. The vendor and purchasers are named, the ownership of the property to be sold established and the property itself described, in particular its location. The vendor acknowledges that he has received the agreed price in the presence of the witnesses, and that the purchasers now have unqualified ownership of the property and the right to make whatever changes to it they see fit, or dispose of it in exactly the manner they choose. It is the responsibility of the vendor (and his heirs and successors) to deal with any legal claims that arise on the property, and the penalties are fixed for failing to do this. In both deeds someone has written on behalf of the illiterate Eulogios, Aurelios Phoibammon in document 1, and the presumably more prestigious Flavios Timotheos, councillor and *conductor* (see document 2, 21 commentary) at Arsinoe, in document 2. There are five witnesses in document 1, among whom only two wine merchants and one surveyor specify their profession; and four witnesses in document 2, a president of the brick-makers association (κεφαλαιωτῆς πλιθουργῶν), a banker, a wine merchant and one other of unspecified job.

As discussed above (p. 68), the conclusion seems inescapable that the property sold is the same in both deeds: in 512 A. D. Eulogios sells a μοναστήριον to one person, and less than a year later sells the same μοναστήριον to two different people. How can this be? Rightly regarding it as highly improbable that Eulogios bought back the property between the two sales, Montevecchi 1941, 105–106; 117–118, has surely provided the correct solution (see also Montevecchi 1973, 210): the first transaction is not really a sale at all, but rather a fictitious sale representing the guarantee for a loan according to a form analogous to this and well known, the ὀνή ἐν πίστει (see Pringsheim 1950, 118–119). The price of the property ‘sold’ is the amount of the loan, and as Montevecchi points out, Eulogios’ former Melitian colleagues are presumably now all the more interested in getting a guarantee for the money they have lent, since Eulogios, having converted to orthodoxy, is no longer one of them. In two other cases in the papyri (Montevecchi 1941, 94 No. 8–9; 98 No. 139–142), exactly the same situation arises of a single property being sold twice by the same vendor to different purchasers, and the explanation must in these cases be as Montevecchi sees it. It may also be that many of the other numerous deeds of sale are in fact fictitious sales of the same sort (for a list of deeds of sale, see Montevecchi 1941, 94–98, supplemented in Montevecchi 1973, 210). Whether Eulogios’ second transaction also represents a loan guarantee, we cannot say. The amount of money involved is slightly more, but the terms of the deed are almost identical, and there seems to be nothing that would distinguish a real sale from a fictitious one.

1. Guarantee in the form of a sale of a μοναστήριον

Document 1 (SB I 5174)
Arsinoe

84.2 × 29.7 cms

7th September 512 A. D.
Tafel 10

The papyrus is complete, and the writing, for the most part, very clear. The ink has faded in some parts along lines of wear caused perhaps by the rolled-up papyrus being flattened out a little, and the ends of the

lines are slightly less distinct: this only causes difficulty with the last words of l. 3. The first hand is the same as that of document 2, 1. There are four kolleses, at 13.1 cms from the left hand edge; at 31.7 cms; at 48.7 cms; at 67.5 cms. The writing is along the fibres, and it is impossible to tell if there is anything on the back, as this is now covered by the framing: Sayce did not note anything.

- 1 (1st hand) Ϙ Ὑπατία Φλαουίων Παύλου{υ} και Μοσχιανού τῶν λαμπροτάτων
 Θῶθ δεκάτη ἕκτης ἰνδικ(τίονος) ἐν Ἄρσιν(όη) ἐπαρχ(ίας) Ἄρκαδίας.
- 2 ὁμολογεῖ Εὐλόγιος μονάζων ποτὲ μὲν Μελιτιανός, νῦν δὲ ὀρθόδοξος, υἱὸς
 Ἰωσήφ, πρώην μὲν οἰκῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ καλουμένῳ Λάβλα τῆς Ἄρσινοειτικῆς
 ἐν[ο]ρίας, τὸ νῦν δὲ τὴν οἴκησιν ποιούμεν[ος] ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ τῷ καλο^υμένῳ
 Μικροῦ Ψυῶν
- 3 προαστίων τῆς αὐτῆς Ἄρσινοειτῶν πόλεως, ἔκουσίᾳ καὶ αὐθαιρέτῳ καὶ ἀμε-
 τανοήτῳ γνώμῃ πεπρακέναι καὶ καταγεγραφεκέναι πρὸς πᾶσαν δεσποτίαν ἀπὸ
 τοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξῆς ἅπαντα χρόνον Ποῦσι πρεσβυτέρῳ Μελιτιανῷ υἱῷ Α. . .
 οἴκοντι
- 4 ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ ὄρει τῷ καλουμένῳ Λάβλα τὸ ὑπάρχον αὐτῷ τῷ πωλοῦντι Εὐλόγιῳ
 καὶ περιελθὸν εἰς αὐτόν, καθὼς διεβεβαιώσατο καὶ ἐνεγράψατο, τῷ ἰδίῳ ἑαυτοῦ
 κινδύνῳ καὶ τιμῆματι, ἀπὸ δικαίων καὶ εὐλόγων αἰτιῶν, ἀκολούθως τοῖς προ-
 σούσ[ιν] αὐτῷ
- 5 δικαίοις καὶ τῇ περὶ αὐτὸν ἀστασιάστῳ νομῇ καὶ δεσποτίᾳ, ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ ὄρει
 τῷ καλουμένῳ Λάβλα, μοναστήριον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, ὅσων δ' ἂν ἔστιν κελλίων,
 ἀνεωγμένον εἰς ἀπηλιώτην, μετὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπλώματος ὄντος ἔμπροσθεν τῶν
 κελλίων,
- 6 καὶ παντὸς δικαίου αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν αὐτῷ
 τῷ πωλοῦντι Εὐλόγιῳ ἐκεῖσε ὑπολειφθαί τι ἄπρατον τὸ σύνολον, οὐ καὶ
 εἰσὶν γίτονες, νότου τὸ ὄρος καὶ μοναστήριον τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀνδρέα πρεσ-
 βυτέρου, βορρᾶ μοναστήριον Νααραοῦ
- 7 πρεσβυτέρου, ἀπηλιώτου τὸ ὄρος, λιβὸς ὁδὸς δημοσία, μεθ' ἣν μοναστήριον
 Πέτρου διακόνου, καὶ ἀπέχειν αὐτὸν τὸν πεπρακὸτα Εὐλόγιον παρὰ τοῦ
 πριαμένου Ποῦσι τὴν συμπεφωνημένην πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ συναρέσασαν ὑπὲρ
 τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πεπραμένου
- 8 αὐτῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ μοναστηρίου ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου τιμὴν πᾶσαν ἐκ πλήρους χρυσοῦ
 νομισμάτια δεσποτικὰ δόκιμα ὀκτῶ πλήρης καὶ ἀργυρίου μεγάλου μυριάδας
 χιλίας διακοσίας, χρ(υσοῦ) νο(μισμάτια) η(πλήρης) (καὶ) ἀργ(υρίου)
 (δηναρίων μυριάδας) ς, δοθέντας αὐτῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ χειρὸς εἰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ
 παρο^υσίᾳ
- 9 τῶν ἐξῆς ὑπογραφόντων μαρτύρων, πρὸς τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τὸν πριαμένον Ποῦσιν
 κρατεῖν καὶ κυριεῦειν τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐώνηται μοναστηρίου ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, ὅσων
 δ' ἂν ἔστιν κελλίων, καὶ τοῦ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν τῶν κελλίων ἀπλώματος, καὶ
 παντὶ δικαίῳ αὐτοῦ
- 10 ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους, ὡς προέγραπται, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν διοικεῖν,
 οἰκονομεῖν, ἐπιτελεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, βελτιοῦν, φιλοκαλεῖν, καθελεῖν, ἀνοικο-
 δομεῖν, μετασχηματίζειν, ἐν οἷα βούλεται ὄψει καὶ διαθέσει, εἰς κληρονόμους
 καὶ διαδόχους παραπέμπειν,
- 11 ἔκποιεῖν ἑτέροις καὶ ἀποχαρίζεσθαι καθ' ὃν βούλεται τρόπον, ἀνεπικαλύτως.

καὶ τὸν ἐπελευσόμενον ἢ ἀντιποιησόμενον τούτου ἕνεκεν ἢ μέρους χάριν παραχρῆμα ἀποστήσιν τὸν πεπρακότα Εὐλόγιον καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ κληρονόμους καὶ διαδόχους, ἰδίους αὐτῶν

- 12 ἀναλώμασιν καὶ δαπανήμασιν, καὶ τὴν νομὴν καθαρτοποιῆσαι τῷ τε πριαμένῳ Ποῦσι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ κληρονόμοις καὶ διαδόχοις. εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσωσιν, προσεκτίσωσιν ἦνπερ εἴληφεν ὁ πεπρακὼς Εὐλόγιος καὶ ἐγγεγραμμένην τιμὴν διπλῆν
- 13 καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀναλώματα καὶ δαπανήματα τὰ φανησόμενα γεγενημένα εἰς τὴν τούτου φιλοκαλίαν ἢ καὶ ἀνοικοδομίαν ἢ καὶ προφάσει αὐτοῦ ζημιώματα ἐν δικαστηρίῳ ἢ ἐκτὸς δικαστηρίου, καὶ αὐτὰ πάντα διπλᾶ. ἢ πρᾶσις κυρία ἀπλῆ γραφεῖσα. καὶ
- 14 ὑπέθετο ὁ πεπρακὼς Εὐλόγιος τῷ πριαμένῳ Ποῦσι εἰς τὴν βεβαίωσιν καὶ καθαρποίησιν τῆσδε τῆς πράσεως πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπάρξοντα ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἐνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ, καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις
- 15 ἐπερωτηθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ὡμολόγησεν. Ϝ (2nd hand) Εὐλόγιος μονάδον υἱὸς Ἰωσήπ ὁ πρωγεγραμμένος πέπρακα ἔκουσίε γνήμη σοι Ποῦσι πρεσβυτέρῳ Μελειτιανῷ τῷ ὑπάρχον μοι ἀπὸ δικαίον καὶ εὐλόγων ἐτιῶν ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ ὄρι τῷ καλουμένῳ Λάβλα τῆς Ἄρσινω-
- 16 ειτηκῆς ἐνωρίας μοναστήριν ἐξ ὠλωκλήρου ἀνεογμένῳ εἰς ἀπιλιώτην, ὥσον δ' ἂν ἔστιν κελλείον, μετὰ τοῦ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτὸν ἀφλώματος καὶ παντὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ δικαίου ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους, καὶ ἐπληρώθην παρὰ σοῦ διὰ χειρὸς τὴν τούτου τημὴν χρυσίου νομισμάτια ὠκτῶ
- 17 πλήρης καὶ ἀργυρίου μεγάλου μυριάδας χιλίας διακοσίας, δοθέντα μοι ἐπὶ παρουσίαν τῶν ἐξῆς ὑπογραφόντων μαρτύρον, καὶ συμφωνί μοι πάντα, ὡς πρόκίτε καὶ ἀπέλυσα. Αὐρήλιος Φοιβάμμων υἱὸς Κυρίλλου ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως ἀξιοθις ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ παρώντος ἀγραμμάτου ὄντος.
- 18 (3rd hand) Αὐρήλιος Παῦλος υἱὸς Δαυεῖτ οἰνωπράτης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσιος καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς τιμῆς τῶν νομισματίων ὀκτῶ καὶ τῶν <τοῦ> κέρματος μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων, ὡς πρόκίται. (4th hand) Αὐρήλιος
- 19 Εὐλόγιος υἱὸς Εὐφραντίου ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς τιμῆς τῶν νομισματίων ὀκτῶ καὶ τῶν τοῦ κέρματος {τῶν} μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων, ὡς πρόκίται. (5th hand) Αὐρήλιος Νεῖλος υἱὸς Φοιβάμμωνος γεωμέτρης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως
- 20 μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς τιμῆς τῶν νομισματίων ὠκτῶ καὶ τῶν τοῦ κέρματος μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων, ὡς πρόκίται. (6th hand) † Ὁρήλιος Ἄπα Ὁλ υἱὸς Ἐλλᾶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς τιμῆς
- 21 τῶν νομισματίων ὀκτῶ καὶ τῶν τοῦ κέρματος μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων, ὡς πρόκίται. (7th hand) Αὐρήλιος Εὐλόγιος υἱὸς Νειλάμμωνου οἰνωπράτης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσινωειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς τιμῆς τῶν νομισματίων ὀκτῶ καὶ τῶν τοῦ κέρματος μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων, ὡς πρόκίται.

- 22 𐤀 di emu Eulogiu eprach(the) — δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου.
 23 Three embroidered strokes.

Apparatus A

1. ὑπατία. φλαουίων. παύλου. Θωθ: δεκατη. 2. υἱός ἰωσηφ. οἰκῶν. Ἀρσινωτικῆς. 3. Ἀρσινωιτῶν. 4. ὑπαρχον. ἰδῶ. 6. μέχρι. ὕψους. ὑπολειφθαι. ου⁷ και εισιν. γείτονες. 7. ὑπερ 8. χρ/ ὅ η πληρj j αργχ ς α / ὦ. 9. πρὸς τό. κυριευει (subscribed dot). 10. ὕψους. 11. ἀποστήσειν. 12. καθαροποιήσειν. ποιήσουσιν. προσεκτείσαι. 14. ὑπεθετο. ἰδικος. 15. μονάζων. υἱος. Ἰωσηφ ὁ προγεγραμμένος. Μελιτιανῶ τό. ὑπαρχον. ἀπὸ δικαίων και εὐλόγων αἰτιῶν. ὄρει. 15–16. τῆς Ἀρσινωτικῆς. 16. ἐνορίας μοναστήριον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου ἀνεωγμένον εἰς ἀπηλιώτην, ὅσων δ' ἂν ἔστιν κελλίων. κελλῆιον. ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν ἀπλώματος. ὕψους. τιμῆν. ὀκτώ. 17. διακοσίας δοθέντας μοι ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῶν μαρτύρων και συμφωνεῖ. ὡς πρόκειται. κυρίλῳ. ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρσινωιτῶν πόλεως ἀξιωθείς. παρόντος. 18. οἰνοπράτης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρσινωιτῶν πόλεως. πράσει. δώσει. νομισματίων. διακοσίων ὡς πρόκειται. 19. Ἀρσινωιτῶν. πράσει. δώσει. προκειται. υἱος. Ἀρσινωιτῶν. 20. πράσει (twice). δώσει (twice). τῶν νομισματίων ὀκτώ. τῶν τοῦ κέρματος μυριάδων χιλίων διακοσίων ὡς πρόκειται. Αὐρήλιος. Ἀρσινωιτῶν. 21. κέρματος. χιλίων διακοσίων ὡς πρόκειται. υἱος. Ἀρσινωιτῶν. πράσει. δώσει. τῶν νομισματίων. τῶν τοῦ κέρματος μυριάδων. ὡς πρόκειται.

Apparatus B

1. Φλαουίου, Sayce; Φλαουίων, Turner. Παύλου, Sayce. ἰνδικ/ λ, Sayce; ἰνδικ(τίονος) λ, SB; ἰνδικτί(ονος), Turner. ἐνορείης ἐπαρχ', Sayce; ἐνορείης ἐπαρχί(ας), SB; ἐν Ἀρσιν(οίτη) ἐπαρχί(ας), Turner. 2. ὀρθόδοξος, Sayce. ἐνορίας νῦν δέ, Sayce. μοναστηρίῳ, Sayce. Μικροῦ [Φυῶν], Sayce; Φυῶν is quite clear, Turner. 3. πάσας δεσποτίας, Sayce; πάσαν δεσποτίαν, Turner. πάντα χρόνον, Sayce. υἱῷ Ἀρ[αἰήσεως], Sayce (who omits the last word of the line); υἱῷ Ἄπα < > οἰκοῦντι, Turner. 4. ὑπὸ δικαίων, Sayce; ἀπὸ δικαίων, SB. ἀκολούθως τοῖς προσοῦσι[ν α]ἰτῶν, Turner; Sayce omits end of the line after ἀκολούθως. 5. κελίων, Sayce; κελλίων, SB (twice). 8. Sayce leaves money abbreviations unresolved; γ(ίνονται) νο(μισμάτια) η πλη(ρης) κ(αί) ἀργ(υρίου) μ(υριάδες) ας, SB. δοθέντα, Sayce. 9. κελίων, Sayce; κελλίων, SB (twice). 10. βέλτιον, Sayce; βελτιο < ὦ > ν, Teodorsson. 11. ἑτέροις ἀποχαρίζεσθαι, Sayce. ἰδοῖς αὐτῶν, Sayce. 12. κατὰ τὴν νομῆν, Sayce; καὶ τὴν νομῆν, Turner. 13. δαπανήματα φανησόμενα, Sayce. 15. πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, Sayce. προγεγράμμενος, SB. Μελιτιανῶ ὑπάρχον, Sayce; Μελιτιανῶ τῷ ὑπάρχον, Turner. ἐτιῶν, Sayce. ὄρει, Sayce. 16. μοναστηρί[ο]ν, Sayce; μοναστηρί[ο]ν, SB. ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, Sayce, Karsomenakis (l. ἐξ ὀλοκλήρως, Karsomenakis); ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, Turner. τιμῆν, SB. 17. μοι, Sayce. ὡς πρόκειται, Sayce. Κυρίλιου, Sayce; Κυρίλ' Ἰου, Turner. ἀγγραμμάτσοντος, Sayce; ἀγγραμμάτου ὄντος, Turner. 18. Αὐρήλιος Παύλας, Sayce; Αὐρήλιος Παῦλος, Turner. Δωτεῖ[νου], Sayce. πόλες, Sayce. νομισμάτων, Sayce; νομισμ<α>τίων, SB. μυριάνων, Sayce; μυριάδων, SB. Αὐρηλίου, Sayce; Αὐρήλιος, Turner. 19. Εὐλόγιος τοῦ Εὐφρών υἱός, Sayce; Εὐλόγιος υἱός Εὐφρωντίου, Turner. τῆ αὐτῆ πράσι, Sayce; τῆδε τῆ πράσι, Turner. ὀκτώ [καί] τῶν, Sayce; ὀκτώ καὶ τῶν, Turner. Αὐρήλιος Νε[ί]λιος, Sayce; Αὐρήλιος Νεῖλος, Turner. Ἀρσινωιτῶν, Sayce; Ἀρσινωιτῶν, SB. 20. μυριάδων, SB. Ὀρνεῖος Ἀπολλ. υἱός Εὐλόγιου (?), Sayce; Ὀρήλιος Ἄπα Ὁλ υἱός Ἐλλᾶ, Turner. 21. κέρματος, Sayce. Νειλάμμωνος, Sayce. 22. 𐤀 di emu eulogiu eptuch[the] di emu eulo (Eulo[giu], SB) δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου ἐπτύχ[θη], Sayce; 𐤀 di emu Eulogiu eptuchthe δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου, Turner; 𐤀 di emu Eulogiu eprach(th) δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου, Diethart and Worp. 23. Three oblique embroidered strokes, Turner; strokes, Diethart and Worp.

“In the consulship of Flavius Paulos and Flavius Moschianos, *virī clarissimi*, in the tenth of Thoth, sixth indiction, at Arsinoe in the province of Arcadia.

Eulogios, once a Melitian monk but now orthodox, son of Joseph, formerly living in the monastery called Labla in the district of Arsinoe, but now making his dwelling in the monastery called Mikrou Psuon in the outskirts of the same town of Arsinoe, acknowledges that he has, with free independent and fixed will, sold and conveyed into complete ownership from the present for all succeeding time, to Pousis Melitian priest son of A... living in the said monastery called Labla, the cell in the said monastery called

Labla which belongs to the vendor Eulogios, and which came down to him, as he has had confirmed and registered, at his own risk and liability, by just and proper deeds, in accordance with the rights pertaining to him and with his unchallengeable possession and ownership.

(He has sold this cell) in its entirety, however many rooms it is, facing east, with the courtyard (?) in it, which is situated in front of the rooms, and with all its rights from the ground to the very top, so that nothing whatsoever be left unsold there for the vendor Eulogios. The boundaries of the cell are: to the south, the desert and cell of the late Andreas, priest; to the north, the cell of the priest Naaraos; to the east, the desert; to the west, the public road in front of the cell of Peter the deacon. The vendor Eulogios (also acknowledges) that he has received from the purchaser Pousis the total price in full mutually agreed and approved for the same cell sold to him by him in its entirety, eight full standard imperial *solidi* of gold, and one thousand two hundred myriads of large silver. (Total), 8 full *solidi* of gold and 1200 myriads of *denarii* of silver. This was given to the vendor from the purchaser by hand, in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, so that henceforth the purchaser Pousis possess and own the same cell he has purchased in its entirety, however many rooms it is, and the courtyard (?) in front of the rooms, and with all its rights from the ground to the very top, as stated above; and have the authority to inhabit, manage, dispose of it, improve it, repair it, tear it down, rebuild it, redesign it, in whatever appearance and condition he wishes; hand it on to his heirs and successors, present it to others or give it away as a gift, in the manner he wishes and without hindrance. And if anyone takes proceedings against or makes a claim on the property or part of it, the vendor Eulogios and his heirs and successors will immediately oppose that person at their own expense and cost, and make free from encumbrances the possession for the purchaser Pousis and his heirs and successors. If they fail to do this, they will pay as penalty double the herein stated price which the vendor Eulogios has received, and double all the expenses and costs which arise, incurred in the repairing or rebuilding of the property, and double the fines incurred on its behalf in court or out of court. This sale written in one copy is irrefutable. And the vendor Eulogios has pledged to the purchaser Pousis for the confirmation and assured freedom from encumbrances of his sale, all his possessions, present and future, severally and generally, by way of guarantee and with the force of a mortgage as though by decree of court. And having been asked the formal question on these matters by him face to face, he has given his agreement to him.

I, Eulogios, monk, son of Joseph, the aforementioned, have of my own free will sold to you Pousis, Melitian priest, the cell in the said monastery called Labla in the district of Arsinoe, which belongs to me by just and proper titles, in its entirety, facing east, however many rooms it is, with the courtyard (?) in front of them, and with all its rights from the ground to the very top. And I have been paid in full by you by hand the price of it — eight full *solidi* of gold, and one thousand two hundred myriads of large silver, given to me in the presence of the undersigned witnesses. And I agree with everything as stated above, and I delivered the deed. I, Aurelios Phoibammon, son of Cyrillos, from the town of Arsinoe having been requested, have written on his behalf in his presence, as he is illiterate.

I, Aurelios Paulos, son of David (?), wine merchant, from the town of Arsinoe,

witness this sale and the payment of the price, eight *solidi* of gold and one thousand two hundred myriads of *denarii*, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Eulogios, son of Euphrantios, from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, eight *solidi* of gold and one thousand two hundred myriads of *denarii*, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Neilos, son of Phoibammon, surveyor, from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, eight *solidi* of gold and one thousand two hundred myriads of *denarii*, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Apa Hol, son of Hellas from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, eight *solidi* of gold and one thousand two hundred myriads of *denarii*, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Eulogios, son of Neilammonos, wine merchant, from the town of Arsinoe witness this sale and the payment of the price, eight *solidi* of gold and one thousand two hundred myriads of *denarii*, as stated above.

Executed by me Eulogios. By me Eulogios.”

1. The consuls Paulos and Moschianos occur in four other documents: see Bagnall and Worp 1978, 121; Bagnall *et al.* 1987, 559.

For discussion of the scribal lectional signs diaeresis, diastole and apostrophe – diaeresis and diastole are used frequently in this document (and document 2) – see Turner 1987, 10–11; 19. Turner 1987, 8–9; 13 also discusses the double dot, or dicolon, and refers to an example in which it divides the total in drachmas from the item to which it refers. Possibly our scribe had something similar in mind when writing Θᾶθ: δεκάτη, although he places it differently in the first line of document 2 (Ἐπειφ ιε:).

Παύλου{υ}. The scribe did not just write Παύλου: there is definitely another letter, either ignored or missed by Sayce, and it seems to be the alternative form of upsilon.

ἰνδικτιονος. Turner read this ἰνδικτί(ονος), but ἰνδικ(τιονος) is clearly the reading.

On Arcadia see Keenan 1977, 193–202.

2. Μελιτιανός. The Melitian schism was caused by bishop Melitius of Lycopolis, and was one of those disputes in the Church arising at the beginning of the 4th century out of the Diocletianic persecution. Like Donatism in North Africa, its origins seem to have lain in matters of Church discipline rather than theology, although certainly in later times the Melitians were accused of doctrinal heresies (see Crum 1927, 22). They took a harder line than the orthodox against those who had lapsed from their faith during the persecution, and Melitius provoked trouble by interfering aggressively outside his own diocese. In the 4th century at least, the Melitians were a powerful force, and their alliance with the Arians also gave them a considerable importance: ‘they were one original authentic voice of indigenous Egyptian Christianity — a voice which at one time was heeded in nearly thirty cities along the Nile Delta and valley, and which posed a powerful threat to the privileges of the See of Alexandria’ (Barnard 1975, 405). Our source material is very largely restricted to the early period: Athanasius in particular, and Epiphanius, and indeed a series of papyri from the 330’s casting important light, from the Melitian side, on events surrounding the Council of Tyre (see Bell 1924, 38–99). Recently our knowledge of 4th century Melitian monks has been expanded greatly by the publication of the Nepheros archive, which the editors believe refers to the same monastic establishment as in Bell 1924, 38–99. Hengstenberg 1935, 357 suggested that the Melitian monks at Labla represented the third, and degenerate, type of monasticism referred to by Hieronymus (*Ep.* 22, 34 CSEL 54), and Cassian (*Conlatio* 18, 3. 2–3 [p. 509 Petschenig]) — a monasticism which fits neither into the Pachomian, coenobitic model nor the Antonian, eremitic model. The 4th century monks of Hathor also seem to be of this type (see P.Neph. introd. p. 19–20). After the 4th century there is only a series of brief notices on the later history of the schism, but it is clear that the Melitians went their separate way for another four centuries.

For modern work, see, for example, Cabrol and Leclercq 1921, col. 2428 ff.; Bell 1924, 38–99; Crum 1927, 19–26; Holl 1928, 283–297; Evelyn-White 1932, 248–249; Hengstenberg 1935, 357; Heussi 1936, 129–131; Kettler 1936, 155–193; Hardy 1952, 45; 51–55; Schwartz 1959, 87–116; Greenslade 1964, 51–55; Barnard

1973, 181–189; Martín 1974, 31–61; Barnard 1975, 399–405; Hauben 1981, 447–456; Barnes 1981, 229–240; P.Neph. introd. 3–34.

ὁρθόδοξος. As already noted (above p. 69), Eulogios' conversion to orthodoxy does not seem on its own to have necessitated a change of residence, as maintained by Husson 1967, 190: document 3, 11–12 shows that orthodox priests as well as Melitians resided at Labla.

ἐν τῇ ὄρει τῇ καλουμένῃ Λάβλα. The word ὄρος has considerable flexibility of meaning in the papyri: see Cadell and Rémondon 1967, 343–349. For discussion of what it means as applied to Labla, see above p. 68–71.

Μικροῦ Ψυῶν. Sayce read Μικροῦ [Φυῶν], and Turner maintained that Φυῶν is clear, but although the word comes at the end of the line where the ink has faded somewhat, the reading is undoubtedly Ψυῶν. It is perfectly clear in document 2, 2. For a similar misreading of psi and phi, see Youtie 1981. Ψόα (or Ψυῶν) is a well-known village in the Arsinoite nome (Calderini, *Dizionario* V 171), although nowhere else attested as Μικροῦ Ψυῶν.

3. προαστίων. This and document 2 are the only texts to give detailed information about the προάστια of an Egyptian town. It would appear that at least at Arsinoe, the outskirts, or part of them, consisted of a group of monastic cells forming the laura of Labla. For discussion on προάστια, see Husson 1967, 187–200.

Ποῦσι. It is not clear whether the scribe was thinking of the nominative Ποῦσις or Ποῦσι — the dative Ποῦσι in l. 3, 12, 14 and 15 could indicate either nominative, and while the accusative Ποῦσιν in l. 9 points to a nominative Ποῦσις, the genitive Ποῦσι in l. 7 points to the indeclinable Ποῦσι (Πούσιτος in BGU II 659 III 17 [3rd century A. D.] is presumably a genitive form of Ποῦσις). Both Ποῦσι and Ποῦσις seem to be virtually exclusive to the Arsinoite nome: Diethart 1980 lists 28 holders of Ποῦσι, 53 of Ποῦσις, and it is difficult to find any examples outside the nome (P.Lond. II 180, 3, p. 94 [3rd century A. D.] and P.Lond. IV 1419, 876 [8th century A. D.] are possibilities).

The end of the line is very indistinct, with only -ντι clear. οἰκέω and οἰκησις occur in l. 2 with reference to Eulogios' residence, so now when referring to Pousis' residence, οἰκοῦντι, read by Turner, seems highly probable. I cannot read the name which precedes it.

4. τὸ ὑπάρχον αὐτῷ. While coenobitic monks had to renounce all their worldly goods, by law after Justinian's measure of 535 A. D., on entering a monastery (on the sources, see in particular Krause 1985, 122–124), at least certain hermits and inhabitants of laura-type monasteries preserved their financial independence, and acted as secular individuals in the free disposition of their personal property. Ioannes in P.Lond. V 1729 (584 A. D.), and Psates in P.Cairo Masp. I 67096 (573/574 A. D.) provide good examples, as well the monk Victor in P.Köln III 157 p. 152–153 (589 A. D.), who actually owns a slave, and the Melitian monks of Hathor in the Nephros archive (P.Neph. introd. p. 18). For discussion, see Steinwenter 1930, 5 ff.; Steinwenter 1932, 55–57; Barison 1938, 40; 71; Ballini 1939, 77–81; Hagedorn in P.Köln III 157 p. 152–153. Krause 1985, 121–133 argues that monks with private possessions did not necessarily have to come from laurae or hermitages, but could also be part of large coenobitic establishments. The evidence, however, comes from the 8th and 9th centuries and can hardly be made to apply to the beginning of the 6th century.

Personal property could, it seems, include monasteries themselves, and we have a number of documents in which monasteries are bequeathed in wills, usually passed on from one monk to another (see especially Steinwenter 1932, 60–63). Bishop Abraham, for instance, in a well known example, leaves all he owns, including the government and possession of the monastery of St. Phoibammon, to his disciple Victor (P.Lond. I 76, p. 231 [8th century A. D.]). In a long Coptic will (Crum and Steindorf 1912, No. 75 p. 239, translated in Crum and Evelyn-White 1926, 343 ff.), Jacob and Elias leave the monastery of Epiphanius of Thebes to the monk Stephen, but they follow established procedure in enjoining on Stephen that when he dies he will not have the right to bequeath the place to his kinsfolk: 'rather he shall seek a revered monk and shall make over unto him the place'. Perhaps a similar qualification in the powers of alienation applied to the ownership of other monasteries, as a sensible way of ensuring that control remained with the monastic community. This was not, however, the case with the monastery of Abba Copteous in P.Oxy. XVI 1890, 7 (508 A. D.) which belonged to a woman called Serena: Copteous himself had left it to her. Evidently Copteous' proprietary rights were unqualified. So too, it would appear, with Eulogios. Whether he actually sells his cell at Labla, or just uses it as security for a loan, he treats it entirely as private property. If the second document is a real sale (and I can find no other example in the papyri where a cell or monastery is sold), the purchasers are explicitly permitted to dispose of the cell in whatever way they see fit. The terms were, as Steinwenter 1930, 6 points out, formulaic

and may have been copied mechanically, and Eulogios' transactions are with other monks of the same monastery, but there are no indications that he had anything but complete ownership. The same applies to Aioulios in document 3.

5. ἀστασίαστος is a rare word in the papyri, occurring only in the 6th century, and elsewhere only in P.Strasb. IV 248, 13 (560 A. D.); V 477, 11; P.Cairo Masp. II 67151, 143 (570 A. D.). In only one of these instances does it not occur in conjunction with νομή.

For detailed discussion of the formula ὄσων ἂν ὄσιν and its variants, see July 1966. One might expect either ὄσων δ' ἂν ἤ κελλίων or ὄσων δ' ἐστὶ κελλίων (see also l. 9; 16; document 2, 5; 11; 19).

ἄπλωμα. The reading is, as Turner noted, secure. LSJ has only one other occurrence of this word, in Sch. Ar., Av. 1218, and gives the meaning 'that which is unfolded, expanse'. E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, New York 1887, 212 adds two further meanings, 'the veil of the Temple' (= καταπέτασμα) and 'the cloth spread on the holy table' (= ἐνδότη). In the present context LSJ suggests 'perh. open space', and Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* has 'Altarbau über die Reliquie'. Krause 1958, 167 (as cited by Wipszycka 1972, 27) argues that along with εὐκτήριον and μαρτύριον, ἄπλωμα is one of the terms used to designate a 'chapel'. If we view Eulogios' property as an entirely independent monastery it might well be expected to have its own chapel, but this seems less likely if we are dealing with a unit within a laura: the archaeological evidence does not point to the presence of a chapel in front of each cell. And the meaning 'chapel' has no obvious connection with the root of the word ἄπλωμα. This latter point can be made against the suggestion of Husson 1979, 193 n. 3: 'une salle sans cloison intérieure, peut-être un bâtiment commun, plutôt que d'un lieu de culte qui aurait eu une architecture spécifique et serait désigné par un vocable propre.' As Daumas and Guillaumont 1969, 5 point out, the literary sources often refer to a courtyard as part of the cells at Cellia ('il est probable que c'était là chose habituelle'). Macarius of Alexandria could shut his courtyard off to keep people away (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 18, 17). The archaeological evidence bears out the importance of the courtyard fully: see, for example, the plans in Kasser 1983 fasc. 2. Likewise at Esna a courtyard was 'un des éléments absolument constant' (Sauneron *et al.* 1972, vol. 1 p. 13). Why the courtyard should be called ἄπλωμα instead of ἀλή I cannot explain, but it seems to me that 'courtyard' is a more likely meaning than those so far suggested, and one that does fit well the root of the word. I have incorporated it into my translation.

6. For the meaning of τὸ ὄρος as 'desert', see Evelyn-White 1932, 21; Husson 1967, 191; Cadell and Rémondon 1967, 344.

8. ἀργυρίου μεγάλου. This is the only occurrence of the term in the papyri: West and Johnson 1944, 126 cite P.Vars. 28 and SPP VIII 975 as other examples, but incorrectly — as pointed out by Sijpesteijn commenting on ἀργύριον μικρὸν in P.Vindob. Sijp. 10, 10–12 (6th century A. D.). Sijpesteijn suggests that the terms originated in an earlier period when they described a payment in larger or smaller silver coins. For myriads of *denarii*, see West and Johnson 1944, 125–126; 166; and for the sign used for myriads of *denarii* see, for instance, P.Prag. I 97 (4th century A. D.); P.Oxy. LI 3268 (5th century A. D.); LV 3804 (6th century A. D.). δηναρίων μυριάδες appears later in the document (l. 18–21) as κέρματος μυριάδες: this is a known interchange — see Johnson and West 1949, 129; Bagnall 1985, 12. Bagnall 1985, 12; 45 argues that after the reform of 352 A. D., the term myriad refers to a coin: 'this usage seems to persist for two centuries or more'. For other examples of the sigma sign for διακόσιαι written in this way, see P.Cairo Masp. I 67055 *passim* (6th century A. D.).

9. ἐώνηται. The grammar seems to require a participle, perhaps πεπραμένου as in l. 7. See also document 2, 11.

ἐμπροσθεν. The scribe has corrected himself from εἴμπροσθεν.

10. βελτιοῦν. Sayce read βέλτιον, and Teodorsson corrected to βελτιο <ῶ>ν, but βελτιοῦν is perfectly clear.

βούλεται. One would expect ἐν οἷα ἂν βούληται ὄνει, and in l. 11 καθ' ὃν ἂν βούληται τρόπον. See also document 2, 12 and 13.

12. ποιήσωσιν. This could be an aorist subjunctive (in which case the scribe would have mixed up the two possible forms of the condition, εἰ + future indicative, ἐάν + aorist subjunctive), but it is much more likely to be an example of the common interchange between ου and ω: see Gignac 1976, 208–211. προσεκτίσωσιν is presumably to be explained as homoioteleuton. See also ποιήσωσεν and προσεκτίσωσεν in document 2, 15.

16. The last nu of the word αὐτῶν (preceding ἀφλώματος) has been written over an upsilon.

17. ἐπὶ παρουσίαν. The dative παρουσίᾳ is used in l. 8 and in document 2, 10 and 20. The accusative hardly seems suitable.

18. Sayce read Δωτει[νου], and the otherwise unattested name Δωτεινός made its way into Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (and thus into Dornseiff and Hansen 1978, 272). The reading, however, is very uncertain. The only secure letters are δ and ει (and even the latter could conceivably be σι). One might be tempted to see traces of a superscribed alpha just after ει, pointing to the possibility of Δωτειανός; Δοτιανός is an attested name, although not in the papyri (Dornseiff and Hansen 1978, 267). This seems unlikely, however. There is hardly enough room, for instance, for [vo]u before the rather strange first omicron of the following word οἰνοπράτης. A completely different possibility suggests itself: the opening delta is followed not by ωτ but by ων, and we would have Δωτειν. I have adopted this, but admit that it is difficult to read what comes after Δωτειν.

ὄκτω with the last two letters deleted certainly seems to be what we have, but it is nonsense and cannot be what the scribe intended.

κέρματος: 'in accounts κέρμα is a synonym for bronze, usually the denarius' — West and Johnson 1944, 129.

19. Εὐφράντιος. Turner read the name as Εὐφρώντιος, but this was its only occurrence, and it did not gain entry into Foraboschi, *Onomasticon*. The middle vowel does, in its own right, look like an omega, but it is in fact an alpha: the alpha in the very next word ἀπό is written in exactly the same way, and elsewhere in the line the scribe has a very distinctive (and different) way of writing an omega followed by a nu. Εὐφράντιος is a rare name, but there are some examples: P.Oxy. XXIV 2415, 65 (3rd century), for instance, and SPP X 153, 14; 15 (6th century A. D.).

πρόκειται. There is certainly a single dot over the tau: possibly the scribe thought of it as an upsilon, which he sometimes wrote in the same way.

2. Sale of a μοναστήριον (?)

Document 2 (SB I 5175)

77.1 × 30.2 cms

9th July 513 A. D.

Arsinoe

Tafel 11

The papyrus is again complete, and as Flinders Petrie reported, in excellent condition (above p. 67). The same fading of the ink as in document 1 occurs at the right hand edge, and there are also one or two perpendicular lines of wear. The first line is written in the same hand as the bulk of document 1 (1st hand). There are kolleseis at 20.5; 54.1; 70.8 cms from left hand edge. The writing is along the fibres, and this papyrus is framed in the same manner as document 1, making it impossible to see whether anything is written on the back. Since the terminology of the two deeds is virtually identical, much of the commentary on document 1 applies to document 2:

- 1 (2nd hand) Ϝ Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν Φλαουίων Παύλου καὶ Μοσχιανοῦ τῶν λαμπροτάτων Ἐπίφιε ἀρχ(ῆ) ἐβδόμης ἰνδικ(τίονος) ἐν Ἄρσιν(όη) ἐπαρχ(ίας) Ἄρκαδίας.
- 2 (1st hand) ὁμολογεῖ Εὐλόγιος ὀρθόδοξος μονάζων μοναστηρίου Μικροῦ Ψυῶν προαστίων τῆς Ἄρσινοειτῶν πόλεως υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ μητρὸς Τλεσίδος ἐκουσίᾳ καὶ ἀθαιρέτῳ καὶ ἀμετανοήτῳ γνώμῃ πεπρακέναι καὶ κατα-
- 3 γεγραφεκέναι πρὸς πᾶσαν δεσποτίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξῆς ἅπαντα χρόνον Παπνουθίῳ υἱῷ Ἰσάκ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ υἱῷ Ἄρανθίου, ἀμφοτέροις Μελιτιανοῖς μονάζουσιν μοναστηρίου καλουμένου Λάβλα προαστίων τῆς αὐτῆς
- 4 Ἄρσινοειτῶν πόλεως τὸ ὑπάρχον αὐτῷ τῷ πωλοῦντι Εὐλογίῳ καὶ περιελθὼν εἰς αὐτόν, καθὼς διεβεβαιώσατο καὶ ἐνεγράψατο τῷ ἰδίῳ ἑαυτοῦ κινδύνῳ καὶ τιμήματι, ἀπὸ δικαίων καὶ νομίμων τίτλων, ἀκολουθῶς
- 5 τοῖς προσοῦσιν αὐτῷ δικαίοις καὶ τῇ περὶ αὐτὸν ἀστασιάστῳ νομῇ καὶ δεσποτίᾳ, ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ μοναστηρίῳ Λάβλα μοναστήριον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου ἀνεωγμένῳ[ν] εἰς ἀπηλιώτην, ὅσων δ' ἂν ἔστιν μενημάτων, μετὰ παντός
- 6 τοῦ ἀνήκοντος αὐτῷ δικαίου ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντός ὕψους, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν αὐτῷ

- τῷ πωλοῦντι Εὐλόγιῳ ἐκέϊσε ὑπολελειφθαί τι ἄπρατον τὸ σύνολον, οὐ καὶ εἰσιν γίτονες, καθὼς ἐκ συμφώνου ὑπηγόρευσαν, νότου
- 7 ἔρημον μοναστήριον, βορρᾶ μοναστήριον Ναυραοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, ἀπηλιώτου ὄρος καὶ ἡ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μοναστηρίου εἴσοδος καὶ ἐξοδος, λιβὸς ὁδὸς δημοσία, μεθ' ἣν μοναστήριον Πέτρου διακόνου. καὶ προσομολογεῖ ὁ αὐτὸς
- 8 πεπρακῶς Εὐλόγιος μονάζων ἀπεσχηκέναι καὶ πεπληρῶσθαι ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη παρὰ τῶν πριαμένων Παπνουθίου καὶ Ἰουλίῳ τὴν συμπεφωνημένην πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ συναρέσασαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ πεπραμένου
- 9 αὐτοῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἴσου μέρους ἡμίσεως καὶ προγεγραμμένου μοναστηρίου ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου καὶ ὑπὲρ παντὸς δικαίου αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους τιμὴν πᾶσαν ἐκ πλήρους χρυσίου νομισμάτια δεσποτικά
- 10 δόκιμα δέκα πλήρης, χρ(υσίου) νο(μισμάτια) ι πλήρ(ης), δοθέντα αὐτῷ παρ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ χειρὸς εἰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῶν ἐξῆς ὑπογραφόντων μαρτύρων, πρὸς τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τοὺς πριαμένους Παπνουθίον καὶ Ἰούλιον κρατεῖν καὶ
- 11 κυριεῦειν ἐξ ἴσου μέρους ἡμίσεως τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐώνηται μοναστηρίου ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, ὅσων δ' ἂν ἔστιν μενημάτων, καὶ παντὶ δικαίῳ αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους, ὡς προέγραπται, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν
- 12 διοικεῖν, οἰκονομεῖν, ἐπιτελεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, βελτιοῦν, φιλοκαλεῖν, καθελεῖν, ἀνοικοδομεῖν, μετασχηματίζειν, ἐν οἷα βούλονται ὄψει καὶ διαθέσει, εἰς κληρονόμους καὶ διαδόχους παραπέμπειν, ἑτέροις ἐκποιεῖν
- 13 καὶ ἀποχαρίζεσθαι καθ' ὃν βούλονται τρόπον, ἀνεπικωλύτως, καὶ τὸν ἐπελευσόμενον ἢ ἀντιποιησόμενον τούτου ἕνεκεν ἢ μέρους χάριν παραχρῆμα ἀποστήσειν αὐτόν τε τὸν πεπρακῶτα Εὐλόγιον καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ
- 14 κληρονόμους καὶ διαδόχους ἰδίοις αὐτῶν ἀναλώμασιν καὶ δαπανήμασιν, καὶ τὴν νομὴν καθαροποιῆσαι τοῖς τε πριαμένοις Παπνουθίῳ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν κληρονόμοις καὶ διαδόχοις. εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο
- 15 ποιήσωσιν, π[ρ]οσεκτίσωσιν ἦνπερ εἴληφεν ὁ πεπρακῶς Εὐλόγιος καὶ ἐγγεγραμμένην τιμὴν διπλῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀναλώματα καὶ δαπανήματα τὰ φανησόμενα γεγεννημένα εἰς τὴν τούτου φιλοκαλαίαν
- 16 ἢ καὶ ἀνοικοδομείαν ἢ καὶ προφάσει αὐτοῦ ζημιώματα ἐν δίκῃ ἢ ἐκτὸς δίκης, καὶ αὐτὰ πάντα διπλᾶ. ἢ πρᾶσις κυρία ἀπλῆ γραφεῖσα. καὶ ὑπέθετο ὁ πεπρακῶς Εὐλόγιος τοῖς πριαμένοις Παπνουθίῳ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ
- 17 εἰς τὴν βεβαίωσιν καὶ καθαροποίησιν τῆσδε τῆς πράσεως πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπάρξοντα ἰδικῶς καὶ γενικῶς ἐνεχύρου λόγῳ καὶ ὑποθήκης δικαίῳ, καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης. καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπερωτηθεῖς
- 18 παρ' αὐτῶν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῖς ὡμολόγησεν. ₪ (3rd hand) Εὐλόγιος ὀρθόδοξως μωνάδων, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ μητρὸς Τλεσίδος, ὁ προγεγραμμένος πέπρακα ἐκουσίᾳ γνώῃ ὑμῖν Παπνουθίῳ υἱῷ Ἰσάκ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ υἱοῦ Ἀρανθίου Μελητιανοῦ^ς μωνάδουσιν, τῷ ὑπάρχον μοι ἀπὸ δι-
- 19 κέων καὶ νομίμων τίτλων ἐν τῷ ἱρημένῳ μοναστηρίῳ Λάβλα μοναστηρίων ἐκς ὀλοκλήρου ἀνεογμένον εἰς ἀπηλιώτην, ὅσων δὲ ἔστιν μενημάτων, μετὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ δικεοῦ ἀπ' ἐδάφους μέχρι παντὸς ὕψους, καὶ οὐδέ μοι ἐκῆσε ὑπωλέλιπτε <τι> ἄπρατων
- 20 τῷ σύνηλων καὶ ἐπληρόθην παρ' ὑμῶν διὰ χιρὸς τὴν τούτου τιμὴν χρυσίου

- νομισμάτια δέκα πλήρης, δωθέντα μοι ἐπὶ παρουσία τῶν ἐξῆς ὑπογραφόντων μαρτύρων, καὶ συμφωνῖ μοι πάντα τὰ προγεγραμμένα, κέ ἐπεροτιθῆς ὁμολόγησα καὶ ἀπέλυσα.
- 21 Φλ(άουιος) Τιμόθεως υἱὸς Ἄβρααμίου βουλε[υ]τῆς κωντούκτωρ τῆς Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως ἀξιοθῆς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ παρόντος ἀγραμμάτου ὄντος. (4th hand) Αὐρήλιος Ἰούλιος υἱὸς Φοιβάμμωνος κεφαλεοτῆς πλινθουργῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι
- 22 τοῦ χρυσοῦ τῆς τιμῆς νομισματίων δέκα, ὅς πρόκειται. (5th hand) Αὐρήλιος Ἄνδρέας υἱὸς Ἄπα Ὀλ τραπεζ(ίτης) ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσοῦ τῆς τιμῆς νομισματίων δέκα, ὅς πρόκειται. (6th hand) Αὐρηλίου Παλατίνος ἰὸς Ἄπα Ὀλ ἀπὸ τῆς
- 23 Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ δόσι τοῦ χρυσοῦ τῆς τιμῆς νομισματίων δέκα, ὅς πρόκειται. (7th hand) Αὐρήλιος Ποῦσις υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ οἰνωπράτης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως μαρτυρῶ τῆδε τῆ πράσι καὶ τῆ ζάσι τοῦ χρυσ[ίου]
- 24 τῆς τιμῆς νομισματίων δέκα ὡς πρόκειται.
- 25 Ϝ di emu Eulogiu epfach(the) — δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλογίου
- 26 Three embroidered strokes.

Apparatus A

1. ὑπατιαν, φλαουῖων, λαμπρῶ, επιφ ιω: Ἐπίφ. 2. Ἄρσενοειτῶν, υἱος. 3. ὄια ισακ, Ἰουλιω ὄια. 4. Ἄρσενοειτῶν, ὑπαρχον. 6. ὄψους, γείτονες, υπηγορευσαν¹ νοτου. 7. βορ¹ρα μοναστηριον¹ νοτου. 8. ἰουλιω, Ἰουλίου, ὑπερ. 9. ἴσου, ὑπερ. 10. χρ⁰, ὄ ι πληρ., πρὸς τό. 11. εζ ἴσου, ὄψους. 13. παραχρημα¹ αποστησιν, 14. ἰδιοις, την¹ νομην, καθαροποιήσιν, ἰουλιω. 15. ποιήσουσιν προσεκτείσιν, εγ¹ γεγραμμενην, τα¹ αναλωματα, γεγεν¹νημενα, γεγενημένα, φιλοκαλίαν. 16. ἀνοικοδομίαν, κυρια¹ απλη, ὑπεθετο, ἰουλιω. 17. βεβαίωσιν καὶ καθαροποιήσιν, παντα¹ αυτου τα υπαρχοντα, ἰδικως, ὑποθηκης. 18. Εὐλόγιος ὀρθόδοξος μονάζων υἱός, μητρός, προγεγραμμένος, γνώμη, υἰῶ Ἄρανήθιου Μελιτιανοῖς μονάζουσιν τό ὑπάρχον. 18–19. ἀπὸ δικαίων. 19. εἰρημένω, μοναστήριον ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου ἀνεωγμένον, τοῦ δικαίου, ἀπ' ἐδάφους, ὄψους, ἐκείσε ὑπολέλειπται τι ἄπρατον. 20. τό σύνολον καὶ ἐπληρώθη παρ' ὁμῶν διὰ χειρός, δωθέντα, ὑπογραφόντων, συμφωνεῖ, προγεγραμμένα, καὶ ἐπερωτηθῆς ὁμολόγησα. 21. Τιμόθεος υἱός, κονδοῦκτωρ, Ἄρσενοειτῶν (twice), ἀξιοθῆς, ἀγραμμάτου ὄντος, κεφαλαιωτῆς πλινθουργῶν, πόλεως, πράσι, δόσει. 22. νομισματίων δέκα ὡς πρόκειται (twice), Ἄρσενοειτῶν, δόσει, Αὐρήλιος, υἱός. 23. Ἄρσενοειτῶν πόλεως (twice), μαρτυρῶ, πράσι (twice), δόσει (twice), νομισματίων δέκα ὡς πρόκειται, οἰνωπράτης ἀπὸ. 24. νομισματίων δέκα ὡς πρόκειται.

Apparatus B

1. Φλαουῖου, Sayce; Φλαουῖων, Turner. Μοσχιανῶ λαμπρ[οτάτων], Sayce; Μοσχιανῶ τῶν λαμπρ(οτάτων), Turner. ἰνδικτι[ῖονος] ἑνορείης ἐπαρχί[ας], Sayce; ἰνδικτι(ονος) ἐν Ἄρσιν(οίτη) ἐπαρχί(ας), Turner. 2. Μακροῦ Φυῶν, Sayce; Μικροῦ Φυῶν, Turner. 3. τὸν ἐξῆς πάντα χρόνον, Sayce. 5. προσοῦσιν αὐτοῦ, Sayce; προσοῦσιν αὐτῶ, Turner. ἐξ ὀλόκληρος, Sayce; ἐξ ὀλοκλήρου, Turner. 6. ὑπηγόρευον, Sayce. 7. ἀπηλιώτος, Sayce; ἀπηλιώτου, SB. 8. ἀπεχρήκναι, Sayce; ἀπε <σ> χηκέναι, SB. ἐντέθεν, Sayce; ἐντε <ῶ> θεν, SB; ἐντεῦθεν is clear, Turner. Παπνούθιος καὶ Ἰουλίου συμπεφωνημένην, Sayce, Παπνούθιου καὶ Ἰουλίω (l. Ἰουλίου) τὴν συμπεφωνημένην, Turner. 10. Sayce leaves money abbreviations unresolved, ἀπογραφόντων, Sayce; ὑπογραφόντων, SB. 12. βέλτιον, Sayce; βελτιω <ῶ> ν, Teodorsson. 14. κατὰ τὴν νομὴν, Sayce; καὶ τὴν νομὴν, Turner. καθαροποιήσει[ν], Sayce. τοῖς αὐτοῦ κληρονόμοις, Sayce; τοῖς αὐτῶν κληρονόμοις, Turner. 15. τιμὴν δικαίην, Sayce; τιμὴν διπλῆν, Turner. δαπανήματα φανησόμενα, Sayce. 17. τῆσδε τῆς λυτρώσεως, Sayce; τῆσδε τῆς πράσεως, Turner. 18. γνώμη, Sayce. υἰῶ Ἄρανήθιου, Sayce. μονάδουσιν τό ὑπάρχον, Sayce. 18–19. ἀπὸ δικαίων, Sayce. 19. μοναστηρίω ἐκς ὀλοκλήρου, Sayce. τοῦ δικαίου, Sayce. ὑπολελειπτένα

ἄπρατον, Sayce; ὑπωλέλιπτε ἄπρατον, Turner. 20. προγεγραμμένα, Sayce. 21. Φλετιμοθεως, Sayce; Φλ(άουιος) Τιμοθέως, SB, Turner. υἱός Ἀβραφαμίου, Sayce; υἱός Ἀβρααμίου, Turner. κωντοναίτωρ, Sayce, Turner. Ἐγραφα, Sayce, Turner; ἔγραφα, SB. ἀγραματεδοντως, Sayce; ἀγραμμάτου ὄντος, Turner. 22. νυμισματίου, Sayce. τρωτηξ/, Sayce; τραπεζ(ίτης), Turner. Αὐρήλιος Πήκτινος Ἴσ..., Sayce (Ἴσ[...], SB); Αὐρήλιος Πήκτινος υἱός Ἄπα Ὀλ, Turner; Αὐρήλιος Παλατίνος υἱός Ἄπα Ὀλ, Diethart. 23. δῶσι, Sayce (for ζῶσι). 24. Sayce omits the line. 25. & di emu eulogiu eptuch[the] di emu eulo (Eulo[giu], SB) δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου ἐπτύχθη, Sayce; & di emu Eulogiu eptuchthe δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου, Turner; & di emu Eulogiu eprach(th) δι' ἐμοῦ Εὐλόγιου, Diethart and Worp. 26. Three oblique embroidered strokes, Turner; strokes, Diethart and Worp.

“After the consulate of Flavios Paulos and Flavios Moschianos, *virī clarissimi*, on the 15th of Epeiph at the beginning of the seventh indiction in Arsinoe, province of Arcadia.

Eulogios, orthodox monk of the monastery of Mikrou Psuon in the outskirts of the town of Arsinoe, son of Joseph, his mother being Tlesis, acknowledges that he has, with free, independent and fixed will, sold and conveyed into complete ownership from the present for all succeeding time, to Papnouthios son of Isak, and Ioulios son of Aranthios, both Melitian monks of the monastery called Labla in the outskirts of the same town of Arsinoe, the cell in the said monastery Labla, which belongs to the vendor Eulogios, and which came down to him, as he has had confirmed and registered, at his own risk and liability, by just and legal deeds, in accordance with the rights pertaining to him and with his unchallengeable possession and ownership.

(He has sold this cell) in its entirety, facing east, however many rooms it is, with all rights pertaining to it, from the basement to the very top, so that nothing whatsoever be left unsold there for the vendor Eulogios. The boundaries of the cell are, as the parties have specifically agreed: to the south, a deserted cell; to the north, the cell of the priest Naaraos; to the east, the desert and the entry and exit of the same cell; to the west, the public road in front of the cell of Peter the deacon. And the same vendor Eulogios, monk, acknowledges in addition that he has received and been paid in full hereupon and now from the purchasers Papnouthios and Ioulios the total price in full mutually agreed and approved, for the same aforementioned cell sold to them by him in its entirety, in equal half shares from the vendor, and for all its rights from the ground to the very top, ten full standard imperial *solidi* of gold, (total) 10 full *solidi* of gold. This was given to the vendor from the purchasers by hand, in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, so that henceforth the purchasers Papnouthios and Ioulios possess and own in equal half shares the same cell they have purchased in its entirety, however many rooms it is, and with all its rights from the ground to the very top, as stated above; and that they have the authority to inhabit, manage, dispose of it, improve it, repair it, tear it down, rebuild it, redesign it, in whatever appearance and condition they wish, hand it on to their heirs and successors, present it to others, or give it away as a gift in the manner they wish and without hindrance. And if anyone takes proceedings against or makes a claim on the property or part of it, the vendor Eulogios and his heirs and successors will immediately oppose that person at their own expense and cost, and make free from encumbrances the possession for the purchasers Papnouthios and Ioulios and their heirs and successors. If they fail to do this, they will pay as penalty double the herein stated price which the vendor Eulogios has received, and double all the expenses and costs which arise, incurred in the repairing or rebuilding of the property, and double the fines incurred on its behalf

in court or out of court. This sale written in one copy is irrefutable. And the vendor Eulogios has pledged to the purchasers Papnouthios and Ioulios for the confirmation and assured freedom from encumbrances of this sale, all his possessions, present and future, severally and generally, by way of guarantee and with the force of a mortgage, as though by decree of court. And having been asked the formal question on these matters by them face to face, he has given his agreement to them.

I, Eulogios the aforementioned, orthodox monk, son of Joseph, my mother being Tlesis, have of my own free will, sold to you Papnouthios son of Isak, and Ioulios son of Aranthios, Melitian monks, the cell in the said monastery Labla, which belongs to me by just and legal deeds, in its entirety, facing east, however many rooms it is, with all its rights from the ground to the very top. And nothing whatsoever has been left unsold there for me. And I have been paid in full by you by hand the price of it — ten full *solidi* of gold, given to me in the presence of the undersigned witnesses. And I agree with everything as stated above, and having been asked the formal question, I have given my agreement and delivered the deed. I, Flavios Timotheos, son of Abraham, councillor, *conductor*, of the town of Arsinoe, having been requested, have written on his behalf in his presence, as he is illiterate.

I, Aurelios Ioulios, son of Phoibammon, president of the brickmakers' association, from the town of Arsinoe witness this sale and the payment of the price, ten *solidi* of gold, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Andreas, son of Apa Hol, banker, from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, ten *solidi* of gold, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Palatinos, son of Apa Hol from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, ten *solidi* of gold, as stated above.

I, Aurelios Pousis, son of Joseph, wine merchant, from the town of Arsinoe, witness this sale and the payment of the price, ten *solidi* of gold, as stated above.

Executed by me Eulogios. By me Eulogios."

1. Bagnall and Worp 1978 do not note this post-consular date for Paulos and Moschianos, but it is listed in Bagnall *et al.* 1987, 561.

2. The reading Μικροῦ Ψυῶν (not Φυῶν as in Sayce and Turner) is absolutely clear. See commentary to document 1, 2.

Τλεσιδος. Only Eulogios' father Joseph is mentioned in document 1. Here we learn that his mother was called Tlesis, a name attested besides here, only P.Rainer Cent. 109, 10 and SPP XX 148, 1.

3. Ἰουλίος υἱὸς Ἀρανθίου. The name Aranthios is very rare. Apart from this document and now document 3, 2 where the person is Ἀιούλιος υἱὸς Ἀρανθείου, the only other examples are P.Strasb. IX 820, 7 (6th century A. D. — Ἀρανθίως), and SB VIII 9775, 5 (7th century A. D. — Ἀρανθί<ου>).

4. τίτλων (also l. 19). In the parallel clause in document 1, 4 and 15, αἰτιῶν was used.

5. μενημάτων. In document 1, 5 and 9, κελλίων was the word used. They are clearly intended to be synonymous. See Husson 1983, 164: 'dans des contextes aussi proches (i. e. documents 1 and 2), les μενήματα et les κελλία désignent les mêmes constructions, à savoir les petites unités dont le groupement forme le μοναστήριον.' The word μένημα occurs only in the Byzantine and Arab periods (11 texts) and only, so it appears, in the Arsinoite nome (Husson 1983, 163).

21. Φλάβιος Τιμόθεος. The name Flavios should indicate a higher social standing than the following witnesses, all called Aurelios, but virtually all the βουλευταί we know have the gentilicium Aurelios, at least in the 4th century (Keenan 1974, 290): perhaps things had changed by the 6th century when the three councillors we have from Arsinoe are all Flavii (Calderini 1951, 21).

βουλευτής. From the end of the 3rd century, councillors were often called πολιτευόμενοι rather than

βουλευταί (Bowman 1971, 31). Calderini 1951, 13–41 listed all holders of the title βουλευτής and found only six in the 6th century, three of them from Arsinoe (but she omitted πολιτευόμενοι and other members of the βουλή who were not actually named as βουλευταί — see Bowman 1971, 138 n. 28). By the 5th century the βουλή as an administrative unit was a thing of the past (Bowman 1971, 126; Bowman 1986, 83), and on the role of councillors in this later period see, for example, Rouillard 1928, 61–62; Montevicchi 1973, 172.

κωντούκτωρ, lat. *conductor*, 'contractor'. Sayce read κωντοναίτωρ and it was confirmed by Turner, but incorrectly. Sayce was misled into this reading by taking the long foot of the kappa as αι (other examples of αι in this hand are written completely differently), and the upright of the kappa as part of the letter nu. In fact the kappa is formed exactly like the scribe's other kappas, and although Turner's confidence in κωντοναίτωρ might give cause for hesitation, the reading κωντούκτωρ (i. κονδούκτωρ) is secure: the meaningless hapax κωντοναίτωρ can be removed from the Wörterbuch (and, for instance, from Daris 1960, 232, who follows the Wörterbuch in trying to make sense of it by suggesting lat. *contionator*). The word κονδούκτωρ, and the related κονδοκτορία and κονδοκτόριον do not occur often in the papyri. Commenting on κονδοκτορία in P.Mich. XI 624, 24 (6th century A. D.) Shelton says: '*conductores* have been clearly attested only for postal services. This man may therefore have been contracted to deliver the mail of the *officium*.' The possibility that there were other contractors outside the postal service is suggested by the editor of P.Oxy. XVII 2115, 3 (4th century A. D.), who takes the official called the λογογράφος κονδοκτορίου to be 'accountant to the board of contractors, these perhaps including others than the contractors of the express postal service who are specified in ll. 6–7.' But it would be quite possible to take the λογογράφος κονδοκτορίου as a postal official. Other relevant texts, all understood to be in a postal context, are P.Cornell 52, 10 (3rd century A. D.); P.Oxy. VI 900, 6; XVII 2110, 4–5; P.Panop. Beatty 1, 60; 63; 2, 274 (all 4th century A. D.). For discussion of the postal system in the Byzantine period, which was a liturgy not a contractual obligation, see Johnson and West 1949, 163–167; Gascou 1985, 53–59. For κωντούκτωρ see also ZPE 75 (1988) 173f.

There is an Aurelios Ioulios son of Phoibammon in SB VI 9282, 14 (6th century A. D.), but there is no particular reason to identify him with our man. We know plenty of brickmakers, but Aurelios Ioulios is the only 'president of the brickmakers' guild we have. On guilds see Johnson 1936, 392–400; Boak 1937; Johnson and West 1949, 151–155; P.Strasb. V 678, 5 n.; Bowman 1986, 110–113.

22. Sayce and Turner read the name Αδρήλιος Πήκτινος, but Πήκτινος occurs nowhere else in the papyri, and the supposed eta is improbable at this date. I am grateful to Dr. J. Diethart for his undoubtedly correct suggestion Παλατίνος, a frequently attested name.

III. Document 3

Settlement

Document 3: T. C. D Pap. D 5
Arsinoe

29.5 × 20 cms

24 August 511 A. D. (?)
Tafel 12

This document is endorsed on the back as an agreement to settle between two Melitian monks Eulogios and Aioulios. It concerns the possession and occupancy of the cell presently owned by Aioulios. The terms όμολογία διαλύσεως, όμολογία διαλυτική and διάλυσις occur quite frequently in the papyri and can refer to a number of different situations.

First they can be mutual agreements, sometimes very elaborate, bringing a dispute to an end, made after and in recognition of an arbitration decision — see Modrzejewski 1952, 254–255 and bibliography there cited. A long and clear example is furnished by P.Mich. XIII 659 (6th century A. D.). For other noteworthy examples see P.Oxy. XXXVI 2768 (3rd century A. D.); P.Oxy. XVI 1880 (427 A. D.); SB III 7033 = P.Princ. II 82 (481 A. D. See Dewing 1922, 113–127); P.Monac. I 1 (574 A. D.); I 7 (583 A. D.); I 14 (594 A. D.); P.Strasb. IV 194; P.Vat. Aphr. 10; P.Lond. I 113 p. 199 (see Wenger, RE I A 1 [1914] 371); P.Lond. V 1731; P.Herm. Rees 31; SB I 6000 (all 6th century A. D.);

SB VI 8988 (647 A. D.). In some of these cases legal proceedings are threatened, or even instituted, (e. g. P.Oxy. XVI 1880; P.Herm. Rees 31, 20), but von Druffel 1970, 28 n. 1 argued that settlements do not necessarily imply previous legal or arbitration proceedings, and there are certainly examples, such as the present document, where there is no reference either to arbitration or to the law.

In their commentary on P.Monac. I 1, 7, the editors argue that for a deed to qualify as a settlement in a legal sense, there must be a mutual concession from both parties. Many settlements, however, take the form of a 'one-sided declaration by the party receiving satisfaction' (P.Oxy. XVI 1880 introd.); see, for example, PSI III 185 (5th century A. D.); P.Lond. V 1768; P.Herm. Rees 31; BGU I 317 (6th century A. D.); SB VI 8988 (7th century A. D. This document is called *ὁμολογία διαλυτική* in l. 105 but elsewhere *Ἀκυλιανή διάλυσις*; on the *stipulatio Aquiliana* see La Pira 1936; Sturm 1972, esp. 44–48; Montevocchi 1973, 232). Some of these apparently one-sided agreements are little more than receipts acknowledging the payment of debts: see SB VI 9392 (136 A. D.); P.Oxy. XVI 1880; P.Cairo Masp. II 67166; 67167; P.Lond. V 1717 (6th century A. D.). They do, however, at least imply a mutual concession: the debtor agrees to pay his debt, the creditor, to renounce his claims.

Another type of 'settlement' is the division of an inheritance; or at least the word *διάλυσις* (not the other two terms) comes to be used occasionally for this mechanism (e. g. P.Princ. II 79 [4th century A. D.]; P.Oxy. XXIV 2416 [6th/7th century A. D.]: it seems to be just a straight alternative for the more usual term *διαίρεσις* — see Kreller 1919, 78. The examples of property division given in Mitteis 1912, 270–271 all use *διαίρεσις*.

Finally, *ὁμολογία διαλυτική* can also describe divorce contracts, such as P.Cairo Masp. II 67154 (6th century A. D.). Here the characteristics of settlement are very prominent, as the two parties agree not just to get divorced but also to retain their personal belongings, to allow the other person to remarry and to look after their child together, rather than have it assigned to one parent. See also P.Cair. Masp. III 67311 (6th century A. D.).

The precise details of the present agreement are made somewhat difficult to interpret by the highly irregular nature of the Greek, but it is clear enough what is going on. On his side, Aioulios son of Arantheios makes the following undertakings: on his death, his cell and all his liabilities and assets will pass to Eulogios, son of Pousi; as long as he lives, if he leaves Eulogios, presumably to go off elsewhere, his cell will pass to Eulogios; and finally if he brings another person within the cell, either monk or layman, and does this *δίχα* Εὐλογίου, the cell will pass to Eulogios (on the meaning of *δίχα* see l. 7 commentary). On his part, Eulogios undertakes not to expel Aioulios physically from the cell, as long as he (Αἰουλίος) lives. There is no mention of arbitration or legal proceedings, which by no means rules them out, as there does seem to have been a dispute. Although the details of the dispute are not explained, it would appear that whatever it was that Aioulios wrote to Isak, son of Sabinos, concerning the cell — he is now declaring the letter invalid — this caused Eulogios to try, or threaten, to throw Aioulios out. The natural assumption is that Aioulios had promised the cell to Isak. Although Aioulios actually owns the establishment, it appears that his continued residence there is not secure against the aggression, and perhaps youth, of Eulogios.

It is a curious document with no obvious parallels. The Coptic papyrus published

by Schmidt 1932, 60–68 has some similarities. Schenute has been chosen abbot of the monastery of Apa Mena, although effectively he seems to have bought the post for 53 gold *solidi*. If he is fired he is to get twice the amount back. On his part he makes certain undertakings:

1. He will look after the monks in everything, according to what is right, just and customary (l. 7–8).

2. He will bring in noone above them, whom they do not want. If he tries to do this, the monks should disobey him (l. 9–12).

3. He will administer and look after all the monastery's possessions and will deal with taxation matters (l. 17–20).

4. He will not run away and desert the monastery (l. 23).

While the two situations are somewhat different, both documents do constitute a form of agreement between monks concerning the administration of their monastic establishments.

The question arises of the relationship between the present text and documents 1 and 2, which deal with Melitian monks at Labla. Λαύλα must be the same place as Λάβλα (the interchange of υ and β is easy — Gignac 1976, 1 p. 69–70). εν ωρω might perhaps most naturally be εν <τῷ> ὄρω (in the Labla region), but in view of the Melitian settlement in the ὄρος of Labla known from document 1, and of the monastic context of the word ὄρος (discussed above p. 68), it would be perverse not to conclude that the scribe was really aiming at εν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα and that all three documents deal with the Melitian monks and monastic establishment of Labla near Arsinoe. Also the script of this text would easily allow an early sixth century date (it is, in fact, quite similar to that of document 2), making it contemporaneous with the other two. There are some shared names like Aurelios Eulogios, Pousi, Isak, but these are all very common and do not point to any necessary overlap. Eulogios, of course, is the name of the vendor in documents 1 and 2, and of one of the parties to the agreement in document 3. The former, however, is the son of Joseph and Tlesis, the latter the son of Pousi: unless Joseph was also known as Pousi, and we are not told, we cannot have the same Eulogios. Very different is the name Aranthios: apart from two other mentions in the papyri (P.Strasb. IX 820, 7; SB VIII 9774, 5) it occurs only here and in document 2. Furthermore in document 2 the reference is to Ἰουλίος υἱὸς Ἀρανθίου, while here we have Ἀιουλίος υἱὸς Ἀρανθείου. Given the extremely irregular orthography of our scribe, it seems more than likely that we are dealing with the same man.

Having established this probable link in the person of Ioulios son of Aranthios, we can return to the date of the present text. It is indicated no more precisely than the first epagomenal day of the fifth indiction, but as document 1 is dated 512 A. D., sixth indiction, and document 2 513 A. D., seventh indiction, it is very tempting to suppose that the present piece with its fifth indiction, starts the series, resulting in a date of 24th August 511 A. D. If so, we find Ioulios son of Aranthios in 511 A. D. in possession of a cell, and two years later apparently buying a half share in another. If he can own one cell there is no particular reason to think that he cannot own another, but it might be argued that he does not seem to be the sort of man to go round buying up cells: he has enough trouble holding on to the one he has in document 3. Along with the complete lack of any other examples of the sale of a cell, this might suggest that document 2 is no more

a real sale than document 1. Still, if he has the resources and energy to lend the money to Eulogios in document 2, perhaps he is just as likely to purchase as to lend. This sort of active business life is very reminiscent of the monks of the Nephros archive (see P.Neph. introd. p. 18).

So far no other papyrus has surfaced dealing with Melitian monks in Labla at the beginning of the 6th century, and the evidence points very firmly to this document being the third of those found by Petrie at Hawara in 1889. Admittedly Petrie described them as deeds of sale, but judging from his account, he was far more interested in the manner of their burial than in their contents. There is no record of when or why the present papyrus came to Trinity College Dublin, but we do know that many of the Flinders Petrie papyri were entrusted, on Sayce's advice, to J. P. Mahaffy for publication (see McGing and Parke 1986, 29–30), and it is quite possible that this one too followed that route, although without Sayce's knowledge, one would have thought.

A strange feature about the presentation of the witnesses should be noted: they do not bear witness individually in the first person singular and in their own hand, as is normal, but instead do so all together after the first person plural μαρτυροῦμεν (l. 9), and all in the same hand. I can only find two other examples of μαρτυροῦμεν: P.Strasb. VI 597, 16; 18 (541 A. D.), where the text is fragmentary and breaks off before the end of the document; and P.Ness. III 57, 1 (689 A. D.). In the latter, μαρτυροῦμεν is followed by the names of seven witnesses in the same hand, but then after that, they all sign individually in their own hand and in the first person singular. The present text is highly irregular, and can scarcely count as valid testimony to the settlement. One might suggest that it is a draft or summarized copy of the deed, but in that case it is strange that it is not all written in the same hand. Perhaps even stranger is that the second hand does not start with the witnesses' statement, but at the end of the previous sentence, at some point in the phrase ὡς πρόκειται. It is clear that the omega of ὡς is in the first hand still, and that -οκίται is in the second hand, while the letters in between are much less distinct. The rho of πρόκειται, although written with a tail that is more characteristic of hand 1 than 2, is written at the angle of hand 2: hand 1 is almost completely perpendicular. It seems almost certain that the change of hand comes after ὡς. One explanation might be that the writer of the first hand left out the word πρόκειται, and then the second writer completed the sentence before embarking on his section.

The papyrus is complete and largely undamaged. There is one tear in l. 12, obscuring about four letters; and the ink has faded badly in some places, but only causing difficulty with one word in l. 11. Judging from the regular, but broad, perpendicular lines of wear which divide the papyrus into some eight panels, it was rolled up and slightly flattened out (this would fit with Petrie's report). The writing is across the fibres.

- 1 (1st hand) Ϝ Τῷ ἐμῷ ἀδελφῷ Εὐλόγιῳ μονάζοντι Μελειτιανός ἐν ὄρφ Λαύλα
υἱός Πουσι ἀπό κόμης Θεαδελφίας,
- 2 παρὰ Ἄιουλιῳ μονάζοντι τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ υἱῷ Ἄραρθείῳ ἀπό κόμης Ψινὸλ
τοῦ Ἄρσενοεῖτου νομοῦ χ(αίρειν).
- 3 ὁμολογῶ ἐπιδὴ γεγράφηκα ἄλλοται Ἰσάκ υἱῷ Σαβίνου περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ
μοναστηρίου {μου} οἶον-

- 4 δήπεται ἐξενίκει τῷ ἐμὸν χαρτίον ἄγυρόν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν τελευταίην ^{μου} τῷ
Εὐλογίῳ
- 5 ἐστὶν τῷ μονατήριόν μου, καὶ οἰονδήπεται ἔχω ἐμαυτοῦ ἦται ζημία ἦται κέρδος
τῷ Εὐλογίῳ
- 6 ἐστὶν. ἐάν δὲ ἀπέλθω ἀπὸ Εὐλογίῳ ζῶντα τῷ Εὐλογίῳ ἐστὶν τῷ μοναστήριόν ^{μου},
ἢ φέρω οἰονδήπεται
- 7 ἄνθρωπον ἢ μονάζοντες ἐπάνω Εὐλογίῳ ἔσω εἰς τὸ μοναστήριόν μου δίχα Εὐ-
λογίῳ, τῷ Εὐλογίῳ ἐστὶν
- 8 τῷ μοναστήριον. καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ὁμολογῶ, ἐγὼ Εὐλόγιος, τῷ ἐμῷ ἀδελφῷ Ἁιουλίῳ
οὐκ ἔξεστίν μου
- 9 ἀπορίψεν σαι ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ζῶντα ἕως τοῦ καὶ ἀποθάνης, ὡς (2nd hand) πρόκειται. †
μαρτυρῶμεν ὑμῖς οἱ εὐλαβέσ-
τατοι Ἁπα Ὁλ (καὶ) Τουρβος {(καὶ)} πρεσβύτεροι ἀγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας
Μελιτειανοὶ ἐν ὄρφ Λαύλα,
11 (καὶ) Ἡλίας διάκον τοῦ αὐτοῦ γο[μο]ῦ, (καὶ) ὑμῖς οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι Ἁνουπ (καὶ)
Παμούτιω (καὶ) Σαμβᾶ πρεσβύτεροι
- 12 ὀρθόδοξοι ἐν ὄρφ Λαύλα περὶ τοῦ ἐγγράφω τούτῳ ὡς πρόκειται. †
- 13 (3rd hand) ἐγράφ(η) ἐπαγ(ομένων) α, ε ἰνδ(ικτίονος). {(καὶ)} δ(ι') ἐμοῦ Ἁπολλῶς
ἐγράφ(η). Tachygraphic signs.

On the back is written, along the fibres:

- 14 (3rd hand) ὁμολογία διαλύσ(εως) Ἁιουλίῳ εἰς Αὐρή(λιον) Εὐλόγ(ιον) μονάζοντι
Μετιανοὶ ἐν ὄρφ
- 15

Λαύλα

1. μονάζοντι Μελιτιανῶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα υἱῶ, κόμης. 2. Ἁιουλίῳ μονάζοντος, υἱοῦ Ἁρανθίου. Ἁρσινοῖτου. 3. ἐπειδὴ, ἄλλοτε, μοναστηρίου. 4. -δήποτε ἐξενικῆ τό, ἄκυρον εἶναι. 5. ἔσεσθαι τὸ μοναστήριον, οἰονδήποτε, ἦτοι ζημίας ἦτοι κέρδους. 6. ἔσεσθαι; Εὐλογίου ζῶν. ἔσεσθαι τό, οἰονδήποτε. 7. μονάζοντα, Εὐλογίου, μοναστήριον, δίχα Εὐλογίου. ἔσεσθαι. 8. τὸ μοναστήριον, ἐξεῖναι μοι. 9. ἀπορίψαι σε, ζῶντα, πρόκειται, μαρτυροῦμεν ἡμεῖς. 10. Μελιτιανοὶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα. 11. διάκων, ἡμεῖς, Παμούτιος, Σαμβᾶς. 12. ὀρθόδοξοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Λάβλα, ἐγγράφου τούτου, πρόκειται. 13. Ἁπολλῶ. 14. Ἁιουλίῳ, μονάζοντες Μελιτιανοὶ ἐν τῷ ὄρει. 15. Λάβλα.

“To my brother Eulogios, Melitian monk in the monastery of Labla, son of Pousi, from the village of Theadelphia; from Aioulios, monk of the same nome (?), son of Aranthios, from the village of Psinol in the Arsinoite nome, greetings. I acknowledge that whereas I have written on another occasion to Isak son of Sabinos concerning my cell, whatever letter of mine he produces is invalid, but that after my death my cell will belong to Eulogios. And whatever I have in my possession whether liability or asset, will belong to Eulogios. If I leave Eulogios during my lifetime, my cell will belong to Eulogios, or if I bring any layman or monk to be senior to (?) Eulogios into my cell without the permission of Eulogios, my cell will belong to Eulogios. And I on my part acknowledge, I Eulogios, to my brother Aioulios that it is not lawful for me to cast you away from me while you live, until you die, as aforesaid. We bear witness, we Apa Hol and Tourbos most reverent Melitian priests of the holy catholic church in the monastery of Labla, and Elias deacon of the same nome (?); and we Anoup and Pamoutios and Sambas most reverent orthodox

priests in the monastery of Labla, concerning this deed, as aforesaid. Written on the first epagomenal day, fifth indiction. Written by me Apollon.”

On the back:

“Settlement of Aioulios with Aurelios Eulogios, Melitian monks in the monastery of Labla.”

1. For the Melitian schism, see document 1, 2 commentary (above p. 77); the ὄρος of Labla, above p. 68; the name Ποῦσι, document 1, 3 commentary.

At the end of the line, two small pieces of papyrus at some point became detached, and one of them was rejoined upside down: only Θεαδ- is secure, but the reference is almost certainly to Theadelphia (for which see Calderini, *Dizionario* II 240–248).

2. τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ is strange. We have not previously been told of any nome for this to be the same one, and for Aioulios to be described as ‘monk of the same nome’ is odd indeed, and does not make obvious sense. From the point of view of the structure of l. 1 and 2, τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ here stands in the same position relative to Αἰουλίου μονάζοντος, as Μελιτιανῶ does to Εὐλογίῳ μονάζοντι in l. 1. Could the writer perhaps mean νόμου, and be designating Aioulios monk ‘of the same order’ (i. e. Melitian)? This is not an attested meaning for νόμος but it is not an improbable extension of its usual meanings. The possibility of metathesis may also be considered. In P.Neph. 11, 3–4 (4th century A. D.) we find δύο πρεσβύτεροι νομῆς | Ἀθῶρτι, where the editors correct to μονῆς citing the same metathesis in P.Haun. III 58, 18–19 (493 A. D.): ὁ βῶσκον (= βόσκων) εἰς τὰς μοιάς (= νομάς). Admittedly our scribe is accurate enough with genders (although wayward with endings), but perhaps in this instance he has thought of μονή as a neuter or masculine word, and was intending μονοῦ (for μονῆς). One way or another, Aioulios is the same as Eulogios, either in respect to being a Melitian, or to living in the same monastery. It is difficult to see anything else the writer could have meant. We have the same situation, almost certainly, in l. 11: although the reading γο[μο]ῦ is very insecure, on analogy with l. 2 it is probably right. Apa Hol and Tourbos are described as ‘Melitian priests of the holy catholic church in the monastery of Labla’ (l. 10), and then we have ‘Turbos deacon of the same nome’ (i. e. he is also Melitian and/ or lives at Labla).

The village of Psinol in the Arsinoite nome is not attested, although Ψιν forms the beginning of a number of place names (see *Wörterbuch* vol. 3 and suppl. 1, Abschnitt 16a, Geographic, and Calderini, Daris, *Dizionario* V 162 ff.). The most interesting possibility seems to be Ψινο[. . .] in SB I 5338, 23 (Byzantine period). But see also Ψιν[], in P.Lond. IV 1460, 32; 129 (8th century A. D.).

3. For the -κα form of the perfect of γράφω, in addition to the regular γέγραφα, see Mandilaras 1973, 435 (1) p. 206.

4. ἐξενίκει is presumably some form of ἐκφέρω. I suggest third person singular first aorist subjunctive: ἐξένικον is attested as a first aorist imperative (Mandilaras 1973, 683 (2) p. 292), and εἰ for ἠ is common (Gignac 1976, 239). It is, however, possible to divide the words differently, and come up with ἐξενικεῖτω — third person aorist imperative: ‘let him produce whatever letter of mine (or, howsoever he produces my letter) it is invalid’. I assume that the verb means ‘produce’, or ‘bring forward’ in some fashion, a meaning not exactly paralleled in the papyri. ἄν has presumably been inadvertently omitted after οἰονδῆποτε (and in l. 5).

ἄγρον for ἄκρον: the interchange of γ and κ is very common (Gignac 1976, 76 ff.).

ἔστιν. An infinitive after ὁμολογῶ is expected, although the writer uses the present indicative throughout for the terms of the agreement. In this case the present εἶναι is clearly satisfactory, but in l. 5, 6, and 7 the intention of the agreement surely has a future force: after Aioulios’ death, or even before, in certain circumstances, the monastery will belong to Eulogios — ἔσεσθαι is needed. In l. 8 either ἐξέσεσθαι or ἐξεῖναι for ἔξεστιν, seems possible.

6. As the Greek is so irregular it is not immediately clear whether the participle ζῶντα applies to Aioulios or Eulogios. It makes most sense, however, with Aioulios (‘if during my lifetime I leave Eulogios’), and is to be contrasted with μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν in l. 4.

I take the clause beginning ἢ φέρω ..., to be another condition after ἐάν: ‘if I leave Eulogios ..., or if I bring ...’. φέρω should, then, be a subjunctive, although having got an aorist subjunctive in ἀπέλθω, it is perhaps surprising that the scribe did not come up with another one — ἐνέγκω, or ἐνίκω perhaps, on analogy with ἐξενίκει in l. 4: he was probably thinking of the indicative.

The meaning of *δίχα Εὐλογίου* is most probably 'without Eulogios' agreement'. In classical Greek *δίχα* can mean specifically 'against the wishes of' (LSJ II 3). In the papyri it usually means 'without', as in the common expression *δίχα δόλου* or *δίχα πάσης ἀντιλογίας*, but it must have an extended meaning here. *ἐπάνω Εὐλογίου* is more problematic: 'into Eulogios' presence' seems a possibility, although if he is going to bring anyone into the cell, it will inevitably be 'into Eulogios' presence'. The word would have more force if it meant, as it can, 'over' in the sense of 'senior to'. In the monastery of Apa Mena, as we have seen (above p. 87), Schenute had undertaken not to bring in anyone above the monks. Some sort of hierarchical structure seems to be implied for Aioulios' unit, although it is the ownership that is at stake rather than seniority. Aioulios cannot bring anyone in who will have a prior claim on the ownership.

8. The word *μέν* is, of course, redundant here: on the so-called *μέν solitarium*, see Denniston 1954, 380–384. The second *ἐγώ* is also unnecessary, and should perhaps be bracketed {*ἐγώ*}, although it does not obstruct the sense, and it just might be emphatic.

9. *ἀπορίψεν*. This looks like some sort of mixture between the present and aorist infinitives, *ἀπορρίπτειν* and *ἀπορρίψαι*, but probably *nu ephelkustikon* has been added wrongly to *ε*, standing for *αι* (a very common interchange), and the aorist infinitive *ἀπορρίψαι* was intended.

ζῶντα, one suspects, could apply to either Aioulios or Eulogios (as in l. 6), but is probably correctly accusative here with *σαι*. The whole is pleonastic but intelligible: 'I will not expel you while you live until you die.' *ἕως τοῦ καὶ ἀποθάνης* is perhaps a mixture of the two constructions that could have been used here: *ἕως τοῦ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν* and *ἕως οὗ καὶ ἀποθάνης*. In temporal clauses one expects *ἄν*, but it can be omitted with *ἕως* and *πρίν*: see Mandilaras 1973, 598 p. 267. The subject of expulsion from a monastery is one that also occurs in the Coptic will (above p. 78), of Jacob and Elias. Jacob had been left the monastery by Psan, but then Elias had come during Psan's lifetime and had been given right of residence. Psan himself had drawn up another will including Elias, and had this to say: 'But as for Apa Elias, (son) of Samuel, he that is come in and dwelleth with us, thou Jacob canst not cast him from the τόπος during such time as he shall pass alive' (translation in Crum and Evelyn-White 1926, 345). The terminology is interestingly similar to the present document.

10. *Τούρβων* is a reasonably common name, but I can find only one other secure example of *Τούρβος*, in SB I 5463 — possibly also in SPP XX 235, 18 (7th century A. D.) where the text is *Τουρβ()*. In the 4th century A. D. the Melitians called themselves 'the church of the martyrs' (*ἐκκλησία μαρτύρων*), while the orthodox were 'the catholic church' (*ἐκκλησία καθολική*) — Eriphanus, *Panarion* 68, 3; 7. It seems odd that here two of the witnesses style themselves 'Melitian priests of the holy catholic church in the ὄρος of Labla'.

11. There is an *Ἠλίας διάκονος* of the sixth century from the Arsinoite nome in SPP VIII 1269, 6, but *Ἠλίας* is a common name and there is no particular reason to link them. For the reading *τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ* see l. 2 commentary. On the words *διάκων* and *διάκονος*, see Thomas 1970, 178. It is perhaps worthy of note to find orthodox priests witnessing this contract, as well as Melitians (there are three of each): orthodox and schismatic seem to have lived together at Labla without any obvious signs of tension. For the same sort of peaceful coexistence at Cellia, see Chitty 1966, 148–149. The sixth century Melitian monks at Scetis, however, did not get on well with their orthodox brothers. The problem was their excessive fondness for communion: 'they used to receive the Chalice many times in the night before they came to church', or, less charitably, 'they used to drink wine in the night several times over and the next day receive the Holy Mysteries'; 'they communicated twenty times a day' (for the quotations and discussion, see Evelyn-White 1932, 248–249). The patriarch Damian treated this as a doctrinal matter, pointing out that they were misinterpreting the actions of Jesus and infringing the law, but it is not an unwarranted suspicion that the Melitians at Scetis were simply too fond of the bottle. Damian expelled them. Hieronymus (*Ep.* 22, 34 CSEL LIV) attributes drunkenness to the group that forms his third type of monasticism: *si quando festior dies venerit, saturantur ad vomitum*.

14. The writer might have been intending *μονάζοντα Μελιτιανόν*, referring just to Eulogios, but elsewhere in the document he does distinguish plural forms. So as he has *Μελιτιανοί*, it looks as if he was aiming at *μονάζοντες*. It is possible, however, to argue that at no stage in the text is Aioulios incontrovertibly addressed as a Melitian Monk at Labla.

Bibliography

- Abbot 1937 = N. Abbot, *The Monasteries of the Fayyum*, Chicago 1937.
- Bagnall 1985 = R. S. Bagnall, *Currency and Inflation in Fourth Century Egypt*, Missoula 1985 (BASP Suppl. 5).
- Bagnall and Worp 1978 = R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Zutphen 1978 (Studia Amstelodamensia etc. 8).
- Bagnall *et al.* 1987 = R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987.
- Ballini 1939 = A. L. Ballini, *Osservazioni giuridiche a recenti indagini papirologiche sui monasteri egiziani*, *Aegyptus* 19 (1939) 77–88.
- Barison 1938 = P. Barison, *Ricerche sui monasteri dell'Egitto bizantino ed arabo secondo i documenti dei papiri greci*, *Aegyptus* 18 (1938) 29–148.
- Barnard 1973 = L. W. Barnard, *Athanasius and the Melitian Schism in Egypt*, *JEA* 59 (1973) 181–189.
- Barnard 1975 = L. W. Barnard, *Some Notes on the Melitian Schism in Egypt*, *Studia Patristica* 12 (1975) 399–405.
- Barnes 1981 = T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge Mass. 1981.
- Bell 1924 = H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt. The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy*, London 1924.
- Boak 1937 = A. E. R. Boak, *The Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt*, *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 212–220.
- Bowman 1971 = A. K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*, Toronto 1971 (American Studies in Papyrology 11).
- Bowman 1986 = A. K. Bowman, *Egypt after the Pharaohs 332 B. C. — A. D. 642 from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*, London 1986.
- Cabrol and Leclercq 1921 = F. Cabrol, H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Vol. 4, Paris 1921.
- Cadell and Rémondon 1967 = H. Cadell, R. Rémondon, *Sens et emploi de τὸ ὄρος dans les documents papyrologiques*, *REG* 80 (1967) 343–349.
- Calderini 1951 = R. Calderini, *Βουλευτικά*, *Aegyptus* 31 (1951) 3–41.
- Calderini, *Dizionario* = A. Calderini, S. Daris, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano*, Cairo, Milano 1935 ff.
- Chitty 1966 = D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire*, Oxford 1966.
- Crum and Steindorf 1912 = W. E. Crum, G. Steindorf, *Koptische Rechtsurkunden des achten Jahrhunderts aus Djeme (Theben)*, Leipzig 1912.
- Crum and Evelyn-White 1926 = W. E. Crum, H. G. Evelyn-White, *The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes*, Part II, New York 1926.
- Crum 1927 = W. E. Crum, *Some Further Melitian Documents*, *JEA* 13 (1927) 19–26.
- Daumas 1967 = F. Daumas, *Les travaux de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale pendant l'année 1966–1967*, *CRAI* 1967, 438–450.
- Daumas and Guillaumont 1969 = F. Daumas, A. Guillaumont, *Kellia I Kom 219*, Cairo 1969.
- Daris 1960 = S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nella lingua greca d'Egitto*, *Aegyptus* 40 (1960) 177–314.
- Dewing 1922 = H. B. Dewing, *A Dialysis of the Fifth Century AD in the Princeton Collection of Papyri*, *TAPhA* 53 (1922) 113–127.
- Denniston 1954 = J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford ²1954.
- Diethart 1980 = J. M. Diethart, *Prosopographia Arsinoïtica I: s. VI–VIII*, Wien 1980 (MPER NS 12).
- Diethart and Worp 1986 = J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten*, Wien 1986 (MPER NS 16).
- Dornseiff and Hansen 1978 = F. Dornseiff, B. Hansen, *Reverse Lexicon of Greek Proper-Names*, Chicago 1978.
- von Druffel 1970 = E. von Druffel, *Papyrologische Studien zum byzantinischen Urkundenwesen im Anschluß an P. Heidelberg 311*, München ²1970.
- Evelyn-White 1932 = H. G. Evelyn-White, *The Monasteries of the Wādi 'n Natrūn*. Part II: *The History of the Monasteries of Nitria and Scetis*, ed. W. Hauser, New York 1932.

- Gascou 1985 = J. Gascou, *Les grands domaines, la cité et l'état en Égypte byzantine*, Travaux et Memoires 9 (1985) 1–90.
- Gignac 1976 = F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Vol. I, Milano 1976.
- Greenslade 1964 = S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church*, London 1964.
- Hardy 1952 = E. R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt: Church and People*, Oxford 1952.
- Hauben 1981 = H. Hauben, *On the Melitians in P.Lond. VI (P.Jews) 1914: the Problem of Papas Heraiscus*, Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Papyrology, New York 24–31 July, 1980, Chico 1981, 447–456.
- Hengstenberg 1935 = W. Hengstenberg, *Bemerkungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des ägyptischen Mönchtums*, Bulletin de l'Institut Archéologique Bulgare 9 (1935) 335–362.
- Heussi 1936 = K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*, Tübingen 1936.
- Holl 1928 = K. Holl, *Die Bedeutung der neueröffneten meletianischen Urkunden für die Kirchengeschichte*, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II: Der Osten, Tübingen 1928, 283–297.
- Husson 1967 = G. Husson, *Recherches sur les sens du mot προάσπιον dans le grec d'Égypte*, Recherches de Papyrologie 4 (1967) 187–200.
- Husson 1979 = G. Husson, *L'habitat monastique en Égypte à la lumière des papyrus grecs, des textes chrétiens et de l'archéologie*, Hommages à la mémoire de Serge Sauneron II, Cairo 1979, 191–207.
- Husson 1983 = G. Husson, *OIKIA. Le vocabulaire de la maison privée en Égypte d'après les papyrus grecs*, Paris 1983.
- Johnson 1936 = A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. Vol. II T. Frank (ed.), Baltimore 1936 (An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome).
- Johnson and West 1949 = A. C. Johnson, L. C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*, Princeton 1949.
- July 1966 = H. H. July, *Die Klauseln hinter den Maßangaben der Papyrusurkunden (insbesondere die Klausel ἡ ὄσων δὲν ὄσιν und ihre Synonyme)*, Diss. Köln 1966.
- Kapsomenakis 1938 = S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit*, München 1938.
- Kasser 1967 = R. Kasser, *Kellia 1965. Recherches Suisses d'Archéologie Copte*, vol. I, Geneva 1967.
- Kasser 1972 = R. Kasser, *Kellia. Topographie. Recherches Suisses d'Archéologie Copte*, vol. II, Geneva 1972.
- Kasser 1983 = R. Kasser, *Survey Archéologique des Kellia (Basse-Égypte). Rapport de la campagne 1981*, 2 fasc. Louvain 1983.
- Keenan 1974 = J. G. Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations in later Roman Egypt*, ZPE 11 (1973) 33–63; 13 (1974) 283–304.
- Keenan 1977 = J. G. Keenan, *The Provincial Administration of Egyptian Arcadia*, Mus. Phil. Lond. 2 (1977) 193–202.
- Kettler 1936 = F. H. Kettler, *Der meletianische Streit in Ägypten*, ZNW 35 (1936) 155–193.
- Krause 1958 = M. Krause, *Das Apa Apollo Kloster in Bawit. Untersuchungen unveröffentlichter Urkunden als Beitrag zur Geschichte des ägyptischen Mönchtums*, Diss. Leipzig 1958 (non vidi).
- Krause 1985 = M. Krause, *Zur Möglichkeit von Besitz im apotaktischen Mönchtum Ägyptens*, T. Orlandi, F. Wisse (eds.), *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies Rome 22–26 September 1980*, Roma 1985, 121–133.
- Kreller 1919 = H. Kreller, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen auf Grund der gräko-ägyptischen Papyrusurkunden*, Leipzig 1919.
- Mandilaras 1973 = B. G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek non-literary Papyri*, Athens 1973.
- Martin 1974 = A. Martin, *Athanase et les Mélitiens (325–335)*, C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. Actes du colloque de Chantilly 23–25 Septembre 1973*, Théologie Historique 27 (Paris 1974) 31–61.
- McGing and Parke 1986 = B. C. McGing, H. W. Parke, *Papyri*, P. Fox (ed.), *Treasures of the Library Trinity College Dublin*, Dublin 1986, 29–37.
- Mitteis 1912 = L. Mitteis, U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde II 1: Grundzüge*, Berlin 1912.
- Modrzejewski 1952 = J. Modrzejewski, *Private Arbitration in the Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*, JJP 6 (1952) 239–256.

- Montevecchi 1941 = O. Montevecchi, *Ricerche di sociologia nei documenti dell'Egitto greco-romano* III. *I contratti di compra-vendita*, *Aegyptus* 21 (1941) 93–151.
- Montevecchi 1973 = O. Montevecchi, *La papirologia*, Turin 1973.
- Flinders Petrie 1889 = W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hawara, Biamhu and Arsinoe*, London 1889.
- Flinders Petrie 1890 = W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Kahun, Gurob and Hawara*, London 1890.
- La Pira 1936 = G. La Pira, *La stipulatio aquiliana nei papiri*, Atti del IV congresso internazionale di papirologia, Milano 1936, 479–484.
- Pringsheim 1950 = F. Pringsheim, *The Greek Law of Sale*, Weimar 1950.
- Rouillard 1928 = G. Rouillard, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*, Paris 1928.
- Rousseau 1978 = P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*, Oxford 1978.
- Sauneron *et al.* 1972 = S. Sauneron, J. Jacquet, H. Jacquet-Gordon, *Les ermitages chrétiens du désert d'Esna*, Fouilles de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire 29, 1–4.
- Sayce 1890 = A. H. Sayce, *Deux contrats grecs du Fayoum*, *REG* 3 (1890) 131–144.
- Schmidt 1932 = C. Schmidt, *Das Kloster des Apa Mena*, *ZÄS* 68 (1932) 60–68.
- Schwartz 1959 = E. Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*, Berlin 1959.
- Steinwenter 1930 = A. Steinwenter, *Die Rechtsstellung der Kirchen und Klöster nach den Papyri*, Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte 50, Kanon. Abt. 19 (1930) 1–50.
- Steinwenter 1932 = A. Steinwenter, *Byzantinische Mönchstestamente*, *Aegyptus* 12 (1932) 55–64.
- Sturm 1972 = F. Sturm, *Stipulatio Aquiliana. Textgestalt und Tragweite der aquilianischen Ausgleichsquittung im klassischen römischen Recht*, München 1972.
- Teodorsson 1976 = S. T. Teodorsson, *Zwei Göteborger Papyri*, *ZPE* 21 (1976) 245–250.
- Thomas 1970 = J. D. Thomas, *Chronological Notes on Documentary Papyri*, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 175–182.
- Timm 1985 = S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit*, Teil 3 (G–L), Wiesbaden 1985 (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B (Geisteswissenschaft) 41/3).
- Turner 1952 = E. G. Turner, *SB 5174, 5175: Some Corrections*, *JEA* 38 (1952) 132–133.
- Turner 1987 = E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd ed. by P. J. Parsons, London 1987.
- Walters 1974 = C. Walters, *Monastic Archaeology in Egypt*, Warminster 1974.
- West and Johnson 1944 = L. C. West, A. C. Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, Princeton 1944.
- Wipszycka 1972 = E. Wipszycka, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IV^e au VIII^e siècle*, Bruxelles 1972.
- Youtie 1981 = L. C. Youtie, *ΦΕΝΤΥΜΙΣ. A False Place Name*, *BASP* 18 (1981) 173–175.

[The page contains approximately 25 lines of handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a historical document or manuscript. The text is written on aged, slightly stained paper and is mostly illegible due to the cursive style and fading. The script appears to be a form of early modern German or Latin cursive.]

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a historical document or manuscript. The text is dense and spans most of the page, with some lines appearing to be part of a list or a series of entries. The ink is dark and the paper shows signs of age and wear.

Handwritten signature or name, possibly "J. M. ...". The signature is written in a large, stylized cursive script and is located at the bottom right of the page.

Handwritten text in an ancient script, likely Coptic, on a fragment of papyrus. The text is arranged in approximately 15 horizontal lines. The script is dense and cursive, with some characters appearing to be in a different dialect or script than others, possibly indicating a mix of languages or a specific regional form. The fragment is irregularly shaped and shows signs of age and wear.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a manuscript page. The text is densely packed and appears to be a single column of writing. The ink is dark, and the paper shows signs of age and wear, including some staining and discoloration. The script is highly stylized and difficult to decipher without specialized knowledge of the language or dialect used.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely a historical document or manuscript. The text is dense and spans most of the page. At the bottom right, there is a large, stylized signature or seal, possibly reading "Johannes" or similar, followed by some smaller, less legible text.

