

## Appointment of Pastophoroi

Inv. 438

10.9 x 12.4 cm

20 December 156

Plate 14

Back blank.

The text, all written in the same hand, fills only approximately one third of the available space. The top margin is 1.4 cm, the left margin 1.5 cm, and the bottom blank space 6.8 cm. The beginning of the second line and the end of the fourth line are damaged, which makes their reading difficult and uncertain. The hand is highly ligatured (note  $\alpha\rho$ ,  $\nu\lambda$  in 3). The ink is faded.

In a letter addressed to the strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, the writer—probably an epistrategos—rules that additional pastophoroi appointed, on the basis of authorization from the prefect, to the body of those in charge of the security at an unidentified temple are entitled to share in the *phylaktron* on the same basis as the other pastophoroi. This short document provides the name of a hitherto unknown strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome (Athenodoros) 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.

Even though palaeographical considerations might suggest a date earlier in the second century, the writer, (C.) Statilius Maximus, is to be identified with the well-known epistrategos of the Heptanomia, whose tenure lies in the second part of the 150s, probably from the summer of 156 until the spring or summer of 159 (cf. J. D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Roman Egypt* [Papyrologica Coloniensia 6, Cologne 1982] 188). Thus, the date of the papyrus is 20 December 156 (= 20th year of Antoninus Pius,

Hadrianos/Choiak 24). The addressee, Athenodoros, appears here for the first time, at least in the function of strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, sometime between March 154 and Jan./Feb. 159 (cf. J. E. G. Whitehorne, *ZPE* 29 [1978] 167-89; and Bastianini and Whitehorne, *Strategi* 92-93). He is perhaps the same man as Valerius Athenodorus, the royal scribe (?) who wrote *P. Oxy.* IV 800 in late 154 (cf. A. Martin, *Cd'E* 54 [1979] 131-33 = *SB XVI* 12374). If this identification is correct, it may provide a very rare instance of a progression from royal scribe to strategos (cf. J. E. G. Whitehorne in *Proc. XVIth Int. Congr. of Papyr.* 419-28, esp. 421, n.6; and 427, nn. 18 and 19).

There is so far very little evidence for the involvement of the epistrategos in temple affairs. From the early second century A.D., the high-level civil administration of temples was the responsibility of the high priest of Alexandria and all Egypt (cf. M. Stead, in *Proc. XVIth Int. Congr. of Papyr.* 411-18) or of the idios logos (cf. Swarney, *Idios Logos* 83-96). By contrast, the role of the prefect in temple administration, at least during the first century A.D., and of the strategos is better attested (cf. *BASP* 28 [1991] 108-13, with references and full bibliography). In this document, the epistrategos is involved in settling a question referred by the strategos concerning the entitlement of pastophoroi to emoluments derived from a tax (cf. *BASP* 28, 118-19).

Στατίλλιος Μάξιμος Ἀθηνοδώρωι στρα(τηγῶ) Ὁξυρυγχ(είτου)  
 χαίρειν·  
 εἰ, ὡς γράφεις, ἐκ συνχωρήσεως τοῦ κρατίστου ἡγεμόνος  
 τοῖς παραφυλάσσουσι τὸ ἱερὸν ἄλλοι γ' καιστοφόροι προσκατε-  
 4 στάθησαν, δύνανται καὶ οἷτοι ὁμοίως τοῖς [σ]υνοῦσι τὸ  
 φύλακτρ' ἔ[ν]·  
 λαμβάνειν. ἐρρώσθαί σε εὐχομ(αι) (ἔτους) κ // Ἀδριανοῦ κθ.

1 Στατίλλιος 2 συνχωρήσεως

Statilius Maximus to Athenodoros, strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. If, as you write, on the basis of a ruling given by his Excellency the prefect another three pastophoroi have been appointed in addition to those in charge of the security of the temple, then these also, like their colleagues, 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 Athenodoros and their respective functions, cf. introduction (above) and, for more details, the historical commentary in *BASP* 28, 104-08. The identification of Statilius Maximus with the early-second-century-A.D. *idios logos* attested in a Greek inscription from Thebes (*OGIS* 408 = *IGRR* I 1226) is unlikely, though not completely impossible. The date of the document would then be 138.

2 We have adopted a reading of D. Hagedorn for the beginning of this line instead of that given in the first edition (cf. lemma above). The epistrategos here effectively protects himself from liability in case the pastophoroi have not in fact been appointed by order of the prefect.

*συγχώρησις* is usually found in the expression *κατὰ τὴν συγχώρησιν*, and is rarely introduced by *ἐκ* in the papyri. The only parallel known to us 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).

The prefect in charge at the time was M. Sempronius Liberalis, attested from Aug. 29, 154 until Aug./Sept. 159 (cf. G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 [1975] 292-94 and *ZPE* 38 [1980] 82). His intervention here might have been exceptional (cf. *BASP* 28, 111-12).

3 About the men in charge of the *παραφυλακή* of the temple, cf. *BASP* 28, 113-18. The verb *παραφυλάσσω* 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, index. The temple referred to cannot be identified and may have been located in one of the villages of the nome rather than in the metropolis (cf. *BASP* 28, 120).

On the role of pastophoroi, cf. H.-B. Schönborn, *Die Pastophoren im Kult der ägyptischen Götter* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 80, Meisenheim am Glan 1976); and *BASP* 28, 113-20 (with additional references and bibliography).

3-4 *προσκαθίσταμαι* is rare in documentary papyri (but common enough in prose history). The only other documentary instances known to us are *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 A.D. 83 regarding the appointment of a *βιβλιοφύλαξ* through a procedure very similar to that described in our document. On the legal, social, and economic aspects of the appointment of administrative personnel in government-related services in the Roman empire, cf. J.-J. Aubert, *Business Managers in Ancient Rome. A Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 B.C.-A.D. 250* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 21, Leiden 1994), chapter 5. The reading here is Hagedorn's.

4 We have adopted Hagedorn's reading of [σ]υνοῦσι; as he notes, the alternative suggested in a note to the first edition, [ν]ῦν οὔσι, is also possible. For οὔσι one might also read αὔσι, but space considerations favor omicron over alpha.

The police-tax (*φύλακτρον*) is attested only in the second century A.D. and was collected by associated *πράκτορες ἀργυρικῶν* (cf. *BASP* 28, 118-19, with references).

5 *ἐρρώσθαί 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* (156/7) or, less likely, *β* (137/8); see above, note to line 1. 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 Diospolite 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 *dioiketēs*] 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]; and *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, *Epistrategos* 194; and J. Bingen, “I.ThSy. 12 (SB I 1525), Antinous 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 about this specific point is weak, if not utterly mistaken.

[Jean-Jacques Aubert]