



**Universiteit  
Leiden**  
The Netherlands

## **P.Princ. II 84 re-edited**

Worp, K.A.; Bagnall, R.S.

### **Citation**

Worp, K. A., & Bagnall, R. S. (2003). P.Princ. II 84 re-edited. *Bulletin Of The American Society Of Papyrologists (Chicago, Ill.)*, 40, 11-26. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10129>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10129>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## *P. Princ. II 84 Revisited*

In publishing the Greek recto of this fragmentary document in 1936, E.H. Kase, Jr. identified it as the sale of a house<sup>1</sup> from the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D., a dating he accompanied by a question mark. The provenance of the papyrus was given as "unknown." Kase noted that a Coptic text stood on the verso; this was published by Leslie MacCoull in *ZPE* 96 (1993) 227-9, where it is identified as a contract to supply wine at a future date against a present payment. She does not comment on the date, but she suggests that the Hermopolite nome is the provenance, a remark based mainly on the name Taurinos (in the unpublished line 3)<sup>2</sup> but also buttressed by the citation of a Greek text providing a close parallel to the Coptic.<sup>3</sup> Digital images of both sides of the Princeton papyrus are now available in APIS.<sup>4</sup> The Greek hand is obviously sixth-century, and the parallels to the phraseology are of the same century, as the editor's introduction indeed acknowledges.<sup>5</sup> The Coptic text is thus cer-

---

<sup>1</sup> Bibliography on sales can be found in H.-A. Rupprecht, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Darmstadt 1994) 115-7. For an updated list of sales from the period A.D. 400-700, see the appendix to this article.

<sup>2</sup> Although most common in the Hermopolite, the name is in fact found elsewhere. It is fair to record, however, that the instances known at Aphrodito all appear to belong to officials who are likely to have originated elsewhere. The origin of the individual in the present case naturally need not be the place of writing of the document.

<sup>3</sup> This document is cited as *SPP* XX 144, but in fact it has been republished with an additional fragment containing lines 1-11 as *SB* XVI 12492; there the date is given as A.D. 638. The parallel is in fact very partial; although many common elements occur, the order and phrasing are different in a number of passages.

<sup>4</sup> Greek: <http://www.columbia.edu/cgi-bin/dlo?obj=princeton.apis.p686&size=150&face=f&tile=0>. Coptic: <http://www.columbia.edu/cgi-bin/dlo?obj=princeton.apis.p847&size=150&face=b&tile=0>.

<sup>5</sup> We take the opportunity to note another misjudgment of date in the volume. *P. Princ. II 85*, a sale of a slave, is dated also to "5<sup>th</sup> (?) cent. A.D." In fact this

tainly not earlier than the later 6<sup>th</sup> century and could easily be somewhat later.<sup>6</sup> We offer some comments on readings in the Coptic document after our reedition of the Greek text.

The question of provenance is difficult. The surviving names (apart from Taurinos) are not distinctive and none can be securely identified with a known person. The formula ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν δώσειν ποιεῖν φυλάττειν in lines 2-3 is not distinctive, and not enough survives here for us to be certain that the variant in this text matches that attested in one place rather than another. The closest parallels appear to be from Hermopolis and Aphrodito, but we must reckon with the fact that many legal documents in the archive of Dioskoros were drafted during his years (566-73) working as a notary in Antinoopolis, the close neighbor of Hermopolis.<sup>7</sup> The formula in line 8 (see note *ad loc.*) is known only from Hermopolite and Antinoopolite documents, but once again nothing in that fact would preclude the possibility that we have a document found at Aphrodito and written in Antinoopolis, or even that the formula was used more widely than our surviving documentation indicates. More decisive, perhaps, is the very opening of the Princeton papyrus, εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμέ[να] ἐπ[ε]ρ[ω]τηθέντες. To this precise phrase there is no parallel, but its near cousin with πρὸς in place of εἰς is found exclusively in the Aphrodito papyri, with one attestation (*P.Herm.* 32) lacking a certain provenance (see n. 7 below), and the same is true of the phrase εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα found earlier in most of the same Aphrodito papyri (see note to lines 2-3). This is the strongest evidence for an Aphrodito provenance. As our

---

hand appears to belong to the sixth or seventh century; cf. *CPR* XXIII 35 for a similar hand.

<sup>6</sup> MacCoull points out that the Greek side is across the fibers, the Coptic with them. This is of course the normal state of affairs in this period; the Greek text was written first, in rotulus fashion across the shorter dimension of the papyrus, the Coptic later along the fibers on the other side. MacCoull says that "Coptic parallels ... also exist," but she does not list any. Those she cites in the line notes are not earlier than the seventh century (*CPR* IV 82, 8<sup>th</sup> cent.; *CPR* IV 83, 7<sup>th</sup> cent.; *P.CrumST* 89, no date assigned).

<sup>7</sup> Jean-Luc Fournet points out to us the case of *P.Herm.* 59, which comes from the Antaiopolite or Apollonopolite Mikra (see *CPR* VII, p. 159 and *Cd'É* 71 [1996] 350). *P.Herm.* 32, which has the formula in question, may also, Fournet suggests, come from the Dioskoros archive.

discussion of the price will show (note to line 7), the *παρὰ κεράτια* phrase also points to Aphrodito. The formula of the Coptic contract is certainly similar to some from Hermopolis (cited below), but without comparable material from Aphrodito it is hard to say how distinctive these formulas are.

The Princeton collection contains, as far as a search of catalogue records in APIS discloses, no sixth-century Hermopolite papyri, but there is one published papyrus belonging to the Dioskoros archive (*P.Princ.* II 89; inv. GD 7681a), and one unpublished contract (GD 7177) assigned "Aphrodito (?)" as a provenance. This information, however scanty, also favors a provenance from Aphrodito for *P.Princ.* II 84. It should be pointed out, however, that the loan for repayment in kind, the "Lieferungskauf" analyzed by Andrea Jördens in *P.Heid.* V, is not a feature of the Aphrodito documentary corpus; Jördens' list (pp. 296-301) contains not a single example. Such documents do occur in the material from all of the other major sixth-century provenances (Arsinoe, Herakleopolis, Oxyrhynchos, Hermopolis, Antinoopolis). It is hard not to wonder if the reuse of the papyrus for the wine document is not to be attributed to Hermopolis or Antinoopolis.

Much of the original papyrus is clearly lost; its surviving width is at maximum 16.5 cm. We have only the last three lines of the main body of the contract, the subscription of the first seller, and the subscription of the second seller together with the statement of her *hypographeus*.<sup>8</sup> The first three lines were not read very successfully by the editor. In the first two lines, the right-hand part of what the editor read stands on a separate fragment, placed in the frame today too far to the left. We propose to read the Greek text as follows:

<sup>8</sup> MacCoull has suggested (p. 229) that "since one of the parties to the sale is Euphemia daughter of John, a nun (μονάζουσα), it is possible that *αμα* in line 4 (cited wrongly by MacCoull as 5) might not be understood as *αμα* but rather as the religious title 'Αμα, 'Ama, Mother,' here in the dative: 'I have sold to Ama Euphemia ...' This could make the Greek document an instance of a religious woman purchasing a dwelling." That, however, is impossible. Euphemia subscribes in lines 9ff. as a seller; the subscription of the purchaser would have no purpose, and her (i.e. her *hypographeus*') [*ἀπέτ*]χον *ἀμμα* (l. *ἀμα*) *αὐτῷ* makes it clear that she is acting with Serenos, the other seller.



however, this view rests on inadequate restorations. It will be observed that in line 3, where the first, scribal hand is at work except for the last few letters, the preserved text to the left of the break at the right side amounts to 25 letters, while the restoration in line 2, where considerably more is lost, requires some 33 letters. That is, not quite half of the text must be lost at right. Bearing in mind that the blank left margin would have accommodated another 4-5 letters, we may estimate that the total width of the text was around 50-55 letters, occupying all but the left margin of a normal roll of 32-33 cm in height. That is, half of the width of the Greek document is lost. The larger hand of lines 4-8 will have given lines of only about 35-40 letters each. In line 8, where the restorations are secure, the amount restored is 19 letters, yielding a total count of 35 (plus an abbreviation stroke); in line 9, where the third and somewhat smaller hand picks up, a restoration of 21 letters yields a line-width of 50 letters.

1 It is not evident what to restore in this line. The appearance of the proper name Phibios (attested at Hermopolis and Aphrodito) is unexpected, as this section of sales is usually occupied with legal boilerplate, not information about the parties. It is also possible that the name is connected with the description or boundaries of the property, but this also is not expected at this point in the formula.

2-3 The restorations are based on standard sixth-century phraseology, although *πρός* is normal instead of *εἰς*. *P.Herm.* 32.30-31 (perhaps from Aphrodito, cf. n. 7 above), is a good example: *καὶ πρὸς πάν[τα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα] | [ἐπε]ρωτηθέντες (l. ἐπερωτηθέντες) ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν δόσειν ποιεῖν φυλάττειν ὁμολογήσαμεν.* Naturally, one could restore *ἐπερωτηθέντες* with some degree of abbreviation. The formula of *ἔχειν δόσειν ποιεῖν φυλάττειν* is attested in variations at Hermopolis (*P.Flor.* III 323.20), Lykopolis (*P.Princ.* II 82 = *SB* III 7033.75-76), Syene (*P.Munch.* I 4+5v.46-47), and Aphrodito (numerous instances, e.g., *P.Mich.* XIII 662.60-61). The *καὶ πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα ἐπερωτηθέντες* part of the clause, however, is attested (apart from the uncertain case of *P.Herm.* 32) only in documents from Aphrodito: *P.Mich.* XIII 662, 663, 664, and 667; *P.Michael.* 40 and 52; *SB* XVIII 13320, *P.Vat.Aphrod.* 4 and 5. The occurrence of *εἰς* here instead of *πρός* is probably to be explained as

a slip caused by the use (in these same documents, plus *P.Lond.* V 1660) of the phrase εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα (or in *P.Mich.* XIII 667.25-26, προγεγραμμένα) at an earlier point in the formulary. (At the conclusion, *P.Lond.* V 1660.47 reads ἐφ' ἅπασιν τοῖς ἐγγεγραμμένοις.) The distinction from Hermopolite usage can be seen clearly by comparison with *P.Flor.* III 323.20, where for ἐγγεγραμμένα we find προγεγραμμένα and after ἐπερω[τη]θεῖσα we get παρ' αὐτοῦ. Neither of these is compatible with the spacing and the traces in the present papyrus.

3-4 It will be noticed that neither *Serenos* nor *Euphemia* has the praenomen *Aurelius* (or *Flavius*). In the context of a legal document, that is likely to indicate religious status, something that we know *Euphemia* had as a female monk, for clerics and monks generally do not use *Aurelius*. See briefly *J.G. Keenan, ZPE* 13 (1974) 287 n.155 and *J.R. Rea, ZPE* 99 (1993) 89. There are exceptions both for clergy and for monks, however, and a proper study of this subject would be worthwhile. In all likelihood, then, a title like μονάζων or some clerical grade followed *Serenos'* patronymic in line 3, occupying the remainder of the available space.

4, 6, 9, 11 The phrasing of the subscriptions to a sale contract with ἄμα in this manner is paralleled as far as we know only in *PSI* XII 1239 (*Antin.*, 430), which is also a parallel to the phrasing in line 8 (see below). The lacuna in 4 may have contained *Euphemia's* patronymic (Ἰωάννου), a description of *Euphemia's* relationship to *Serenos*, or μοναζούση.

5, 10 A wide variety of phraseology with cὺν χρηστηρίοις is attested; the wordings restored here are both known, but cὺν τοῖς αὐτῆς would also be possible in 5.

6 τούτων is restored *exempli gratia*; ταύτης would be equally possible, depending on how the writer was thinking about the property. This appears to be a rare instance in which the two subscribers did not write exactly the same text.

7 The bulk of the first editor's introduction is occupied by discussion of the problem posed by the purchase price. Here only the letter epsilon is preserved, while in line 12 only the word δεκαπέντε is preserved. These are obviously irreconcilable if both are assumed to be the number of solidi, and the editor properly excluded a very

high price like 115 sol. The editor then considered the possibility of reading the price as 5 sol., 15 ker., but rejected this on grounds of length. Even if the latter objection was misconceived (as we believe), such a price would be out of line with normal usage. The correct solution was recognized by H. Maehler, *Das Römisch-Byzantinische Ägypten*. Aeg.Trev. 2 (Mainz 1983) 132: the price must be a number of solidi beginning in epsilon παρά κεράτια δεκαπέντε. There is no difficulty in restoring lines 11-12 accordingly, and the length of the expected restoration will accommodate any of a number of possibilities. It will be seen, however, that the same is not true in line 7, where even the shortest restoration (ἐξ) and abundant abbreviation give us a line length exceeding that of the other restorations in the portion written by this person. One could gain two letters by assuming βεβαιῶ instead of the future, but this is a doubtful expedient.

The situation is complicated further by the fact that the παρά computations with solidi are not made up of random numbers. The list compiled by Klaus Maresch, *Nomisma und Nomismatia*. Pap.Colon. 21 (Opladen 1994) 159-71, shows that in the sixth century documents from Hermopolis and Antinoopolis almost always show a number of keratia five or six times the number of solidi (that is, the solidi in question were reckoned as containing only 18 keratia). As with all provenances, there are occasional variations (e.g. *P.Herm.* 65, A.D. 553, with 3.6 keratia per solidus discount), and the precise history of this usage is not fully understood, but no restoration of ε[ will yield a figure compatible with the information known about Hermopolite and Antinoopolite documents. In Aphrodito, by contrast, the discount is usually 2 keratia per solidus, although some variety is again attested.

To make the number of solidi match the normal ratio to keratia in any known provenance, we could restore only ἐ[πὰ ἡμῶν: 7.5 solidi x 2 keratia, correct for Aphrodito. This restoration, however, would exacerbate the problem of the length of the restoration. No number beginning in epsilon would yield a restoration compatible with Hermopolis or Antinoopolis. It is perhaps more attractive to restore ἐξ and accept a ratio of 2.5 keratia per solidus. But there are enough quirky cases visible in Maresch's list that we think prudence requires refraining from printing a restoration in the text.



8 The first editor put *καὶ* inside braces without explanation. He apparently did not recognize the clause used here. A good parallel occurs in *SPP* XX 121.38-40 (Hermop., 439; cf. *CPR* VI 6), a sale of land in which the subscription of the seller concludes *καὶ ἀπέσχον τὰ τῆς τιμῆς χρυσοῦ νομικμάτια τεσσεράκοντα ἐκ πλήρους καὶ βεβαίωσω | περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς πρόκειται καὶ πληρωθεὶς τῆς τιμῆς ἀπέλυσα τὴν πρᾶσιν καὶ ἔστιν μου ἰδιόγραφον | ὀλόκληρον*. The seller thus asserts that on receiving the price he has released the sale document to the purchaser. Similar phraseology stands in *PSI* I 66.36-37 (prob. Hermop.; cf. *BL* II.2, p. 137), *P.Flor.* III 310.19-20 (Hermop., 425-450, cf. *BL* VIII, p. 129), and *PSI* XII 1239 (Antin., 430). All known examples are thus Hermopolite or Antinoopolite.

13-14 Kollouthos is probably the *hypographeus* for Euphemia, since the hand is the same as that of the previous lines. Kase restored at the start of line 14 τῆ]γ πρ[ᾱ]ς[ιν . . ]κ[.], but this reading does not persuade us, only the rho seeming to us secure, nor is it expected in the formula concerning illiteracy that Kase restored in line 13. There is certainly sufficient room for some version of the illiteracy formula in line 13, and we cannot say with any confidence what should stand in line 14. Line 13 may have read as simply as *Κολλοῦθος Ἄμ[μωνίου ἀξιωθεὶς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς*, which comes to just 40 letters (cf., e.g., *P.Mich.* XIII 662.66), perhaps with the addition *γράμματα μὴ εἰδυίας* (cf. *P.Vat.Aphrod.* 5.24), which would bring the restoration to 57 letters, still within the range of possibility for this writer, even without taking account of the possibility of abbreviation. In neither case is it likely that this formula will have continued into line 14 (and we do not think that [. . .] γρ[άμμ- is a plausible reading there). The absence of *Αὐρήλιος* with Kollouthos' name, however, could be an indication that the patronymic was followed by some ecclesiastical or monastic title; nor is there room at the end of line 12 for *Αὐρήλιος*. In that case, the shorter version of the signatory's formula may have been written. Presumably the signatures of witnesses are still needed before the end of the document, but what we have at the start of 14 does not look to us like [μαρτ]υρ[.



phrase describing the capacity of the kados followed in the lacuna. At the very end of line 4 it is possible that an amount in the hundreds preceded "fifty," but if so we have not managed to read it. The surface on the right side in lines 4-5 seems very disturbed, and we are not certain that there is not something written between the lines.

6 Ed.pr.: ΝΑΪ ΤΙΖΟΜΟΛΓΕΙ ΜΗΧΔΔΥ Ν[ΔΜΦΙΒΟΧΙΑ ΠΑΡΑΧΚΕ ΝΑΚ ΖΝ], "these [sc. the measures of wine] I agree with no equivocation to furnish you in ..." (the editor in fact begins the translation "... for me," but this is an erroneous translation of ΝΑΪ, which is the demonstrative here). The parallel passage in *P.Lond.Copt.* I 1040.4, however, gives the wanted sense: ΝΑΪ ΤΙΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ ΤΑΤΔΔΥ ΝΑΚ ΖΝ ΠΟΥΩΩ ΜΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΜΕCOP[H], "these I agree to give to you, God willing, in Mesore . . ." Line 6 should be in fact read ΝΑΪ ΤΙΖΟΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ Τ[Δ]ΤΔΔΥ Ν[ΔΚ ΖΝ ΠΟΥΩΩ ΜΠ]ΝΟΥΤΕ Ν "these I agree to give to you from the crop of the eleventh indiction in . . ." (see note to line 7 for the continuation).

7 ΜΕCOPΕ ΠΕΒΟΤ [CYN ΘΕΩ ΜΝΤΟΥΕ ΙΝΔΙΚ(ΤΙΟΝΟC) x (measures), ed.pr. In the Greek parallel cited, however, an amount is not given here: ἐν τῷ ΜεCορή μηνί τῆς cὺν θεῷ δωδεκάτης ἰνδ(ικτί)ο(νοC) ἐν οἴνω νέφ etc. Similarly, Coptic sales like *P.Lond.Copt.* I 461 and 1040 in this place do not give the quantity, which has been mentioned earlier; the first of these is particularly revealing: ΤΑΤΔΔΥ ΝΑΚ ΜΕCOPH ΠΕΒΟΤ ΝΠΚΑΡΠΟC ΝΠΡΩΤΗC ΙΝΔ(ΙΚΤΙΟΝΟC), "I am to give them to you in the month of Mesore from the crop of the first indiction." There are in fact traces on the papyrus after ΠΕΒΟΤ, and they do not resemble the letters required by the first editor's text. We propose reading instead, ΜΕCOPΕ ΠΕΒΟΤ ΜΠΚ[ΔΡΠΟC ΕΝΔΕΚΑΤΗ]C ΙΝΔ(ΙΚΤΙ)Ο(ΝΟC). The parallel passage in *P.Lond.Copt.* I 1040.5 continues precisely as line 8 does here.

8 At the end of the passage the printed text reads ΕΥΔΡΕΚΚΕ ΝΑΚ ΔΥΩ . . . ("satisfactory to you and . . .") before continuing in line 9 with ΘΒΩ ΝΑΚ ΕΡΟΟΥ. Here again the London parallels are decisive; they are indeed cited in Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* 656b along with other examples in the defining ΘΒΩ. We should read at the end of the line, ΤΔ[Τ]Ι, the conjunctive "I am to protect them for you" etc.

12-13 The penalty clause begins ΕΙΔΕ ΜΠΤΔΔΥ ΝΤΙΠΡΘΕΣΜΙΑ ΕΠ... | ΤΑΤΙ ΤΡΙΜΗCΙΝ CΝΔΥ, "If I do not give them to you on the appointed day, I shall pay two trimesia." There is no comment on the unread characters. In fact, the end of 12 is to be read ΕΠΙΤΔ, Greek ἔπειτα, "then." For this loan word in Coptic, see Hans Förster, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Wörter in den Koptischen dokumentarischen Texten* (Berlin 2002) 276; the same spelling occurs twice as a rendering of ἐπειδή, but that word is not appropriate here.

15 MacCougll read the debtor's name throughout as ΠΔΔΚΗΤ, but the concluding letters are clear in line 1. Here also there are traces of alpha after the tau, and we must read ΠΔΔΚΗΤΔ[C]. Cf. lines 15-16 interlinear.

15-16 Interlinear ΠΔΔΚΗΤ is all that can be read with any confidence. There are faint traces after tau, but at some distance from it and probably not part of the name. The tau may be raised slightly to indicate abbreviation. Cf. lines 1 and 15.

18 The printed text does not indicate that approximately 11 letters must have been lost before the beginning of the restored text, as the lacuna is something like 22 letters in width.

### Appendix: List of House Sales, A.D. 400 - 700

The list is arranged by provenance (the place of writing, not of finding) and date; provenances and dates are given in principle according to entries in the *HGV* internet version.

#### Antinoopolis

*PSI XII 1239* = *SB IV 7996* (430): third share of one-story house; price: 2 sol.

*SPP I*, pp. 7-8 (454): half share of house with a cistern, underground chamber, court and equipment; price: 9 sol.

*P.Berl.Zill.* 6 (527-565): 2/3 part of a house, i.e. 3 *kellia*, 1 *koi-ton*, 2 *topoi*, + share in well and sun room; price: lost.

*P.Cair.Masp.* II 67247 (VI): sale of a house or of land? Price: not stated.

**Aphrodito**

*P.Mich.* XIII 663 (VI): 2 *kellia* in a house; price: 2 sol.

*P.Vat.Aphrod.* 4 (2<sup>nd</sup> half VI): (part of) a house; price 3.5 sol.

*P.Vat.Aphrod.* 5 (VI): (part of) a house; price: lost.

*P.Vat.Aphrod.* 6 (VI): (part of) a house; price: 1.5 sol. – 2 ker.<sup>9</sup>

*P.Princ.* II 84 (VI): a house; price: [ ] sol. – 15 ker.

*P.Mich.* XIII 662 (615): part of a house in decay; price: 2/3 sol. – 2 ker.

*SB XVIII* 13320 (= *P.Mich.* XIII 665; 613-641): part of a house consisting of a hall and two men's apartments; price: 2 1/3 sol. – 2 ker.

**Apollinopolis Magna**

*P.Grenf.* I 60 (582): share of a walled courtyard (*BL XI*, p. 86); price: [-] ker.

*SB I* 5112 (618): half a hall in a house; price: 1 2/3 sol.

*SB I* 5114 (630-640): 1/3 part of a house; price: 1 1/3 sol.

**Arsinoe<sup>10</sup>**

*BGU II* (VI-VII): receipt for the price of an already sold house; details of price not indicated.

*P.Dubl.* 32 = *SB I* 5174 (512): a hermit's cell; price: 8 sol., 1200 myr. den.

*P.Dubl.* 33 = *SB I* 5175 (513): a hermit's cell; price 10 sol.

**Bau, Diopolite Minor**

*P.Lond.* V 1735 + 1851 (?) (see *BL VII*, p. 92; late VI): a fifth part of a house; price: 3 sol.

<sup>9</sup> In line 8, the editor has incorrectly restored the numeral for keratia as γ rather than the correct β.

<sup>10</sup> Although Preisigke entitled *SB I* 5320 a "Hauskauf," we omit it because it is actually a sale of plots of agricultural land.

**Herakleopolite**

*P.Rain.Cent.* 102 (459): (part of a) house?; price: lost.

*P.Köln* VII 323 (Papa Megale; VI/VII): an entire house + courtyard and well; price: 22 sol.

**Hermionthite** (Memnoneia)

*P.Lond.* III 991, pp. 257-258 (482/483; see *CSBE*<sup>2</sup> App. D): and entire house; price: 5 sol.<sup>11</sup>

*P.Herm.* 28 (503): an entire (?) house; price: 2 sol.

**Hermopolis**

*CPR* VII 46 (VI): half part of a *ktema*; price: lost.

*SB* VI 9586 (600): 1/2 of a small *koiton* in decay; price: 10 ker.

*BGU* XVII 2698 (VII): a dining room + terrace above; price: 3 sol. - 3 ker.

*P.Herm.* 35 (VII): an entire house in decay; price: lost.

**Kynopolite**

*T.Varie* 15 (VI): an entire house + courtyard and well; price: not preserved.

**Oxyrhynchos**

*P.Mich.* XV 730 (430): an entire house; price: lost.

*P.Wash.Univ.* I 15 (late V): 1/8 of a house with a courtyard, well and other appurtenances; price: not preserved.

*SB* VI 8987 (644/645): one *symposion* + *aithra*; price: 3 sol. of 23 ker. each.

**Panopolis**

*P.Par.* 21 ter + *P.Par.* p. 257 (599): a third share of a three-story building with underground chambers; price: 2 sol. - x ker.

<sup>11</sup> In line 3 restore [ἀπὸ κόμης Μεινον]ίων.

**Syene**<sup>12</sup>

*P.Münch.* I 15 + *P.Lond.* V 1855 (493): *cella* and court; price: 2 sol.

*P.Lond.* V 1722 (530): house with two *cellae* in basement, two dining rooms on second floor with terrace, two others on unroofed third floor also with terrace; price: 18 sol.

*P.Lond.* V 1724 (578): house with a small *cella* on first floor, dining room and small chamber (*doma*), a third share of another chamber and a third part of all equipment including porch, *pylon*, terrace, and half share of a bake house; price: 10 sol.

*P.Lond.* V 1728 (585): transfer of half share of a house to sister and brother-in-law on condition that the latter assume the entire obligation for maintenance of his mother.

*P.Münch.* I 9 (585): half share of a dining room in a four story house, share of fourth story chamber, share of a house inherited from his father, share of a small house inherited partly from mother and partly from father, and a half share of another house purchased by vendor; price: 10 sol.

*P.Münch.* I 11 (586): half share of a home including half share of porch, *pylon*, terrace, sun rooms, and bake shop; price: 5 sol.

*P.Münch.* I 12 (590): half share of three story house, *cella* on first floor, dining room on second floor, *hypopession*, dining room on third floor, open air chamber and large room with equipment; also half of porch, *pylon*, terrace, and bake shop; price: 5 sol.

*P.Lond.* V 1733 (594): half share of a dining room on the second story, fourth of an open air apartment above the *accubitum* with half of a porch, *pylon*, terrace, passageway and bake shop; price: 3 sol.

*P.Münch.* I 13 (594): half share of a court of a house in decay; price: 1 1/3 sol.

*P.Lond.* V 1734 (mid VI): dining room; price: 3 sol.

---

<sup>12</sup> For house property in Syene and the documents listed here see G. Husson, "Houses in Syene in the Paternouthis Archive," *BASP* 27 (1990) 123-37. For the descriptions of house sales, especially in Syene, we have used the summaries in A.C. Johnson - L.C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies* (Princeton 1949) 199-200.

*P.Münch.* I 16 (end of VI): court; price: 2 sol.

**This**

*P.Par.* 21 bis (592): house in ruins, a small *cella* and lot; price: 3 sol. - 1 ker.

*P.Par.* 21 (616): entire house; price: 13 ker.

**Provenance Unknown**

*P.Köln* III 155 (VI): house + appurtenances; price: 4 2/3 sol.

*SB XX* 14448 (VI/VII): half part of a house; price: lost.

*P.Got.* 22 (VI): a small house and an *epaulis*; price: lost.

ROGER S. BAGNALL

*Columbia University*

KLAAS A. WORP

*University of Amsterdam /*

*University of Leiden*