

The Appointment of Temple Personnel in the Second Century A.D.: P.Col.Inv. 438

In a letter to the strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, the writer--probably an epistrategos--permits him to take a certain course of action, on the basis of a ruling issued by the prefect of Egypt, pertaining to the appointment of additional pastophoroi in charge of the security at an unidentified temple. This short document provides the name of a hitherto unknown strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome and sheds some light on the control exercised by various levels of provincial and local administration over the appointment of temple personnel. It also gives some valuable information about the financial support of pastophoroi.

I. Text

The papyrus is 10.9 by 12.4 cm, the top margin 1.4 cm, the left margin 1.5 cm, and the bottom blank space 6.8 cm. The text, all written in the same hand, fills only approximately one third of the available space. Damage to the beginning of the second line and the end of the fourth line makes their reading difficult and uncertain. The ink is pale. The back of the papyrus is blank.

Στατίλλιος Μάξιμος Ἐθηνοδώρωι στρα(τηγῶ)

Ἐξυρυγ(είτου) χαίρειν·

εἰ δ[...], γράφεις ἐκ συγχωρήσεως τοῦ κρατίστου ἡγεμόνου

4 τοῖς παραφυλάσσουσι τὸ ἱερόν, ἄλλοι γὰρ παστοφόροι προσκατα-
σταθῆμαί δύνανται καὶ οὔτι οὐμοίως τοῖς [...]ουσι τὸ φύλακτρον
λαμβάνειν. ἐρρωσθαί σε εὐχομ(αι) (ἔτους) κ // Ἀδριανοῦ κδ.

1 Στατίλιος 2 συγχωρήσεως 4 φύλακτρον 5 εὐχομ(αι)

Statilius Maximus to Athenodorus, strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. If you write (?) on the basis of the permission given by his Excellency the prefect to those in charge of the security of the temple, another 3 pastophoroi can be appointed and these, like those

who are now - - -, are entitled to receive (a share of) the police-tax. I pray for your good health. Year 20, Hadrianos 24.

1 About Statilius Maximus and Athenodorus and their respective functions, cf. historical commentary, below.

2 Because of the lacuna, which can accommodate one or two letters, the reading of the beginning of the sentence is problematic. εἰ δ[ἐ] γράφεις would be very odd, unless we follow R.S. Bagnall's suggestion that our document is a copied excerpt--which would explain why it is all written in one hand--and that δέ reflects an abridgement. εἰ δ[ια]γράφεις is a possibility, but the verb διαγράφω, in the sense of "I draw a list, I enroll, I levy," is not used in the papyri except in the Ptolemaic period, and then only in a transitive way, cf. *P.Rev.* col. xiii, lines 1-4 (III B.C.).

συγχώρησις is usually found in the expression κατὰ τὴν συγχώρησιον, and is rarely introduced by ἐκ in the papyri. The only parallel known to me is *P.Oxy.* L 3567 (252): ἐκ συγχωρήσεως τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης. The verb συγχωρέω is used with the prefect as subject in *P.Giss.* 41 (ca 120).

3 About the people in charge of the παραφυλακή of the temple, cf. historical commentary, below. The verb παραφυλάττειν is relatively rare in documents of the Roman period, cf. *P.Petaus* 53 (184/5); *BGU* II 388 (II/III); *P.Oxy.* XXII 2341 (208); and *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3354 (257). It becomes more common in the Byzantine period, cf. *P.Cair.Isid.* 1 (297) and *P.Lond.* IV and V, indexes. Grammatically, the dative τοῖς παραφυλάσσουσι could in theory be the indirect object either of [?]γράφεις or of προσκατασταθῆναι, although in the latter case the order of the words would be strange and the first verb would lack an object. The dative can also be understood as representing the addressees/recipients of the prefectural συγχώρησις.

3-4 προσκαθίσταμαι is very rare in documentary papyri, the only other instances known to me being *P.Petr.* II 4.2 (p.7, 255-4 B.C.) and *P.Fam.Tebt.* 15 (114-115), quoting (lines 98-115) a letter from the prefect to a strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome in 83 regarding the appointment of a βιβλιοφύλαξ through a procedure very similar to that described in our document. The meaning of the verb καθίσταμαι is "I am appointed to a certain position" and corresponds to the technical Latin word *praeponor*, the past participle of which is used as a noun in both military and civilian contexts to describe an agent entrusted with a specific

mission (*praepositus*). The *πρός* stresses that these three are additional appointments.

4 The lacuna is wide enough to call for the restoration of two or three letters. Some conservation work showed that the traces of ink on both edges could be part of a *ν*. One should read *ν[Ϝ]ν* or *ξν*- which would fit both the general meaning of the text and the traces of ink seen under the microscope. *Παροῦσι* or *λερεῦσι* are in my judgment less likely.

5 *ἐρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι*: according to J. Hengstl *et al.*, *Griechische Papyri aus Ägypten* (Munich 1978) 32, this form replaced the older form *ἔρρωσο* at the end of the first century A.D. Cf. H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki 1956) 151-54.

The numeral after the sign for *ἔτους* could be either *κ* or, less likely, *β*.

The name of the emperor is omitted. The editors of *P.Oxy.* IV 712 comment that "the occurrence of two dashes after the number of the regnal year and the omission of the Emperor's name point to a date in Commodus' reign, when both these practices became common." They acknowledge, however, the difficulty of such a late date, since the document contains a reference to a debt contracted in 146/47. In fact, omission of the reigning ruler's name is attested sporadically in the first century and a half of the empire, cf. *P.Oxy.* II 296 (under Gaius, Claudius, or Nero?); *BGU XV* 2465 (108); *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2754 (111); *BGU XI* 2094 (131). The practice seems to have been appropriate in tax receipts (*BGU XI* 2107; 2109; 2110; *BGU XIII* 2288, etc.; cf. R. Bogaert, *Cd'E* 55 [1980] 284-305) and in letters sent by higher officials to their subordinates (*BGU XV* 2465, 108: order from the prefect to a strategos of the Diopolite nome to pay the salary of a royal scribe; *P.Oxy.* XXXVI 2754, 111: prefectural edict concerning legal procedure; *P.Oxy.* VII 1032, 162: endorsement of a petition by the epistrategos; *P.Oxy.* XVIII 2182, 166: letter from a strategos to a royal scribe and acting strategos concerning requisitioned donkeys and drivers; *P.Oxy.* III 474, 184: letter from a high official [epistrategos, *idios logos*, or dioiketes] to the strategoi and royal scribes of several nomes). By the last third of the second century, regnal formulas without the Emperor's name become common in all kinds of public and private documents (cf. *P.Oxy.* VI 905, 170; *P.Oxy.* XLVII 3339, 191; *P.Oxy.* VI 899, 200; *P.Oxy.* X 1302, 208).

The reference to the honorific month named after the emperor Hadrian (= Choiak) was in use from the 130s (after Hadrian's visit to Egypt in 130) throughout the second century and even later. Cf. J. Day, in *P.Col.* V, pp. 74-75; J.D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Roman Egypt* (Papyrologia Coloniensia 6, Cologne 1982) 194; J. Bingen, "I.Th.Sy. 12 (SB I 1525), Antinoüs et l'épistratège Gallus Marianus," in R. De Smet *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Varia Bruxellensia* II (Leuven 1990) 5-12, esp. 9-10; against K. Scott, "Greek and Roman Honorific Months," *YCS* 2 (1932) 201-78, esp. 261-63, whose evidence is weak, if not utterly mistaken.

II. Historical Commentary

1. The date of the document

The interpretation of this papyrus rests on its dating, explicitly, though ambiguously, ascribed (line 5) to what I read as the 20th--or, less likely, 2nd--year of an unnamed emperor, on the 24th day of the month named after Hadrian. The omitted reigning emperor could be Hadrian or any of his second-century successors. As noted above, the peculiarity of the regnal formula cannot be taken as evidence for a late second century date. Since the honorific month Hadrianos provides a *terminus post quem* in 130, we have to choose between the following dates: December 135, 138, 156, 161, 179, 193, and 211. A palaeographical evaluation points toward an early second century date, but does not permit a decision between a date in the 130s and 156.¹ To choose between these possibilities it is necessary to rely on internal evidence, namely the identification of both sender and addressee, which in turn depends on what one is to make of the nature of the business dealt with in this letter.

We know of several second-century personages named Statilius Maximus (*PIR* III, pp. 260-262, nos. 599-604). The omission of his *praenomen* by the writer of our document adds to the uncertainty concerning his identity. Among those who can plausibly be identified with our Statilius Maximus, two persons deserve careful attention. First, a Theban inscription set up by one Timotheus, an inhabitant of the village of Pserkis, records one Maximus Statilius in the capacity of *idios*

¹Prof. S.A. Stephens kindly informed me that she would favor an early second century date, on palaeographical grounds only.

logos in the early second century.² The fact that *nomen* and *cognomen* are inverted in the only (epigraphical) source where the title is recorded is irrelevant, as the phenomenon is not uncommon in inscriptions.³ This inscription has been dated to the reign of Trajan on the basis of the identification of one of the persons mentioned in it--together with Maximus Statilius and Julia Pa[siclei]a--as C. Iulius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, king of Commagene, consul in 109, whose sepulchral monument was erected in Athens between 114 and 116. Though plausible, this identification is not cogent. Besides, it does not follow that the inscription was set up shortly after Philopappus' death, or that the three people mentioned by Timotheus were connected with one another, or even contemporaries. If the *idios logos* Maximus Statilius was in charge some time after the death of Philopappus, he could possibly be identified with T. Statilius Maximus Severus who reportedly listened to the Colossus of Memnon on Feb. 18, 136.⁴ As the *idios logos* Claudius Iulianus is known to have been in charge from November 21, 135 until at least 137,⁵ P.Col.inv. 438 cannot be dated in December 135 on the basis of the identification of its sender with the homonymous *idios logos*. In addition, the date of 135 would be inconsistent with the addressee of P.Col.inv. 438, since we know that from March 134 until January 138 the position of strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome was occupied by one Apolinarius.

We cannot dismiss the possibility that Statilius Maximus succeeded Claudius Iulianus in the position of *idios logos*, being in charge in the second year of the reign of Antoninus Pius. If the writer of P.Col.inv. 438

²OGIS 408 = IGRR I 1226: Τιμόθεος Ψερκιοκωμήτης | ἐμνήσθη ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ Φιλοπάππου | τοῦ [βασιλέ]ως καὶ Μαξίμου | Στατίλιου ἰδιολόγου τῶν | λογωτάτων καὶ φιλάτων | καὶ Ἰουλίας Πα[σικλεί]ας For the date, cf. S. Follet, *Athènes au IIe et IIIe siècle. Etudes chronologiques et prosopographiques* (Paris 1976) 32, note 6; 56-57; and 59. A. Stein, *RE* 27.2 (1929) col. 2192, no. 22 dates his tenure of office to the time of Trajan or Hadrian; P.R. Swarney, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos* (Am.Stud.Pap. 8, Toronto 1970) 126 indicates only an early second-century date.

³Cf. J.E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy*² (London 1927) 213, with examples of inversion *cognomen-nomen* in both literary and epigraphical sources. The same inversion (Maximus Statilius) is attested in an undated Latin inscription from the colossus of Memnon, cf. *I.Memnon* 54 = *CIL* III 47.

⁴*CIL* III 46 and 47 = *I.Memnon* 48 and 54-55. Cf. A. and E. Bernand, *Les inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon* (IFAO 31, 1960) 127 and 137-39; and *PIR* III, p. 261, no. 603.

⁵P.R. Swarney (above, n. 2) 127-128, with reference to *M.Chr.* 372, col. vi (Nov. 21, 135), and *Stud.Pal.* XXII 184 = *SB* XVI 12685 (Aug. 6, 137).

is to be identified with T. Statilius Maximus Severus, it is not clear why or in what capacity he would have been in Egypt almost three years before entering office. In addition, if P.Col.inv. 438 were to be dated in Dec. 138, the strategos Athenodorus should be squeezed between Apolinarius and Petronius Dionysius (attested in January 139), which is theoretically possible, but unlikely.⁶ Consequently, the hypothesis that our document was issued by an *idios logos* in 138, though at first sight an attractive possibility, should be abandoned.

A more likely candidate is C. Statilius Maximus, attested as epistrategos of the Heptanomia in several papyri and inscriptions. His tenure lies in the second part of the 150's.⁷ In this position he succeeded [?]ius Parmenio, last attested in Aug./Sept. 154 (*P.Oxy.* VI 899), and preceded Vedius Faustus, first attested in a document dated after 157/8 (*Stud.Pal.* XX 9) and, at the latest, on Dec. 24, 161 (*PSI* X 1100). As there was no fixed term of service for epistrategoi, there is no way to tell when C. Statilius Maximus entered into office, but J.D. Thomas points out that no epistrategos is known to have been in office for more than two years and eight months, and that C. Statilius Maximus has the second longest recorded tenure (two years, seven months), after M. Herennius Philotas (attested from July 148 to March 151).⁸ This leads one to think that C. Statilius Maximus' *epistrategia* probably started in the summer 156 and ended in the spring or summer 159.

If we accept the identification of the sender of P.Col.inv. 438 as the well-known epistrategos of the 150's, our document is to be dated to Dec.

⁶About Apolinarius and Petronius Dionysius, cf. G. Bastianini-J.E.G. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt. Chronological List and Index* (Papyrologica Florentina 15, Florence 1987) (hereafter B-W, *Str.R.Scr.*) 91-92. A short tenure is attested, for instance, in the case of Iunius Hestiaeus, who was strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome in 88/89 for less than a year (after Nov. 5, 88 and before Oct. 31, 89), cf. B.-W., *Str.R.Scr.* 89. Cf. J.E.G. Whitehorne, "The Role of the Strategia in Administrative Continuity in Roman Egypt," in *Proc. XVIth Int. Congr. of Papyr.* (Am.Stud.Pap. 23, Chico 1981) 419-28, esp. 423, note 11 and 424, where the author sees a connection between short tenures in the office of strategos and changes of prefect. Such would not be the case in 138, since the prefect Avidius Heliodorus is known to have been in charge from the summer or fall of 137 until 142, cf. G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 288.

⁷*BGU* I 340 (after 148/9); *P.Stras.* V 302 (after 154/5); *P.Würzb.* 9.66-71 = *W.Chr.* 26 (Aug. 24, 156); *P.Oxy.* III 487 (Dec. 14, 156); *P.Laur.* III 63 (March/April 159); *BGU* II 462 = *W.Chr.* 376 (reign of Antoninus Pius); *P.Oxy.* XVII 2118 (undated); and possibly *I.Memnon* 54 and 55 (both undated); cf. A. Stein, *RE* 27.2 (1929) cols. 2192-93, no. 23; *PIR* III, 260, no. 600; and J.D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Roman Egypt* (Papyrologia Coloniensia 6, Cologne 1982) 188.

⁸J.D. Thomas (above, n. 7) 55, note 40.

20, 156. It is remarkable that one of the documents addressed to him, dated less than a week before P.Col.inv. 438, was written by an inhabitant of Oxyrhynchus, which provides some evidence for a recent passage of the epistrategos in the town.⁹ The identification of our Statilius Maximus with the epistrategos is further strengthened by some similarity of style between our document and the letter addressed to the strategos of the Thinite nome and quoted in *P.Würzb.* 9 (= *W.Chr.* 26, dated Aug. 24, 156). In this document the writer likewise omitted his *praenomen* and title in the greeting (line 66: Στατεῖλιος Μάξιμος 'Ορεῖωνι στρατηγῷ Θεωεῖτου χαίρειν (...)).

How does this hypothesis fit with the evidence concerning the addressee? Athenodorus appears here for the first time, at least in the function of strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, in which he was possibly the successor of Aelius Aphrodisius (attested from Dec. 27, 148 to March 7, 154) and the predecessor of Phokion (first attested in Jan./Feb. 159).¹⁰ Our Athenodorus is perhaps the same man as Valerius Athenodorus, the royal scribe (?) who wrote *P.Oxy.* IV 800 in late 154.¹¹ If this identification is correct, it provides an altogether rare instance of a progression from royal scribe to strategos.¹² According to current lists of strategoi,¹³ there is room for the *strategia* of Athenodorus between

⁹*P.Oxy.* III 487. J.D. Thomas (above, n. 7) 57-64 considers as a likely assumption that the epistrategos of the Heptanomia resided at Memphis (before 130) or at Antinoopolis (since 131) and that he went on frequent trips (ἐπιδημῶν, *P.Oxy.* VIII 1119, 254) through the nomes. In the late autumn or early winter he would go to Alexandria to confer with the prefect in preparation for the conventus.

¹⁰B-W, *Str.R.Scr.* (above, n. 6) 92-93, with references.

¹¹A. Martin, "Le P.Oxy. IV 800 et le financement des travaux publics," *Cd'E* 54 (1979) 131-33 (= *SB XVI* 12374). The document was addressed to one Ptolemaeus (name or alias, ὁ καὶ Π.), a current or former strategos (στρατη[γός] or στρατη[γῆσας]) of an unidentified nome. Martin suggests that Ptolemaeus was either an Oxyrhynchite known as acting royal scribe in the Arsinoite nome between 154 and 156 (= B-W, *Str.R.Scr.* [above, n. 6] 128) or should be included in the list of *strategoi* of the Oxyrhynchite nome between 154 and 159. Bastianini and Whitehorne reject Martin's hypothesis and list Ptolemaeus among the *strategoi* of unidentified nomes, while considering Valerius Athenodorus a possible dioiketes rather than a royal scribe (B-W, *Str.R.Scr.* 113). The text of *SB XVI* 12374, as it stands, does not allow us to decide between the two interpretations regarding Athenodorus' position (line 13: Οὐαλερίου 'Αθηνοδώρου δη[] / ... and line 16: Οὐαλέριος 'Αθηνώδαρος β[] / ...), but *P.Col.inv.* 438 seems to strengthen Martin's case, insofar as Athenodorus is concerned. The case of Ptolemaeus remains uncertain.

¹²J.E.G. Whitehorne (above, n. 6) 421, with note 6 and 427, nos. 18 and 19.

¹³J.E.G. Whitehorne, "A Checklist of Oxyrhynchite Strategi," *ZPE* 29 (1978) 167-89; and B-W, *Str.R.Scr.* (above, n. 6) 92-93.

March 154 and Jan./Feb. 159, unless one includes Ptolemaeus at the beginning of this period.

Among the later dates envisaged as possible for P.Col.inv. 438 (cf. above), only 161 and 179 provide open slots for a strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome and for an *idios logos*, but not for an epistrategos. As no cross-identification is available for these dates, the dating of our document in either of these two years remains an open, though unverifiable, possibility. Hopefully, the numerous unpublished papyri from Oxyrhynchus will yield more information about Athenodorus and the date of his tenure as strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome.

2. Epistrategos or idios logos?

As sensible as it may sound, the identification of our Statilius Maximus as epistrategos in 156 meets one difficulty: there is so far very little evidence for the involvement of the epistrategos in temple affairs. Among other duties, the epistrategos was responsible for appointing liturgists and granting exemption from compulsory positions, and handling judicial cases. He is not known to have had anything to do with temple administration, even though we cannot exclude that he may have done so on an exceptional basis. J.D. Thomas considers that "priests are another sector of the community for whom the epistrategos might be thought to have a special concern, since they appear with some frequency in documents in which he is mentioned. However, most if not all these texts can be readily explained in terms of the epistrategos' known spheres of interest."¹⁴ In our document the epistrategos can be described as extending his advice or information, rather than authorization or order, on the procedure leading to the appointment of a

¹⁴J.D. Thomas (above, n. 7) 176-77. However, the hint of a "special concern" arises from no more than four documents. *P.Tebt.* II 302 (71/2) is a report of a decision made by the epistrategos concerning the allocation of land to priests. *SB* VI 9066 (Soknopaiou Nesos, under the reign of Antoninus Pius) shows the epistrategos conducting hearings in a dispute opposing different groups of priests and pertaining to income rights. *SB* VI 9016 (160) records a trial before the *antarchiereus*. The boule of Ptolemais claims some right over a temple at Koptos and an examination ordered by the *antarchiereus* and conducted by the epistrategos should provide a basis for settlement of the dispute. Finally, *BGU* I 194 (Fayûm, Oct. 28, 177) may suggest that the epistrategos was instrumental in granting exemption from liturgical services to priests. Cf. Thomas 84-85; 110; 134; and 177. Prof. Thomas kindly informed me that he is not greatly troubled by the occurrence of the epistrategos in connection with priestly affairs, though on this point he can add nothing to the evidence collected in his book.

certain kind of non-liturgical temple personnel and the apportionment of tax money. There is no parallel for such activity on the part of the epistrategos.

It is puzzling to see an epistrategos involved in the appointment procedure of temple personnel in P.Col.inv. 438, since, from the time of Trajan or Hadrian onward, temple affairs fell under the jurisdiction of two high civil officials, the ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Αἰγύπτου πάσης and the ἴδιος λόγος.¹⁵

The high priest of Alexandria and all Egypt, or *archiereus*, was in charge of controlling the number of Egyptian priests, of deciding questions of eligibility for the priesthood, and of implementing the imperial policy regarding circumcision of the clergy.¹⁶

The *idios logos* was an important financial official in Egypt and was often involved in temple affairs.¹⁷ In the second century A.D. he is known to have had jurisdiction in disputes concerning the appointment of temple officials. He sold salable temple offices, supervised the transfer of inherited positions and the payment of the established fee (ἐισκριτικόν), investigated and judged irregularities in the occupation of these offices as well as all other improprieties liable to a fine. As P.R. Swarney rightly stresses, the *idios logos* was concerned with financial matters bearing on the revenues of the imperial treasury, and had no interest in religious procedure. At a general level, the involvement of the *idios logos* in temple affairs is dealt with in some detail in the *Gnomon* (BGU V 1210, sections 71-97, after 161). The *idios logos* determined the privileges and incomes of each category of priests and attendants (sections 79 and 88). More specifically, a few papyri illustrate the interest of the *idios logos* in temple matters. *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3275 (ca 103-17) is a report addressed by some priests to the strategos in compliance with the request of the *idios logos* Priferminus Augurinus for an annual account of the properties belonging to the temples.¹⁸ In

¹⁵G.M. Parássoglou, "A Prefectural Edict Regulating Temple Activities," *ZPE* 13 (1974) 21-37, esp. 33-34. The positions of *idios logos* and of *archiereus* were quite distinct in the second century A.D., as *SB VIII* 9658 (193) shows.

¹⁶M. Stead, "The High Priest of Alexandria and All Egypt," *Proc. XVIth Int. Congr. of Pap.* (Am.Stud.Pap. 23, Chico 1981) 411-18. G.M. Parássoglou (above, n. 15) has a list (35-37) of known *archiereis*, to which one can add now *P.Oxy.* L 3567 (252).

¹⁷P.R. Swarney (above, n. 2) 83-96.

¹⁸Priferminus Augurinus is not recorded in P.R. Swarney (above, n. 2), cf. *BGU IV* 1033 (105/6), with *BL V*, p.90 and *VII*, p.17; *P.Ryl.* II 291 (106/7); and *P.Oxy.* XLVI 3274 (99-117).

Stud.Pal. XXII 184 (= *SB XVI* 12685, Oct. 3, 139) the priests of Soknopaiou Nesos dispatch to the strategos the summary of a dispute going back to earlier times and quote an earlier petition (βιβλίδιον) joined to a letter from the *idios logos* to the strategos (col. iii, lines 55-62, dated Aug. 6, 137). In lines 52-54 there is reference to another letter from the *idios logos* concerning the grant of a position of prophet (περὶ τῆς συγχωρήσεως τῆς προφητείας).¹⁹ *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3472 (Aug. 28, 149) is a letter addressed by a strategos and a royal scribe to some temple dwellers, possibly a group of pastophoroi attached to the temple of Athena in the quarter of Thoereum of Thenepmoi. The document records an earlier ruling by the *idios logos* whereby those who held plots within temple precincts were required to make a declaration of property in exchange for an appropriate return to be issued by the city secretary.

Considering what we know about the administration of temple affairs in second-century Egypt, we could have expected to find the sender of *P.Col.inv.* 438 in the position of *idios logos* or, perhaps, *archiereus*.²⁰ As the proposed date of 138 seems unlikely for reasons expounded above and as those in 161 and 179 are unsubstantiated, the conclusion that the letter was sent in 156 by the epistrategos to the strategos seems inescapable. Our document points toward a role for the epistrategos in temple affairs, in particular in the appointment of temple personnel and the apportionment of tax money to pay the salaries of attendants responsible for security (cf. below).

¹⁹P.J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 44 (1981) 119-35.

²⁰According to the existing list of known *archiereis*, we cannot exclude the possibility that our Statilius Maximus was an *archiereus* (otherwise unattested) in 138, 161, or 179; cf. G.M. Parássoglou (above, n. 15) 35-37. The crux concerning the title of the sender of *P.Col.inv.* 438 is hardly unique. We have another document dealing with temple affairs where the identification of the official's title is problematic. *P.Aberd.* 16 is an official letter from one Marcius Hermogenes to the *strategoi* and royal scribes of the Arsinoite nome concerning exemptions from liturgies in the chora for priests and prophets. The sender has been identified as a former prefect of the imperial fleet in Alexandria in A.D. 134 (*I.Memnon* 38 and 39), but it is not clear in what capacity he sent this letter. The choice is between the position of epistrategos, *idios logos*, or *archiereus*. J.D. Thomas (above, n. 7) 209-10 points out that the position of epistrategos of the Heptanomia was filled by other known characters in the late 130's, which makes the second or third hypothesis more likely. On *P.Aberd.* 16, cf. J.A.S. Evans, "A Social and Economic History of an Egyptian Temple in the Greco-Roman Period," *YCS* 17 (1961) 166-67.

3. Civil officials and the administration of temples

Apart from the question of the epistrategos, P.Col.Inv. 438 provides some information about the role of other officials in the administration of temples.

a. Prefect

At the top of the hierarchy, the prefect's involvement in temple affairs is well attested as early as the reign of Augustus, when the prefect C. Tyrannius required the annual registration of priests, *pastophoroi*, and all other people attached to temples, with the definition of their particular functions, in order to determine who was exempted from poll-tax (*BGU* IV 1199, 4 B.C.). This measure was possibly updated and extended under Nero.²¹ During the first century A.D. prefect and *idios logos* are both found involved in temple affairs. P.R. Swarney states that there was a division, but no sharing or exchange, of responsibilities between the *idios logos* and the prefect, and that no case of concurrence of administrative competence can be taken as evidence of the subordination of the former to the latter.²² By the time of Trajan and Hadrian a change occurred in the administration of temples, whereby the prefect's involvement became exceptional, the administration of temple activities being exercised almost exclusively by the *idios logos* and the *archiereus*.²³

Thus the circumstances surrounding the appointment of additional *pastophoroi* in P.Col.inv. 438 might have been exceptional because it required a prefectural decision.²⁴ We know that the prefect was

²¹J.E.G. Whitehorne, "P.Lond. II 359 and Tuscus' List of Temple Perquisites," *Cd'E* 53 (1978) 321-28; *idem*, "Tuscus and the Temples Again (SB VI 9066)," *Cd'E* 54 (1979) 143-48; and *idem*, "New Light on Temple and State in Roman Egypt," *JRH* 11 (1980) 218-26.

²²P.R. Swarney, "Prefect and Idios Logos," *Proc. XIIIth Int. Congr. of Pap.* (Am.Stud.Pap. 7, Toronto 1970) 455-60, esp. 457.

²³G.M. Parássoglou (above, n. 15) 32-33, dealing with P.Yale inv. 1394v (= SB XII 11236, Oxy. or Ars., 120), containing an edict of T. Haterius Nepos, part of which is also preserved in P.Fouad 10, cf. J. Scherer, "Le papyrus Fouad Ier Inv. 211," *BIFAO* 41 (1942) 43 ff. Similarly, E. Battaglia, "Dichiarazioni templari. A proposito di P.Oxy. XLIX, 3473," *Aegyptus* 64 (1984) 79-99, esp. 81.

²⁴The prefect in office when P.Col.inv. 438 was written was M. Sempronius Liberalis, first attested on Aug. 29, 154 and last in Aug./Sept. 159; cf. G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975) 292-94 and *ZPE* 38 (1980) 82; for an extended up-to-date bibliography on the prefect of Egypt, cf. O. Montevecchi, *La papirologia* (rev. ed. Milan 1988) 127-35 and 553-54.

sometimes called upon to hear complaints from temple officials and asked to grant redress in cases involving wrongdoings in apportionment of revenues in money and in kind and other serious offenses allegedly committed by priests against other temple attendants.²⁵ In P.Col.inv. 438, Statilius Maximus instructs Athenodorus to act on the basis of the ruling of the prefect, but it is not clear what the ruling was about. It might have been concerned with the apportionment of tax money.

b. Strategos

The involvement of the strategos in the appointment of temple personnel is not surprising, as this official, assisted by the royal scribe, was "responsible for implementing the decisions of the provincial government, prefect, *idios logos*, *epistrategos*."²⁶ For instance, *P.Aberd.* 16 (*ca* 134) illustrates the role of the strategos and royal scribe in guaranteeing the exemption of priests from compulsory services outside the temples, a privilege that was not always systematically respected and tended to be whittled away.²⁷

The chief interest of the strategos in temple matters was fiscal. Every year the priests were expected to turn over to him a list of temple personnel and a complete inventory (*γραφή ιερῶν καὶ χειρισμοῦ*), of which several examples are preserved (*P.Bacch.*, *passim*). Copies were sent to the royal scribe, to the keepers of public archives (*βιβλιοφύλακες τῶν δημοσίων λόγων*), to the tax auditor (*ἐκλογιστής*), and to the tax inspector (*ἐξεταστής*) delegated by the *idios logos*.²⁸ Similarly, we know that temple attendants such as *pastophoroi* submitted in addition to their declaration of temple property a list of offerings and income (*γραφή ἀναθημάτων καὶ προσόδων*) to the same officials (*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3473,

²⁵F. Dunand, "Une plainte de pastophores," *Cd'E* 44 (1969) 301-12, editing a first- or second-century A.D. papyrus of unknown provenance (= *SB* X 10564).

²⁶J.E.G. Whitehorne (above, n. 6) 420.

²⁷J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 262-65; G.M. Parássoglou, "Four Official Documents from Roman Egypt," *Cd'E* 49 (1974) 332-41, esp. 335-37, about P.Yale inv. 458 ("A regulation concerning *pastophoroi*") dated to the first rather than to the second century A.D., according to J.D. Thomas, *Cd'E* 51 (1976) 315-17; J.E.G. Whitehorne, *JRH* 11 (1980) 220-21.

²⁸E.H. Gilliam, "The Archives of the Temple of Soknobraisis at Bacchias," *YCS* 10 (1947) 177-281 (= *P.Bacch.*), esp. 197-98.

161-69).²⁹ These documents enabled the central and local administration to apportion taxes and compulsory services according to the make-up of the population and its resources.

The strategos also supervised the process leading to the grant by the *archiereus* of the permission to circumcise would-be priests. According to M. Stead, "the strategos was the main intermediary between candidates for the priesthood and the central bureaucracy" represented by the *archiereus* and the *idios logos*.³⁰ Because of the long history of the Egyptian religious establishment's involvement in politics, it was important for the Roman administration to keep track of the priestly population and to control its membership. The role of the strategos was instrumental in implementing this policy of tight control, as shown by *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3470-71 (Dec. 22, 131), sworn declarations by priests concerning the *epikrisis* of the children of priests and of priestly stock, addressed to the strategos and to the royal scribe acting on behalf of the *idios logos*. It is therefore not surprising to see the strategos Athenodorus actively involved in the procedure of appointment of *pastophoroi* in *P.Col.inv.* 438.

4. Temple personnel and security

Although we know a great deal about the personnel of Graeco-Egyptian temples in the Ptolemaic and Roman period, the scope of individual functions is not always clearly established.³¹ Some of these functions are definitely religious, others purely administrative, while some can be described as oriented toward the performance of menial tasks. There is strong evidence for a high degree of specialization.

As Graeco-Egyptian temples were organized along the same lines as lay communities and drew their revenues from leased land, industries,

²⁹E. Battaglia (above, n. 23) 79-99, esp. 85 and 96, referring to a few *γραφαὶ παστοφόρων* in *P.Kron.* 1; *P.Tebt.* II 600; and *P.Lond.* II 345 (p. 113). Cf. also H.-B. Schönborn, *Die Pastophoren im Kult der ägyptischen Götter* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 80, Meisenheim am Glan 1976) 39, n.1 referring also to *P.Mil.Vogl.* II 81 (= *SB VI 9394*), and 40.

³⁰Cf. M. Stead (above, n. 16) 416; J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 159-60; and *P.Tebt.* II 292 and 293.

³¹J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 185-203 discusses the evidence for the offices of (local) *ἀρχιερεύς*, *λεσῶνις*, *προφήτης*, *στολισταί*, *πτεροφόρος*, *ιερογραμματεὺς*, *ὠρολόγοι*, *ψῆδος*, *παστοφόροι*, *χααχῦται*, *ταριχευταί*, *λυχνάπτης*, *λυχνοφόρος*, *ιερόδουλοι*, and *ἐπιστάτης* in both the Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

and businesses managed by temple dwellers as well as outsiders, one of the priorities of the administration was to protect the temple and its dependents from outside aggression and from internal disorders. For that purpose a certain number of attendants were assigned to police and guard duties. Unfortunately, we have very little evidence as to how the temple police was recruited, organized, and paid. As often in administrative matters, the terminology for security officials is loose.

In Graeco-Roman temples across the empire, the maintenance of the premises and the administration of non-religious (social and economic) activities performed in the sacred area fell under the responsibility of a manager called *aeditu(m)us*,³² ἱεροφύλαξ,³³ or νεωκόρος,³⁴ who was sometimes assisted by slaves and freedmen. Protecting temple property was part of his duties. The first-century-A.D. Stoic philosopher Chaeremon of Alexandria refers to *neokoroi*, together with *pastophoroi* and other attendants, as second-rank temple personnel, as opposed to those performing sacerdotal functions.³⁵ In Roman Egypt, *neokoroi* are attested in the papyri only in connection with the cult of Sarapis and Tyche.³⁶ There is no evidence, however, that the position existed outside Alexandria. In temples located in the towns and villages, their functions were taken over by other attendants, such as the

³²E. Saglio, *Dar.-Sag.* 1 (1877) 101; P. Habel, *RE* 1.1 (1893) cols. 465-66; D. Vaglieri, in E. De Ruggiero, *Diz. Epigr.* 1 (1895) 271-73; J.E. Stambaugh, "The Functions of Roman Temples," *ANRW* II 16.1 (1978) 554-608, esp. 575; the fourth-century writer Rufinus reports that at the Serapeum in Alexandria, the *pastophorion* was inhabited partly by "aeditui," and partly by candidates for initiation (*Historia eccles.* 11.23); cf. Th. Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae* (Bonn 1922-25) 4:627 (= *FHRA*); and H.-B. Schönborn (above, n. 29) 44.

³³Scaevola (18 *dig.*) *Dig.* 33.1.20.1; *JG* XIV 291 (Segesta, date unknown); *SB* I 285 (Panopolis, Ptolemaic inscription, where the word should possibly be read προφύλαξ or θεροφύλαξ). The position is not attested in the papyri.

³⁴E. Beurlier, *Dar.-Sag.* 4 (1907) 55-59; K. Hanell, *RE* 16.2 (1935) cols. 2422-28.

³⁵Chaeremon, *FGrH* III C 618, p. 152 (= *FHRA* [above, n. 32] 2:182) (quoted by Porphyrius, *De Abst.* 4.8): καὶ τὸ μὲν κατ' ἀλήθειαν φιλοσοφοῦν ἐν τε τοῖς προφήταις ἦν καὶ ἱεροστολισταῖς καὶ ἱερογραμματεῦσιν, ἔτι δὲ ὠρολόγοις· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῶν ἱερέων τε καὶ παστοφόρων καὶ νεωκόρων πλῆθος καὶ ὑπουργῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καθαρεύει μὲν ὁμοίως, οὔτι γὰρ μὴν μετ' ἀκριβείας καὶ ἐγκρατείας τοσησθε. Cf. Th. Hopfner, *RE* 18.4 (1949) cols. 2107-09.

³⁶Cf. for instance *P.Oxy.* III 477 (Oxy., 132/33); *P.IFAO* III 18 (Oxy., 136); *P.Mil.Vogl.* II 56 (Tebt., 151); *P.Alex.Giss.* 5 (Ars. nome, 215); *P.Mich.* XI 620 (Ars. nome, 239/40); *P.Oxy.* III 507 (Oxy., 169).

pastophoroi or a rather obscure official, the *λεσῶνις*.³⁷

In larger temples security matters called for a more sophisticated organization. In Alexandria, the Serapeum is known to have been garrisoned since Pharaonic times, but the purpose of this extended far beyond the security of the temple. In other Egyptian towns, such as Oxyrhynchus, Memphis, Arsinoe, and Hermopolis, there is some evidence that hired guards (*φύλακες*, *ναοφύλακες*, *νυκτοφύλακες*) were a common feature of temple life, at least in the third and fourth centuries. While in some cases those guards belonged to the army, in the majority of cases they were hired employees or local people performing liturgical services.³⁸

What then was the role of pastophoroi in the organization of temple security in Roman Egypt? This aspect of their activities is documented so far by only two papyri. Despite its fragmentary condition, *P.Brem.* 70 (Apollonopolite Heptakomias, between 114 and 119) shows a pastophoros writing to the strategos in a matter pertaining to his *παραφυλακή*, which he exercised in several temples or sacred areas (line 4, *ἰδίους ἱεροῖς παραφυλακ[ή]*). Much more explicit is *SB XVI* 12531 (= *PSI X* 1149), a first-century-A.D. internal memorandum from the temple of Soknebtynis at Tebtynis, which reports that the pastophoroi were responsible for "guarding those inside the precinct of the temples, [in accordance with] the sacred law of Semnouthi which stands in agreement with the decrees of the prefects."³⁹ It is interesting to note that these two

³⁷Cf. J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 185-86, with reference to *P.Tebt.* II 295 (*Tebt.*, 126-138) and *BGU I* 337 (= *W.Chr.* 92, *Sokn. Nes.*, II/III); cf. also *P.Tebt.* II 313 (*Heliopolis*, 210/11). The Ptolemaic *ἐπιστάτης* disappears from our sources by the Roman period, even though the tax (*ἐπιστατικόν*) levied on the priests to provide for his salary is still collected then, cf. Evans 200-03 and 273-74.

³⁸M.C.J. Miller, "The *φύλακες* of the Serapeum in Roman Alexandria," *Proc. XVIIIth Int. Congr. of Pap.* (Athens 1988) 223-27, citing *BGU II* 362 (*Ars.*, 215); *P.Harr.* 64 (= *Cd'E* 46 [1971] 149-53) (*Oxy.*, 269/70, cf. D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 12 [1973] 283, n.23); *P.Oxy.* I 43 (after 295); XIV 1627 (342); cf. also W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Leipzig 1905-1908) 1:285 and 2:21. The evidence for *ναοφύλακες* is extremely scant, cf. *BGU II* 362, cols. i 17; ii 10; iv 16; viii 11; xii 11; xiii 24; and xv 16 (*Ars.*, 215); and, outside Egypt, *IG IV²* (i) 402 (*Epidaurus*, II). *Νυκτοφύλακες* are often attested (cf. *P.Oxy.* XVII 2128 [*Oxy.*, II] and 2125 [*Oxy.*, 209/10]; *P.Petaus* 66 and 67 [*Ptolemais Hormou*, 185]; *SB XIV* 12136 [*Ars. nome*, II/III]; *P.Achm.* 7 [= *SB I* 4636, *Panopolis*, 197]; *P.Oslo III* 93 [*Small Oasis*, 212]; and *PSI XII* 1232 [*Herakl.*, IV]), but none is explicitly connected with temple security.

³⁹The relevant part of the text reads ...*τοὺς παστοφόρου[ς] τὴν παραφυλακὴν ποιεῖσθαι πάντων τῶν ἐντὸς [περι]βόλου τῶν ἱερῶν καθὼς ἔτι ἀνωθεν ἐποιοῦσαν, [το]ῦ τε ἱερατικοῦ νόμου Σεμνουθι τὸ ἴμοιον τοῖς [κρίμα]σι τῶν ἡγεμόνων περιέχοντος.* Cf. G. Bastianini, "Dall'archivio del tempio di Soknebtynis: *PSI X* 1149," *Studi A. Biscardi III* (Milan 1982) 481-88. Cf. H.-B. Schönborn (above, n. 29) 24; and A. Passoni Dell'Acqua, "Ricerche sulla versione dei LXX e i papiri. I. Pastophorion,"

papyri and P.Col.inv. 438 are all consistent with a later account by the fifth-century-A.D. writer Horapollon of Panopolis, who assigns to pastophoroi the mission of "φυλάττεσθαι τὸ ἱερόν" on the basis of the meaning of the hieroglyphic sign "wn" representing them, the meaning of which can be rendered as "φύλακα οἰκίας."⁴⁰ Although we can hardly infer from Horapollon's passage that the police function of pastophoroi had its origin in Pharaonic times, it is remarkable that already in the Ptolemaic period they are shown protecting the inhabitants of the temple.⁴¹

In P.Col.inv. 438 the expression "τοῖς παραφυλάσσουσι τὸ ἱερόν" (line 3) refers to the pastophoroi already in charge, who obviously had a say in the appointment of additional pastophoroi, probably because it affected the overall organization of the group in terms of either duties or privileges--or both. There is some evidence that the pastophoroi of a temple formed an association (σύνοδος, *collegium*) headed by an officer called ἀρχιπαστοφόρος or by a board of πρεσβύτεροι.⁴² The appointment of new members had to be approved by senior ones. The internal organization of the association and the role, duties and privileges of pastophoroi within the temples was regulated by a charter called ἱερατικός νόμος Σεμνουθι, mentioned in PSI X 1149,⁴³ which

Aegyptus 61 (1981) 171-211, esp. 175-80, about the various functions of pastophoroi.

⁴⁰Horapollon, *Hieroglyphica* 1.41 (= *FHRA* [above, n. 32] 4:586. W. Otto (above, n. 38) 1:96 at first rejected the passage, but changed his mind in *Beiträge zur Hierodulie im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Abh.Bayer.Ak.Wiss., Philos.-hist. Kl. 29, 1950) 23-24; cf. also J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 193 and H.-B. Schönborn (above, n. 29) 8-9. About Horapollon, the philosopher from Phenebythis (Panopolite nome), cf. J. Maspero, "Horapollon et la fin du paganisme égyptien," *BIFAO* 11 (1914) 163-95, esp. 191-93; and, more recently, P. Chuvin, *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans* (Cambridge, MA, 1990) 105-11; and G.W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Ann Arbor 1990) 56-57 and 60-61.

⁴¹H.-B. Schönborn (above, n.29) 24, citing P.Grenf. I 38 and UPZ I 5 and 6.

⁴²J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 192 and 195, with reference to Apuleius, *Met.* 11.17 (*sacrosanctum collegium*); *P.Lond.* II 345 (p.113, Nabla, Ars., 193); and *P.Oslo* III 143 (Oxy., I). Ἀρχιπαστοφόροι are attested at Oxyrhynchus (*P.Oxy.* II 241, 98) and at Thebes (*WO* 1174 [Roman date]; *O.Bodl.* II 1192, 103 and 1480, 171). J.E.G. Whitehorne, *JRH* 11 (1980) 222 points out that the use of the term "colleagues" (μέτοχοι) in the address of *P.Oxy.* XLIX 3472 (149) hints at an organized group--if it is indeed addressed to pastophoroi--but it could simply refer to jointly-liable tax collectors. Cf. also W. Otto (above, n. 38) 1:98 and H.-B. Schönborn (above, n. 29) 12-13.

⁴³And perhaps in two other documents of the same period, *SB X* 10564 (line 20, ἱερατικός νόμος) and *P.Yale inv.* 458 (= *Cd'E* 49 [1974] 335-337, no. 2) (line 6, νομικὴ βύβλος), cf. above, nn. 25 and 27.

was perhaps the subject of a book entitled Σεμενουθι by one Apollonides Horapion in the second century AD.⁴⁴

Since neither the charter nor Apollonides' book is preserved, we have to rely on the all too scarce papyrological evidence to determine the precise nature of the responsibility of pastophoroi in terms of security in sacred precincts. As all three documents discussed above refer to παραφυλακή in connection with pastophoroi, one should try to extract from the available inscriptional and papyrological evidence the meaning of the concept encompassed by this term.

Παραφυλακή, in the meaning of the maintaining of public order, was, in a way, everyone's concern. In the villages of Athena and Anubias (Arsinoite nome) the responsibility for upholding peace and security (προνοεῖν τῆς παραφυλακῆς) fell onto a variety of local officials (*P.Oxy.* XVII 2121, 209-210). There are reasons to think that the concept of παραφυλακή refers to something different from, and possibly higher than, ordinary police duty. In 151, a strategos wrote to law enforcement officials of the Busirite nome to have a couple of runaway slaves picked up (*P.Harr.* I 62). The order was addressed to the regular police (δημόσιοι) and to a different group (οἱ πρὸς τῇ παραφυλακῇ τεταγμένοι), which may represent either the civilian authorities supervising the regular police or some kind of militia distinct from it. By the beginning of the third century the function of παρα[φ]υ[λ]ακῆ τῶν τόπων has become liturgical and falls onto villagers (*P.Oxy.* IV 705, 202). The people responsible for παραφυλακή could subsume several titles. There is no evidence that they were ever named παραφύλακες in Roman Egypt, at least before the Byzantine period,⁴⁵ but we find the title in Asia Minor, in Samos, and in Thrace.⁴⁶

⁴⁴J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 167; G. Bastianini (above, n. 39) 486, following P.J. Parsons, *Cd'E* 49 (1974) 153-56, mentions a possible identification of the author mentioned by Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolyicum* II 6, *FGrH* III C 661 p. 212f.) with an ἀρχιπροφήτης of Memphis in A.D. 86, cf. *P.Ryl.* IV 676 and *P.Gen.* I 7 (= *W.Chr.* 80).

⁴⁵*P.Oxy.* XVI 1853 (*Oxy.* VI/VII). R. MacMullen, *Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, MA 1963) 53, infers the existence of civilian *paraphylakes* from the reference in *P.Fay.* 38 (Euhemeria and Taurinus, late III/early IV) to a συνήθης παραφυλακή.

⁴⁶Cf. O. Schulthess, *RE* 18.4 (1949) cols. 1367-69, s.v. παραφύλακες; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) 647-48, and 1515-16, n. 47; and M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*² (Oxford 1957) 717, n. 31 and 722, n. 45. Additional references in *Bull.Ep.*, *passim*. The only instances outside Asia Minor known to me are *Bull.Ep.* 1958, no. 391 (Samos, II), where a νεωποίης attached to the temple of Hera is also a παραφύλαξ (cf. E. Buschor, "Samische Tempelpfleger," *MDAI(A)* 68 [1953] 11-24, esp. 22); and *Bull.Ep.* 1954, no. 172 (Pautalia/Thracia). Known παραφύλακες came from all social classes, from slaves (*Bull.Ep.* 1931, p. 226, Ephesus) to local aristocrats (*Bull.Ep.* 1958, no. 422, Ephesus,

In conclusion, I suggest that the pastophoroi supervised and, at times, supplemented regular police forces in their task of enforcing order within the temple area.

5. The financial support of temple personnel

Interestingly, P.Col.inv. 438 is one of the few documents showing the recipient side of taxation: the pastophoroi, whose activities included guarding temples, were paid out of the police-tax (φύλακτρον). This little known tax is attested only in second-century papyri and was usually collected, like the poll-tax (λαογραφία) and distributed taxes (μερισμοί) providing the salaries of local officials, by associated πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν.⁴⁷ As these liturgists were appointed by the epistrategos, the explanation for the role of the epistrategos in our document may lurk somewhere in the process of collection and allocation of this tax.⁴⁸

Two, possibly three, documents show that at Oxyrhynchus the φύλακτρον was paid, together with a brick-tax (πλιυθειομένη), by the landlord as part of a contract of lease of a house (*P.Oxy.* III 502, 164) or workshop (*P.Mert.* II 76, 181, with reference to an unpublished lease in the Ashmolean Museum). It is not known how the money passed from the πράκτορες to the pastophoroi, but our document may hint at a role for the strategos in this process.

Incidentally, we know of another tax collected for the benefit of temples, the bath-tax or βαλανευτικόν, which was paid sometimes to a πράκτωρ ἀργυρικῶν, and sometimes directly to the τελῶναι θησαυροῦ

where a third-century official became παραφύλαξ after holding the position of strategos and before becoming δεκάπρωτος, at the beginning of a long and successful career).

⁴⁷S.L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938) 150-51 understands it as a tax supporting a kind of "debtors' prison." Cf. *P.Meyer* 25 (Thebes, 68) and 39 (Thebes, 62); *BGU* III 881 (Soknopaiou Nesos, 153) with *BL* 1, p. 441 (receipt for taxes paid in money including ὀψώνιον φυλάκων, ἐπικεφαλαῖον, and φύλακτρον ἀπόρων); *P.Stras.* V 419 (Bacchias, 134/5) and 424 (Bacchias, 126-28); *BGU* XV 2537 (Karanis? 142-44) and 2539 (Karanis, 149-51); *P.Cair.Goodsp.* 10 (Memphis, 180); *P.Flor.* I 12 (Memphis [Fayûm], 186-89) and *P.Lond.* III 1216 (p. 34, Memphis [Fayum], 192), with *BL* III, p. 97 and VI, p. 63). At Apollinopolis Magna, the Jewish population paid a tax called φυλ(ακτικόν), cf. *CPJ* II; *O.Cair.* and *O.Edfou* I-III, indexes. Cf. also Wallace 146-48; H. Kortenbeutel, in *BGU* IX, pp. 6-10; K.A. Worp, *P.Vindob.Worp*, pp. 64-66; and C.A. Nelson, in *BGU* XV, pp. 155-59.

⁴⁸The πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν are attested since Trajan, but it is only in the 150's or 160's that they started being appointed by the epistrategos after selection by lot, cf. J.D. Thomas (above, n. 7) 70 and 72.

ἱερῶν.⁴⁹ Both φύλακτρον and βαλανευτικόν were parts of a larger tax package raised by the temple, which was earmarked, in addition to subsidies paid by the local government and the proceeds of temple production, to support temple personnel and activities.⁵⁰ Since the administration of all taxes collected by the temple had been taken over by the Roman civil administration, it seems unlikely that any of those who collected money for the benefit of the temple, such as the ἐπιτηρηταὶ ἱερατικῶν ὠνῶν, whose role is far from being securely established,⁵¹ can be described as agents of the temple.

Besides the payment of a salary in money, pastophoroi received some food allowances from the priests themselves.⁵² In the temple of Soknebtunis at the beginning of the second century A.D. each of the three pastophoroi attached to the temple received one-eighth artaba of wheat daily.⁵³ It is possible that this wheat, or at least part of it, was produced on temple land. On occasions, temple personnel received gifts (φιλάνθρωπα) from the local population.⁵⁴

⁴⁹J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 223-24, with reference to *O.Wilb.* 44-48; *O.Tait* (Cambr.) 60-62; *O.Tait* (Bodl.) 670 and 673; *O.Stras.* 483-90; *O.Wilb.* 11 and 45; *WO* 843 and 544. Evans considers that there were two different taxes of the same name. Cf. S.L. Wallace (above, n. 47) 155-59, esp. 157.

⁵⁰J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 207-44. On the salary of temple employees and priests, cf. W. Otto (above, n. 38) 2:21-42. About taxes paid to the temple (σύσταξις, ἄπομοιρα, etc.), cf. Otto 1: 340-84.

⁵¹J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 266-67. The ἐπιτηρηταὶ ἱερατικῶν ὠνῶν might have been collecting taxes from, rather than for the benefit of, the temples.

⁵²*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3473 (161-69), records a customary allowance of 12 artabae on festive days (26 ff).

⁵³J.A.S. Evans (above, n. 20) 260-61, citing *P.Tebt.* II 298. The figure, which makes up a total of a little over 45 artabae a year for each pastophoros, may be confirmed by *P.Tebt.* II 600 (III, described), which mentions a total of 200 artabae a year for an unspecified number of pastophoroi. It is uncertain whether the quantity of wheat to which they were entitled was higher on festive days for officiating pastophoroi than on regular ones (cf. previous note).

⁵⁴*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3473.39 (161-69); *SB* I 5245 and 5243 (12); *P.Lond.* II 357 (p. 165, with *BL* I, p. 257) (14-15); *P.Mert.* II 73.8: ἀπό τε συστάξεων [καὶ] φιλανθ[ρώπων] in reference to the revenues of a priestess (*Oxy.* 163-64), cf. D. Hagedorn, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 65-68. S.L. Wallace (above, n. 47) 41 and 372, n. 64. W. Otto (above, n. 38) 2:25. This custom goes back to the Ptolemaic period, cf. *PSI* IX 1018 (110 B.C.); 1022 (106 B.C.); and 1024 (104 B.C.); and H.-B. Schönborn (above, n. 29) 29-30. On the subject of taxes and temples, cf. M. Stead, "A Model to Facilitate the Study of Temple Administration in Graeco-Roman Egypt," *Atti XVII Congr. Int. Pap.* (Naples 1984) 3:1045-52, esp. 1047-48.

6. The identification of the temple in P.Col.inv. 438

The *ιερόν* referred to here cannot be identified. Pastophoroi are known to have been attached to several temples at Oxyrhynchus, in particular to the temple of Apollo (*P.Oxy.* VI 984, under Domitian?), of Isis (*P.Oxy.* VIII 1155, 104), of Sarapis (*P.Oslo* III 105, 139), and of Athena, also called Thoeris (*P.Oxy.* X 1268, III, confirmed by *P.Oxy.* VIII 1117). *Ἀρχιεπιστωφύρος Θεήριδος καὶ Ἴσιδος καὶ Σ[α]ράπιδος καὶ Ὀσί[ριδος] καὶ τῶν συννάων θεῶν μεγίστων* is also attested (*P.Oxy.* II 241, ca 98).

In addition, one cannot exclude the possibility that our document refers to a temple located in one of the villages of the Oxyrhynchite nome. The temple of Apollo and associated gods at Pella (*P.Oxy.* XLIX 3473, 161-69), of Thoeris, Isis and other gods at Mouchinor (*P.Oxy.* III 491, 126), of Apollo at Teis, and of Saphthis in a nearby village (*P.Oxy.* XII 1435, 147), were all manned with one or several pastophoroi living on the premises (*P.Oxy.* VI 984, *οἰκῶν ἐν παστοφορίῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἱεροῦ*).⁵⁵

Columbia University

Jean-Jacques Aubert

⁵⁵I am grateful to Prof. R.S. Bagnall for supervising my work. The edition of the text benefited from the help of Profs. J. Long, S.A. Stephens, and the late C. Wehrli. Prof. J.D. Thomas and Dr. K.A. Worp usefully criticized an earlier draft of the commentary. Remaining errors are mine. The History Department at Columbia University and the Swiss National Fund of Scientific Research provided me with generous financial support. This papyrus belongs to the Columbia Papyrus Collection and appears here with the permission of Mr. K.A. Lohf, Head of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Library of Columbia University.