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H.I. Bell described *P.Lond. V 1876* as follows:

Inv. No. 1626 B. Acquired in 1906. Provenance unknown. 4 1/2 in. x 3 1/8 in. 5th (?) cent. In an upright cursive hand, along the fibers. Probably folded right to left. Fragment from the left side of a document of uncertain character, but probably a lease. One party was Φλ(αύλος) [sic] Ἀπι[, apparently a court official (l. 2, παλατίνου, perhaps but not necessarily miswritten for παλατίου); and γεουχοῦντι ἐν[αύλα in l. 2 recalls the Fl. Apion documents from Oxyrhynchus; but the hand suggests an earlier date than theirs, and in them ἐνταύθα is preceded by καί. Boundaries are specified. The name Ἀπα Νακίου occurs in the endorsement. 10 lines, small traces of an 11th, and endorsement, along the fibers (1).

With one exception (2) the papyrus seems to have been ignored until E.R. Hardy mentioned it in his *Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt*, suggesting in a footnote that it was "probably another lease addressed to Flavius Apphous as landowner and son of the late palatine Eulogius" (3). This proposition provided some certainty to Bell’s description; it gave *P.Lond. V 1876* an Oxyrhynchite provenance and a date at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century (4). Almost fifty years later, Hardy’s hypothesis was seconded by one of the present authors, who (from a photo of the papyrus) read lines 1 and 2 as follows:

---

(*) We express our gratitude to Herwig Maehler and Roger Bagnall, both of whom kindly reexamined the back of the papyrus on our behalf; and to the British Library, for permission to publish the text.

(1) *P.Lond. V*, p. 274.

(2) Bell’s remarks about παλατίνου/παλατίου were revised, cf. *BL I* 304: “παλατίνου ist die regelmäßige Form.”


He concluded, however, “In the end, one can suggest, but far from prove, the piece’s connection with the archive [of Eulogius and his descendants].” When they reexamined the Eulogius dossier in 1997, the present authors likewise expressed reservations about the identification of Apphous as the landowner (6), and they promised a complete edition and discussion of the text (7). Hence the present article.

To begin with, it is certain that *P.Lond. V* 1876 is from the Oxyrhynchite — the phrase ἐκοσισίως ἐπιδέχομαι κτλ. (l. 4) should remove any doubt — and that the text is a lease in the form of a ὑπόμνημα, specifically the lease of an artificially irrigated plot of land called a μηχανή (8). There is nothing about the hand that suggests a date other than the fifth (or early sixth) century (9).

(5) Keenan, “From the archive of Flavius Eulogius and his descendants,” *ZPE* 34 (1979) 133-34, n. 5, cf. *BL* VIII 194. παλατίνου should have been printed, and as the remainder of the note indicates, it would have been expected. For Keenan’s restorations in ll. 1-2, see the notes to these lines below.

(6) “More from the archive,” 210, n. 8.

(7) Originally intended for *P.Bingen*, but withheld by the authors from their contribution in deference to editor’s length limit.

(8) See n. to l. 6 below. μηχανή literally means “saqiya,” but synecdochic usage is well attested. Both usages are clearly illustrated in the Coptic vita of St. Matthew the Poor [ed. E. Amélineau, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne aux iv, v, vi, et vii siècles* (Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, vol. 4, fasc. 2), 718]:

> ἀσωπης δὲ ῶν οὐγροον ἐπε ὀψηρε ων μεθυ εγτοι επαυρμ νσα νετεννοονυ ἡπηναςτηριον ἡπεινατ απα μαθεος ἡ παλαβολος ει ἐπηρη [sic; read οἰε πωηρη] κογι επεινη ἐπημι αυμις δω μπουω δγω δηερε ὄγνοδ οννω ωςφε αφω ϊβο ανι πννηςε τηρη ετωορ τμ πνοι.

And it also happened one day that a small boy was up on a *mekhanē* [*i.e.*, *saqiya*] goading the animals [*i.e.*, the ones powering the *saqiya*] of the monastery of our father apa Matthew. The Devil made the little boy fall down into the *lakkos* [*the saqiya’s reservoir*]. He sank in the water, and when a long time had passed, the whole crowd that was in the *mekhanē* [*here clearly = “artificially irrigated parcel”*] cried out.

(9) Oxyrhynchite texts are uncommon in *P.Lond. V*. Organizing them by BM inventory number (as opposed to publication number) yields the following result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inv. no.</th>
<th><em>P.Lond. V</em></th>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1619 recto</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>probably Oxyrhynchite, cf. <em>BL</em> X 108</td>
<td>VI-VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite, cf. <em>BL</em> VIII 194</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problematic is the identity of the landowner, who is not surprisingly a member of the “Flaviate” (10). It is certain that his name begins with Απ-. Thereafter, decipherment becomes difficult: the seemingly hopeless bits of ink immediately following πι, faint traces — maybe — of a long descender, perhaps with a tail curling to the right, and perhaps crossed by a line that once joined the dot of ink above the γamma of γεουχοὐντι. Bell’s dotted iota must carry weight, but one wonders to what extent it was influenced by the two letters preceding it. Φλάουιος Απ- is of course suggestive — as it was for Bell — of the famous Flavii Apiones (11). His reservations about the hand of the London papyrus are justified with regard to the Apiones who are styled “II” and “III”; the writing likely should not be dated to the forties of the sixth century, the decade during

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inv. no.</th>
<th>P.Lond. V</th>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1624+1748C</td>
<td>1777+1895</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite</td>
<td>7.ix.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite</td>
<td>19.ix.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626A</td>
<td>1797 = P.Bingen 129</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite</td>
<td>probably 10 (?) July 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626B</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite</td>
<td>V-VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchite or Hermopolite</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have ignored the texts dating to the Islamic period, cf. BL X 107 on 1738 (the “linch-pin” text in this series): “Die Herkunft... ist nicht zwingend.”

With the exception of inv. nos. 1731 and 1759 — the former of uncertain provenance, the latter an “outlier” with respect to its date (and date of acquisition) — all of the Oxyrhynchite texts have an inventory no. between 1619 and 1626 and date between the fifth and seventh centuries. Inv. no. 1623 may well fit the pattern; the provenance of this text dated V-VI is unknown. Inv. no 1620, however, belongs to the archive of Dioskoros of Aphroditó and thus breaks a possible Oxyrhynchite run. That this arrangement was not imposed upon the papyri in London, but rather reflects a common origin (i.e., a single acquisition), seems likely, for the provenances of 1619 recto, 1621, 1622, and 1626B (the present text) were unknown at the time of publication.


which Apion II assumed control of the family’s Oxyrhynchite estate (12). Apion I, whom Bell likely had not encountered (13), cannot be ruled out on such grounds. There are reasons, however, to consider excluding him. For one, Apion has not yet been attested as a landowner in the Oxyrhynchite (14). Line two’s παλατίνωv is probably also an impediment. If the first Strategius was Apion’s father (15), then one must reckon with the fact that Strategius likely would not have been referred to as a palatinus (16). If παλατίνω should be read for παλατίνωv, then one must attempt to reconcile this with what is known about Apion’s career. At best, one can note that he was a praefectus praetorio Orientis vacans in 503 (17), a title earlier (in the fourth century, post 380) awarded to those completing service as one of the four palatine “ministers” (quaestor sacri palatii, magister officiorum, comes rei privatae, or comes sacrarum largitionum) (18).

What of Flavius Apphous, then? In contrast to our earlier qualms, we would suggest that he is the better fit, though not a perfect one. It is certainly conceivable that Bell’s iota — from the image, we presume that he only saw the end of the downstroke — was in fact part of a phi. This may leave a crossbar (cf. above) unexplained, or, at a minimum, the trace of ink above the gamma of γεουχούντι. We would prefer to see any crossbar — it may just be some darkened fibers — as a pious addition to the tail of a rho, but Απρ[ and Απ.ρ[ are unappealing. Harder to explain

(12) Cf. P.Oxy. LXIII 4397. Bell’s comments about και ἐνταύθα are applicable to these Apiones.
(13) Of the documentary texts referring to this Apion, only Stud. Pal. VIII 772 was published before P.Lond. V, and without any papyri to provide context, Bell would have had no reason to make the identification. Whether or not he accepted (or even knew of) Spöhrr’s suggestion (P.Land. III 48, p. 115; published in 1913) that the Egyptian Apion mentioned in literary sources like Procopius’ De bello persico (i.e., Apion I) was connected to the family appearing in the papyri is unknown.
(14) Cf. P.Oxy. LXVII 4614, n. 1. 2.
(15) N. Gonis, P.Oxy. LXVII 4614, n. 1. 2, raises the possibility that he was Apion’s father-in-law.
(16) He is only attested as a curator of imperial estates and an honorary comes sacri consistorii, and it is the latter title that he bears in a text (P.Heid. IV 331) just months before his decease. For the palatini, see R. Delmaire, Les institutions du Bas-Empire romain, de Constantin à Justinien, Paris 1995, esp. 122 and n. 7 (with refs. cited).
(18) Delmaire, Les institutions, 15. Note that Apion was PPO vacans quite early — he lived for at least another twenty-one years — and that his son Strategius, whose career is generally thought to be reflective of the family’s upward mobility, was comes sacrarum largitionum only at the end of his life.
is the ink above the gamma. It may be the beginning of a lambda, and Απο[λωτος (or the like) seems, in truth, to be an acceptable reading. But no such geouchountes are known to us from the Oxyrhynchite. Apphous, conversely, is attested as a landowner (only) in the Oxyrhynchite (19), and his father Eulogius is described as a palatinus in several papyri (20), which removes any need for thoughts of emending παλατίνων to παλατίνα (21). If indeed Apphous is the landowner, then P.Lond. V 1876 would be the first document that unambiguously concerns his agricultural (as opposed to urban) holdings (22). The eighth (fiscal) indiction mentioned in the text would refer to 499-500 or 514-15 (23), and the text presumably would have been drafted in the prior (chronological) indiction (498-499 or 513-514) (24). The restorations following assume that the document was in fact addressed to Apphous:

1 Φλ(αουι( ύ Απρ[ούτι τό λαμπροτάτω τριβούνω υιό τοῦ τῆς ἀρίστης μνήμης Εὐλογίου γεναμένου] παλατίνων γεουχουντί ἐν[ταθα τῇ λαμπρά καὶ λαμπροτάτη Ἤξυρυχιτῶν πόλει Ἀδρήλιος Ἅπανάκιος υίός] γεουμπονιού μητρός [ - - - ]

4 χαίρειν. ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους Ὀξυρυχνικήτω ἐρα - - - ὁγυδής ἰνδικτίνοις ἀ[πὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων - - -]

(19) He is simply described as γεουχουντί ἐνταθα; there is no καὶ present, cf. Hickey - Keenan, “More from the archive,” 210, n. 8.

(20) P.Oxy. XVI 1876.3, 1961.6, and SB XVI 12583.5, with the latter two texts dating to the period after his death. Grenfell, Hunt, and Bell (1876.3) classify him among the mittendariti — i.e., as an employee of the CSL or CRP — but he was in fact an agent in rebus, cf. P.Oxy. XVI 1960.4. In theory at least, Arcadia should not have been his province of origin or his domicile, cf. CTh 8.8.4.

(21) If Apphous were an imperial notary, cf. Hickey - Keenan, “More from the archive,” 209, n. 2, palatinus could be applied to him.

Sijpesteijn’s introduction to P.Mich. XV 731 suggests that the British Museum at one time possessed at least one other text from the dossier of Eulogius and his descendants. Traianos Gagos, however, informs us, “P.Mich. XV 731 (inv. #3303) comes from Lot III of the Nahman collection which was purchased by the University of Michigan in 1925. The purchase was through the famous ‘cartel’ and the papyri went originally to the British Museum where the papyri were checked and evaluated by H.I. Bell” (e-mail, 16 December 1996). In other words, P.Mich. XV 731 was never part of the British Museum collection.

(22) P.Oxy. XVI 1994, e.g., might be a land lease, although based upon the patterns in the dossier, we suggested (“More from the archive,” 212) that it was a lease of house property.

(23) Apphous first appears as a Flavius on 29.xi.495 (P.Oxy. XVI 1891) and is last attested on 17.viii.511 (P.Oxy. XVI 1960). For additional discussion, see n. 1. 10 below.

(24) See n. 1. 4 below.
αύτής έκ νότου ταύτης [----------------- μηχανήν ----------------]
εξηρτισμένην πάση [ξυλικῆ εξαρτία καὶ σιδηρώμασιν ---------------- καὶ]
8 φυτῶν παντοίων καὶ [παντὸς ἐτέρου δικαίου ---------------- ής?]
γίτονες νότου γῆδια τοῦ [----------------- τῆς περὶ-
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Back, running perpendicular to front side’s right edge and situated at bottom edge:

1. μισθ(ωσις) 'Απανακίου μηχ( ) κολ( ) α[  
2. Φλ, pap. 2 παλατινον' pap. 3 ψεναμο'νυνο' pap. 4 εκο'σιως pap. 5 ὁγδόνης: first o ex e? 6 α"της, νοτον', τα"της pap. 9 νοτον' pap.; l. γείτονες back μισθ0, μηθ, κολ' pap.

1 This was probably not the first line; one would expect a dating clause (consuls, month-day, indiction) to have preceded it; cf. Keenan, “From the archive,” 133-34, n. 5. The restoration is identical to that suggested by Keenan. If Apphous is the landowner, 'Απφο[δ] might also be read, cf. P.Oxy. XVI 1959.3. Φλασούν ο 'Απφο(δ) sic appears in P.Oxy. XVI 1891.2. ἀρίστης: μακαρίας also appears, e.g., in P.Oxy. XVI 1994.4. γεναμένου: Or γενομένου, cf. P.Oxy. XVI 1961.6. 2 ἕνταυθα is probable, though ἐν is attested, cf. P.Oxy. LXVII 4615.5. Up to πόλει, the restoration follows that of Keenan, “From the archive,” p. 134, n. 5. 'Απανάκιος: For the spelling, cf. P.Oxy. LV 3804, n. 1. 221, and refs. 3 Ψεναμούνιον: The name seems to have been rare in the Byzantine Oxyrhynchite, only appearing in P.Oxy. XVIII 2195.22. μητρός: After the name of the lessee’s mother, his profession likely appeared (on which cf. the note below concerning the back of papyrus), then his.origo. 4 Possible Oxyrhynchite eras for Apphous are: 175 = 144, 190 = 159. Note that, following standard Oxyrhynchite practice, these eras should correspond to the seventh (chronological) indiction; the eighth indiction in the following line is the fiscal one. For possible restorations following the era, see P.Oxy. LXVII 4615, l. 10 and notes. 5 ὁγδόνης: Probably preceded by τῆς σὺν Θεό, cf. P.Oxy. LXVII 4615, n. 1. 11. 6 αὐτῆς: Following it has a noun like κώμης been omitted? μηχανήν: δλόκληρον μηχανήν καλομεμένην X typically appears, cf. P.Berl. Zill. 7.12-13; P.Flor. III 325.10-11; P.Oxy. LVIII 3955.11-12, LXIII 4390.10; PSI I 77.14-15; P. bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 47.3 (Hickey, P.Anastasia, in preparation). 7 ἔξηρτομεμένην: Dependent upon μηχανήν in the preceding line. For the (probable) restorations following πάση, cf. P.Berl. Zill. 7.14; P.Flor. III 325.11; P.Oxy. LVIII 3955.12-13; PSI I 77.15-16; and P. bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 47.4 (P.Anastasia). P.Oxy. LXIII 4390.10 omits ξυλικῇ. 8 παντὸς ἔτερου δικτίου: For this restoration, cf. P.Berl. Zill. 7.16; P.Oxy. XVI 1683.3, LVIII 3955.14; and P. bibl. univ. Giss. inv. 47.3 (P.Anastasia). 9 For the “γείτονες clause” in leases, cf. P.Heid. V, n. ll. 16ff. In misthôseis from the late Oxyrhynchite, it only seems to appear in P.Oxy. VIII 1126.
(P.Erl. 75 is actually from the Hermopolite; it is being addressed by Hickey elsewhere.)

10 Ἰοάννου: Admittedly an Allerweltname, but peribleptos (spectabilis) suggests a count, specifically Apio Theodosius Iohannes vir sp(ectabilis) com(es) sacri consist(orii) et praesis provinc(iae) Arc(a)d(iae) [so P.Oxy. XVI 1877.11], on whom cf. now J. Banaji, Agrarian change in Late Antiquity: Gold, labour and aristocratic dominance, Oxford 2001, 134. For John’s “archive” — at best really only a dossier, and preferably to be separated into those texts concerning John and those concerning the counts Samouël and Phoibammon — see Montevecchi, Pap., p. 259, no. 78, adding P.Oxy. I 155 (so Banaji), P.Harr. I 91 (included by Rémondon, “L’Égypte,” 144, n. 4), and very probably PSI VIII 957 (cf. BL XI 248-49). Count John is last attested alive on 19.xi.503 (P.Oxy. I 141); if he is the John who is mentioned here as deceased, then P.Lond. V 1876 would have to have been created in 513-14, making it the latest attestation of Flavius Apphous.

Back We suggest that μηχ( ) be resolved μηχ(ανάριου) or, perhaps, μηχ(ουρ-γου). For such lessees, cf. P.Cair. Masp. I 67109 (Antaiopolite, 565) and PSI XII 1233 (Panopolite, 323 or 324), and note the individuals designated ὅρτοπάροχος ἀτρήφ μηχανάριος in P.Oxy. XIX 2241.12, 41. κρλ( ) : κρλ( ) seems less satisfactory palaeographically but might also be read. If it is correct, then one should probably read the end of this line as μηχ(ανής) καλ(ουμένης) 'Α[. α[: δ[πο?]

Addenda:

- For additional texts from the archive of Eulogius and his descendents, see now P.Oxy. LXVIII 4686, 4693-94.
- For P.Erl. 75 (n. l. 9 above), see now Archiv 49 (2003) 205.
- For Count John (n. l. 10 above), see now P.Oxy. LXVIII 4696, n. l. 4.