



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

On the Aureliate of Clergy and Monks

Worp, K.A.

Citation

Worp, K. A. (2005). On the Aureliate of Clergy and Monks. *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik*, 151, 145-152. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10148>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/10148>

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

ON THE AURELIATE OF CLERGY AND MONKS*

The subject of the use of the prefix (or nomen) Aurelius and Flavius in the papyrological and epigraphical documentation from the Roman empire has given rise to a large body of scholarly discussion, culminating, as far as Roman Egypt is concerned, into two by now 'classic' articles by J.G. Keenan, "The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations in Later Roman Egypt", appearing in *ZPE* 11 (1973) 33-63 and 13 (1974) 283 - 304; some afterthoughts on the subject were added by the same author in *ZPE* 53 (1983) 245-250. The general system governing this use of Flavius and Aurelius was summed up aptly by Keenan in *ZPE* 53, p. 245: "The name Flavius was restricted to definite categories of Egypt's population, with the name Aurelius being available for the rest".

At the same time it is to be kept in mind that these status markers, however widely used, turn out to be absent in quite a few texts. It would, e.g., have been cumbersome and tedious for individual scribes to give a prefix Aurelius / Aurelia to all (or almost all) persons mentioned in long administrative lists like, e.g., the well-known registers of landowners from mid 4th-century Hermopolis (see *P.Herm. Landl.*; for the date see *BL* 8.159) or in the equally well-known Skar-Codex (see *CPR* V 26; Vth cent., cf. *BL* 8.102, 9.65). Inconsistent use of this status marker is found in, e.g. *BGU* XVII 2685 (Hermop., 585), a land lease offered (l. 6) $\pi(\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha})$ $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\text{P}\alpha\pi\nu\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\text{I}\omega\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\omega$ $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$. . . $\alpha\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\text{P}\iota\nu\nu\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\tau\iota\pi\pi\omega\rho(\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu)$, $\kappa\tau\lambda.$ but subscribed by the lessees themselves while omitting the status marker $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$. And in another document from late Oxyrhynchus, *SB* VI 8987 (644/45) all persons are lacking a marker of their civil status, while there appears no reason for attributing this absence to some particular reason. The fact that two women figuring prominently in this text are described as widows ($\chi\eta\rho\alpha\iota$, l. 3) should not have prevented them from being at the same time $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega$ or $\text{F}\lambda\alpha\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega$.

In a recently published article¹ Roger Bagnall and I myself noticed that the absence of a prefix Aurelius (or Flavius) as a marker of a person's civil status in the context of a Byzantine legal document likely indicated religious status, for clergy and monks generally do not use often Aurelius. We referred to the remarks on the subject made by Keenan in *ZPE* 13 (1974) 287 n. 155 and J.R. Rea in *ZPE* 99 (1993) 89 while noticing that "there are exceptions both for clergy and for monks, however, and a proper study of the subject would be worthwhile".

The following lines present a collection and analysis of such exceptions. For this I scrutinized the *Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri* for a combination of the name beginning in $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda-$ + [clerical function] (for the terms precisely searched for, see below), with a maximum of 10 words intervening.² Not really relevant are, of course, those cases where the religious function turns out to be related or relatable to the name of a person's father.³ In order to be able to follow historical developments texts are listed below in chronological order.

* As usual, I should like to express my gratitude to my colleague R. S. Bagnall who read an earlier version of this paper and contributed some observations for refining its argument. I am also grateful to my colleague B. P. Muhs for correcting some flaws in my English.

¹ Appearing in *BASP* 40 (2003) 16, note to ll. 3-4.

² The number may seem arbitrarily chosen, but the list below will show that in practice there even do not appear seven words intervening between the name and the office.

³ Compare $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\text{S}\epsilon\rho\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{F}\iota\lambda\omicron\zeta\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$, *P.Oxy.* XVI 1961.26 (Oxy., 487); [$\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\text{O}\nu\eta\omega\phi\rho\iota\nu$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\text{P}\alpha\mu\theta\omicron\theta\iota\omega\nu$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$], *P.Oxy.* XIX 2238.10 (Oxy., 551); $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\text{P}\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\text{Γ}\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\{\acute{\iota}\omega\}$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$, *CPR* XIV 11.7 (Arsin., 578); $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\Psi\acute{\alpha}\omega\varsigma$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\text{P}\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (ou) $\text{π}\rho(\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon)$ $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ $\text{M}\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ $\delta\rho\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ $\text{K}\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, *P.Berl.Zill.* 7.7 (Oxy., 574); $\text{π}\alpha\rho'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\text{π}\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\{\acute{\iota}\omega\}$ $\text{P}\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\upsilon$ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ $\text{K}\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\omega$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ $\text{π}\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ $\text{P}\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\omicron\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$ $\gamma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\{\nu\}$, *P.Lond.* V 1714.16 (Antaiop., 570); $\text{A}\rho\eta\rho\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$

ἀναγνώστης:

1. Αὐρήλιος Ἀμμώνιος Κοπρέως ἀναγνώστης τῆς ποτε ἐκ(κ)λησίας κώμης Χύσεως *P.Oxy. XXXIII 2673.8 (Oxy., 304)*
2. Αὐρήλιος Ἰακῶβ Βήσιος πρ(εσβυτέρου) ἀναγνώστης καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας *P.Kellis I 32.20 (Mothites, 364)*
3. Αὐρήλιος Νε]μεσιῶν [υἱὸς] Ἡρακλέους ἀναγνώστης τοῦ α[ὐ]τοῦ ἐποικίου *P.Gron. 9.24 (Arsin., 392; cf. BL 7.63)*

ἀρχιδιάκονος, ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος, ἀρχιμανδρίτης:

No relevant attestations

διάκων / (ὑπο)διάκονος⁴

4. παρὰ [Αὐ]ρηλίου Ζωΐλου Μέλαν[ος] δ[ι]άκων τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλη[σ]ία[ς] ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδ[ε]λφίας *P.Sakaon 48 = SB VI 9622.2 (Arsin., 343)*
5. π(αρά) Αὐρηλ[ί]ου Μουσῆτος ὄρου ἀπὸ Σαιτῶν πόλεως διάκονος καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας κώμ[η]ς Πάεως *P.Oslo III 113.5 (Hermop., 346)*
6. παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἀκάμμωνος Ἡρα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρσινοϊτῶν πόλεως καταμένοντος ἐν κώμ[η] Κε[ρ]κε[σ]ήφει διάκονος *P.Würzb. 16.2 (Arsin., 349)*
7. παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἡρων[ος] διάκων[ος] ἀπὸ κώμης Βερενικίδος *P.Abinn. 55.2-3 (Arsin., 351)*
8. Αὐρήλιοι -- Πκουρ[] δίακονος κ[αὶ] Χ[ω]λ[ος] ἄλ[λο]ς (sc. διάκονος) *P.Kellis I Gr. 24.11 (Mothites, 352)*
9. Αὐρήλιος Κεφάλων Θεοδώρου μη(τρὸς) Σοφία(ς) διάκων(ος) καθολικῆς ἐκ[κ]λη[σ]ία(ς) ἀπὸ κώμης Ταμωρῶ *P.Rain.Cent. 86 = SPP XX 103.3 (Herakleop., 381)*
10. Αὐρήλιος Πέτρος Δωροθέου διάκων καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας *P.Prag. I 33.15 (Prov. unknown, 391)*
11. Αὐρήλιος Ἀρίμματος διάκονος κ[] *P.Haun. III 56.20 (? , IV/V)*
12. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Λέων διάκ(ων) καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκ πατρὸς Ὠριγένους ἀπὸ κώμης Κόβα *P.Rain.Cent. 101.3 (Herakleop., 457)*
13. Αὐρήλιος Ἀπολλῶς Φεύτος διάκονος (ed.'s corr.; the papyrus has διακονου!) *SPP III 95.9 (Hermop., 494/95; cf. BL 8.435)*
14. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἀνδ]ρέας Φοιβάμμωνος διάκονος *P.Heid. V 356.6 (Hermop., V/VI)*
15. Αὐρ(ήλιοι) [Ἰ]ωάννης εὐλ[α]βέστατος διάκονος καὶ Κολ[λ]οῦθος Φοιβάμμωνος διάκονος *P.Stras. V 484.4-5 (Hermop., 548 or 549, cf. CSBE² App. D s.a. 548)*
16. [† Αὐρ(ήλιος) Σαρ]ατιδώρου Θεοδώρου διάκ(ων) ἀπὸ Ἐρ(μουπόλεως) *P.Stras. V 399.17 (Hermop., VI)*
17. [† Αὐρήλιος] Ἀνούθις Ἰωσηφίου διάκ(ονος) ἀπὸ Ἐρ(μουπόλεως) καὶ ἱατρὸς *P.Lond. III 1044 = M.Chr. 367.37 (Hermop., VI)*

⁴ Ὀνωφρις υἱὸς Παμοῦν πρ(εσβυτέρου) μητρὸς Ἄννας ἀπὸ ἐποικίου) Ἀπελλῆ, *PSI III 179.13 (Oxy., 631)*; παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Πανεχάτου ὄρου πρ(εσβυτέρου) ἀπὸ κώμης Σενομορῶ, *P.Vindob.Sijp. 4.1 (Hermop., 340)*.

Within this context I note that in *P.Col. VIII 244.21 (Arsin., VI)*, Αὐρήλιος Φοιβάμμων υἱὸς τοῦ μακαρ(ίου) Μηνᾶ πρ(εσβυτέρου) ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρσινοειτῶν πόλεως, the editors' note ad loc.: "In all likelihood πρ(εσβυτέρου) is a mistake for the nominative" is not necessarily correct; on the contrary, the absence of clear-cut instances of 6th-century priests still being provided with a prefix Αὐρήλιος (see below) may be taken as an indication that in fact his now deceased father was once a priest. For the same reason one may correct in *SB IV 7369.29-30 (Hermop., 512)*: Αὐρ(ήλιος) | Ἀνδρέας Μέλανος πρ(εσβυτέρου) Ἐρμουπόλ(εως), in l. 30 πρ(εσβυτέρου) into πρ(εσβυτέρου).

⁴ For obvious reasons I omit *P.Laur. IV 182.2*: δι(ὰ) Αὐρηλίου Βίκτ(ωρος) διακ(όνου), see the reedition of the text by F. Morelli in *ZPE 138 (2002) 155*, reading δ(ιὰ) Ἀντ(ωνίου) Βίκτ(ωρος) διακ(όνου).

18. Αὐρήλιος [± 5]ς ὑποδιάκονος τῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας
υἱὸς Ἰωάννου *PSI VIII 964.23 (Oxy., VI⁵)*
19. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Βικτ[ω]ρι[νος] c 40] δ[ι]άκ[ο]ν[ος] *P.Stras. VIII 755.22 (Hermop., VII)*
20. [Αὐρ(ήλιος) Νειλάμω]ν διάκονος υἱὸς [-] *SB XIV 12194.11 (Hermop., VII)*
- πρεσβύτερος:**⁶
21. [Αὐρήλ]ιος Παγεῦς Ὁρου ἀπὸ κόμης Ἰπώνων τοῦ
Ἡρακλεοπολίτου νομοῦ πρεσβύτερος *P.Lond. VI 1913.2 (Cynop., 334)*
22. Αὐρήλιος Ἀρπ[ο]κράτης πρεσβύτερος καθολικῆς
ἐκκλησ[ί]ας *P.Kellis I Gr. 58.8 (Mothite, 337)*
23. παρὰ Αὐρηλίω Αμόιτος Ὁρου καὶ Πατάπιος
Παησιου καὶ Σαρμάτου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ Παπνουτίου
Παησιου τῶν πάντων ἀπὸ κόμης Ἰσειου *P.Oxy. VI 897.5 (Oxy., 346)*
24. Αὐρήλιον Ἑλλάν Αιώνεως πρεσβύτερον ἀπὸ κόμης
Τριστόμου *P.Würzb. 16.8 (Arsin., 349)*
25. Αὐρήλιος Παμίνις πρ[ε]σβ[υ]τερος *P.Kellis I Gr. 24.11 (Mothite, 352)*
26. Αὐρ[ή]λιον [Ἀ]πολλῶν πρεσβύτερον τῆς [α]ύτης
κόμης Σύρων *P.Oxy. XLIX 3479.7 (Oxy., 361?)*
27. Αὐρήλιος Ὁρίων πρ(εσβύτερος) Ἰουλιανοῦ *P.Lips. I 58.25 (Thebaid, 371)*
28. Αὐρήλιος Ἡράκλειος πρ(εσβύτερος) *SB XIV 11857.9 (? , IV/V)*
29. [Αὐρηλίου Θεοδώρου, πρεσβυτ(έρου) τοῦ ἀγίου] |
[τόπου ἄπα Δίου *P.Cair.Masp. I 67117.6-7, cf. I. 23*
(Aphrodite, 524)
30. [Αὐρήλιος Πασαμ ± 5 ὁ] εὐλαβ(έστατος) πρ(εσβύτερος)
[τῆς] ἀγίας ἐ[κ]κλησίας [Κάστρου c ?] *P.Lond. V 1719.3 (Thebes, 556)*
31. [† Αὐρή]λ(ιος) Ἰωάννης ἐλ(ά)χ(ιστος) πρε(σβύτερος)
υ[ι]ὸς τοῦ μακαρ[ί]ου Ν.Ν. *P.Stras. VII 658.10 (Hermop., VI)*
32. Αὐρήλιος Κοσμάς [τῶν] πρεσβυτέρων παρατούρας
υἱὸς Ἰωάννου *P.Grenf. II 100.7 (Arsin., 683)*

This listing enables us to make the following observations:

(I) As to the ἀναγνώσται (# 1-3; all fourth century A.D.), it should be kept in mind that before the fifth century A.D. these persons had nothing to do with the ecclesiastical organisation (see E. Wipszycka in *JJP* 23 [1993] 194ff.). It is, therefore, not a problem that these three men featured a prefix Αὐρήλιος.

(II) In the listing of Αὐρήλιος + διάκονος / διάκων (a major ecclesiastical rank in the church of Egypt, cf. E. Wipszycka, *ibidem*, 187) it seems not necessary to keep

13 (the title seems to belong to the father's name [cf. sub 'anagnostes' no. 2] and the editorial correction is rather arbitrary);

14 (the first letter of Α[ὐρ(ήλιος)] is read doubtfully and the rest is restored; maybe the trace read as Α is to be taken as part of a † separating ὠμολ(όγησα) from the following subscription?);

⁵ Cf. J.M. Diethart - K.A. Worp, *ByzNot.*, p. 87 sub 21.2: the notary Philoxenos is attested between ca. 530-550.

⁶ I have excluded *P.Flor.* III 336.4 (cf. *BL* 1.459, 3.58), Αὐρήλιου Γεώργιος ὁ καὶ Μουῖσαϊος πρεσβ[υ]τερος υἱὸς Βίκτορ[ος] κτλ., because it seems possible that George is an elder son of Biktor. The same argument might be made about *P.Bad.* VI 168.4ff. (Oxy., VI, cf. *BL* 7.9), μετ ἐγγητο(ῦ) --- ἐμο(ῦ) Αὐρηλ[ί]ου Βικτ[ο]ρος πρ[ε]σβυτερο(υ) υἱοῦ Ἀπολλῶτος [μ]ητρὸς[ς] τρεσής, and *CPR* X 22.6 (Arsin., VI), [Αὐρ(ήλιος) Σα]μβῆς πρεσβύτερος υἱὸς [N.N. (it is to be noted that Αὐρ(ήλιος) has been restored); see also the appendix to this paper. In the case of *BGU* III 808v = *SPP* III 112v it seems more likely to reckon with a 'A to B' opening of a document; in that case, 'B' is an anonymous elder son of Phoibammon.

16, 17, 20 (Αὐρήλιος completely restored, probably inspired by some form of editorial 'horror vacui'), and

19 (J. Gascou, by e-mail on 28.i.2004: "Αὐρ(ήλιος) est sûr, mais pas δ[ιάκο]ν[ος], car la seule lettre identifiable est delta si bien que plusieurs possibilités se présentent").

It is obvious that most of the certain attestations of Αὐρήλιος + διάκονος / διάκων date from the 4th century (cf. ## 4 - 10) or perhaps slightly later (cf. # 11).⁷ These eight cases of Αὐρήλιος + διάκονος / διάκων may be compared with the thirteen texts attesting a διάκονος / διάκων without Αὐρήλιος within the same century. To be sure, eight of these turn out to be lists or accounts (cf. *P.Preis.* 20.20; *P.Col.* VII 167.7, 171.14; *P.Herm.* 68.13,23; *P.Herm.Landl.* G 200; *P.Mich.* XII 651.4; *P.Oxy.* LV 3787.24; *SB XIV* 11972.10), while *P.Herm.* 59, *P.Lips.* 43 = *M.Chr.* 98, *P.Lond.* III 981 = *W.Chr.* 130, *P.Lond.* VI 1913, and *PSI XIII* 1342 are letters, reports of proceedings, or contracts addressed to, sent by, or mentioning a deacon referred to by name but without the prefix Αὐρήλιος. It is obvious, then, that after eliminating first the doubtful cases, only ## 12, 15, and 18 would belong to a period considerably later than ca A.D. 400. In the case of # 12 (from A.D. 457), however, the reading of the abbreviated prefix Αὐρ() is most uncertain and probably incorrect, while even the 'certain' reading of the deacon's name as Λέων turns also out to be problematical. One could also read the whole passage together as a single personal name ending in -μων.⁸ In the case of # 18 (ca. A.D. 530-550, cf. fn. 5) it is important to bear in mind that in the church of Egypt the rank of a subdeacon was always considered a lower grade (cf. E. Wipszycka, *ibidem.* 190-194); this may help to explain why in this single case a subdeacon was labelled unproblematically Αὐρήλιος. In the 5th century one finds several dozens of deacons without the prefix Αὐρήλιος versus only one or two questionable attestations of the same term with the prefix (see above), and the 6th and 7th century the number of deacons without the prefix exceeds a hundred. In sum: the elimination procedure of some doubtful cases would leave us with only # 15 (from A.D. 548 / 549) as a 'late' attestation of the phenomenon under review. There is good reason, therefore, to assume that for deacons it became a regular habit, if not a more or less official policy, to abandon the civil status marker Αὐρήλιος once one obtained this position within the higher clerical hierarchy. The late use of this marker in *P.Stras.* V 484 may be attributed simply to some form of inadvertence.

(III) The combination of the prefix Αὐρήλιος + πρεσβύτερος is also a predominantly 4th-century phenomenon (cf. ## 21 - 27; cf. also # 28, dating from the 4th or 5th century).⁹ As to the later cases, all of them involve an element of doubt. In the case of # 29 the prefix has been restored by the editor, though the subscription by Theodore himself (cf. l. 23) omits it. In # 30 one is dealing, again, with an editorial restoration instead of which one could also restore [Πααμ υἱὸς Ν.Ν. ὁ] εὐλαβ(έστατος) πρ(εσβύτερος). With most of Αὐρή[λ(ι)ος] being restored in # 31 one wonders how compelling the reading of the lambda is; a photo of the papyrus allows me to observe that the ink trace read as λ could in fact come from any letter or symbol. Finally, in # 32 there is the question whether one is really dealing with '(one) of the priests of the (= overseeing the?) παρατοῦρα = Lat. *paratura*'. The primary meaning of the Latin word seems to be that of the decorated border of a garment, cf. the editorial commentary to the ed.princ. of *SB XVI* 12254.14 in *Aegyptus* 61 (1981) 100.¹⁰ In my view there is in

⁷ See within this context also CPR V 11 (early [?] 4th century; deacon's work contract).

⁸ To my regret I have not been able to find a name which matches with all ink traces preserved.

⁹ At the same time, however, the restoration of the prefix in # 22 may be considered unwarranted. In # 27 it seems attractive to reckon with Aur. Horion senior being the son of Julian, cf. *P.Haun.* II 43.1: Αὐρήλιος Ὁρος πρ(εσβύτερος) Ὡρου, where the Demotic confirms the resolution of the Greek adjective πρ(εσβύτερος).

¹⁰ Within this context I note that the editors of *P.Amh.* II 142.16 (= *M.Chr.* 65), -- κελεύσα[ι τ]ῶ πραπίσσι τ[ῶ]ν κάστρον ἵππων[ων] (but read ἵππωνων, cf. *BL* 1.4) τῆς ἐγγίστη(ς) περατοῦρας --, note in their commentary: "περατοῦρας: the word also occurs in Gr.Pap. (= *P.Grenf.*) II 100.7 where πρεσβύτεροι παρατοῦρας are mentioned"; obviously, they reckoned with a slight spelling error in the first syllable πε-/πα-. Indeed, such an error is not uncommon (for interchange

P.Grenf. II 100.7 no obstacle against accentuating the word παρατουρας of the papyrus as παρατουράς = 'haberdasher, i.e. manufacturer/seller of ribbons, lace, thread'. For such nouns in -ās in general, cf. C. D. Buck - W. Petersen, *Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* [Chicago 1945], where the word in question is not yet listed). The same noun may be supplied in *SPP* X 210.8, παρατουρ() [obviously taken as a personal name by the editor], and 210.9, παρ[ατουρ()]. In this connection J. M. Diethart drew my attention to J. P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions grecs et latines decouvertes dans les fouilles de Tyr 1963-1974* (= *Bull.Mus.Beyrouth*, 29) no. 133: σωρός διαφέρων Ἀδελφίου παρατουρά (καὶ) ὑποδιακόνου, from where it has been taken over into *LSJ Rev.Suppl.* with the interpretation 'maker or seller of furnishing materials'. Moreover, it remains to be seen whether Aurelius Kosmas really was a priest, as there is no reason to accept the editorial restoration [τῶν] πρεσβυτέρων without further questioning. If one restores [ἀπό] πρεσβυτέρων (cf. *P.Oxy.* VIII 1147.6), the result is that Aurelius Kosmas was an *ex*-priest and a garment maker (on priests being deprived of their charge see G. Schmelz, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten*, München - Leipzig 2002 [= *Archiv*, Beiheft 13], p. 154-159, 'der Ausschluss aus dem Klerus'; this use of ἀπό + gen. = 'former ...' is well known, cf. N. Lewis, 'Two terminological novelties', *AJPh* 81 [1960] 186-187 = idem, *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt*, 73-74).

(IV) By way of summary conclusion I note that while it was not uncommon during the fourth century to combine the prefix Αὐρήλιος with an indication of a clerical office like διάκονος or πρεσβύτερος, this is done far less normally in later centuries. The persistent use of this prefix during the 4th century is easily acceptable once one realizes that since A.D. 212 this had been the common practice in Egypt and that old habits were not easily dropped, even when acceptance of a grade in the ecclesiastical organisation of the Christian church implied abandonment of a person's civil status in the secular world.

(V) Finally, for Φλάουιος + [clerical function] one may compare the following cases, all suspect because one does not expect Flavii (a title attributed since A.D. 324 to government officials, see Keenan's articles referred to at the beginning of this paper) to hold any clerical rank. Most of these 'attestations' involve in fact an unwarranted restoration of the element Φλ(άουιος) or an unnecessary resolution of an abbreviation πρ(εσβύτερος) vel sim., i.e.:

a. *P.Cair.Masp.* I 67126.1 (Aphrodite, 541): this line reads [Φλ(άουιος) ? Βίκτωρ] ἔλλει Θεοῦ πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας διακειμένης [ἐπὶ τὴν Θη]βαίων χώραν ἐν κώμῃ λεγομένη Ἀφροδίτῃ, υἱὸς [Βησαρίωνος τοῦ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης, but cf. already *BL* 8.72 (removing the element Φλ(άουιος));

b. *P.Cair.Masp.* I 67126.43 (Aphrodite, 541): this line reads [Φλ(άουιος) ? Βίκτωρ ἐ]λλεί Θεο(ῦ) πρεσβύτερος υἱὸς Βησαρίωνος το(ῦ) μακαριω[τάτου, cf. already *BL* 8.72 (removing the element Φλ(άουιος));

c. *P.Cair.Masp.* II 67134.2 (Aphrodite, 547/8?): the editor read [δι' ἐμοῦ Βίκτορος Ψαίο(υ) διὰ Φλ(αουίου) Βίκτορος c 13, εὐλαβεστ(άτου)] πρε(σβυτέρου) καὶ προνοητ(οῦ), but cf. already *BL* 4.13 for a more convincing alternative restoration, i.e. [τῆς Ἀνταιοπολιτῶν δι' ἐμοῦ Βίκτορος Ψαίο(υ) (cf. *BL* 8.72) ;

between α and ε cf. F. Th Gignac, *Grammar*, I 278 ff.). Even so, the remarks made on this text in the *ThLL* s.v. *paratura*, expressing uncertainty about the word's precise meaning, seem well founded. In a translation "order to the commander of the camp at Hipponon (that is part) of the nearest" one expects a concept indicating something like a topographical or spatial entity, but it remains to be seen whether a translation like 'border' (between two [military] districts) is viable here. On the other hand, during an exchange of e-mail with D. Hagedorn the idea arose with the author of this contribution to regard παρατούρας as an error for πεδατούρας. For the meaning of the latter word see the remarks made by R. S. Bagnall in *GRBS* 25 (1984) 85: "pedatura refers to a delimited area of land. In ancient --- Latin it referred mostly either to the land surrounding a (funerary) monument --- or to an area 'assigned in a camp to an individual unit' (*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1317 s.v. b)". There seems to be every reason to connect the latter meaning with the litigious word in the Amherst papyrus, but the text should be checked for this at some later moment (at present the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York is closed for purposes of renovation).

d. *P.Flor.* III 67296.16 (Aphrodite, 535): [† Φλ(αούιος) Ἐνο(ῶ)φις Ψενθαησί(ου) πρεσβ(ύτερος); one may resolve here πρεσβ(ύτερου), of course. Likewise, in
e. *SB* I 5112.78 (Edfu, 618?): Φλ(αούιος) Παάμ ἄπα Δίου πρεσβ(ύτερος) . . . ; a check of the plate (cf. *P.Lond.* II p. xx, sub inv. 220 descr.) shows that after ἄπα Δίου one should read πρι , the character following the iota probably to be taken as a sign of abbreviation; and πρι() can be expanded into a (transliterated) Latin term like πριμιπιλάριος, πριμικήριος, or πρίωρ, cf. S. Daris, *Il lessico Latino nel Greco d'Egitto*² (Barcelona 1991), 94-95.

f. In *P.Grenf.* II 104 = *SPP* III 506.2 (Arsin., VII/VIII): δι' ἐμοῦ Φλ(αούιου) πρε(σβ(ύτερου) γραμμάτεως), one may better resolve a personal name starting in Πρε() .

g. For *P.Lips.* I 25.4, †† Φ(λάουιος) Σέργιος ἐλάχι(στος) διάκονος υἱὸς τοῦ μακαρ(ίου) Βασιλείδου ἀπὸ Ἐρμου(οῦ) π(όλεως), cf. already *BL* 1.25 (removing the element Φ(λάουιος)).

This leaves us with only

h. *P.Flor.* III 323.22 (Hermopol., 525): Φλ(αύι(ος) Ἰωσήφ Ἀκ(ω)ρίου διάκ(ονος) α[. . .] . . . ; the photo of the text in *Pap.Flor.* 30, pl. CXLIV, shows that the reading of Φλ(αύι(ος) is most doubtful; in light of the results obtained above it should probably be rejected. Unfortunately, however, it seems impossible to find a completely convincing reading of the traces preceding the letters read as Ἰωσήφ Ἀκ(ω)ρίου, for which one should read: -- Ἡφαίσ[τί]ωνος; as Ἡφαίσ[τί]ωνος should be taken as a father's name, one expects the name of his son coming first; at best, I can read here Σιλβανός, but the reading is far from certain.

(VI) For the sake of completeness I have also collected the attestations of Aurelius + μοναχός / μοναχή / μονάζων / μονάζουσα, with the following result:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Αὐρ[ηλί]φ Ε[.] β[.] [.] ωι [c ? ο]υ μ[ονα]χῶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὄ[ρους] | <i>P.Nepheros</i> 48.4 (Herakleop., 323, cf. <i>BL</i> 9.174; sale of a house) |
| 2. Αὐ[ρηλί]φ Πασαλυμίφ Παπνουθίου μονάζοντι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κόμης | <i>P.Köln</i> III 154.6 (Cynop., 423; loan of money) |
| 3. Αὐρήλιος Βίκτωρ Σύρου μονάζων | <i>SB</i> V 7996 = <i>PSI</i> XII 1239.2 (Antinoop., 430; sale of part of a house) |
| 4. Αὐρηλίφ Παπνουθίφ υἱῶ Ματθ[α]ίου μ[ο]νάζον[τι] ἀπὸ κόμης Κέρκε | <i>P.Wisc.</i> I 10.4 (Oxy., 468; cf. <i>BL</i> 6.70, 7.100; loan of money) |
| 5. διαλύσις Αἰουλίου εἰς Αὐρή(λιον) Εὐλόγ(ιον), μονάζοντες Με(λι)τιανοὶ ἐν (τῶ) ὄρει Λάβλα | <i>P.Dubl.</i> 34v.14 (Arsin., 511; settlement) |
| 6. Αὐρή[λι]ος Ἰσακος Βίκτωρ Κωσταντίου μονάζων ἀπὸ κόμης Ἀφροδίτης | <i>P.Flor.</i> III 279.3 (Aphrod., 514; lease of land) |
| 7. Αὐρ[η]λίφ Ἀπολλῶτι Ὄρου μονάζοντι [μοναστηρίου] Ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος ἐν ὄρει κόμης Τιτκῶεως | <i>SB</i> XVI 12267.4 (Hermopol., 540; document related to transportation) |
| 8. Αὐρηλία Τσῶνη θυγάτηρ Μηνᾶ ἐκ μητρὸς Ταπίας μοναχή ὁρμωμένη ἀπὸ Συήνης | <i>P.Lond.</i> V 1731.4.38 (Syene, 585; receipt for money in settlement of dispute) |
| 9. [Αὐ]ρ(ήλιος) Ἀλίτου (I. Ἄλιτος) Δωροθέου μονάζων | <i>P.Prag.</i> II 158.13 (Hermopol., V/VI; lease of land) |

In contrast to the combination of the prefix Aurelius with a term διάκων / διάκονος or πρεσβύτερος, most of these texts come from the Vth or VIth century.¹¹ Among them one finds hardly any document which for some reason or another may be dismissed on the grounds that the name has been

¹¹ For the remarkably early # 1, see below, fn. 13.

restored.¹² One notes, furthermore, that people either style themselves as Αὐρηλ- N.N. μονάζων / μοναχή (# 3, 5, 6, 8, 9), or are being addressed/described this way (# 1, 2, 4, 5, 7). Precise affiliations with a particular monastery are not consistently indicated (or at least based on a restoration, cf. # 1,¹³ 7). I have not been able to detect much of a system between

(1°) μοναχός / μοναχη / μονάζων / μονάζουσα preceded by the prefix Αὐρήλιος, and

(2°) μοναχός / μοναχη / μονάζων / μονάζουσα not preceded by Αὐρήλιος.¹⁴

At best one might start wondering whether 'Αὐρηλ- N.N. μονάζων / μοναχή' could simply indicate that the man or woman in question was living 'single', i.e. unmarried, whereas only the indication of μοναχός / μοναχη / μονάζων / μονάζουσα without an element Αὐρήλιος / Αὐρηλία would refer to monks or nuns. There is, however, **no evidence** that Greek μοναχός / μοναχή or μονάζων / μονάζουσα ever had the meaning of 'unmarried' without any religious connotation; in other words, the Greek language apparently never had a substantive equivalent of Lat. 'caelebs'.

Appendix:

Attestations of πρεσβύτερος υἱός in documents from Byzantine Egypt

The following appendix was inspired by a remark made by E. Wipszycka in *JJP* 18 (1974) 220 (in a review of M. Naldini, *Il Cristianesimo in Egitto*, Firenze 1968): "Le problème de la signification de termes tel que πρεσβύτερος ou ἀναγνώστης – termes qui ont derrière eux un passé païen – est important. Pour le IIIe et pour la première moitié du IVe, il faut tenir compte de la possibilité que ces termes aient une signification non chrétienne; mais pour la période postérieure, cette possibilité est pratiquement minime." In other words: in Greek documents written later than ca. 350 a πρεσβύτερος denotes most probably a Christian priest. A search in the *DDBDP* for attestations of the word combination πρεσβύτερος υἱός in texts between A.D. 300 - 800 allows us to test whether and in how far one can be certain of this.¹⁵ Before proceeding I note that in texts from Roman Egypt forms of the combination πρεσβύτερος υἱός are found eleven times, viz. in *BGU* I 350.6 (Arsin., 98-117); *P.Bas.* 7 = *M.Chr.* 245.3 (Soknop.Nesos, 117-138); *P.Lond.* II 258.iii.6; iv.51; ix.231.234 (Arsin., 94); *P.Munch.* III.1 80.24 (Soknop.Nesos, 102-117); *O.Bodl.* II 1763.15 (Thebes, II), 1940.10 (Thebes, III?); *O.Cair.* 60 (Hermonth., 170); *O.Leid.* 298.2 (Thebes, II/III). In the documents from later than ca. A.D. 300 the following picture emerges:

Attestation

CPR VIII 68.4 (Herakleop., VI/VII)
P.Dubl. 28.7 (Herakleop., 611/12)
P.Stras. VII 658.10 (Hermop., VI)
P.Cair.Masp. II 67126.1,43 (Aphrod., 541)
P.Oxy. XVI 1892.38,46 (Oxy., 581)
P.Oxy. LVIII 3952.50 (Oxy., 610)

Quality

= priest, cf. epithet εὐλαβέστατος
 = priest, cf. epithet εὐλαβέστατος
 = priest, cf. use of ἐλ(ά)χ(ιστος)
 = priest, cf. use of ἐλέει Θεοῦ
 = priest, cf. line 9
 = priest? Cf. restoration [!] in line 7

¹² Only # 9 may reasonably seem to be a candidate for reconsideration. A check of the photo (in *P.Prag.* II, pl. XXVI), however, shows that the rho + diagonal abbreviation stroke belonging to '[Αὐ]ρ(ήλιος)' is absolutely correct.

¹³ Is a restoration σ[υ]μ[μ]ά[χ]η conceivable here?

¹⁴ There are dozens of attestations of this situation; the *DDBDP* lists μονάζων 37x, μονάζουτ- 113x, μονάζουσα-ση 11x and μονάζουσι 5x; furthermore, there are ca. 35 cases of μοναχός or its plural form versus ca. 10 cases of a μοναχή; it falls beyond the scope of this paper to determine why forms of the participle μονάζων are so much more frequently used than forms of the adjective μοναχός.

¹⁵ The reverse word order υἱός πρεσβύτερος seems to occur only in *M.Chr.* 156.6 (109 B.C.).

<i>CPR</i> XIV 5.6 (Arsin., 530/33)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? Partner <i>is</i> an Αὐρήλιος
<i>CPR</i> X 127.6 (Arsin., 584)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? Partner <i>is</i> an Αὐρήλιος
<i>P.Oxy.</i> XVI 1972.5 (Oxy., 560)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? Partner <i>is</i> an Αὐρήλιος
<i>SB</i> XVI 12484.5.20 (Oxy., 584)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? Partner <i>is</i> an Αὐρήλιος
<i>CPR</i> XIV 32.9 (Arsin., 655?)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? Accompanied by clergy.
<i>P.Cair.Masp.</i> I 67107.3 (Aphrodit., 525/40)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>P.Flor.</i> III 287.5 (Aphrodit., VI)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>CPR</i> X 23.11,19 (Arsin., 520/21?)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>SB</i> I 4753.13 (Arsin., 523)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>SB</i> I 5681.7,9 (Arsin., 623?)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>W.Chr.</i> 8 = <i>P.Lond.</i> I 113 (10).7 (640/1)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>SB</i> I 4490.6 (Arsin., 641/656)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>SPP</i> III 308.5 (Hermop., VII)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest?
<i>P.Ant.</i> III 189.15 (Antinoop., VI/VII)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? But text = list, cf. above
<i>P.Oxy.</i> XIX 2244.v.76 (Oxy., VI/VII)	No Αὐρήλιος, hence priest? But text = list, cf. above
<i>PSI</i> I 58.5 (Oxy., 566-568)	No Αὐρήλιος restored, hence priest?
<i>P.Ross.Georg.</i> III 39.3 (Arsin., 584) + <i>SB</i> I 4489, cf. line 14	No Αὐρήλιος restored, hence priest?
<i>CPR</i> X 131.4 (Arsin., 611/12)	No Αὐρήλιος restored, hence priest?
<i>CPR</i> X 102.1 (? , V/VI)	No Αὐρήλιος restored, hence priest?
<i>CPR</i> X 22.6 (Arsin., VI)	Has Αὐρήλιος, but in restoration; cf. above, fn. 6.
<i>P.Bad.</i> VI 168.7 (Oxy., V)	Has Αὐρήλιος; cf. above fn. 6.
<i>P.Flor.</i> III 336.4 (Arsin., VII?)	Has Αὐρήλιος; cf. above fn. 6.
<i>BGU</i> III 808verso (? , Byz.)	? Cf. above fn. 6.
<i>P.Rain.Cent.</i> 121.2 (Herakleop., 719/20)	?

Wipszycka's view turns out to be broadly vindicated; the great majority of attestations of some form of *πρεσβύτερος υἱός* indicates a priest or at least lacks a prefix *Αὐρήλιος*, hence in these cases it may be supposed that one is dealing with a 'priest, son of ...' On the other hand, it seems unlikely that nowhere in a document from Byzantine Egypt reference would ever have been made to a person being a 'senior' bearer of a particular name or 'elder son', hence it may be supposed that one of the few cases of *Αὐρήλιος* N.N. *πρεσβύτερος υἱός* N.N. indicates precisely this situation.