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FIRST MET JOHN OATES in the fall semester 1966 at Yale. I was a second-year graduate student, he a junior faculty member just back from a year in England during which his projects included what was to become his famous article “A Rhodian Auction Sale of a Slave Girl” (JEA 55 [1969] 191–210). From the ancient history seminar that he conducted that semester came the ideas that would later be developed in the dissertation I wrote under Bradford Welles’ direction. Unless I am mistaken, and through no merit of my own, but sheer good fortune, I own the distinction of being one of John Oates’ first students and one of Bradford Welles’ last. I was much too green to contribute to the Festschrift in Welles’ honor (Am.Stud.Pap. 1 [1966]), but time passing has made me seasoned enough to contribute to this special GRBS issue for John.

It also happened that during his year in England, John had read and reviewed Horst Braunert’s Die Binnenwanderung: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemaër- und Kaiserzeit.1 His enthusiasm for Braunert’s book carried over into conversation and obviously made quite an impression on me. Braunert’s concern was the internal migration of people in Egypt as evidenced mainly by the papyri. Massive as the book is, Die Binnenwanderung treats the Byzantine period only relatively briefly toward its conclusion (pp.293–338). So it was that some

1 Bonn.Hist.Forsch. 26 (Bonn 1964). The review, with apposite sympathetic comments on the difficulty of writing history from the papyri, will be found in BibO 23 (1966) 263–265.
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years later, in the mid-1970s, I gathered evidence meant to flesh out Braunert’s treatment of the Byzantine period. This was deployed in a manuscript “On Egyptian Society in Late Antiquity,” completed in 1978 and earmarked for inclusion in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.

That piece to some extent was a coda to my 1975 article “On Law and Society in Late Roman Egypt” (ZPE 17 [1975] 237–250), continuing the theme that society was more mobile in the Egypt of the papyri than the empire of the law codes seemed to allow. It was never published but did generate some spin-offs. The first part of what later became “Papyrology and Byzantine Historiography” was expropriated, sometimes verbatim, from the ANRW manuscript, as was the framework for some additional remarks on the names Flavius and Aurelius.\(^2\) Not in the manuscript but a beneficiary of the collection of data used in its composition was the essay “On Village and Polis in Byzantine Egypt.”\(^3\) But the material on “die Binnenwanderung,” which I also collected and wrote up as a major part of the ANRW manuscript, remained unpublished. That is what I wish to present here, now extensively revised and somewhat corrected and expanded.

Some observations on terminology

As can be gathered from Braunert’s pages on the subject, the Byzantine-period papyri are especially amenable to the subject at hand because there had developed over time a variety of formulaic expressions to indicate that an individual was residing in a place other than his place of origin.\(^4\) This was so


\(^4\)E.g., in SB I 5941, 6000; ArchPF 2 [1903] 183 = SB XVIII 13170; and see infra. The following expands on Braunert’s discussion of the subject; see, more generally, Ramsay MacMullen, “Roman Bureaucratese,” Traditio 18 (1962)
much ingrained in the system that on occasion the formulas were used to stress that places of residence and origin were in fact the same. Although the usage sometimes influenced more casual writings, it is most frequently to be found in contractual and other formal documents. In these, for example, an individual’s place of origin was often marked by the phrase ὀρμωμένος (μὲν) ἀπὸ + place-name, or, shorthandedly, simply by ἀπὸ + place-name. The expressions for current residence (often τὸ or τὰ νῦν ἐνταῦθα) were more varied. Some of the terms—διάγον, καταμένων, καταγινόμενος—have been assumed to have been equivalent in sense and therefore interchangeable, but, generally speaking, the situation may be more complicated than this assumption allows. Presumably (for example), notions about residence were expressed more explicitly by the participle οἰκῶν or even more verbosely by such expressions as τὸ ἐφέστιον/τῆς οἰκῆς ἐξο/ποιομένος.

Perhaps implied by such terms are extended periods of residence, possibly (this is just a guess) confirmed by leaseholds


5 P.Cair.Masp. III 67305.6, ὀρμωμένῳ καὶ σύτῳ ἀπὸ X; P.Mich. XI 607.8, ἔξω ἥς καὶ ὀρμωμένος.

6 Presumably τὸ νῦν is to be read also in P.Ant. II 104.3 instead of τον... ἐνταῦθα.

7 So P.Hamb. I 23.9f. note, but for complications concerning διάγον see what follows. καταγινόμενος, which will not be discussed specifically in this section, although it will figure from time to time below, seems to have had a usage more restricted in scope than other terms, with special currency in third- and fourth-century Oxyrhynchus: P.Oxy. VIII 1121.4, 1133.4, 6; XXII 2347.4; XLIII 3122.6, 3126.1.2, ii.5, 3146.5; vide contra XLIII 3144.3 (καταμένον, apparently for καταμένων). For a man who was καταμένων in Oxyrhynchus, but whose place of origin is not indicated, see P.Oxy. LVII 3914 (A.D. 519); likewise, for someone καταμένων in Antinoopolis, whose place of origin is unstated but who was “Hebrew by ἑθνος,” see P.Ross.Georg. III 38 (570).

8 E.g., BGU II 401.9, III 941.4–5, 943.4; P.Cair.Masp. II 67155.9; SB I 4504.12–13, 5174.2.

or purchases of residential property whose documentation is now lost. Less explicit is the term ἐφεστός (P.Hamb. I 23.10), but more descriptive are terms like ἐμπορευόμενος, “travelling (and residing as a merchant) in” (SB VI 9283), and χρηματιζόμενος, “conducting business” (P.Oxy. XVI 1880.5–7, cf. LXIII 4942.9–11, restored); while αὐλιζόμενος (P.Lond. V 1724.[1], 73), literally “lying in the courtyard,” by extension, “bivouacking” or “spending the night,” used of a monk away from his place of origin, strikes a rather colorful note. The monk in question, John alias Kattas, was “dwelling (aulizomenos) in the monastery of Pampane, but at present found in Syene.” Finally, ownership of property in places other than one’s place of origin might be indicated by the perfect participle κεκτημένος (P.Berl.Zill. 6.9).

The various terms just discussed seem, then, to convey the fact that the parties in question were away from their places of origin for extended periods of time, or had vested interests away from home. Less permanent ties would seem to be marked by words like παρών (SB I 5681.20, VI 8787.6) or εἰρεθείς. The latter word was in the sixth century used of witnesses to documents drawn up at Antinoopolis (P.Cair.Masp. II 67161.17 [a merchant from Lykopolis], P.Lond. V 1716.15 [a rhetor (?) from Panopolis]), at Syene (P.Monac. I 11.80 [the defensor of Apollonopolis Magna], 13.80 [a soldier of the numerus of Philai]), and at Memnonia of the Hermontite nome (P.Herm. 10).

10 The text is dated to 542. The crucial locus is lines 8–9. The merchant’s place of origin is not given, only that he “is now doing business here in the Arsinoite.” The text later (13–14) seems to allude to tow, pulse, and bundles of something, but it is unclear whether these were the commercial products in which he dealt.

11 Translation excerpted from Bezalel Porten, J. Joel Farber, et al., Pap.Eleph. Eng. D32, pp.480, 483. For the verb αὐλιζομαι, see also SB I 1572.10, 1579.6, inscribed armbands citing Psalm 90, thereby reinforcing the religious connotations of the word, cf. P.Athen.Xyla 11.1 and note, SB XIV 11494.8–9 (partly restored).

12 See also P.Cair.Masp. III 67295.1.1: κεκτημ(ένου) ἐν Φενεβώθει; cf. 67297.3.
31.29–30 [a priest from a monastery of the Lykopolite nome]).

Apparently those witnesses, not residents of the aforementioned cities, happened to be present: they were sought out and “found”—κατὰ τύχην, “by chance,” in P.Monac. I 13—to witness the transactions in question. The word εὑρέθεις is also used of the monk (see above) who was a party to P.Lond. V 1724 and, again, of four villagers from Aphroditto who witnessed the dispute settlement, P.Vat.Aphrod. 10 + P.Mich.inv. 6922. In the latter instance, the presence of the villagers in Antinoopolis can hardly have been due to chance, for the arbitration concerns a dispute among fellow-villagers, one of whom happens to be residing (διάγων) in Antinoopolis, and the property at issue is an estate or vineyard back in Aphroditto. A reviewer’s suggestion that the “complainant” in the arbitration was the resident in Antinoopolis and that it was this that influenced the choice of venue seems to hit the mark. It is hard to resist imagining that in this case the “finding” of so many Aphroditans in Antinoopolis all on one day must have been arranged in advance.

But as if matters needed further complication: εὑρέθεις is also found in BGU XII 2200.3–5 of 561 in combination with διάγων. Here the terms are applied to one Aurelius Ρσα[s], “originating (ὁρμώμενος μέν) from the village of Thynis of the Hermopolite nome, but now found and residing here (τὸ νῦν δὲ εὑρέθεις καὶ διάγων ἐνταῦθα) in the said (city) of Hermopolites for the sake of making this contract (τῆς ποιήσεως ἐνεκα τούτης τῆς ὁμολογίας)—explicitly indicating a short-term migration from home.

13See also the very fragmentary P.Cair.Masp. II 67263: a witness from Antinoopolis is “found” in A[ntinoopolis].
16The contract is unfortunately much damaged and incomplete. Psas had apparently fallen on hard times; he entrusts a female dependent to the care of a
Perhaps analogous circumstances account for the use of διάγυν as applied to merchants (πραγματευταί) from Lykopolis (see below) temporarily residing in Antinoopolis (P.Cair.Masp. II 67161.5, 18, 19). The word is also in a famous document (P.Cair.Masp. II 67126.5) used of two villagers originating from Aphroditus in the Thebaid who in 541 were residing (διάγυντες) in Constantinople, “the royal and all-blessèd city.” They there took out a loan from a banker named Flavius Anastasius, perhaps to cover their cost of living while away from home on matters of importance before the imperial court.17 Again, διάγυν is used of two men who in 583 had come from Syene to Antinoopolis to seek arbitration in a legal dispute (P.Monac. I 7 + P.Lond. V 1860.15)18 concerning the share of a house back home and half-share of a boat. And it is applied to one of the Aphroditans who was party to the settlement P.Vat.Aphrod. 10 + P.Mich.inv. 6922 mentioned above. The editors there take διάγυν to denote “an extended stay in another city just short of a permanent change of residence.”19 Just how “extended” such a stay could be remains to be seen. Probably the two best test cases are to be found later in this paper: Flavius Dioscorus of Aphroditus, who spent from four to seven years as a notary διάγυν in Antinoopolis, and Aurelius Pachumius, a purple-seller from Panopolis, who set up shop and spent so many years in This of the Thinite nome that is hard not to think of him as having permanently changed his residence.

Dioscorus and Pachumius notwithstanding, it seems, then, at least to be generally true that one who was διάγυν was a de facto

---

17 The text is discussed as “A Constantinople Loan, A.D. 541,” BASP 29 (1992) 175–182.
temporary resident away from home, one who had (perhaps) not put down more permanent roots by (say) renting or buying an apartment or house-property, one who expected to return home as soon as his business or legal transactions were concluded, even if this took a long time. Perhaps such a person intended to stay away longer than a person who was simply “present,” παρών. But that word, too, like διάγων, is used of litigants away from home (SB VI 8987.6, 8).

Finally, διάγων also appears in two especially interesting examples. In the first, it is used in combination with παραμένων (P.Cair.Masp. III 67305): a certain Aurelius Senouthes, son of Makarios and Maria, originating (ὄρμωμενος) from Antaiopolis is said in 568 to be διάγων [δὲ] τὰ νῦν ἐνταύθα καὶ παραμένων in Antinoopolis. The word παραμένων perhaps suggests that Senouthes was bound in service, παραμονή (in which case he would be obligated to a “chartularius of the auspicious praetorians of the ducal officium”), and this is what explains his absence from his home in Antaiopolis and his presently “residing,” διάγων, in Antinoopolis. As described, he has taken under his care and tutelage by this unusual document (one that would, like so many other Cairo Maspero papyri, well repay further study) a stepson, son of his own second wife, as if he were his own legitimate child. But what is of interest for immediate purposes is that, although the arrangements in this document operate at a higher social level, the collocation of the participles διάγων and παραμένων calls to mind the formulaic παραμένειν καὶ διάγειν clause that is standard in guarantees issued for coloni adscripticii on the Apion estates in Oxyrhynchus from the late fifth through the early seventh centuries. In these, it is guaranteed that these farmers will unceasingly “remain (in

20 As implied in PSI I 76, where a wealthy female plaintiff from Oxyrhynchus seems to have spent considerable time, and money (she refers at line 8 to ἐντετέλεξα ... ἐπανήμετα), in Alexandria. See James G. Keenan, “The Case of Flavia Christodote: Observations on PSI I 76,” ZPE 29 (1978) 191–209.
service) and reside in” such-and-such a place (a specified rural estate or hamlet).²¹

The second especially interesting example of the use of διάγων is presented by *P.Ant.* I 42, a sale with deferred delivery dated to 542. The buyer is Aurelius Josephius, “Jewish by religion,” from the village Lenaioi of the Antinoite nome. The men engaged to supply the wine for which they have been paid are two farmers ὅρμωμένοις (l. ὅρμωμενοι) ἀπὸ κώμης Ληναίου τοῦ Ἀντινοίτου νομοῦ, τὰ νῦν διάγωντος (l. διάγωντες) ἐνταῦθα ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης. The editor offers no comment despite the apparent anomaly of two men “now residing” in the village from which they “originated”: had they in the meantime resided elsewhere? Here and throughout, as can be glimpsed in the extract above, the document shows, for one professionally drafted, a high degree of error in grammatical detail. We are left to wonder whether the notary, here in a larger error, misapplied the formula, or entered the wrong village (and perhaps nome) name as place of origin for the two payees.

From these and other examples it would seem that, as warranted, Byzantine Egyptian notaries in drafting contracts and other documents would regularly distinguish an individual’s place of origin from his place of residence, whether long- or short-term. Unusual in this regard are two examples where all three elements—place of origin, place of long-term residence, place of short-term stay—come into play. Both are very late documents. In one of these, *SB* I 5681, dating to 623 (*BL* IX 244), a man named Phoibammon was from “this city of Arsinoites” (ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς Ἀρσινοίτων πόλεως), but for some time (ἐκ πολλὰ ὀδό) had been making his residence in the Herakleopolite village Peensamoi (τὴν οἰκησιν π[ο]ιούμενος ἐν

²¹ A leading example (often reprinted) is *P.Oxy.* I 135 (line 16), but there are many more, *e.g.*, *SB* XII 10944.14, XVI 12484.13.
he was now again present (παρόντος [I. παρόν] νῦν ἐνταῦθα) in the Arsinoite as party to a legal settlement (compromissum). In the other example, SB VI 8987 (A.D. 644/5), two women are “from” (ἀπό) one place (its name survives only in part), “but are now residing” (τὰ νῦν δὲ οἰκοῦσαι) in the village of Pinechis of the Herakleopolite nome; they are “present” (παρούσαι) in Oxyrhynchus on matters of legal concern, including the sale of a symposion and other house property (under prior mortgage) located in Apollonopolis Magna. Although the document in question post-dates the Arab conquest, it is one in a series of documents, SB VI 8986–8988 and the Budge Coptic papyrus, concerned with legal disputes dating back to 622. Of interest in both documents are the use of simple ἀπό to designate origo, the use of terms implying “housing” to indicate place of long-term residence, and the use of παρόν rather than, as so often in the examples above, διάγων to express temporary presence in connection with matters of legal concern.

Some results

(a) Antinoopolis. Terminology like that just discussed contributes to our knowledge of internal migration in Byzantine Egypt. Blending this with other evidence leads to a number of results. First, as Braunert noted, evidence for long-distance migration is limited. Most evidence concerns connections between nearby


23 Falivene 180 for the village of Pinechis (referred to only here) and for a brief summary of details of the case; in extenso, A. A. Schiller, “The Budge Papyrus of Columbia University,” JARCE 7 (1968) 79–118.

24 SB VIII 9763 (A.D. 457) provides further variety. One of the witnesses to an arbitration drawn up in Hermopolis indites after his name: ἀπὸ Ἀντινῶν καταμένον ἐν Ἑρμοῦπολεὶ παρῆμην καὶ μαρτυρῶ τῇ διαλύσει (59). Among other matters, his endorsement raises the question of the distinction added by παρῆμην (a reasonably frequent occurrence) to the majority of witness clauses that simply have μαρτυρῶ. Note, however, that in the same text a witness from Hermopolis itself (line 58) also uses παρῆμην.
places, within nomes or between adjacent nomes. It should come then as no surprise that the papyri evidence considerable connectedness between the cities of Antinoopolis, lying on the east bank of the Nile, and Hermopolis Magna, opposite on the west bank. The latter, besides being a considerable city in its own right, was agriculturally important, there being a relatively wide swath (eight to nine miles) between its Nile bank and the desert. Its land was a convenient and attractive object of investment for well-to-do Antinoopolites. Antinoopolis, founded by Hadrian in 130, had early on become a commercial and cultural center. Now, in the Byzantine period, it became an important administrative center, not just a nome capital, but capital for all of the Thebaid, both under its civil governor (praeses) and under its duke. The two cities were in fact so close to one another that they are sometimes found mentioned virtually in the same breath; and travellers from outside the region, if visiting one of the two cities, were sometimes likely to pay their respects to the other (P.Cair.Masp. I 67068.10–11; P.Ant. III 192.13, alluding to Antinoopolis and a three-month stay in Hermopolis; cf. P.Rein. I 56.21–22).25

But for more permanent ties, for the fourth century there is, thanks largely to well-known land registers, evidence that people from Antinoopolis owned a considerable, though hardly a dominant share of land in the Hermopolite.26 Scattered fourth-century papyri lend support to the tendencies evident in the land lists. In P.Ant. II 89, for example, in the early fourth century, an Antinoopolite councillor (bouleutæ w) owned land in the Hermopolite near the village of Pois that he leased out to


two villagers, one from the Antinoopolite village of Pesla, the other from the Hermopolite village of Alabastrine. Later evidence will be found in PSI XIII 1341 (fifth century), which has two Antinoopolites as landowners near the Hermopolite village Kleopatra. Another document, SPP XX 121 (A.D. 439; Bagnall/Worp, Chronological Systems 117) from Hermopolis, alludes to a γεωργίαν καλούμενον τοῦ Ἀντινοῦ, “a farm called the Antinoite’s” (16). Still later are some Cairo Maspero papyri from Dioscorus’s years in Antinoopolis: P.Cair.Masp. III 67312 of 567 (the will of Flavius Theodorus, exceptor on the ducal officium of the Thebaid; he owned land in at least three territories: Hermopolite, Antinoopolite, Panopolite); II 67169 bis of 569 (an Antinoopolite buys land near the Hermopolite village Magdola Mire); and II 67151 of 570 (the will of Flavius Phoibammon, chief doctor of Antinoopolis: he owned vineyards near the Hermopolite village Ibion Sesumbothis).

From the very end of the period under discussion, we are fortunate in having a document which, though different in character, matches in extent and importance the fourth-century land registers mentioned above: P.Sorb. II 69, published by Jean Gascou with extensive introduction and commentary, records payments in kind made in the seventh century by individuals and by institutions based on landholdings in the Hermopolite nome. As had been the case centuries earlier, a good number of landowners were from Antinoopolis, and many of these were provincial staff officials, “surtout des bureaucrats de rangs moyen ou subalterne,” based in and presumably residing in Antinoopolis.

28 For this village: Drew-Bear 141–143.
29 For the two Hermopolite villages, see Drew-Bear 160–163, 127–128, respectively. Ibion Sesumbothis had especially close ties with the Antinoite nome.
30 Un codex fiscal hermopolite (Am.Stud.Pap. 32 [1994]).
31 Gascou p.61. See Index II (pp.277–279) “Topographie” and Index IV (280–282) “Agents administratifs” etc., especially (but not exclusively) s.vv.
The pattern of staff officials from Antinoopolis owning land in the Hermopolite is to at least a small extent balanced by evidence for Hermopolites who for convenience’ sake took up residence in Antinoopolis while serving in the provincial bureaux of the Thebaid. A noteworthy example is Flavius Isidorus, a late-fourth-century officialis, then beneficiarius, then ex-beneficiarius, whose “archive” is preserved in the Leipzig papyri (P.Lips. 17, 20–23, 33–37, 45–56, 58–64). In later times (P.Berl. Zill. 6, Justinian’s reign), we find Flavius John, a scriiniarius of the ducal officium of the Lower Thebaid, originating (ὅρμωνένφ) from Hermopolis, purchasing house property in Antinoopolis; his ownership of other property in the capital city had apparently been long-standing (κεκτημένφ πρό πολλόν). His residence in Antinoopolis must have lasted at least as long as his service on the ducal officium.

In addition to provincial staff officials, we find in evidence overwhelmingly belonging to the sixth century that artisans and merchants and farmers from Hermopolis and its villages sometimes took up temporary or even more permanent residence in Antinoopolis so as to carry on their trades or business activities: for example, date- (P.Cair.Masp. II 67155 [date lost], reading doubtful) and vegetable-selling (II 67164 [569]); or they took up residence there for reasons that are not revealed (SB VIII 9763 [457/474], P.Cair.Masp. II 67165 [date lost], P.Strasb. V 317 [529]).

32 For this phenomenon, for both the Thebaid and Arcadia (see below), see Braunert 304–305, 326–327, though he mistakenly places the capital of Arcadia at Herakleopolis rather than Oxyrhynchus.
33 Cf. (perhaps) SB V 8029, with discussion below, a singularis. For another officer on the ducal officium originating from elsewhere (place-name lost), but διάγων in Antinoopolis, see P.Cair.Masp. II 67167.1–4 (Maspero’s readings and restorations here are uncharacteristically suspect).
34 In the last-cited reference, Aurelius Apollon, a farmer from Toou Neaniskon (Drew-Bear 306–307), borrows money from an Antinoopolite. In 3–4, for ″... ✶✶✶✶✶... οὐ...,” perhaps read in some form, and with appropriate signs of doubt, κτετε[μένον].
drawn up in 538, is a sworn guarantee made out by Aurelius Andronikos, a “slow writer” from Hermopolis now residing (διάγων) in Antinoopolis, an estate steward (προνοητής) by occupation. He avers to Aurelius Phoibammon, an assistant (βοηθός) from Hermopolis, himself also residing in Antinoopolis, that he will for a given number of months (number lost) oversee estates supervised by Phoibammon, apparently in service to a landlord named Dioscorides, a singularis on the ducal officium. The location of the estates is not given; farmers and vinedressers are mentioned. In a document of 569 (P.Hamb. I 23) Aurelius Phib and Aurelius Jeremias, vinedressers (ἀμπελοφυγοί) originating from the village Ibion Sesumbothis of the Hermopolite nome, undertake to lease a walled vineyard and assorted other property, including a house and epaulis, owned by an exceptor of the ducal officium, Flavius Philippus, and located in or near Antinoopolis (text damaged at line 21). It seems they mean to live there for the lease’s five-year term. A fragmentary sixth-century document (P.Ant. II 104) presents a farmer from the epoikion Perseon of the village Tertompsake (Drew-Bear 287–288) of the Hermopolite nome dwelling (διάγωντος) in Antinoopolis and borrowing money from a scholasticus fori of the Thebaid. From the very end of our period, in the seventh century, comes from Hermopolis the intriguing Graz papyrus, a model or formulary for a lease of land with many points of interest. The lessor is named (or perhaps given a typical name of) Flavius John, a singularis of the Thebaid’s civil (ἡγεμονική), rather than its ducal, officium (τάξις). The lessee, Aurelius So-and-So (in the dative case), son of So-and-So, is

38 Published by U. Wilcken in ArchPF 2 (1903) 183–184 [SB XVIII 13170]; additional discussion: Keenan (supra n.2) 249–250. Wilcken had assigned the text, on palaeographical grounds and because there is an Arabic protocol on the back of the Greek text, to the post-Arab conquest period, though still within the seventh century. The Greek text, however, suggests to me that, even if late, it belongs still to the pre-conquest Byzantine period.
portrayed as a farmer originating from Such-and-Such a village of the Hermopolite nome, τὰ νῦν δὲ διάγραμτι ἐντοῦθα ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντινοείων πόλεως. The location of the land is not specified: the text simply stops at the crucial locus. Nevertheless, the preponderance of the documentation might suggest that the land was located (notionally at least) near a Hermopolite village, this despite the farmer’s stated current residence in Antinoopolis.

Besides drawing new residents from Hermopolis and its territorial villages, Antinoopolis was a magnet for migrants from other places as well. In the sixth century, they came from Lykopolis to the south (P.Cair.Masp. II 67161 [A.D. 566], 67163 [570], perhaps III 67309 [569]; P.Lond. V 1707 [566]), from Antaiopolis and its villages (P.Cair.Masp. I 67155 [date lost], III 67305 [568]), and from Panopolis (P.Coll.Youtie II 92 [569], P.Lond. V 1716 [570?]). Much earlier (P.Ryl. IV 662 [364]), a woman from the Arsinoite nome (to the north) was living in Antinoopolis, where she was co-depository in a deposit of 11,600 silver talents. The depositor was an Antinoopolite, and so also was the other depository; all three were women. The reasons for movement from these places to Antinoopolis parallel those already mentioned for movement from Hermopolis. Some men in the sixth century came to serve on the provincial (in this case, ducal) officium. These certainly included the scriniarius Flavius Helladius, who originated from Panopolis (P.Coll.Youtie II 92 [569]),36 and possibly Flavius John, an assistant accountant (βοηθός λογιστηρίου), who originated from [Lyko]polis (restored), but had for a long time (πρὸ πολλοῦ) been residing (καταμένον) in Antinoopolis (P.Cair. Masp. III 67309 [569]). Others, like the pragmateutēs Flavius

36Cf. P.Cair.Masp. II 67167. The reading of the first four lines is suspect, but we can at least be sure that one of the parties to the contract served on the ducal officium, that he originated from elsewhere but was now residing (διάγραμτι) in Antinoopolis.
Konon (*P.Cair.Masp. II* 67161, *P.Lond. V* 1707 [both 566]), evidently came to Antinoopolis to engage in business generally, or to pursue specific activities like embroidering or wine-selling (*P.Cair.Masp. II* 67163 [570]).

Of the documents cited in the preceding paragraph, *P.Cair. Masp. II* 67161 may be the most interesting for the subject at hand. By this contract, dated to 566 and drafted in Antinoopolis, power of attorney is conferred upon Flavius Dioscorus of Aphrodito, the well-known poet and notary, by Aurelia Athanasia, with her husband Flavius Konon, *pragmateutês*, acting as her adviser. Athanasia and Konon are both from Lykopolis, but διώροιτες for the time being in Antinoopolis. There are three witnesses to the document, all *pragmateutai*. One is from Lykopolis, but “found” in Antinoopolis. The other two do not state their places of origin, but they are both διώροιτες in Antinoopolis. Likewise of special interest is *P.Cair.Masp. II* 67164 of 569, also drawn up in Antinoopolis: Aurelius Kolouthos, a greengrocer (λαχανοπώλης) from Hermopolis, takes out a loan from a pork-butcher (χοιρομάγειρος) also named Aurelius Kolouthos, who originates from Antinoopolis. The loan-contract is drafted in epistolary form in the first person. The debtor assures his creditor that he will stay in Antinoopolis, “doing business” (πραγματευόμενος) and “selling (literally “pitching”) vegetables” (λαχανοπροβάλλων) until his debt of nine and a half keratia is paid off. Of course, we must not forget that these two documents, along with many others from Antinoopolis dating between 566 and 570 (e.g., all but one of those cited in the preceding paragraph), owe their distant preservation to Flavius Dioscorus, who himself pursued a legal or bureaucratic career in Antinoopolis, having emigrated from his native village Aphrodito of the Antaiopolite nome. Thus, as

37 In *P.Cair.Masp. II* 67163 the word for embroiderer (ποικιλτής, 7) is well preserved, that for wine-dealer (οίνοσφράτης, 10) is much damaged.
a party to rather than notary of *P.Cair.Masp.* II 67161, cited above, Dioscorus is identified as originating (ὁρμωμένω) from the village Aphrodito of the Antaiopolite nome, but now residing (διαγωντι) in Antinoopolis.

(b) Oxyrhynchus. It should come as no surprise that the role played by Antinoopolis for the Thebaid, and particularly for the Lower Thebaid, was similarly played for the province of Arcadia by Oxyrhynchus, following the province’s establishment toward the end of the fourth century. As with Antinoopolis and the Thebaid, some residents of Byzantine Oxyrhynchus were provincial staff officers from outside Oxyrhynchus who had come there to serve on the staff of the *praeses*. They are sometimes evidenced as leasing rooms and house property in Oxyrhynchus, probably to be used as residences during their terms of service away from their places of origin. In 476 (*P.Oxy.* XVI 1958) Flavius Paulus, a *cursor* (his place of origin is unfortunately not given), took in lease house property in the Pammene’s Garden district “near the gate” (προς τη πόλη) from the *palatinus* Flavius Eulogius. In 502 (*P.Oxy.* L 3600) Flavius Timotheus, an *officialis* originating from the Herakleopolite village Koba (τω νυν διαγων επι της Ὁξυρυχιτοων πόλεως), took in lease a *symposion* “in the quarter of the lane of Aollus’ guesthouse” from an Oxyrhynchite named Aurelius Komes. In 553 (*P.Oxy.* XVI 1965) Flavius Gerontius, a *taxugrâfow* (*exceptor*) originating from the city of Arsinoites, took in lease one third of

---


40 For Koba and its close links to the Oxyrhynchite see Falivene 104–105. By this time the *symposion* was no longer a specialty room for dining and entertainment, but a suite of rooms for private living. See Richard Alston, *The City in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (London/New York 2002) 83–85; cf. *P.Harr.* II 238 introduction.
a house in the Bronze Door district. In 588 (P.Oxy. LVIII 3934) a cursor named Theodorus, from Oxyrhynchus itself, apparently also took Oxyrhynchus house property under lease (see editor’s introduction).

Like Theodorus, other Arcadian staff officials were from Oxyrhynchus (P.Berl.Zill. 7 [A.D. 574], tachygraphos; P.Oxy. VII 1042 [578], subadiuva) and owned their own house property there. In one instance, however (P.Oxy. XVI 1964 [518], title lost), the staff officer owned house property in Oxyrhynchus (he was διόγων there), but originated from the Oxyrhynchite village Spania. Still others are known to have come from the Herakleopolite nome (P.Oxy. L 3600 [502], title left in blank, village Koba, vide supra; cf. perhaps SPP XX 117 [411], beneficiarius) and especially from the Arsinoite nome (BGU I 306 [566], proximus; P.Oxy. XVI 1965 [553], tachygraphos; SB VI 9152 [492], sitoupoios, 9592 [581], title lost). Finally, civil servants originating from and resident in Oxyrhynchus might own property outside the nome, as indicated by the case of Flavius Philoxenos (P.Berl.Zill. 7), “ταχυγράφος of the praesidial officium of this province of Arcadians,” who in 574 leased out farmland that he owned lying north of the village of Ko of the Herakleopolite nome, a village that “gravitated towards the Oxyrhynchite nome.”

Oxyrhynchus also drew new residents from other levels of society. From the Small Oasis, very early on in our period (P.Oxy. VIII 1121 [295]) came a woman named Aurelia Tectosis; she had come to live (καταγένοντης, 4) in Oxyrhynchus, apparently to tend to her dying mother. Living in Oxyrhynchus in 318 (SB X 10728) was an honorably discharged veteran from the village of Taleei of the Apollonopolite nome of the Lower Thebaid (Apollonopolis Parva). From “Ammon’s Oasis” came (P.Oxy. XLIII 3126.i) one Aurelius Kastor (κατα-

---

γινομένου); in 328 he bought a quarter share of a house in the Temple of Hermes district, so we must assume his intentions to stay in Oxyrhynchus were long-term. An Antinoopolite ship owner and captain in 362 (P.Oxy. XXII 2347) resided not in the city of Oxyrhynchus but in the Oxyrhynchite village Pesla; his profession required regular travel to Alexandria and to other points unnamed. In 396 (P.Oxy. VIII 1133) a fruit-seller (ὀπωροπώλης) from the Arsinoite nome was dwelling (καταγινόμενον) in Oxyrhynchus and there purchasing fruit from a gardener (πωμαρίτης) from Herakleopolis; the gardener had himself also shifted residence and was now dwelling (καταγινόμενος) in the epoikion Nesos Limenios. In the next century, in 462 (PSI III 175), Aurelius Martyrius from Hermopolis took in lease a symposion in the district of the Temple of Thoeris; since he describes himself as a servant (ὑπηρέτης) of the inn (ἀπαντητήριον) of Oxyrhynchus, his ties to Oxyrhynchus may well have been permanent. Six years later (P.Wisc. I 10 = Pap.Lugd.Bat. XVI 10; BL VI 70 [468]), from the Theodosiopolite (i.e., Arsinoite) village Kerke there came to dwell (καταμελόντι, 6) in Oxyrhynchus a monk named Aurelius Papnouthios; he lends money to an Oxyrhynchus greengrocer.

Just as merchants (πραγματευται) came to Antinoopolis, so they also came to Oxyrhynchus, even from the great city of Alexandria (P.Oxy. XVI 1880–1881 [both 427]; LXIII 4392 [479]). At the same time, as evidenced in leases of house property, new residents came to Oxyrhynchus from various villages. In 499, for example (P.Oxy. XVI 1959), Aurelius John from the Oxyrhynchite village Senkomis took in lease an epaulis and the dwelling places (οἰκήματα) within it “in the vicinity of the bakery” (πλησίων τοῦ ἀρτοκοπίου). In 487 (P.Oxy. XVI 42

\[\text{Cf. P.Lond. V 1676 (sixth century): an ex-defensor of Antaiopolis who became a monk, leaving his son in the care of his (the son’s) maternal uncle and no doubt shifting his own residence, perhaps to Aphroditus; SB I 5174 (512): the monk Eulogius has changed monastic dwellings as a result of his shift from Melitian to orthodox confession.} \]
Aurelia Martyria, from the village Ibichis of the Herakleopolite nome, took in lease from the well-known brothers Martyrius and Apphous house property in the Pammenes’ Garden district. In 518 (P.Oxy. XVI 1964) a villager from Spania took in lease house property, again in the Pammenes’ Garden district, owned by a provincial staff officer.

In this connection, it is worth mentioning the rather vigorous relations and exchanges among the towns and islands of Upper Egypt near the First Cataract—Ombi, Syene, Elephantine, Philai—that can be traced thanks to the papyri of the late sixth-/early seventh-century archive of Flavius Paternuthis (P.Lond. V 1722–1737, P.Monac. I). Most evidenced movement is local in character, but in 586 the defensor of Apollonopolis Magna was “found” to be visiting Syene. He witnesses a deed of sale (P. Monac. I 11). Similarly close connections may be seen between the neighboring Oxyrhynchite and Kynopolite nomes (P.Oxy. XLVIII 3423.12 and note), whose capitals lay at about the same latitude, the one on the Bahr Yusuf, the other on the Nile.

(c) Other places. Residence changes involving places other than those already discussed may be conveniently deployed in chronological order running from the very beginning of the traditional papyrological Byzantine period right down to its end. In 291, we find (P.Oxy. XVII 2136) a man named Aurelius Nemesas from the Lower Kynopolite who is kataméνων, appar-

---

43 P.Oxy. XVI 1961 is the only mention of this Herakleopolite village. Falivene 86–87 misreads the text as described by Grenfell and Hunt. It is the lessee who is from Ibichis. The property belongs to Eulogius’s sons, Martyrius and Apphous.

44 It is unfortunate that this and other documents in the lease series, P.Oxy. XVI 1957–1968, frequently cited in this and the preceding paragraph, appear only in descriptions at the back of the volume. Though perhaps individually negligible, together they present many details of interest. (For 1962 and 1963, see the articles cited supra n.39; 1962 now = SB XVI 12583; 1964: N. Gonis, ZPE 132 [2000] 189–192.)


ently in the Arsinoite metropolis, Ptolemais Euergetis, “near the Akantheion.” In Ptolemais Euergetis, in a sale-under-lease, he conveys ownership of his Greek boat of 400-artaba capacity to two men from the Oxyrhynchite. Since he is illiterate, his assent to the contract is supplied by an ex-gymnasiarch from Leontopolis in the Delta. At around the same time, or perhaps a bit later, a man from Diospolis, perhaps a watchman (ed. note to line 4), was καταμένων in the necropolis Apteos (P.Grenf. II 72). The year 302 (P.Corn. 20) saw Aurelius Alexander, a former councillor and prytanis of Thmouis in the Delta, now to be active in the Arsinoite nome in an official capacity as “measurer” (ἀναμετρητής) of the 4th–5th toparchy of the Herakleides meris. Toward the middle of the fourth century the Arsinoite proved a place of refuge for a fugitive barber from Lykopolis (P.Abinn. 42), while early in the fifth century Aurelius Senouthes, an oarsman (ἐρήτης) of the gubernatorial boat of the praeses of the Thebaid is said to be from Hermopolis but καταμένων in Panopolis (P.Grenf. II 80 [402], 81 [403]). In the early sixth century, Flavius Varius, Count of the Devoted Domestics, originated from Memphis, but had important landholdings (he is styled γεουχὼν), though he need not have resided, in the Arsinoite nome (P.Ross.Georg. III 32 [504]). To the village of Aphrodito of the Antaiopolite nome there came in the sixth century monks originating from villages of the Hermopolite and Oxyrhynchite nomes (P.Cair.Masp. I 67096 [573/4], lines 10–14, 23–26; BL I 107) and hired farmers from the villages Arabon of the Panopolite nome (P.Cair.Masp. I 67095 [548]) and Tanyathi of the Lesser Apollonopolite nome (P.Cair. Masp. III 67303 [553]). Contrariwise, in the first part of the seventh century (P.Mich. XIII 665 = SB XVIII 13320 [613/641]) an Aphroditan

47In P.Grenf. II 81(a), also dated to 403, but later in the same year, Senouthes is simply stated to be “from Hermopolis” (4), and in 82 (date lost) he is called a “Hermopolite” (7). There is no mention in either of Panopolis; perhaps he had returned home some time after 26 May (Payni 1) 403: P.Grenf. II 81.1–3.
wine dealer (οἰνοπρ(άτης), 87), who had taken up residence in Panopolis, sold off house property he owned back in his native village where he still had relatives (his brother’s children). In the late sixth and early seventh century, a long-term change of residence was effected by Aurelius Pachumius (SB I 4503–4505), a purple-seller (πορφυροπόλης) who moved from Panopolis and set up business and home (οἶκοντι) about sixteen miles south (as the crow flies) at This in the Thinite nome (SB I 4504.10–13 [613]). There, as recorded succinctly in a Coptic document of the early seventh century (CPR IV 23 [610]), as “Pachom son of Psate, the dye-seller and citizen of Schmin [Panopolis],” now living “in Tin in the district of Psoi,” he married off his daughter (curiously unnamed) to an inhabitant of Tin named Dioscorus son of Arsenius.48 In 623, a certain Aurelius Phoibammon son of Phib, perhaps (the document’s heading is much scrambled) a dyer (βαφεύς), was from “the city of Arsinoites,” but a long-time resident of the village Peensamoi of the Herakleopolite nome (SB I 5681.10–20; vide supra). Finally, not strictly relevant to Egypt, but hard to resist mentioning, are two soldiers originating (ὁρμομενοι) from the village Nessana in the Negev Desert of southern Palestine who had come to live in the city of Rhinocolura on the Mediterranean coast between Egypt and Palestine (P.Ness. 15 [512]). More apropos is the Egyptian girl, recently orphaned, who in the fourth century (P.Bour. 25 = Sel.Pap. I 165) writes from (probably) Syrian Apamea to her maternal aunt in Koptos.

As apparently in the last-mentioned reference, personal circumstances may well have occasioned any number of residence changes. For example, changes of residence for at least

---

48 Translation in Jane Rowlandson, ed., *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1998) 213–214 (no. 157). The CPR text is closely associated with P.Schøyen ms. 1980 whose publication is being prepared by Sarah Clackson. Dr Clackson has identified a dozen documents as belonging to Pachom/Pachumius’s bilingual dossier, the earliest dating to 592, the latest to 616.
one of two partners are sometimes either implicitly or explicitly at issue in marriages (and divorces) between men and women from different nomes. Examples are provided by *P.Herm*. 31 and *P.Cair.Masp. II* 67155, both sixth-century documents (specific dates have not survived). *P.Herm*. 31, a deed of friendly settlement (*dialysis*) concerning a paternal inheritance, is issued by David son of Pisraelios in favor of two step-brothers and four step-sisters. Pisraelios was from Memnonia of the Hermouthite nome; David’s mother Maria was from “the mountain at Skinopeus of the Lykopolite nome.” Rachel, the mother of the step-brothers and step-sisters, was, however, like her husband Pisraelios, from Memnonia. The text does not indicate which of Pisraelios’s two marriages was first, the relatively unproductive marriage to Maria or the very fruitful one to Rachel. In *P.Cair.Masp. II* 67151, a deed of divorce, both partners were living in Antinoopolis, the husband καταμένων δὲ πρὸ πολλοῦ (5), the wife οἴκοισα (9). This perhaps implies (how else explain the difference in wording?) that the husband had taken up residence in Antinoopolis well before his wife, who may have moved there only upon her marriage. The husband originated from the Hermopolite village Isidoros, the wife from the Antaiopolite village Mounkrechis. Lastly, in the very fragmentary marriage contract published as *P.Cair.Masp. III* 67340, probably drafted in Antinoopolis, the bride agrees to accompany the groom (18–19) anywhere he wants in the province (ἐπαρχία, scil. the Thebaid), or to Alexandria.

(d) Intra-nome migration. In addition to evidence for residence changes across nomes, the papyri provide testimony for movement within nomes, whether from village to city, from city to village, or between villages.

Village-to-city movement. In the early fourth century a woman from Theadelphia named Aurelia Artemis in successive years

49 Drew-Bear 134.
purchased two different houses in the nome metropolis, Ptolemais Euergetis, one formerly a fuller’s shop in the Dionysiou Topoi district, the other in the Thebans’ district (P.Sakaon 59 [305] and 60 [306])—though it is not certain whether she intended to live in either. At the time of the sales, she is described as being “from (ἀπό) Theadelphia,” but her ancestral village, based on petitions to the prefect dating to the 280s (P.Sakaon 36–37), was the Arsinoite village Thraso. In 339 (SB XII 10980) a man from the Panopolite village Psonis took in lease for three years house property (a symposion and an exhedra) located in Panopolis. In the next century, a woman from the Oxyrhynchite village Alkonis engaged herself in a service contract (παραμονή, P.Köln II 102 [418]) to a resident of the nome metropolis. The sixth century provides an example of a villager from Thynis of the Hermopolite nome residing in Hermopolis (BGU XII 2200 [561]): ἐξελέγχομαι μὲν ... τὸ νῦν εὑρεθεὶς καὶ διάγων ἐνταῦθα κτλ. In another sixth-century document (P.Strasb. I 40 [569]), we find an agreement made out between two villagers originating from the village of Thmounkrektis50 of the Antinoite nome, now living in Antinoopolis (see esp. lines 9–12, 16–18), one of them a landlord (κτήτωρ) who had been in Antinoopolis for some time (καταμένων δὲ πρὸ πολλοῦ). There is also the case of the priest of the Catholic Church of Oxyrhynchus who originated from an (apparently) Oxyrhynchite epiokion (PSI III 216 [534]). In references already provided, as indicated by their status as lessees of house property, in 499 (P.Oxy. XVI 1959) a villager from Senkomis came to live in Oxyrhynchus, as in 518 (P.Oxy. XVI 1964) did a man from Spania who is described as διαγων in Oxyrhynchus.

City-to-village movement. This seems the least common movement of all. Nevertheless, in 349 (P.Würz. 16) a deacon from the Arsinoite metropolis was residing (καταμένων) in the Arsinoite

50 Drew-Bear 114–115.
village Kerkesephis; he gives surety for a priest from the village Tristomos. In 388 (P.Lips. 22) a man from Hermopolis was residing (κατεμένον) in the Hermopolite village Timonthis. Much later, in 618 (BGU II 401), a fruit gardener (πομαρίτης) from the Arsinoite metropolis was found to be dwelling (οἰκῶν) in an Arsinoite hamlet (ἐποίκιον Κενταύρου). Later still (CPR XIV 17 [652?]), a courier (σύμμαχος) from the Arsinoite metropolis was dwelling (οἰκῶν) in another Arsinoite hamlet (ἐποίκιον Κρούστου).

Village-to-village movement. Recall Aurelia Artemis, mentioned above, who had moved from Thraso to Theadelphia in the Arsinoite before (perhaps) settling in the Arsinoite metropolis. In 318 (P.Sakaon 39) two thieves of goats pasturing “on the plain of Berenikis-on-the- Shore” in the Arsinoite nome are each identified as dwelling (οἰκόντα bis, 11–14) in the epoikion Dionysiou, but one of the two was originally from another epoikion (Myron’s) and only dwelling in the epoikion Dionysiou “as an alien” (ός [= ός] ἕνον, 13). In 322 (P.Oxy. XLIII 3122) we meet three villagers, two of whom were from the village Posompous of the fifth pagus of the Oxyrhynchite nome; the third was merely residing (κατηγεινόμενος) there. In 342 (SPP XX 90) a man from the village Kaminou was “settling” (κατοικῶν) in the (presumably Arsinoite) village of Karanis; he borrows money from a councillor of Herakleopolis. In 470 (P.Herm. 61) two brothers from the Hermopolite village Ophis (BL V 46) were residing (διάγοντες) in Telbonthis of the same nome.51 And in 565 (P.Cair.Masp. I 67110) Aurelius Psais, a potter from one Antaiopolite village (village name damaged; it begins Pte-) was now dwelling ([τ]ῶ ν[ῶ]ν οἰκ[ῶν], 7) in and renting part of a pottery near the Antaiopolite village Aphrodito. This arrangement was to last for the full natural life of the lessee (14–15,

51 Drew-Bear 187, 272–274, respectively for these two villages.
19–20), so the potter’s move to Aphrodito must be deemed as intentionally permanent.

Conclusions

Overall, the evidence presented immediately above and throughout this paper is far less for village-to-village movement than for movement in and out of cities. This may simply be a function of the chances of the finds. Some time ago (supra n.3) I briefly explored some of the implications of the short-term movement of people between villages and cities. What has been presented here about longer-term changes of residence, though almost entirely anecdotal, should add to scholarly impressions of social mobility in Byzantine Egypt. When most of this material was first gathered for publication, over twenty-five years ago, such results might have occasioned surprise. But now that Egypt before the Arab conquest has in the generation just past come to be viewed by scholars in a more favorable light, this evidence merely enhances the impression of a society more open and fluid than used to be thought. It turns out that “die Binnenwanderung” in Byzantine Egypt was not just for “wandering poets” and the educated elite. For the papyrus evidence, despite instances to the contrary, shows in movement people of varied and often quite ordinary circumstances: mid- and low-level provincial staff officers, curiales, merchants, estate overseers, assorted villagers of unknown occupation, ship’s captains, inn servants, potters, greengrocers, dyers, embroiderers, purple-sellers, wine-dealers, oarsmen, fruit gar-

52 In brief, with relevant bibliography in the notes: Raffaella Cribiore, Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt (Princeton 2001) 242–243.

53 E.g., sureties like P.Cair.Masp. III 67296 (535), in which guarantees are given to the riparius (local police officer) that two honey-makers (μελισσουργοί), father and son, will remain in the village of Aphroditus, and P.Strasb. I 46–51 [566], binding sausage-makers (ισκευρωμοί) for one-year terms to the market in Antinoopolis. But it seems the circumstances in these and in many other such guarantees were extraordinary.
deners, fruit-sellers, goat thieves, monks, veterans, priests, deacons, vinedressers, farmers, brides who upon marriage moved to their husbands’ places of residence, a woman tending to her dying mother. All these people can be taken to represent “the average man,” who was not after all, as formerly maintained, “fixed for life in the station to which he was born,” at least in terms of local mobility. For even if the average man was legally fixed (debatable in itself), he somehow managed to exercise freedom of action within the spaces of the normative system that bound him.  
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