#articleTitle

**An 8th-Century Heracleopolite *compromissum* from the Bodleian Library**

#author

Sophie Kovarik

#affiliation

Universität Wien

#email

sophie.kovarik@univie.ac.at

#acknowledgement

The following article was drafted within the framework of the project “From the Nile to the Caucasus” (I 4674-G), funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) which I thank for its continuous support. The papyrus was first transcribed in 2010 when I joined Amin Benaissa and Nikolaos Gonis in cataloguing the unpublished papyri of the Bodleian library. Thanks go to Lajos Berkes and Nikolaos Gonis for comments on the edition and Paul Schubert for checking the Geneva papyrus catalogue; remaining errors are my own responsibility.

#introduction

The papyrus edited in this article is one of the latest legal documents from Egypt written in Greek. The sheet is complete, all margins are preserved. The format is odd for a contract: it is neither cut from a roll and written with the fibres, nor is the roll turned and written *transversa charta* alongside its height, as expected from a notarial document. Its width rather suggests that the roll was split in half to accommodate two documents written *transversa charta*, and then cut after the writing was completed. This is known especially for letters in the 7th century, see [CPR 30](https://papyri.info/biblio/21293): 38 for the practice in the Senouthios-archive, and would also fit with the space around the notarial signature (executed in a larger contract cursive and in pale ink), which might suggest that a window was left to be written in at a later stage. The 15 lines of text slightly slant to the left. Lines 5–7 are damaged; the papyrus is held together by a few vertical fibres. Most of the back fibres are missing. The last semi-loose fragment on the right needs to be moved half a centimetre to the right, in order to join the *my* of νομοῦ in l. 4 with its descender. There is evidence of slightly uneven horizontal folds (which are not parallel to the bottom margin, but higher on the right-hand side), suggesting that the document was stored folded up. These folds run parallel to the writing on the recto as well as to the endorsement on the verso (now unfortunately illegible), which was likely written rotated 180°, rather than in the same direction as the recto. This seems supported by a few legible letters (α, ν, π) and by the fact that the last fold at the bottom is incomplete which implies that the document was folded from top to bottom; if not turned after folding, the docket would indeed run at 180° in relation to the recto. The papyrus displays a typical eighth-century minuscule. The date can be confirmed on prosopographical grounds, see below II. Most abbreviations belong to the dating in l. 12, as is customary. The subscription is in Coptic.

The papyrus was donated to the Bodleian library by Lucy Hunt, A. S. Hunt’s widow, in 1934.
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I. Provenance

This *compromissum* was drawn up by a notary named Ioannes on the 21st of Phamenoth in an 11th indiction. The provenance of both parties suggests that it was written in Leukogion ([TM Geo 1248](http://www.trismegistos.org/place/1248)), an important harbour (ὅρμος) and trading place between the Arsinoite and Heracleopolite nomes. Its location is unknown; [Falivene 1998](https://papyri.info/biblio/15230): 122 places it at the Nile, but Morelli in [CPR 22 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/70243).5n. at the Bahr Yusuf at the entry to the Fayum. It is mostly referred to as κώμη (village) or κτῆμα (piece of land, estate) and might once have belonged to the Arsinoite ([P.Cair. Isid. 9](https://papyri.info/hgv/10421).282, 284 [309]), but in the 6th to 8th centuries it is exclusively attested in the Heracleopolite nome. Although notarial documents were usually drawn up in the nome capitals, Leukogion seems to possess notarial customs of its own, at least in the 7th and 8thcenturies, which differ from the tabellionic tradition of Heracleopolis.[[1]](#footnote-1) Apart from Ioannes, son of Phib, we only know of two more local notaries, Eugenios in [P.Dubl. 1 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474), and an unknown (?) cleric, in [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592) (and [P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803), cf. the corrections in appendix II). All 7th- and 8th-century documents from Leukogion are collected in appendix I.
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II. Date and Notary

The date of the Bodleian papyrus may be narrowed down thanks to additional information on this notary who appears in two other documents from Leukogion. One of them is an unpublished deed of sale housed in the Pushkin Museum with the inventory number ИГ-4814; I.1.б 608, preserving the end of the body of the document and the subscriptions, including the notarial signature of Ioannes. There is another fragment, the beginning of a contract (ИГ-4812; I.1.б 706) of similar width, written in Leukogion, in the same clear and upright minuscule which seems to connect it to ИГ-4814, and with a precise dating by the Diocletian era year 434 and month to 4 April 718 (1st indiction). They were assumed to be part of the same document, but ultimately cannot; nevertheless, there is a strong indication that these papyri are related.[[2]](#footnote-2) Our Bodleian papyrus was drawn up in an 11th indiction which is therefore, if we consider the date of ИГ-4814 (718), likely to correspond to either 713 or 728. This will make it the latest attested contract in Greek known from Egypt.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The other papyrus signed by the notary Ioannes is [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811), where the notarial signature is only partly preserved as [ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣] ̣ ̣ Φιβ ἐγράφη. It can now be restored with the help of the two other documents as [Ϯ δι᾿ ἐμ]ο̣ῦ̣ [Ἰωάν]ν̣ο̣υ̣ υἱο̣ῦ̣ Φιβ ἐγράφη Ϯ Ϯ. Drawn up in Pachon (day of the month unclear) of a 15th indiction, it could be tentatively dated to April/May 717. The indiction in the Herakleopolite nome ran concurrently to the Egyptian civil year, starting with Thoth and there is no reason to assume this changed in the post-conquest period.[[4]](#footnote-4) In Arsinoite and Herakleopolite papyri from 657 onwards we additionally find the Era of Diocletian (calculating with the first year of Diocletian’s reign). Discrepancies between era dating and indiction usually differ a whole year and cannot help in establishing the starting point of either the indiction or the era dating. The Geneva papyrus lacks the invocation that usually introduces the prescript of a notarial document and provides only an informal date with month, indiction, and place of issue. It is written with the fibres in a vertical format, meaning its length corresponds to the height of a papyrus roll, and is almost complete (only the beginning of the notarial signature is broken off), but partly abraded. [Diethart and Hasitzka 2011](https://papyri.info/biblio/79081): 239 and [Gascou 2015](https://papyri.info/biblio/87150) suggested corrections to the unread parts of the document in the body and the Coptic subscription (= [SB 4 Kopt. 1807](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811)). The acquisition information – the Bodleian papyrus was donated (after it was presumably bought by Grenfell and Hunt in Egypt), the Moscow papyri were sold to the museum by V. S. Golenischev between 1908 and 1912 (mediated by the Egyptologist B. A. Turaev) and the Geneva papyrus[[5]](#footnote-5) was bought by Édouard Naville for Jules Nicole in the “période d’achat 1882-1897“ (according to the [the online catalogue](https://archives.bge-geneve.ch/ark:/17786/vta2648eaa40b282d94)) – gives at first sight no indication of a common provenance.

The diversity of these three documents in format, layout and style attests to the blurring of Late Roman traditions in the 8th century: two of the three testimonies of this notary dispense with the proper prescript (the Oxford and Geneva documents), and two use the minuscule (Oxford and Moscow). This would not happen in a standard tabellionic document, which remains a refuge of the cursive until the very end (apart from subscriptions), see Kovarik (forthcoming b). Two (Geneva and Oxford) contain a Coptic subscription. All three notarial signatures, however, are written in cursive and are identical in their composition and possibly even in handwriting (see l. 15n.), but for a cross above the *omega* of Ἰωάννου in the Moscow papyrus. The verb of completion is ἐγράφη, which is not typical for contemporary notarial documents from this region. Ioannes also mentions the name of his father, Phib, which is also uncommon in late Heracleopolite documents, but the other two notaries from Leukogion ([P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474), [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592)) do it as well. We do not know of any notarial documents in Greek from the 8th century from outside the Heracleopolite, see [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142), but there are Coptic documents with Greek notarial signatures; they usually use ἐγράφη as well. On family relations and the long-lasting notarial traditions in those late texts, see Kovarik (forthcoming).
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III. *Compromissa*

Among these Arsinoite and Heracleopolite contracts from the 6th to the 8th centuries there is a preponderance of *compromissa.* A *compromissum* is an agreement between two contractual parties to appoint one or more arbitrators to resolve an ongoing conflict between them with their judgement (ὅρος, *sententia*) and is a stage of out of court arbitration. Another route of dispute resolution is the settlement (διάλυσις), which accounts for most of our documentation in this context and usually recounts all stages of the conflict in detail, see [Kreuzsaler 2010](https://papyri.info/biblio/79781): 22–25. Those arbitration decisions, on the other hand, are very few and varied in their style. All these document types (*compromissum, dialysis, horos*) seem to have required the participation of a notary.

There are two such ὅροιpreserved from early 7th-century Leukogion, [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712) (616) and [17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060) (early VII), both broken off at the bottom. They, too, do not start with a prescript, but go directly *in media res*: ὅρος (l. ὅρον) δεδώκαμεν ἡμεῖς + names*.* Another ὅρος, which probably comes from the Heracleopolite nome, is [P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803), assigned to the early 7th century, but it is probably not earlier than the middle of the century.[[6]](#footnote-6) Perhaps their small number is due to the fact that they were usually announced orally, and not necessarily written down.

There are more than 100 papyri, in Greek and Coptic, attesting alternative dispute resolution (see [Kreuzsaler 2010](https://papyri.info/biblio/79781): 17), among which ca. 25 published Greek *compromissa* and a few inedita. Their structure consistently contains the same elements from the 4th to the 8th centuries. The *compromissum* is usually (at least in part) styled objectively as a bilateral document, see [Kovarik 2012](https://papyri.info/biblio/87430): 213–217, and is potentially signed by both parties, who agree on arbitrators (who are mostly specified by name) and pledge to abide by their ruling, otherwise a penalty (*poena compromissi*) had to be paid (cf. 12n.), see [Kreuzsaler 2010](https://papyri.info/biblio/79781): 19; [Ziegler 1971](https://papyri.info/biblio/7792): 90-104.

A discussion of the cause of the dispute is not required in this kind of document. There is no trace in the papyri of the counterpart of the arbitrators, the *receptum arbitri*, in which the arbitrators confirm that they will act as such in the case, see [Kreuzsaler 2010](https://papyri.info/biblio/79781): 20-21; [Ziegler 1971](https://papyri.info/biblio/7792): 77-80*.* Almost as silent is the situation for arbitration proceedings, one famous exception being the Coptic P.Budge[[7]](#footnote-7) which also resulted in a *dialysis*, [SB 6 8988](https://papyri.info/hgv/17841) (Apollonopolis, 647).[[8]](#footnote-8)

Two more Heracleopolite *compromissa* also date from the 8th century, [P.Rain. Cent. 121](https://papyri.info/hgv/15452) (719) and [SPP 3 415 + P.Vindob. G 40284,](https://papyri.info/hgv/39378) both (re)edited in [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142): 60, 62, of which the first one is complete. They were both drawn up by the notary Paulos and display an anomalous format, i.e. written *transvera charta* while not preserving a vertical format – this could again have been a half-roll-format, but a higher one with 37cm; there is no prescript, the first line starts directly with the greeting formula.

Another fragmentary *compromissum* from Leukogion is [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934), put in relation to the decisions recorded in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712) and [17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060) by Morelli 2004: 182, in particular [16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712), in which the same person, Chonis, son of Naaraus, might appear and which may have been written by the same hand, cf. 3n.

[SB 1 4673](https://papyri.info/hgv/38350) from the late 6th century preserves only the end; [SPP 3 402](https://papyri.info/hgv/37704), which breaks off in the middle of the text and might be a draft from the 6th or early 7th century, and the unpublishedP.Vindob. G 26321, which again only preserves the top part, complete the picture of the Heracleopolite *compromissa*. The latter two omit the prescript, similar to the Bodleian papyrus edited here.

More *compromissa* are preserved from Arsinoe,[[9]](#footnote-9) but none of them is as late as the Heracleopolite material. Recently, the latest dated Arsinoite *compromissum* from 675 was published in [Harrauer and Pintaudi 2021](https://papyri.info/biblio/96571): 56–57, with the same opening as the Bodleian papyrus (see 1n.) and preserved in its entirety. The names of the arbitrators are curiously omitted, but they are referred to in their capacity as judges of the public prison. Although clearly a *compromissum*, the summary in the endorsement describes the document as a *horos*. For more details see appendix II with corrections.
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#text

<S=.grc

<=

1. \*stauros\* τὸ παρὸν κομπ̣ρόμισσον ποιοῦνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἑκουσίᾳ

2. γν̣ώμῃ ἐκ μ[ὲ]ν̣ τοῦ ἑνὸς <:μέρους|reg|μέρος:> (Πεκύ̣(σιος)) (πρε(σβύτερος)) υ̣ ἱ(¨)ὸ̣ς Ν̣ααραoυ

3. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δευτέ̣ρου μέρο̣υς Αμπα <:υἱὸς|reg|υ ἱ(¨)ῷ:> (Νααρ(αo)υ) Πκανεε ἀμφ

4.- ότεροι ἀπὸ κώμης Λευκογίο[υ] τοῦ (Ἡρ(ακλεο)π(ολίτου)) <:ν̣ομοῦ|subst|πομου:>.

<:ἀμφιβολία[ν]|reg|ἀμφιβολ̣εία̣[ν]:>

5. ἔ̣[χ]ο̣ν̣τε̣[̣ς] μ̣ε̣τ’ ἀλλήλω̣[ν π]ε̣[ρί τ]ι̣ν̣ων [αὐτῶν κ]ε̣

6.- [φ]αλαίων καὶ μὴ δυ̣[νηθέντ]ες [δι’ ἑαυτῶν]

7. [ἀ]παλ̣λα̣γῆναι ᾑ̣[ρέσαν]τ̣ο ἑ[κουσίας]

8. αὐτῶν γνώμης <:Κοσμᾶν|reg|Κοσμᾶ:> υἱὸν Παπᾶ κα̣ὶ <:Μηνᾶν|reg|Μηνᾶ̣:>

9. υἱὸν Ἀντω̣νίου ὥστε αὐτοὺς δικαιολογήσασθαι

10. αὐτοῖς. τὸ δὲ παραβαῖνον μέρος τὴν διδομένην̣

11. πα̣ρ’ αὐτ̣[ῶ]ν δίκην παράσχῃ τῷ ἐμμέ̣ν̣ο̣ντι ὑπ̣ὲ̣ρ̣

12. προστίμου (χρυ(σοῦ)) (νο(μισμάτια)) <#δ=4#>. (ἐγρ(άφη)) (μ(ηνὶ)) (Φαμ(ενω)θ) <#κα=21#> (ἰνδ(ικτίωνος)) <#ια=11#>. \*stauros\*

13. $m2 ~|Ϯ ⲡⲓϭⲱϣ <:πρεσβύτερος=grc|reg|ⲡⲣⲉⲥⲃⲏⲧⲉⲣⲟⲥ:> <:στοιχεῖν=grc|reg|ⲥⲧⲓⲭⲓⲛ:> ⲉⲡⲉⲓ<:κομ

14.- πρόμισσον=grc|reg|ⲕⲟⲩ\ⲛ/14.- ⲡⲣⲱⲙⲓⲥⲥⲟⲛ|alt|ⲕⲟⲩⲛⲡⲣⲱⲙⲓⲥⲱⲛ:>|~cop

(15, indent) $m1 or $m 3 \*stauros\* δι’ ἐμοῦ Ἰωάννου υἱοῦ Φιβ ἐγράφη *sign* \*stauros\* \*stauros\*

=>

#translation

<T=.en<=

† On the one side Pekysios, priest, son of Naaraous, and on the other side Sambas (?), son of Naaraous Pkanee, both from the village Leukogion of the Heracleopolite nome, make the present *compromissum* with each other of their own free will. Because they have a disagreement with each other about some matters between them and they could not agree among themselves, they chose of their own free will Kosmas, son of Papas, and Menas, son of Antonios, that they should make a judgement for them; the party that does not abide by the judgement they deliver, should hand over as fine to the complying party 4 gold solidi. Written on the 21st of the month of Phamenoth, 11th indiction †. (Coptic) I, Pikosh, priest, I agree with the *compromissum*. † Written by me, Ioannes, son of Phib † †.

=>=T>

#commentary

1 The format and formulary of *compromissa* usually fall into one of two distinctive categories: either the document, as in the present case, emphasises the κομπρόμισσον at the very beginning, followed by the bilateral objective greeting formula – τὸ παρὸν κομπ̣ρόμισσον ποιοῦνται … ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς/ἑτέρου μέρους … χαίρειν – which appears to be the Heracleopolite version[[10]](#footnote-10) of the introductory τόδε τὸ κομπρόμισσον ποιοῦνται, typical of the 7th-century *compromissum* in Arsinoe;[[11]](#footnote-11) or it is reduced to just the greeting formula, omitting any reference to the *compromissum*, followed by ᾑρήσαντο κοινῇ γνώμῃ in some Heracleopolite documents.[[12]](#footnote-12) In the Arsinoite material, there is also a variant in which the contracting parties are both mentioned in the nominative: N. N. καὶ Ν. Ν. (ἀλλήλοις) χ(αίρειν).[[13]](#footnote-13)

2 The Name Pekysios ([TM NamVar 12766](http://www.trismegistos.org/namvar/12766)) is very common throughout Egypt, as well as Naaraous ([TM NamVar 2750](http://www.trismegistos.org/namvar/2750)), the Middle Egyptian variant of the name Inaros. Naaraous is a particularly common name in Leukogion, including both fathers in our text, ll. 2–3.[[14]](#footnote-14) One Pechysios, son of Naaraous Chonis appears in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).3, dated to 616 – perhaps an ancestor? In general, the onomastic material in the Leukogion documents is limited, so either people chose from a narrow pool of names, or, these documents concern the same people and families, see the table of Leukogion documents, appendix I.

3 ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δευτέ̣ρου μέρο̣υς: the use of the ordinal is singular; typically, ἑτέρου μέρους is found, but sometimes this is replaced by θατέρου, as in [P.Rain. Cent. 121](https://papyri.info/hgv/15452).2.

Αμπα υἱῷ Νααρ(άo)υ Πκανεε: Αμπα is most likely Σαμβᾶς, written haplographically with the *sigma* of μέρους before, like e.g. [P.Ross. Georg. 3 32](https://papyri.info/hgv/40989).14, 15 (Arsinoe, 504), where after υἱός the initial *sigma* is omitted.[[15]](#footnote-15) There is a Sambas, brother of Theodoros, in Pushkin Museum ИГ-4812.4 (718); the papyrus breaks before the patronym.

Πκανεε: or perhaps Πκανεθ. There is no exact equivalent, but there are similar names in 8th century Aphrodito like Πκανα ([TM Nam 49969](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/49969)). Pkanee could either be an alias of the father, or the name of the grandfather.

The specification of a person with three determinants is common in this period; this could either be three names or two names and the profession, like in the case of the priest Pekysios in l. 2, who also gives the name of his father. If three names are just arranged one after the other, it is not easy to understand if the third name is the name of the grandfather or the alias name of either the person in question or their father. In the documents from Leukogion we see in [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060).1: Ἀπανάκιος υἱὸς Ἐνὼχ υἱὸς Αἰούλιος, where the filiation υἱός indicated that the third name is the one of the grandfather (although it should then actually be υἱοῦ). Different is the case in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).3: Πεχυσίω ̣υἱ̣ῶ Νααρ(άου) Χῶνι, where initially just the name Chonis was written and Νααρ(άου) was added above the line only later.

If we assume Pechysios’ father is the same person who in [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).5-6 appears as Χῶνις υἱὸς Νααραου, then this means that he shared his father’s name, not very common in late antiquity where papponymy prevails, but was actually known as Chonis. According to [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452): 188 the second is the principal name. We see something similar in [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474).1 where the alias must also refer to the father of the issuing party (Μαρίας θυγατρὸς Να[αρ]αοῦς Παχῶς), which becomes only apparent as such in the *hypographe*, ll. 10–11, where the name Naaraus is dropped: Α[ὐρη]λ̣ιας Μαριας θυγατρος Παχο͂ς.[[16]](#footnote-16)

It thus seems that when names are added one after the other without filiation, the second is the father’s alias-name in Egyptian (or a less Graecised form). See also [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341).1 Ὀνοφρίου υἱὸς Μηνᾶ Πμουει, [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).2 Παφνούθιος υἱὸς Ἰωσὴφ Πουααλ.[[17]](#footnote-17) In contrast, in [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695).5–6: Αὐρήλιος Σεν  ̣[  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣ υἱὸς] τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀνοῦπ ὁ καὶ Καν̣[, the alias-name, although also given after the patronym, in fact refers to the issuer Aurelios Sen[outhios?] himself. In this case, however, ὁ καὶ needs to be included for clarity.

In light of this naming practice, Pekysios, son of Apakyrios in ИГ-4812 (718), likely drawn up by the same notary, could indeed be the same individual as our Pekysios, son of Naaraous, with Apakyrios serving as alias-name. In our case, either Naaraous, the father of Pekysios in l. 2, or Naaraous Pkanee, the father of Sambas in l. 3, could be the deceased husband of Tamene in [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811).3.

υἱός (l. 2) – υἱῷ (l. 3): both parties should be introduced in the nominative; the structure nominative – dative, however, recalls the pattern of the introduction of the contractual parties in unilateral documents, i.e. the standard tabellionic instrument; it is likely used in analogy to the usual practice, see [Kovarik 2012](https://papyri.info/biblio/87430): 214.

4 κώμης Λευκογίο[υ]: Leukogion is also called κτῆμα. The other examples of our notary Ioannes, [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811).2 and ИГ-4812.3, also have κώμη. The expression κτῆμα seems to disappear in the Arab period; the latest dated example is [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).4 and the other texts from this dossier, see appendix I. Noteworthy are [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060) and [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610), which distinguish between κώμη and κτῆμα as places of origin. In the first ([P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060)), the arbitrators (l. 2) are from the κώμη, while the conflicting parties are associated with the κτῆμα (l. 4). In the second ([P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610)), one party comes from the κώμη, the other from the κτῆμα.[[18]](#footnote-18)

4–5 ἀμφιβολ̣εία̣[ν] ἔ̣[χ]ο̣ν̣τε̣[̣ς] μ̣ε̣τ’ ἀλλήλ[ων: the reference to the dispute as ἀμφιβολία (“ambiguity, uncertainty of mind”) does not occur very often and mostly in the context of mediation (*compromissa* and *dialyseis*) in the 6th to 8th centuries ([P.Cair. Masp. 3 67313](https://papyri.info/hgv/36530).16 [Aphrodito], [P.Heid. 7 404](https://papyri.info/hgv/41101).15 [Arsinoe], [P.Mich. 13 659](https://papyri.info/hgv/21374).125, 134 [Antinoe], [SB 22 15764](https://papyri.info/hgv/39651).17 [Arsinoe], [SPP 3 402](https://papyri.info/hgv/37704).2 [Herakleopolis]); cf. [P.Heid. 7 404](https://papyri.info/hgv/41101).15–16n. An exact parallel is the Herakleopolite [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).8 with πρὸς ἀλλήλους instead of μετ’ ἀλλήλων. [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060).6 similarly has [τὰ μετα]ξὺ αὐ̣τοὺς χάρι̣ν τ̣ῶν [ἀμ]φιβαλλομένων παρ’ αὐτῶν̣, while the Arsinoite *compromissa* have δίκην ἔχοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, see [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059).11 and [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).23–24, and ἐπείπερ δίκην ἔχουσα in [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).12 (648). Sometimes the synonyms φιλονικία or ἀμφισβήτησις are used, e. g. in [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474).4 ἐπειδὴ περὶ φιλονικίας γεναμένης μεταξὺ ἡμῶν, or [P.Apoll. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/39089).2: ἀμφισβήτησις ἐγένετο μετα[ξὺ αὐτῶ]ν.

There is also the clause δίχα πάσης ἀμφιβολίας καὶ δίκης καὶ κρίσεως vel. sim. in contracts of the Thebaid tradition, showing the ambivalence of the terminology ([P.Cair. Masp. 3 67305](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.cair.masp%3B3%3B67305).21, [P.Lond. 5 1716](https://papyri.info/hgv/19732).8, [P.Vat.Aphrod. 1.24](https://papyri.info/hgv/15683)), cf. 11n.

5-6 π]ε̣[ρί τ]ι̣ν̣ων [αὐτῶν κ]ε̣[φ]αλαίων: τι is written like in ἐμμέ̣ν̣ο̣ντι in l. 11 with *iota* ascending over the line. [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).10 contains the same expression: πε̣ρ̣ί̣ τινων αὐτῶν κεφαλ(αίων); the Arsinoite *compromissum* [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).24 has περί τινων κεφαλαίων.

The κεφάλαιον is a legal technical term, the exact meaning of which is not entirely clear; see the detailed discussion in [Simon 1969](https://papyri.info/biblio/97352): 21-24. [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).24-27 (648, Arsinoe) illustrates how Christodora, having asked a relative to represent her in a legal dispute, agrees to regard as valid everything done by him in this present matter (*kephalaion*): πάντα τὰ παρὰ σοῦ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πραττόμενα καὶ πραχθησόμενα ἐπὶ τῷ παρόντι κεφαλαίῳ. In [BGU 12 2173](https://papyri.info/hgv/16125).2-3 (498, Hermopolis), a certain Eucharistia brings an action (αἰτισίαν) against someone who was liable to her in various points (ἐνεχομένου αὐτῇ ἐπὶ διαφόροις κεφαλαίοις). These points are then enumerated (ll. 4-7) and seem to denote either the charges brought or the offences committed: he violently forced his way into a house in Hermopolis, where he illegally took up residence and stole moveable belongings deposited there and also the servants. In l. 15 the κεφάλαια are specified as χρηματικά or ἐγκληματικά, that is civil and criminal claims.

6–7 μὴ δυ̣[νηθέντ]ες [δι’ ἑαυτῶν ἀ]παλ̣λα̣γῆναι: the same collocation appears in the *compromissa* [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).25f. μὴ δυνηθέντες δι’ ἑαυ̣τοὺς ἀ̣[παλ]λαγκῆναι and again, as for the preceding lines, [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).10–12 μὴ δυνηθέντες δι’ ἑαυτῶν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀπαλλαγῆναι.

7–8 ᾑ̣[ρέσαν]τ̣ο ἑ[κουσίας] αὐτῶν γνώμης: this expression is used in three other late Heracleopolite *compromissa* ([CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).13, [P.Rain. Cent. 121](https://papyri.info/hgv/15452).2 and[SPP 3 415 + P.Vindob. G 40284](https://papyri.info/hgv/39378).2), see [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142): 63, while in Arsinoite *compromissa*, we find αἱρέομαι in infinitive-constructions[[19]](#footnote-19) like ἔδοξεν αὐτοὺς αἱρήσασθαι ([BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059).12–13, [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).26) or ὁμολογῶ αἱρήσασθαι ([SB 30 17412](https://papyri.info/hgv/133270).9-10). Alternatively, some Arsinoite documents are constructed differently as ὁμολογοῦμεν δικάσασθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ + anonymous arbitrators ([P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).15–16, [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).16–17, [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).10, ed. in [Harrauer, Pintaudi 2021](https://papyri.info/biblio/96571): 56, cf. 9n.).

9 δικαιολογήσασθαι: δικαιολογέομαι means “plead one’s cause before the judge”, which cannot be what is required of the arbitrators: in this context they were rather called upon for their opinion and in consequence, a decision. It is otherwise attested in three 6th-century *dialyseis*, [P.Lond. 1 113, 1](https://papyri.info/hgv/41019).16 (VI, Arsinoe), [P.Mich. 13 659](https://papyri.info/hgv/21374).40, 53, 108, and [P.Münch. 1 6](https://papyri.info/hgv/15314).54 (583, Syene?) where it means the pleading of the parties. There are also numerous attestationsof δικαιολογία, e. g. [P.Münch. 1 14](https://papyri.info/hgv/15322).35 (594, Syene). In our case it might have been mistaken for δικάσασθαι, see 7–8n.

10–11 παραβαῖνον and ἐμμέ̣ν̣ο̣ντιare *termini technici* for the breaching- and non-breaching party to a contract and typical for the penalty clauses in both *compromissa* and *dialyseis*.

11 δίκην: this is a reference to the decision of the arbitrators. It is as such not a specific *terminus technicus*, since there are also other terms (δίκη, ὅρος or κρίσις) in use to indicate the decision or judgment of the arbitrators, sometimes within the same text, which seems to suggest that they were synonyms stuck to certain clauses, see also introduction. δίκη, however, is most common, and a fixture of the ἐμμένειν-clause in all *compromissa*:καὶ ἐμμένειν or ἐμμεῖναι τῇ διδομένῃ ἡμῖν or τῇ αὐτῶν δίκῃ vel. sim. in [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059).15–17, [P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803).2, [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).21–22, [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).33–34, [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).18–20, [SB 26 16564](https://papyri.info/hgv/78171).4 (unknown origin, probably a *compromissum*) and [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).10, as well as in [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).18 (see note 19) and 28 in the context of a lawsuit. Yet δίκη is also the reason given: “we have a conflict” (δίκην ἔχοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους) in [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059).11, [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).23 and [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).12. Most often, the word appears in the καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης-clause, where δίκη means trial. This can lead to terminological confusion. Cf. 4–5n.

The designation for the few written judgements that we have (which were already discussed in the introduction), is however always ὅρος(boundary, landmark), see [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).1 and [17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060).1 which start with ⳨ ὅρος δεδόκαμεν ἡμεῖς + names; [SB 22 15764](https://papyri.info/hgv/39651).22 has ἐγράφη ὁ παρὼν ὅρος ἐκ φωνῆς τῶν εἰρημένων δικ̣ασ̣τ̣ῶ̣ν. We find it also – erroneously – in the summary of [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).25 in the place of κομπρόμισσον (see appendix II). The penalty clauses of [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558). 21 and [SB 26 16564](https://papyri.info/hgv/78171).5 refer to ὅρος as well: εἰ δέ τις ἐξ ἡμῶν μὴ στέρξῃ τῷ ὅρῳ, while [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059).17–18, [P.Prag.1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).23, [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).34–3 and [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).10 on the other hand use κρίσις in this context: εἰ δέ τις ἐκ τῶν μερῶ(ν)/ἐξ ἡμῶν μὴ στέρξῃ τῇ αὐτῶν κρίσει.

Along the same line, the decision-makers, the arbitrators, are either called δικασταί like in [SB 22 15764](https://papyri.info/hgv/39651).22, [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).21, [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).22; ὁρισταί in [P.Prag. I 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).19 and [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).17, so someone who settles boundaries, and κριταί potentially only in [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).10 (see appendix II for corrections). [SPP 3 402](https://papyri.info/hgv/37704).3 mentions an ἀκροατής, someone who listens.

12 προστίμου χρυ(σοῦ) νο(μισμάτια) δ: It is not clear whether there is a correlation between the amount of the penalty and the value that lies at the centre of the conflict, as the context is not given in the *compromissum* agreements. The four solidi could indicate a substantial sum as cause of the conflict, but there are higher ones like the 12 solidi in [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).15-16, ed. in [Harrauer, Pintaudi 2021](https://papyri.info/biblio/96571): 56); see also [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142): 65–66.

This penalty is usually paid to the other contractual party. But in the 8th century parallels from Herakleopolis ([P.Rain. Cent. 121](https://papyri.info/hgv/15452).5, [SPP 3 415 + P.Vindob. G 40284](https://papyri.info/hgv/39378).5 and some Arsinoite documents from the 7th century ([P.Prag. I 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).26 and [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).22–23) the penalty goes to the *praetorium*, the residence or office of a high official, potentially the *dux, topoteretes* or pagarch, see [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142): 64–65. There will have been no such a building in Leukogion and the other party is thus the rightful recipient of a potential penalty.

13–14 The subscription is written in Coptic. There are parallels in late 7th- and early 8th-century contracts for this practice, mostly from the Herakleopolite: first and foremost [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811/) from the same notary Ioannes from Leukogion; [P.Eirene 2 6](https://papyri.info/hgv/128647), [SB 6 9146](https://papyri.info/hgv/38721) and a number of unpublished papyri from Vienna.

Ⲡⲓϭⲱϣ ([TM NamVar 54904](http://www.trismegistos.org/namvar/54904)), a variant of the more common Ⲡⲉϭⲱϣ or Ⲡⲉⲕⲱϣ is the Coptic equivalent of Pekysios and is attested in a variety of contemporary texts. On the person Pekysios, see above 2n. and 3n.

15 For the notary Ioannes, son of Phib, see introduction. The use of patronyms in Heracleopolite documents is so far only known from Leukogion: the three testimonies of our notary Ioannes, as well as [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474), [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592) and probably [P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803) (see appendix II). [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474) even has a digraphic Latinate-Greek signature. For the use of patronyms in notarial signatures of Arsinoite documents, where mentioning the father is customary, see [Kovarik 2023b](https://papyri.info/biblio/96554): 197–199 and 210–212. In the Herakleopolite, on the other hand, this is not common practice and our notary is exceptional in this way.

ἐγράφη is written with a peculiar and idiosyncratic ligature of *phi* and *eta* which is added low at the descender of *phi*. Then two or more strokes run through it. The same can be found in his other two signatures in ИГ-4814 and [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811). All three signatures are virtually identical in their various elements, written in cursive with minuscule intrusions in form of the hooks on the descenders and the *ny*.
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**Appendix I: Leukogion**

The following table lists all documents from the 7th to 8th centuries (there are no attestations for the 5th-6th centuries) from or about Leukogion.[[20]](#footnote-20) Mostly, they are legal documents that were either drawn up there (ἐν Λευκογίῳ vel. sim.) or whose parties come from there, or both. Some only mention Leukogion somewhere in the text. There are about 30 testimonies in total, which fall in a few distinct groups or dossiers of papyri; therefore, it is all the more striking that their acquisition history appears to be varied. The majority stems from the early 7th century, and then there is the little dossier around our notary Ioannes from the early 8th century as well as some contemporary fiscal documents. These papyri might hence go back to only two archival finds.

For the 7th century, the documentation can be assigned to various sub-groups according to different criteria like handwriting, prosopography or acquisition.

The first and earliest group is connected via the script (“hand A”) and comes from the early 7th century: **[SB 30 17667](https://papyri.info/hgv/140512)** (603), [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610) (611/612), **[P.Bodl. 1 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592)** (615/616), and [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060) are all written by the same hand. Another papyrus ([CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838)), assigned to the fifth/sixth century and said to be of unknown provenance, is written in the same hand (and shares other peculiarities from Leukogion, see appendix II). Also, **[P.Bodl. 1 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592)** concerns a Menas, son of a late Apollôs who in turn might be identical with Apollôn, son of Menas in **[SB 30 17667](https://papyri.info/hgv/140512)**. There is no obvious connection by acquisition history. The three Vienna papyri ([SB 30 17667](https://papyri.info/hgv/140512), [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060), [CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838)) were bought (or registered) in different years[[21]](#footnote-21); the Bodleian papyrus was donated as well by Hunt’s widow and nothing is known about Trinity College Dublin, the papyri of which are of [unknown provenance](https://www.tcd.ie/library/research-collections/subject-strengths/papyri.php).

The second group concerns a conflict and its resolution involving a certain Pechysios, son of Naaraous ([P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712)), his father Chonis, son of Naaraous ([P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060), [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934)) and a priest named Herakleides ([P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712)), who also appears in [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610), [P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003), and [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004). [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712) can be dated to 616, and the other documents are approximately from the same period – similar to group 1. On the whole dispute see [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452). The first three papyri belong to the Vienna collection, the other three to Trinity College Dublin and the British Library. Via the person of Herakleides and “hand A”, this group is connected to the first and the third group.

Then there is another small group, connected by acquisition and housed in the British Library; they were bought, like the Vienna papyri, from Theodor Graf, in March (**[P.Lond. 2 450](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond%3B2%3B450)**) and April 1893 ([P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003),[P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004), **P.Lond. inv. 399**, ed. [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 124) respectively. They again come from the early 7th century, and[P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004)can tentatively be dated to 621. [P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003) and [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004)also concern the priest Herakleides, the former also a Theophilos like in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712), which connects this group as well to the other two groups. **[P.Lond. 2 450](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond%3B2%3B450)** (VII) mentions a Leukogiotes – on this text see [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 124 and [Gonis 2024](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 144–145.

A common provenance was already established by [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452): 180-183, who counts 6 documents as belonging to the dossier of Pekysios and Chonis, so a combination of all three groups ([P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712), [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060), [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934), [P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003), [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004), [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610)), but Morelli suspects there are more (see [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452): 183, n. 32 “sospetti mi sembrano ad esempio P.Dubl. 24, 25, e 26, cronologicamente e geograficamente vicini al nostro gruppetto di documenti”).

The same μονὴ (τοῦ) Λευκογίου which is mentioned in [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004).2-3(14th indiction) appears also in[PUG 1 50](https://papyri.info/hgv/35933).6 = **SB I 5748** (VI-VII) from a 15th indiction; the latter is from the Genova collection which was acquired on the antiquities market; ed. pr. was by B. P. Grenfell already in 1897. It concerns, l. 6: ὑπὲρ τοῦ σου μέρους μονῆς Λευκογίου, most likely “des liturgies postales”, see [Gascou 2014](https://papyri.info/biblio/86373): 215. The importance of Leukogion for the *cursus publicus* is underlined by the existence of a postal station (ἀλλαγή) in a Viennese text, [SPP 8 952](https://papyri.info/hgv/37984).2 (VI): σταβλίτ(ῃ) γ̣(  ) ἀλλαγη(  ) Λευκογι(  ), which probably comes from the Arsinoite.

Three other contemporary papyri from Leukogion are [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474), [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695), purchased in Egypt by B.P. Grenfell and F. W. Kelsey in March-April 1920 and kept in Michigan and [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) from the Vienna collection which was purchased in Herakleopolis. [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474)might be connected by its handwriting to the mediation papers of the second group via [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934) and [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712). [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474) has a Latinate signature, which seems to emulate the official notarial tradition, but it is written *transversa charta* and without a prescript and uses a hypomnematic greeting formula (τῷ δεῖνι παρὰ τοῦ δεῖνος); both parties come from Leukogion. There is also the possibility that the fathers of Pechysios in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).3 and Maria in [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474).1, 10-11 are identical, see 3n. There are also some paleographical similarities, especially in the form of the *ny*, between [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695) and [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341), but not enough to postulate a common origin.

All three preserve indiction datings; [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474) is dated Mesore of a 3rd indiction which could equate 600/615/630. In [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695), a *delta* remains from the indiction-number, but there is no regnal year, so Pachon in a 10th (δεκάτης), 12th (δωδεκάτης) or 2nd (δευτέρας) indiction – and probably less likely also 4th (δ) – could be meant, covering the years 623, 625 or 629 of the Sasanian occupation – a date after the Arab conquest (653 or 655) seems less likely. [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)records Payni of a 14th indiction, potentially 611/626; one party comes from the *kome* Onne, which connects this document in turn to [P.Dubl. 25](https://papyri.info/hgv/37475), a loan in which all parties come from Onne, on the back is a draft of a labour contract ([P.Dubl. 26](https://papyri.info/hgv/37476)) in which a certain Kosmas (l. 1), potentially the same person who is mentioned on the other side (only the patronym survives in l. 2), now resides in the Arsinoite village of Tamauis. These documents could have been acquired together with [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474)or [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610). Two more documents concern the village Onne and both come from the Vienna collection, [P.Rain. Cent. 137](https://papyri.info/hgv/35855) and [SPP 3 371](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal%3B3%3B371), the latter a fragmentary receipt, again written in a similar style and a typical *ny*. In [P.Rain. Cent. 137](https://papyri.info/hgv/35855).1 an Enoch and Theodoros appear; people by this name are attestedin [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060).1and [PUG 1 50](https://papyri.info/hgv/35933).4; and in [P.Dubl. 25](https://papyri.info/hgv/37475).2 a Daniel whom we might know from [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004).2, but without any indication of filiation and profession, these common names (over different villages) are very slim connections.

Lastly, there is one document in the dossier of the probably Arsinoite notary Apollôs from the 7th century, who works for people who come explicitly from the Arsinoite ([SPP 3 344](https://papyri.info/hgv/41144), [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548) [40](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548)), as well as Herakleopolite ([SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635) [185](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635)); [SB 1 4681](https://papyri.info/hgv/38352) and [SB 1 5259](https://papyri.info/hgv/38382) have Arsinoite-style *completiones.* One ineditum of this same notary also mentions Leukogion (**P.Vindob. G 26398**.5), but it is too fragmentary to give any more context. Apart from [SB 1 4681](https://papyri.info/hgv/38352)which today is in the Louvre and was bought by Rev. Chester in June 1879, all papyri are today kept in Vienna and were bought in the 1880s.[[22]](#footnote-22)

While some of these documents are only loosely connected, groups 1-3 are clearly related and might, despite the difference in acquisition history, all concern one archival find which was later dispersed and spread around in different collections. This presumptive common provenance might even extend to all early 7th-century documents from this same geographical region, like Onne.

A second larger dossier is the one around our notary Ioannes[[23]](#footnote-23) from the beginning of the 8th century, with the Bodleian papyrus edited above (**MS. Gr. Class. e. 135 (P)**), and the Geneva ([P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811)) and Moscow pieces **ИГ-4814** and potentially also **ИГ-4812** (see n. 2), the latter dated 718, suggesting a date in the early 8th century for the remaining papyri of this group (713/728 and 717).

These dates coincide with a number of tax documents from Leukogion. **[CPR 8 76](https://papyri.info/hgv/9885)** (698), **[SB 6 9262](https://papyri.info/hgv/38722)** (714) and **[SB 20 14234](https://papyri.info/hgv/23698)** (716), have no obvious internal or external connection. The first belongs to the Vienna collection and was acquired in Herakleopolis; the second is in Cairo and the last came to Berlin via the collection of the German Egyptologist Heinrich Brugsch in 1891. [SB 20 14234](https://papyri.info/hgv/23698), however, makes part of a little archive of well-preserved and sealed tax receipts around Menas, son of Senouthios Baouch who is known from two more tax receipts ([SB 18 13269](https://papyri.info/hgv/18409), [SB 18 13268](https://papyri.info/hgv/18414)), from 719 and 722 respectively, as is his brother, Georgios ([SB 18 13270](https://papyri.info/hgv/18410)), also in 719. These papyri also come from the Brugsch collection and have the consecutive inventory numbers P. 7885-7888 in the Berlin museum, suggesting that they were acquired together. Two more *entagia* (**[P.Grenf. 2 105](https://papyri.info/hgv/11321)** and **[P.Grenf. 2 106](https://papyri.info/hgv/11322)**), again issued 719 by the same Arab official, concern Leukogion, too; the latter regards again Menas, son of Senouthios Baouch which connects these texts that were purchased together for the Bodleian library from B. P. Grenfell in 1896, to the rest of the archive. On this group of texts see [Gonis 2001](https://papyri.info/biblio/70057): 225-226 with n. 6.

There is, however, no other reason to connect these texts (which were mostly written between 714-719) to our deeds from Leukogion (**MS. Gr. Class. e. 135 (P),** [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811), **ИГ-4812** and **ИГ-4814**), probably datable 713-718, other than their date.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The two Bodleian documents – [P.Bodl. 1 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592) and MS. Gr. Class. e. 135 (P) – dating from the early 7th and the early 8th centuries and both donated by Lucy Hunt, link the two larger chronological dossiers through a possible common provenance.

The onomastic material in these texts is very limited, but it is not clear if this means all the people with the same names are identical or related. A few people in the two major groups can, however, be identified with some likeliness: Apollôn, son of Menas in **1**, Menas son of Apollôs in **3**. Chonis in **4, 5** and **6** (and **13** (?), cf. n. 16); the priest Herakleides in **2, 4, 9** and **10**. A Theophilos appears in **4** and **9**; Biktor, son of Aioulios in **5** and **6** (another or the same Aioulios in **5**).There is a Menas, son of Senouthios Baouchi in **21** and a Menas, son of Baouch, son of Menas in **26**. The same “hand A” (or the same writing style?) appears at least in **1, 2**, **3**, **5** and “hand B” in **4**, and **6** and perhaps **13**.

The following table brings together all the information discussed above, listing papyri in chronological order and adding details about the contracting parties,[[25]](#footnote-25) genre, handwriting, place names, and acquisition history.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Publication** | **Place** | **Genre/Hand** | **Parties** | **Acquisition history** |
| **Early 7th century** | | | | | | |
| **1** | 603 | [SB 30 17667](https://papyri.info/hgv/140512)  (P.Vindob. G 14047)  same hand as **2**, **3**, **5**, **7** | l. 4: ἐν [Λευκογί]ῳ **κτήμ[ατ]ι**  both parties | loan (γραμμάτειον)  Hand A | 1. Aur. **Apollôn, s. of Menas (†) (?)**  2. Aur. Naaraous alias Papa, s. of Apa Pnas (†) | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “Ex 1883 Hermopolis Magna” |
| **2** | 611/612 | [P.Dubl. 28](https://papyri.info/hgv/21610)  (Pap. Gr. 113)  same hand as **1**, **3**, **5**, **7** | l. 4: ἐν Λε(υκογίου) **κτ(ήματι)** corr. [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 125, n. 2  first party κώμη l. 6; second κτήμα l. 9 | loan  Hand A | 1. pair of brothers  2. **Heraklides, priest**, s. of Assias, priest | Dublin, Trinity College |
| **3** | 615/616 | [P.Bodl. 1 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592) (MS. Gr. class. c. 123 (P) same hand as **1**, **2**, **5**, **7** | ἐν τ̣ῷ Λευκογίῳ **κτήματι**, l. 3, corr. [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 125, n. 2  both parties | loan  Hand A | 1. Aur. **Menas, s. of Apollôs (†)**  2. – | Bodleian Library; donated by Lucy Hunt in 1934,  relation to MS. Gr. class. c. 124 (P) = P.Bodl. 1, p. 334 (fragments from the back of [P.Bodl. 1 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592)) |
| **4** | 616 | [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712)  (P.Vindob. G 35606)  same hand as **6** | both parties ἀπὸ τοῦ Λευκογίου **κτήματος** (l. 4) | ὅρος  Hand B | 1.**Theophilos**, s. of Theonas  2. Paphnouthios, s. of Ioseph Pouaal  **for Heraklites, priest and Pechysios, s. of Naaraous Chonis** | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  cf. [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934) |
| **5** | early VII | [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060) = SPP 10 234 (P.Vindob. G 12234)  same hand as **1**, **2, 3** and **7** | arbitrators ἀπὸ **κώμης** Λευκογίου (l. 2)  parties ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ **κτήματος** (l. 4) | ὅρος  Hand A | 1. Apanakios, s. **Enoch**, s. of **Aioulios**  2. Ioannes, son of Timotheos for **Chonis, s. of Naaraous** and **Biktor, s. of Aioulios** | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  “ex 1886” (edition) |
| **6** | early VII | [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934)  (P.Vindob. G 25954)  same hand as **4** | both parties ἀπὸ τοῦ Λευκογίου **κτήματος** (l. 6-7) | κομπρόμισσον  Hand B | 1. **Aur. Biktor, s. of Aioulios**  2. **Chonis, s. of Naaraous** | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  “Erster Faijûmer Fund ex 1881/4”  “2 Stück amtlicher Art, 1 Compromiss und 1 ὄρος“, probably [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712), see [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452): 186 |
| **7** | early VII | [CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838),  (P.Vindob. G 26722)  same hand as **1**, **2**, **3** and **5** | – | division of property (διαίρεσις)  Hand A | 1. Petamos alias Kapareou, s. of Phib  2. Makarios, son of Naaraous Papsios  3. **Apollô**, son of Georgios *hyographeus* | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  “Ex 1896” |
| **8** | early VII | P.Lond. inv. 399a, ed. [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 124 | [ἐν τ̣ῷ Λευκογίῳ **κτήματι**] (?) | loan | – | British Library  from Theodor Graf in April 1893 |
| **9** | early VII | [P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003)  (Pap 391) | – | lease | 1. **Theophilos** and **Naaraous** and **Heraklite, priest**  2. – | British Library  from Theodor Graf March1893 |
| **10** | early VII (620/621) | [P.Lond. 2 392](https://papyri.info/hgv/37004)  (Pap 392) | *Oikonomos* τῆς **μωνῆς** το\ῦ/ Λευκωγίου (l. 2-3)  monastery (?), see [Gascou 2014](https://papyri.info/biblio/86373): 215 | receipt | 1. Alexas and **Daniel**, *oikonomos*  **2. Herakleitai, priest**  grammateus **Pekysios** | British Library  from Theodor Graf March1893 |
| **11** | VI-VII | [PUG 1 50](https://papyri.info/hgv/35933)  (number unknown) | l. 6: ὑπὲρ τοῦ σου μέρους **μονῆς** Λευκογίου  monastery (?), see [Gascou 2014](https://papyri.info/biblio/86373): 215 | receipt | 1. Abraamios, son of Thomas (†), *bouleutes*  2. Theodoros, s. of Ioannes (†), *bouleutes* | Genova |
| **12** | VII  (VI ed.)  2nd ind. | [SPP 8 952](https://papyri.info/hgv/37984)  (P.Vindob. G 11662) | l. 2: σταβλίτ(ῃ) γ̣(  ) ἀλλαγη(  ) Λευκογι(  ) | order | 1. N.N. from Arsinoe (village)  2. N. N. *stablites*, via Apa (?) *scholasticus*, son of Menas | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  “Faijûm ex 1883” |
| **13** | VII | [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474)  (Pap. C 2) | both parties ἀπὸ τοῦ Λευκογίου **κτήματος** (l. 2) | ἀμεριμνία/ἀσφάλεια (conflict resolution)  Hand B (?) | 1. Matthias, s. of Phoibammon  2. Maria, d. of **Naaraous** Pachos | Dublin, Trinity College |
| **14** | VII | [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695)  (P. 489) | l. 5: ἐν Λευκογίῳ,  corr. [Gonis 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96726): 125, n. 2  both parties ἀπὸ **κώμης** (ll. 8. 11) | loan | 1. Aur. Senouthios (?), s. of Anoup (†) alias Kan[  2. Aur. Markos, s. of Andreas (†) | Ann Arbor  purchased in Egypt by B.P. Grenfell and F.W. Kelsey in March-April 1920 |
| **15** | VII | [P.Lond. 2 450](https://papyri.info/hgv/38877)  (Pap 450) | l. 2-3: κυρ(ίου) Ἰωάνν(ου) Λευκογιώτ(ο)υ | receipt | 1. Ioannes *stippourgos*  2. Ioannes, Leukogiotes | British Library  from Theodor Graf April 1893 |
| **16** | VII  (14th ind. 596 or 611 ed.pr.) | [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)  (P.Vindob. G 11068) | 1. ἀπὸ κώμ(ης) **Ὀννή**  2. ἀπὸ **κώμης** Λευκογίου (l. 3) | receipt | 1. Onnophrios, son of Menas Pmouei and  Paniskos, son of. Pekysios  2. Menas, s. of Eiatros | Vienna  from Theodor Graf  “Ahnas ex 1883” |
|  | VII | [P.Dubl. 25](https://papyri.info/hgv/37475)  (Select Box 136.1), back [P.Dubl. 26](https://papyri.info/hgv/37476) | 1.+2 from **κώμη**  **Ὀννή** | Loan with mortgage  Same hand like [P.Dubl. 26](https://papyri.info/hgv/37476) (Hand B?) | 1. N.N., son of **Daniel**  2. N.N., son of Menas | Dublin, Trinity College |
|  | VII | [P.Dubl. 26](https://papyri.info/hgv/37476)  (Select Box 136.2), back [P.Dubl. 25](https://papyri.info/hgv/37475) | 1. from Onne, but now in Tamauis  2. from either Onne or Tamauis | Draft contract of labour  Same hand like [P.Dubl. 25](https://papyri.info/hgv/37475) (Hand B?) | 1. Aur. Kosmas, son of –  2. Aurelios (draft) | Dublin, Trinity College |
|  | VI | [P.Rain. Cent. 137](https://papyri.info/hgv/35855)  (P.Vindob. G 25880) | 1. Onne | Order of payment | 1. **Enoch**, *grammateus* of Onne  2. **Theodoros**, son Iakob, through Ioannes *notarios* | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “Ex 1881” |
|  | VI-VII  (ed. pr. V-VI) | [SPP 3 371](https://papyri.info/hgv/35546)  (P.Vindob. G 11276) | *boethos* of Onne is mentioned | receipt | 1. N. N. + Apa Neilos, son of Anysios, farmers | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “ex 1883” |
| **17** | VI-VII  notary Apollôs | P.Vindob. G 26398 | l. 6 Λευκογίου | *diamartyria* (?) | – | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “Ex 1881/4 Erster Faijûmer Fund” |
| **Late 7th to 8th century** | | | | | | |
| **18** | 698 | [CPR 8 76](https://papyri.info/hgv/9885)  (P.Vindob. G 11837) | l. 2: ὑπὲρ τ(ο ) χω(ριο ) Λευκ(ο)γ(ίου) | Dossier of Atias  minuscule | 1. Flavius Atias, *dux*  2. N. N. from the village Isiou for Leukogion | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “Ex 1883 Herakleopolis Magna” |
| **19** | 713/728  notary Ioannes | MS. Gr. Class. e. 135 (P) | both parties  ἀπὸ **κώμης** (l. 4) | κομπρόμισσον  minuscule | **1. Pekysios, s. of Naaraous, priest**  2. Sambas (?), s. of **Naaraous** Pkanee  Arbitrators: Kosmas, s. of Papas and Menas, s. of Antonios | donated by Lucy Hunt in 1934 |
| **20** | 714 | [SB 6 9262](https://papyri.info/hgv/38722)  (P. Fouad 131) | l. 2: ἀπὸ **χ(ωρίου)** Λευκογ(ίου)  Damianos from Leukogion (χωρίον) | *entagion* | **1.** **Mohammed Aboulqasim**  2. Damianos, deacon | Cairo, IFAO Fouad Collection  purchased in 1930 |
| **21** | 716 | [SB 20 14234](https://papyri.info/hgv/23698)  (P. 7888) | l. 2: ἀπὸ **χ(ωρίου)** Λευκογ(ίου) | tax receipt  minuscule | **1. Mohammed Aboulqasim**  **2. Menas, son of Senouthios Baouchi** | Berlin Sammlung Brugsch 1891 |
| **22** | VIII  (717?)  notary Ioannes | [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811) (P. Gr. 149) | l.2: ἐν κώμῃ Λευκογίῳ  both parties  ἀπὸ **κώμης** (l. 6) | ὁμολογία | 1. Tamene, widow of **Naaraous**, s. of Arasios?  2. Lacher, widow of Papaioannes, son of Pseeios, priest | Geneva  Bibliothèque  1882-1897 by Edouard Naville for Jules Nicole |
| **23** | 718  notary Ioannes (?) | Pushkin Museum  ИГ-4812 | l. 3 ἐν **κώμῃ** Λευκογίῳ | contract  minuscule | 1. **Aur. Pekysios, s. of Apakyrios** (†), s. of Koueisan  2. **Sambas** and Theodoros, brothers | from V. S. Golenischev between 1908-1912 |
| **24** | VIII  notary Ioannes | Pushkin Museum  ИГ-4814 |  | sale (πρᾶσις)  minuscule | 1. Maria, daughter of Anoup (†) | from V. S. Golenischev between 1908-1912 |
| **25** | 719 | [P.Grenf. 2 105](https://papyri.info/hgv/11321)  (MS. Gr. Arab. d. 75 (P)) | l. 4: ἐρχο(μένου) ἀπὸ Λευκ(ογίου) | *entagion*  minuscule | 1. **Zoubeir, son of Ziada**  2. Senouthios, son of Aioulios Amei( ) via Laios | SC 32373  presented by F. C. Conybeare or bought from B. P. Grenfell in 1896 |
| **26** | 719 | [P.Grenf. 2 106](https://papyri.info/hgv/11322)  (MS. Gr. Arab. d. 75 (P)) | l. 4: Μην(ᾶ)   ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣ Λευκογεί(ο)υ | *entagion*  minuscule | 1. **Zoubeir, son of Ziada**  2. **Menas, son of Baouch, son of Menas** | SC 32373  presented by F. C. Conybeare or bought from B. P. Grenfell in 1896 |
|  | 719 | [SB 18 13269](https://papyri.info/hgv/18409)  (P.Berol. 7887) | –  cf. **21**, **26** | tax receipt  minuscule, seal | **Menas, son of Senouthios Baouch** | Berlin Sammlung Brugsch 1891, Fayum |
|  | 719 | [SB 18 13270](https://papyri.info/hgv/18410)  (P.Berol. 7885) | –  cf. **21**, **26** (brother) | tax receipt  minuscule, seal | **Georgios, son of Senouthios Baouch** | Berlin Sammlung Brugsch 1891  Fayum |
|  | 722 | [SB 18 13268](https://papyri.info/hgv/18414)  (P.Berol. 7886) | –  cf. **21**, **26** | tax receipt  minuscule, seal | **Menas, son of Senouthios Baouch** | Berlin Sammlung Brugsch 1891  Fayum |
| **27** | VIII | [CPR 4 171](https://papyri.info/hgv/82300)  (P.Vindob. K 4010)  from Oxy (?) | l. 17: ἀπὸ **χ(ωρίου)** Λευκωγ(ίου) μαρτηρῶ | ἀσφάλεια  Coptic | Witness (correction of Lajos Berkes via PN) | Vienna  from Theodor Graf “aus Oxyrhynchus” |
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[BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059)

This *compromissum* is drawn up by the notary Georgios and is datable to the years 627 or 642; the earlier date is probably more likely. A fuller (κναφεύς), Apa Ioulios, son of the deceased Ioseph, and a shop-keeper (κάπηλος),Ioseph, son of Aioulios, agree to have another shop-keeper, Apa Hol as arbitrator in their conflict. This is repeated in the endorsement, read as † κομπρόμισσ(ον) γενόμε(νον) μεταξ(ὺ) Α[ὐρ(ηλίου) ἄπα] Ἰ[ου]λίου κν[αφέως υἱοῦ] Ἰ[ωσ]ὴφ κ[αί in the ed. pr. The names should be corrected to Aπα̣ Ιο̣[υ]λίου̣ κν[α]φ̣(έως) (κ̣α̣ὶ̣) Ἰω̣σ̣ὴφ καπ̣ή̣λ̣(ου). μεταξξ has a plural abbreviation to indicate both parties (as does [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945) and [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366), see below). The rest of the docket is covered by cardboard.
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[CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838)

This large and patchy document, consisting of two fragments, concerns a division of property (διαίρεσις, frg. 2, l. 28) between two men, Makari(o)s, son of Naaraous Papsios and Petamos alias Kapareous, son of Phib. The former omits the first alias-name of his father, Naaraous, in the *hypographe*, the second his own first alias-name. The text is not easy to understand because of its fragmentary state, orthography and linguistic peculiarities.

The name Kapareous ([TM Nam 19571](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/19571)) is otherwise unattested. It first appears in l. 3 to denote a *kella* (*kellia* in the papyrus)of his: κελλίας \Κα/παρέως – the ending survives only in traces. In l. 6 we have Πεταμος ὁ καὶ Κα̣παρέους τ̣ὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος. Ιn Petamos, peculiar, to say the least, the *alpha* is difficult, but the name is attested twice in earlier periods ([P. Hels. 1 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/5159).v2 [163/162 BCE]); [P.Princ. 1 9](https://papyri.info/hgv/12824).6 [31]); the final *sigma* reaches the base line and almost has a descender. In Κα̣παρέους the final *sigma* iswritten in ligature with a following stroke. I would rather read Κα̣παρέου, εἰ τ̣ὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος. This also finds confirmation in the signature, l. 29 where there is no space for a *sigma.* The name is thus apparently indeclinable and reads Καπαρεου in all cases, and not Καπαρευς, Καπαρεως, or Καπαρει, as the editor assumed. Read thus Καπαρέου also in l. 3.

The beginning of l. 17 is very fragmentary: δε  ̣  ̣  ̣ε  ̣  ̣πσα[  ̣  ̣]  ̣; it can be improved, though it is still not properly understood: δε ̣ ̣θέντ̣ως α̣ ̣ [, perhaps it stands for δὲ α̣ὐ̣θεν<τι>κῶς.

In l. 24–25, ἕκαστον ἐξ ἡμῶ̣ν̣ κρατεῖν καὶ κυρι̣εύειν καὶ δεσποτεύειν τὸν [- - - ] σὺν τέκνοις   ̣  ̣  ̣ (the rest of the line remains unread), I would read instead: σὺν τέκνοις αὐτοῦ Μα̣κ[α]ρ̣(ίου) κ̣υ̣ρι̣ε̣ύ̣ε̣ι̣ν (κ̣α̣ὶ̣) δε̣σ̣π̣οτ̣(εύειν) (κ̣α̣ὶ̣) ο̣ἰ̣κο̣δ(ομῆσαι) (κ̣α̣ὶ̣) κρ̣α̣τ̣ε̣ῖ̣ν̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣, apparently repeating the phrase from the line before.

In l. 28, the stipulation at the end of the line, ἐπερω(τηθέντες) ὁμολογ(ήσαμεν) † † † has indeed a plural abbreviation, read ἐπερω(τηθέντες) (επερρ pap.) ὁ̣μω̣λογ(ήσαμεν).

In ll. 29–30, we find the concluding *hypographe*:† Αὐρήλιος Καπαρε̣ὺ̣ς̣ σ̣τ̣ο̣ι̣χ̣ε̣ῖ̣ μ̣ο̣ι̣   ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣ | ἔγρ̣αψα [ὑπὲ]ρ αὐτοῦ μ̣ὴ̣ εἰ[δότος γρά]μ̣[μ]α̣τ̣[α]; but what survives is more stubstantial:

29 (*m2*) †̣ Αὐρήλιος Καπαρεο̣υ̣ υἱ(οῦ) Φ̣ι̣β στιχῖ̣ μοι. ἐγ̣ῶ Ἀ̣π̣ολλῶ υἱ(οῦ) Γεω[ργίου]

30 ἔ̣γρ̣αψα [ὑπ]ὲ̣ρ αὐτ̣οῦ ἀ̣[γραμ]μ̣[άτου ὄντος †]

This should be the *agrammatos*-clause attested for Middle Egypt, for the Arsinoite one, see [Kovarik 2009](https://papyri.info/biblio/77554): 222-223.
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[P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803)and[P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592)

The text of the Geneva papyrus has already been corrected extensively by D. Hagedorn in [Kruse 2013](https://papyri.info/biblio/86328): 230, but several doubtful points remain, not helped by the poor quality of the online [photo](https://www.ville-ge.ch/musinfo/imageZoom/?iip=bgeiip/papyrus/pgen151-ri.ptif). The signatures of the ed. pr., ll. 14-15, read ἐγ\ὼ/ Ψ̣ε̣[είου παρὼν ἐπιδέδωκα.] †̣ ἐγὼ Ἀπολλώνιο(ς) π[α]ρὼν ἐπιδέδωκα † † ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης νο(τάριος) μαρ̣[τυρῶ τῇ διαλύσει.]

However, this document is, as already suggested by [van Minnen 2013](https://papyri.info/biblio/97327): 325, a judgement, not a dialysis. This is evident from ἐπιδέδωκα (cf. n. 6) in the only completely preserved signature at the beginning of l. 15, indicating the subscription of the arbitrators, which means that the one who signs there cannot be the same as the conflicting parties mentioned in the document. The name in the second signature was already corrected by both Hagedorn and van Minnen to: Ἀπολλὼ υἱὸ(ς) Πραοῦ –– he is the first arbitrator; the supposed witness subscription in the same line, also corrected by both to † ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης υἱὸ(ς) Μα ̣[- - - ἐπιδέδωκα], is the signature of the second arbitrator. Hagedorn has suggested Μαθθαίου or Ματθαίου; the first option seems more likely to me. I agree with van Minnen that the supplement in l. 15 (τῇ διαλύσει) should be changed to τῷ ὅρῳ or τῇ δίκῃ/κρίσει, see 11n.

For the first signature at the end of l. 14, ἐγ\ὼ/ Ψ̣ε̣[είου, I concur with the correction of Hagedorn who tentatively reads ἐγρά(φη) instead, with supralinear *alpha*, μη([νί)], like in the judgement [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).15-16: † ὅρος ἐγράφη μηνὶ Φαμενὼ̣θ̣ κϛ τ̣ῆς δ ἰνδ(ικτίονος).

The people mentioned in the body of the document, the priest Ψέειος (πρεσβύτερος, translated in the edition as “l’ancien”), in l. 8 and 9 and the deacon Apollô – read as Ἀπολλώ(νιος) in the ed. pr. in l. 12, are the conflict parties. They were taken to be the ones signing in the end, but are indeed different people from the arbitrators who do so, albeit with an onomastic overlap in the name Apollôs (with the genitive Ἀπολλῶ for nominative in both cases), one is a deacon, one is not.

An Arsinoite provenance was suggested in the edition and the name Pseeios in ll. 5, 8, 9, 13 confirms a middle Egyptian origin, but the Arsinoite is not likely. Hagedorn suggests the Oxyrhynchite nome, because of the use of χρυσοῦ in l. 10 and the name Πραοῦς ([ΤΜ Nam 11771](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/11771)) in l. 15, a “typisch oxyrhynchitischer Name”, but Praous is attested also in the Arsinoite and Herakleopolite area, for example in Leukogion, in the already mentioned [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592).12. Several other points suggest a Herakleopolite origin.

Paleographic evidence suggests that the papyrus likely dates from the early Arab period in the second half of the 7th century, or possibly even later, rather than from the early 7th century as proposed by the editors. The notary signs in Greek and we would expect an Arsinoite notarial *completio*, also post-conquest, to be Latinate, whereas this feature disappears soon in the Arab period in the Heracleopolite documentation,[[26]](#footnote-26) see [Kovarik 2023](https://papyri.info/biblio/96755): 96–97 and Kovarik forthcoming.

The notary’s name, Ἄπα Ἰε̣[ρ]ε̣μί\ου/ according to the ed. pr., was again already corrected by Hagedorn who proposes to read it as † Αππα Κ[ύ]ρ̣̣̣ου υἱοῦ [.

Patronyms within the notarial *completio* are in Heracleopolite deeds so far only attested from the Arab period and here exclusively from Leukogion, see above 15n.

Specifically, the *delta* in δι and the supralinear -ligature in ἐμοῦ, both of which are also used by our notary Ioannes, resemble the signature in [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592). I would thus propose to read the name of the same notary there, but with the additional indication that he was a priest as well:

† δι᾿ ἐμοῦ Α̣π̣π̣α̣ Κύ̣ρ̣ου ἐλαχ(ίστου) υἱ(ο)ῦ Γ[εω]ρ̣γίου πρεσ[βυτέρου]

This suggests that [P.Gen. 4 181](https://papyri.info/hgv/129803) may have been acquired together with [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811), which was drawn up in Leukogion as well. The inventory numbers are P. Gr. 151 and P. Gr. 149.

Another correction to [P.Bodl. 73](https://papyri.info/hgv/22592).10 is Μη̣ν̣ᾶς υἱ(ος) Ἀπολλῶ instead of Μη̣ν̣ᾶ\ς/ Ὡρ̣απολλῶ. The abbreviation stroke running through *iota* is unmistakable.
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[P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811)

Corrections have already been suggested by [Diethart and Hasitzka 2011](https://papyri.info/biblio/79081): 239 and [Gascou 2015](https://papyri.info/biblio/87150), but some problems still remain in ll. 8-11. Incorporating these corrections, lines 9-11 read:

#blockQuote

9 παρ’ ἐμ̣οῦ εἰς [σὲ τὴν (?)   ̣  ̣  ̣] τ̣ῆ̣ς̣ (?) τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τ̣ῆς̣

10 φ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣χο  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣φ  ̣  ̣  ̣ τῶν̣ χρυ̣σοῦ

11 νομ(ισμάτων)   ̣μ  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣[  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣]  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣ διὰ γὰρ (?) τοῦτο

#endBlockQuote

This could probably be improved to

#blockQuote

9 παρ᾿ ἐμοῦ εἰς ἀ̣σ̣φ̣ά̣λ̣(ειαν) τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τῆ̣ς

10 Ἰω̣άνν̣ο̣υ̣ ὑ̣π̣ὲρ αὐτῶν χρυ̣σοῦ

11 νομισμά̣τ̣ω̣ν̣

#endBlockQuote

The problem is the article τῆς at the end of l. 10. It rather reads like τις which does not help much either.

The notary’s signature in l. 18 should be emended in light of the new papyrus and the Moscow piece, restoring the notary’s name as: [Ϯ δι’ ἐμοῦ Ἰωάν]ν̣[ου] υἱο̣ῦ̣ Φιβ ἐγράφη *sign* Ϯ Ϯ
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**[SB I 4847](https://papyri.info/hgv/33915)**

This is a fragment of a 6th or 7th century *compromissum* in the Louvre which can be improved by the online [photo](https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl01004028) and the help of parallels such as [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060).13-17, [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).21-28, [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366).33-38, and [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).19-24.

In the following, the reading of the *editio princeps* is shown on the left-hand side, and my corrected version on the right-hand side:
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[SB 1 5271](https://papyri.info/hgv/41364)

Only the beginning and the endorsement is preserved of this seventh-century *compromissum*. A few corrections have already been made and recorded in the [BL](https://beehive.zaw.uni-heidelberg.de/hgv/41364). The first party in l. 7 is a certain Paulos who is defined by his employer as ὑπουργὸς τῆς ἐνδόξου ὑπηρεσίας Στρατηγίου τοῦ ὑπερφυ[εστ]άτου πατρικίου, ll. 8-9, followed by the filiation, ll. 9–10, υἱοῦ Θεοδότ̣ου Κίλικος and the second party, ll. 10-11: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἑτέρου μέρους Μαροῦς [– – –]της [– – – χ]ωρὶς κυρίου [χρηματίζουσα – – –]. I suggest reading υἱοῦ Θεοδότ̣ου Κῖλιξ, which was already suggested in BL 8 320; BL 10 183 adds the supplement of ἀνδρός and BL 11.197 the name of the father; but the name of Marous’ father alone is not enough to fill the lacuna. The mother’s name must have followed as well, cf. [BGU 1 317](https://papyri.info/hgv/41060).3–4 (Arsinoe, 580/581): θυγά]τηρ τοῦ μακαρίου Γεωργίο(υ) μητρὸς ἄμα Ἡραίδος [χωρὶς κυρίου χρημα]τίζουσα.[[27]](#footnote-27)

The whole passage would then read: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ἑτέρου μέρους Μαροῦς θ̣[υ]γ̣[ά]τηρ Τιμ̣[οθέου μητρὸς Ν.Ν. χ]ωρὶς κυρίου [ἀνδρὸς χρηματίζουσα – – –].

In the endorsement, the corrections are minimal. The papyrus breaks off after κομπρόμισσ(ον) γεν, taken as γεν(όμενον), but γεν[όμε(νον) or γεν[άμε(νον) is more likely. There is also a cross before Ϯ κομπρόμισσ(ον) and a *staurogramm* before the invocation written below the endorsement, which was read as a cross and a few letters that are or are not there; therefore, instead of Ϯ ἐν ὀν[όμ]ατι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπ[ότου read ⳨ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δε̣σ[πότου.
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[SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366)

This is another example of the same style of *compromissum* as [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059). The first party consists of two priests, both named Georgios, sons of Ioannes (ll. 6-9). The first Georgios has an alias mentioned at the beginning of line 8   ̣  ̣[  ̣]μ̣άρωνος. This should be read as Σα̣μ̣βαρί̣ω̣νος, with a small *alpha* and majuscule-*my*, cf. [CPR 14 10](https://papyri.info/hgv/41089).6 (556–578, Arsinoe).

The reading at the beginning of l. 21, ἐν|ταῦθα [ἐ]ν τῷ Ἀρσινοίτῃ, appears too short for the available space; a better restoration is ἐν|ταῦθα̣ ἐ̣ν̣ τ̣ῷ̣ αὐ̣τῷ Ἀρσινοίτῃ.

The clumsy *hypographe* can be corrected in a number of small details: The first Georgios signs in his own hand across the space of 4 lines. Instead of of υἱὸς Ἰώννου [στοι]χῖ μ[οι] τ[όδε] τὼ κομπρόμισον (corrected from [  ̣  ̣  ̣]  ̣  ̣  ̣[  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣]  ̣ω κομπρόμισσον [ὡς] πρόκ[ει]ται in BL 12 183) in ll. 40-42, I read Ἰωάννου [στοι]χῖ μ̣[οι] τὼ κομπρόμισον [ὡ]ς. In the following subscriptions in ll. 42-43, † Γεώργιος πρ(εσβύτερος). (hand 4) Φοι[βά]μ̣μ[ω]ν ὁ̣ προκ(είμενος) στοιχεῖ ἡμῖν, ὡς πρ(όκειται), we find a plural formulation instead: Γεώργιος πρ(εσβύτερος) (καὶ) Φοι[βά]μ̣μ[ω]ν οἱ προκ(είμενοι), that is, one communal signature despite the fact that the signers belong to different parties.

The notary’s name in the *completio* in the next line was corrected in BL 8 322 from Eliu to Fib esemio(the), which should be read as esemioth.

The docket has † κο̣μπρ(όμισσον)   ̣  ̣  ̣[  ̣  ̣]  ̣  ̣  ̣  ̣ μεταξὺ̣ Γεωργίου̣, which should be corrected to † κομπρόμισσ(ον) γενόμε(νον) μεταξ(ύ), again with the plural-abbreviation μεταξξ, as in [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059) and [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).
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**[PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060), ed. [Harrauer and Pintaudi (2021)](https://papyri.info/biblio/96571): 56–57**

This is a new and complete *compromissum* which is exactly dated by the era of Diocletian: ἔτους Διοκλ(η)τ(ιανοῦ) τξα Θῶθ κϛ γ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) in l. 3. This corresponds to 23 September 645.

The notary, however, is already known from [P.Ross. Georg. 3 53](https://papyri.info/hgv/40995), dated by era-year to 674/675 (τϙα), month lost, and indeed, the second cypher, which is split by a tear on a fold-line, should be read differently as a *qoppa* in [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060) as well – our papyrus thus comes from the same year 675, τα (the era-year runs concurrently to the indiction-year starting in Epeiph, see [CSBE](https://papyri.info/biblio/17873)[2](https://papyri.info/biblio/17873): 66).

The two conflict parties are Aurelios Apa Hol, fruit gardener (πωμαρίτης), son of Apa Isionos, ll. 5-6, and Aurelios Phoibammon, sandal maker (σανδαλᾶς), son ofPtollon, ll. 6-7 – the reading of this patronym Πτόλλωνος is again disturbed by a break. As already mentioned by the editors, the standard form of the name is Πτολλίων and I think that is also what we have here: read Πτολλί̣ων.

In the following lines 7-9, the origin of the two parties is given: ἀπὸ τῆς | Ἀρσινοι{νοι}τῶν πόλεω̣[ς] ἀπὸ ἀμφ[όδ]ου μητ̣ρ̣οπόλ(εως) Ψαππαλλίου | ὁ δὲ Φοιβάμμων Κλεοπατρίου.

Psappalliou and Kleopatriou are both city quarters, and we would expect a parallel construction: the one from here, the other from there. Line 8 has to be revised to read ἀπὸ ἀμφό̣δ̣[ο]υ ὁ μὲν Α̣π̣α Ολ Ψαππαλλ(ί)ου to correspond to the second part – the name of the city quarter at the end of the line has been abbreviated internally.[[28]](#footnote-28)

This part is followed by their agreement to have the matter judged by arbitrators in ll. 9-11: ὁμολογοῦμεν | δικάσασθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁριστὰς | τὴμ̣ δημοσία[ν] ὀφιλὰν τῆς α̣ὐ̣τ̣ῆς πόλεως. This passage is problematic for a variety of reasons. First, the reading of τούς is difficult; *tau* seems to be written in two strokes and has a superfluous ascender above; perhaps something was corrected here. Then, the expression denoting the arbitrators at the end of l. 10 presents paleographical difficulties. An initial *omicron* appears unlikely; rather, the presence of an ascender in the first letter seems undeniable. On this basis, I would consider reading κριτάς instead. However, this term is not yet attested for arbitrators in this specific context. That said, their decision is called κρίσις in l. 13, which is an alternative to δίκη, also used here in l. 12, and to ὅρος, found on the verso, see below and 11n. A reading ὡριστάς cannot be entirely excluded either; on the verso we also find ὥρος for ὅρος.

Their purview follows in the next line, read τῆς δημοσίας φυλακῆς; the arbitrators belong to the public prison. Parallels have ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁριστὰς ἐποικ̣[ίου in [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558).17 or ἐ̣[π]ὶ ὁριστ̣ο̣ῦ τοῦ αὐ̣τ(οῦ) νομοῦ in [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945).19, where the arbitrators also remain anonymous.

In l. 16 the abbreviation of χρ(υσίου) has what looks like a supralinear *ypsilon* and should be resolved χρυ(σίου); the *kyria-*clause κύριον τὸ κομπρώμισσον is actually correctly written κομπρόμισσον. The stipulation ἐπερ(ωτηθέντες) ὡμολ(ογήσαμεν) in the following line 17 has a plural abbreviation, ωμμ instead of ωμολ. The *hypographe*, starting at the end of the line with Ἄπα Ὃλ καὶ Φοιβ(άμμων) στοιχ(oῦμεν) ἡμῖν, should be resolved στοιχ(εῖ) ἡμῖν. In the second witness subscription l. 20 read μαρτυρῶ instead of μαρτυρo. And in the last witness subscription in ll. 20-21 the abbreviation is κομπρομίσῳ ⟨ὡ⟩ς, not κομπρομ(ίσσῳ) ὡς.

Finally, the notarial *completio* should read θμγ di emu Cosma Fib δι’ ἐμοῦ Φιβ θ, cf. [Kovarik 2019](https://papyri.info/biblio/97353): 251, where a Latinate signature of the same notary in [P.Ross. Georg. 3 53](https://papyri.info/hgv/40995) (674/675) is corrected. [PL III/1029](https://papyri.info/hgv/980060)shows the only complete Latinate-Greek signature (the same notary also appears with his father’s name in Greek in [SPP 3 422](https://papyri.info/hgv/37716) and in [SB 1 4699](https://papyri.info/hgv/38356). [SB 28 17202](https://papyri.info/hgv/64904) might concern the same notary with another fragmentary Latinate signature.

The summary in the endorsement of this *compromissum* reads: † Ὧρος Φοιβ(άμμων) σανταλ(ᾶς) (καὶ) Ἄπα Ὃλ πομ(αρί)τ(ης), l. πωμ(αρί)τ(ης). The first word in the docket usually indicates the type of the contract, and we would expect κομπρόμισσον, but instead it is labeled as a judgement, that is ὥρος, l. ὅρος. The editors took ὥρος as a spelling mistake for Αὐρήλιος and resolve the whole phrase in nominative. Instead, we have the judgement of Phoibammon und Apa Hol, and the names and professions need to be resolved in genitive. Read thus † ὥρος (l. ὅρος) Φοιβάμμ(ωνος) σανταλᾶ̣ (καὶ) Ἄπα Ὃλ πομ(αρί)τ(ου), l. πωμ(αρί)τ(ου).

The second part of the docket, after a small *vacat*, is transcribed as χ  ̣  ̣η̣λ̣ιγ̣ρ  ̣[  ̣  ̣  ̣]  ̣  ̣ μ̣ι̣σ̣θ̣οπρασείας τξα †, is also doubtful, but the quality of the photo does not help. Complete endorsements of *compromissa* mostly show the construction with μεταξύ, see e.g. [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945): † κομπρόμισσ(ον) γενόμε(νον) μεταξ(ὺ) Ἰωάννου γρ̣[αμμ]α(τέως) [καὶ Παύλο]υ̣ (καὶ) Πεκυσίου †. But in our case the structure is different and the first part already gives the necessary information. Additionally, perhaps the reason for the dispute is given, the fineof 12 *solidi*, or the names of the arbitrators, who however remain anonymous on the recto. Perhaps, the initial *chi* points to the second option, χρυ(σίου) νο(μισμάτια) ιβ λό(γῳ) π̣ροστ[ίμου, but it has to remain conjecture.

The presumed reference to the year τξα at the very end is obsolete with the correction above.

Instead, these letters look like τρα or τρου, and could be read with the three preceding letters as εἰατροῦ, either as a personal name (cf. [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341) [68](https://papyri.info/hgv/39341).3: Εἰατροῦ) or the profession ἰατρός (physician) of one of the anonymous arbitrators.

Unfortunately, the remaining letters are too hard to read satisfactorily.
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1. This goes along with a number of Heracleopolite localities that we encounter as places of composition in the 5th to 8th centuries, which all appear to be on edge of the Heracleopolite nome either bordering the Arsinoite (Bousiris: [P.Rain. Cent. 124](https://papyri.info/hgv/15454) [492], Leukogion, Tinteris: [P.Michael. 126](https://papyri.info/hgv/21426) [538]) or Oxyrhynchite (Kerkesephis: [SPP 20 127](https://papyri.info/hgv/18745) [463], Koba: [SPP 20 117](https://papyri.info/hgv/18740) [411], Papa megale: [P.Köln 7 323](https://papyri.info/hgv/38728) [VII/VIII], Pasei: [P.Vind. Sijp. 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/17169) [463], Phebichis: [P.Rain. Cent. 123](https://papyri.info/hgv/15453) [478], Tosachmis: [SB 6 9593](https://papyri.info/hgv/36844) [VI/VII]). Perhaps the distance to the metropolis was the deciding factor for the development of local notarial traditions, or, as in the case of Leukogion, the importance as a centre of trade, see [Morelli 2004](https://papyri.info/biblio/73452): 184, n. 39. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Thumbnail images and metadata for both papyri were once available on the website of the Pushkin Museum but have since been taken down; see the catalogue of [Chepel 2018](https://papyri.info/biblio/97326), which records the two documents as belonging together. However, the woman subscribing in ИГ-4814, l. 6 – what else survives of the contract is likewise formulated in the singular – does not match the group of people who appear as the issuing party at the beginning of the greeting formula in ИГ-4812, l. 4. Both papyri, written in the same minuscule hand and originating from the same Heracleopolite locality in the early 8th century, were part of the private collection of V. S. Golenischev. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This is something I claimed before for another *compromissum* from the 8th century, edited in [Kovarik 2020](https://papyri.info/biblio/96142): 67 for which I suggested the date 724-725 (?). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Rarely do we find the specification with ἀρχῇ/τέλει after the month; no Arab-period examples are preserved for the Herakleopolite. In the Arsinoite, where the indiction starts in Epeiph, we find τέλει still for Payni ([CPR 24 33.](https://papyri.info/hgv/70351)3 [653]), [SPP 8 866](https://papyri.info/hgv/39479).4 (VII) and ἀρχῇ still for Epeiph ([SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).5 [648], [SB 1 4763](https://papyri.info/hgv/41335).3 (2nd half VII), [SPP 8 941](https://papyri.info/hgv/41289).2 [VII]) or Mesore ([P.Mich. 15 748](https://papyri.info/hgv/21398).2 [651] or even Thoth ([CPR 14 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/41090).7 [644?]. If, however, for some reason indiction starts would become unified in the Arab period, beginning in Pachon (like in the Thebaid and probably the delta), then [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811) would date to the year 716. ИГ-4812.3 dates to Pharmouthi and has no indication of τέλει, [SB 20 15092](https://papyri.info/hgv/39695).4 (2nd half VII), also from Leukogion, from Pachon has no ἀρχῇ which of course does not count for much. In Oxyrhynchos, however, we have the case of [P.Wisc. 1 11](https://papyri.info/hgv/38681).3-4 (646?): Ἐπεὶφ η ἰνδ(ικτί)ο(νος) τετάρτης̣ ἀ̣ρχ(ῇ) σὺν θ(εῷ) πέμπτης and [P.Mich. 15 748](https://papyri.info/hgv/21398).2 (651): Μεσορὴ κ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) θ, ἀρχ(ῇ) σὺν θ(εῷ) δεκάτης ἰ(νδικτίονος), which is interesting, as the indiction year only changes with Thoth, but there is not enough data to draw significant conclusions. In the Oxyrhynchite case it could also be an assimilation to the Arsinoite practice. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The online catalogue also notes that “C. Wehrli renvoie dans son catalogue à P.Gen. inv. 61, mais ce dernier manque dans la collection de Genève depuis 1987” – [this latter papyrus](https://archives.bge-geneve.ch/ark:/17786/vtab09a4b1b3089a8c9), however, seems to be [P.Gen. 4 198](https://papyri.info/hgv/129817) (P.Gen. inv. 150), of Arsinoite origin, dating 634. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. It is the arbitrators who issue and sign the document (ἐπιδέδωκα), cf. [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712) and [17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060). See appendix II for more detail on this papyrus. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See [Schiller 1968](https://papyri.info/biblio/47131). The papyrus is currently being reedited by T. S. Richter with a legal discussion by M. Wojtczak and J. Urbanik. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. On alternative dispute resolution, see in general [Steinwenter 1925](https://papyri.info/biblio/7767), [Modrzejewski 1952](https://papyri.info/biblio/40186), [Ziegler 1971](https://papyri.info/biblio/7792), [Gagos and van Minnen 1994](https://papyri.info/biblio/13571), [Urbanik 2007](https://papyri.info/biblio/76819), [Kreuzsaler 2010](https://papyri.info/biblio/79781) and [Wojtczak 2016.](https://papyri.info/biblio/96816) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059) (627/642), [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945) (643), [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366) (624), [SB 30 17412](https://papyri.info/hgv/133270) (596) are preserved in full. [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558) (mid VII) is almost complete. Fragmentary are [BGU 1 309](https://papyri.info/hgv/9045) (602), [BGU 21 2895](https://papyri.info/hgv/997966) (624), [BGU 21 2896r](https://papyri.info/hgv/997967) (659), [CPR 6 8](https://papyri.info/hgv/15775) (509?), [P.Lond. 2 456](https://papyri.info/hgv/37012) (2nd half VII), [P.Prag. 1 48](https://papyri.info/hgv/12773) (615), [SB 1 4847](https://papyri.info/hgv/33915) (VI-VII), see appendix II, [SB 1 5257](https://papyri.info/hgv/33984) (mid VII), [SB 1 5271](https://papyri.info/hgv/41364) (615), [SB 8 9775](https://papyri.info/hgv/41310) (649), [SB 24 15899](https://papyri.info/hgv/41363) (608) and a handful of Viennese inedita. From Oxyrhynchos is only [P.Iand. 3 41](https://papyri.info/hgv/35304) (VI). See appendix II for corrections to [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059), [SB 1 5257](https://papyri.info/hgv/33984) and [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Also probably [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934) (early VII) and P.Vindob. G 26321 (VI) as well as the Arsinoite *compromissum* in [Harrauer, Pintaudi 2021](https://papyri.info/biblio/96571): 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. [BGU 1 309](https://papyri.info/hgv/9045) (602), subjective; [BGU 1 315](https://papyri.info/hgv/41059) (642); [CPR 6 8](https://papyri.info/hgv/15775) (VI): τοῦτο τὸ κομπρόμισσον; [SB 1 5271](https://papyri.info/hgv/41364) (615), subjective; [SB 1 5681](https://papyri.info/hgv/41366) (624), [SB 14 12194](https://papyri.info/hgv/14558) (2nd half VII), [SB 24 15899](https://papyri.info/hgv/41363) (608) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [SPP 3 402](https://papyri.info/hgv/37704) (VI), [P.Rain. Cent. 121](https://papyri.info/hgv/15452) (719), [SPP 3 415 + P.Vindob. G 40284](https://papyri.info/hgv/39378) (720s) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. [SB 30 17412](https://papyri.info/hgv/133270) (596), [P.Prag. 1 48](https://papyri.info/hgv/12773) (615), [P.Prag. 1 49](https://papyri.info/hgv/40945) (643), [SB 8 9775](https://papyri.info/hgv/41310) (649). The above mentioned Heracleopolite document [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811) (717?) seems to be constructed the same way. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Naaraous, father of Pechysios in [P.Paramone 16](https://papyri.info/hgv/78712).3; father of Chonis in [CPR 6 7](https://papyri.info/hgv/35934).6 and [P.Paramone 17](https://papyri.info/hgv/37060).3; father of Maria and Georgios in [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474).1, 5, and son of Senouthios in in [P.Dubl. 24](https://papyri.info/hgv/37474).6; father of Makarios in [CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838).5. Naaraous in [P.Lond. 2 391](https://papyri.info/hgv/37003).1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12 and the deceased husband of Tamene in [P.Gen. 4 189](https://papyri.info/hgv/129811).3; Naaraous, son of Andreas as *hypgrapheus* in ИГ-4814.7, and father of two witnesses, l. 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. A potential variant of Ἀμβας ([TM Nam 41053](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/41053)) can be excluded. It is only recorded in [P.Ross. Georg. 3 32](https://papyri.info/hgv/40989).15, which clearly concerns the name Sambas. [SPP 3 314](https://papyri.info/hgv/35531).1 (VII, Hermopolis) probably has νοσοκ(ομίου) τοῦ ἁγίου Αββ̣̣̣[α Λ]εο̣ντίου and not Α̣μ̣β̣[α; [SB 18 13218](https://papyri.info/hgv/18408).13 (713, Aphrodito) Ἀμβᾶ Κουμνᾶ is the name Αμβακουμ, transliteration of biblical Habakuk ([TM Nam 8469](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/8469)). The name Ambas does not exist. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Perhaps Chonis ([TM Nam 12942](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/12942)), a name exclusively attested for this person, is a nick-name for Pachos ([TM Nam 4777](http://www.trismegistos.org/name/4777)), then the Naaraous Pachos, father of Maria could also be the same person. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. I would suggest that the Μακάρις υἱὸς Να̣α̣ράου Παψ̣[ίου mentioned in [CPR 7 44](https://papyri.info/hgv/34838).4-5 (?, V-VI) and later in the *hypographe* l. 20 referred to only as Makarios, son of Papsios, gives reason to assume a 7th century Herakleopolite provenance for this text which seems to be confirmed by paleography („Hand A”, see appendix II). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Another example where κτῆμα is used for a village which is otherwise referred to as κώμη (e.g. [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/37570)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/37570) [71](https://papyri.info/hgv/37570).2)is Arsinoite Tamauis in [P.Dubl. 1 26](https://papyri.info/hgv/37476).2. Interestingly, by an inhabitant of Onne, a neighbouring Herakleopolite village to Leukogion, who at the moment was residing at Tamauis, cf. appendix I. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Also, in [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).17–23 (648, Arsinoe) when Christodora asks to be represented: καὶ μὴ δυνηθεῖσα τὴν τοιαύτην δίκην ποιήσασθαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς παρακέκλη[κά] σε ἀπαλάσσειν τὸ ἐμὸ(ν) πρόσωπον καὶ **αἱρέσασθαι πρὸς αὐτ(οὺς) ἐπὶ τῶν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν αἱρεθησομέ(νων) δικαστῶν** καὶ κομπρόμισσα ἐκθέσθαι καὶ πρόστιμον ἐπὶ παραβασίᾳ. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The names κώμη and κτῆμα are used interchangeably, cf. above introduction. I exclude lists of toponyms, that is [SB 26 16442](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb%3B26%3B16442).11 (VI-VII) and [SPP 10 149](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/stud.pal%3B10%3B149).8 (VI). There is also a small sub-group of documents from the Heracleopolite village Onne, which seem connected. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. 1881, 1883 and 1896. But the Vienna inventory is not entirely reliable. The recorded provenance for **[SB 30 17667](https://papyri.info/hgv/140512)** as Hermopolisis clearly unlikely. An erroneous Hermopolite provenance for papyri from the First Fayum find in the Vienna collection is not uncommon, see e.g. [Morelli 2008](https://papyri.info/biblio/77329?q=liciniano): 142-144. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. The few catalogue entries seem to match the internal information: [SB 1 5259](https://papyri.info/hgv/38382) (P.Vindob. G 24442) “Ex 1881/4 Erster Faijûmer Fund” and [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548) [40](https://papyri.info/hgv/37548) (P.Vindob. G 11040) “Fayum ex 1883” come from the Fayum; [SPP 3](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635)[2](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635) [185](https://papyri.info/hgv/37635) (P.Vindob. G 11040) “Ahnas ex 1883” from Herakleopolis. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. This dossier of notarial or pseudo-notarial documents from the Herakleopolite countryside fits with other documents from similar localities, mostly from the 5th century, see note 1 above. “ [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Except the tentative connection that a Damianos from Leukogion appears in [SB 6 9262](https://papyri.info/hgv/38722).2 and in a witness subscription in **ИГ-4814**.8. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. A † means that the mentioned person was deceased. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The very few post-conquest Oxyrhynchite contracts also have a Latinate signature and show that there was no change in the decades after the conquest, like in the Arsinoite evidence; see [SB 6 8987](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/sb%3B6%3B8987) (644-645) [P.Wisc. 1. 11](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.wisc%3B1%3B11) (646/661/676), [PSI I 52](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/psi%3B1%3B52) (647), [PSI 10 1122](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/psi%3B10%3B1122) (651-652?), [P.Michael. 35](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.michael%3B%3B35) (652?), [P.Merton 2 98](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mert%3B2%3B98) (mid VII). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Here, ἀνδρός should probably be added as well, suggested by contemporary Arsinoite parallels ([P.Grenf. 2 85](https://papyri.info/hgv/41304).3-4 (536), [SPP 20 139](https://papyri.info/hgv/41001).3-4 (531), and [SB 24 15899](https://papyri.info/hgv/41363).10 (608). This addition would necessitate longer supplements in the surrounding lines – for example, in line 2, one might reconstruct [ταύτην τὴν παροῦσαν ἔγγραφον] ὁμολογίαν like in [CPR 19 50](https://papyri.info/hgv/50307).4-5 (VII) rather than τὴν [π]α̣ροῦσ̣α̣ν ἔγγραφον ὁμολογ[ίαν. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. The name of the *amphodon* Ψαππαλλίου – attested also in [BGU 1 305](https://papyri.info/hgv/41056).7, 12, 18 (556) and [CPR 14 11](https://papyri.info/hgv/41089).9-10 (578) – is more often written Ψανπαλλίου. However, an examination of all known attestations shows that the spelling ππ is consistent across all examples. See the [photo](https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010001372) of [SB 1 4903](https://papyri.info/hgv/41354).2 and the [photo](https://collections.louvre.fr/en/ark:/53355/cl010001378) of [SB 1 4899](https://papyri.info/hgv/13970).2 (ca. 630-645) and also [P.Muench. 3 100](https://papyri.info/hgv/41093).6 (574), [SB 26 16362](https://papyri.info/hgv/97359).24 (VI-VII), and [SPP 20 243](https://papyri.info/hgv/41011).9. The letter *ny*, often mistaken for *pi* and vice versa, cannot form a ligature with the following letter. The variant Ψανπαλλίου does not actually exist. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)