



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF PAPYROLOGY



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW
FACULTY OF LAW AND ADMINISTRATION
CHAIR OF ROMAN LAW AND THE LAW OF ANTIQUITY



THE RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG
FOUNDATION

THE JOURNAL OF JURISTIC PAPYROLOGY

FOUNDED BY
RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG

EDITED BY
TOMASZ DERDA
ADAM ŁAJTAR
JAKUB URBANIK

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS
GRZEGORZ OCHAŁA

VOL. XLVI (2016)

SCIENTIFIC BOARD

Roger S. Bagnall (New York University), **Benedetto Bravo** (Uniwersytet Warszawski), **Willy Clarysse** (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), **Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski** (Université Paris I – Sorbonne/École pratique des hautes études), **Bernard H. Stolte** (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen), **Dorothy Thompson** (Girton College, Cambridge University), **Jacques van der Vliet** (Universiteit Leiden/Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen), **Ewa Wipszycka** (Uniwersytet Warszawski)

LANGUAGE CONSULTANTS

English: **Giovanni R. Ruffini** (Fairfield University), French: **Chris Rodriguez** (Université Paris I), German: **Martin Lemke** (Uniwersytet Warszawski), Italian: **Fabiana Tuccillo** (Università degli studi di Napoli «Federico II»), Spanish: **José Luis Alonso** (Universität Zürich)

© For the book by Fundacja im. Rafała Taubenschlaga
© For the constituting papers by the authors

Computer design and DTP by
Tomasz Derda, Grzegorz Ochała, and Jakub Urbanik

Cover design by
Maryna Wiśniewska

Warszawa 2016

ISSN 0075–4277

This publication has been published with financial support from the Institute of Archaeology and Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Warsaw

Wydanie I (wersja pierwotna)
Nakład: 200 egz.

Druk i oprawa: Sowa Sp. z o.o., ul. Raszyńska 13, 05-500 Piaseczno

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITORS IX

Katarzyna DANYS & Marcin KOTYL

A name tag on a piece of Late Roman Amphora (LR7) 1

Abstract: The paper offers an edition of an unpublished ostrakon from the Giessen Collections bearing the siglum O. Giss. inv. 537. It is a potsherd of an Egyptian Late Roman amphora (LR 7) carrying a short one-line name tag that was most likely used to indicate the ownership.

Keywords: Late Roman Egypt, inscription, name labels, amphora, LR7, Giessen papyrus collection.

John LONDON

Intorno all'entagion emou 9

Abstract: The article focuses on fourteen published documents opening with the phrase *ἐντάγιον ἐμοῦ*. Thirteen of these texts are receipts; in this group, some documents record payments related to taxation (*demosia*, *embole*, the freight charge – *naulon*), while others refer to loan repayments, disbursements in kind (wine), or unidentified payments. One papyrus, on the other hand, is an order of payment. The article analyses the physical features, the structure and vocabulary of the documents, and, last but not least, their provenance and date. All texts are associated – certainly or with a high degree of probability – with Oxyrhynchos or the Oxyrhynchite nome and dated to the fifth–sixth c. AD. Therefore, they would represent a local documentary model and its variations.

Keywords: *entagia*, receipts, orders of payment, fiscality, transactions, documentary model, Oxyrhynchos.

Martin MUSS & Patrick REINARD

Ἀργύριον δημόσιον καινόν? Überlegungen zu dem Fragment P. Dura 129 und zur Münzprägung unter Severus Alexander im Jahr 225/6 n. Chr.

21

Abstract: The paper offers an examination of the phrase ἀργύριον δημόσιον καινόν in *P. Dura* 129. Its main focus is a comparison of the term with numismatic evidence. After a short analysis of the document itself, different possibilities for the label 'new' are discussed. For this purpose new coin motifs, changes of the emperor's portrait, unusual coin legends, political changes, and connections with unknown victories or even new coin types are investigated.

Keywords: Dura-Europos, new coins, new money, numismatic, reverse types, *restitutio monetae*, Greek imperials, provincial coinage, *P. Dura*.

Lothar THÜNGEN

Zwei Fragmente frühbyzantinischer Rechtsliteratur aus Hermopolis Magna. Neu-edition von P. Berol. Inv. Nr. 16976 und 16977. Teil I. Einleitung zu beiden Papyri. Neu-edition von P. 16977 aus einer griechischen Index-Vorlesung zu den diokletianischen Kodizes

47

Abstract: In 1945 Wilhelm Schubart published two papyri in the Festschrift for Leopold Wenger. In the present paper (in two subsequent parts) I wish to offer their re-edition and a new commentary to both of them. Among other things, their new dating has been established to AD 450–500. Because they deal with completely different subjects, it is assumed here that they belonged to two different codices, contrary to Schubart's opinion, who believed that they are part of one and the same manuscript. P. 16977, edited in the first part of the paper, originates from Eastern Roman legal teaching practice. It is a fragment of a Greek index lecture about two Diocletianic codes. Greek indices were concise summaries of Latin legal texts, intended especially for law students who did not know Latin. The present fragment deals with nine constitutions about non *numerata pecunia*, 'the lack of payment for a credit'. One constitution is taken from the Hermogenian Code, the remaining ones from the Gregorian Code. Four of them are completely or partly preserved in the Justinianic Code (CI. 4, 30, 4–7).

Keywords: juristic papyrology, legal literature, teaching Roman law in Greek, index lesson, Codex Gregorianus, Codex Hermogenianus, *exceptio non numeratae pecuniae*, Hermopolis Magna.

Joanna WEGNER

The Bawit monastery of Apa Apollo in the Hermopolite nome and its relations with the 'world outside'

147

Abstract: The present article gathers papyrological testimonies of contacts of the monastic community at Bawit and its members with 'the world outside':

officials, tenants, and various partners in economic activities. Its objective is to investigate the role played by these external connections in the life of the monastery in the sixth–eighth centuries and the extent to which economic and fiscal circumstances could influence the administration of the community.

Keywords: Bawit, monastic economy, monastic organisation and administration.

Marzena WOJTCZAK

Legal aspects of dispute resolution in Late Antiquity. The case of P. Mich. XIII 659 ... 275

Abstract: The arbitration and settlement of claims in the Roman law have been the subject of multiple analyses. Recent years have witnessed a particular interest in the practical application of these institutions in Late Antiquity. At first sight, legal papyri may seem confusing and give the impression that they present solutions distant from the standard ones known from the compilations of the law. When one ventures to take a closer look, however, at the complex web of legal concepts and terms, one can notice the context in which the agreement is situated as well as the relations connecting both sides of the dispute. The present article offers a legal analysis of *P. Mich. XIII 659*, published in 1977, which concerns a dispute settled by means of *mesiteia* (i.e. mediation/arbitration). A plausible reconstruction of events is provided, which allows insight into the numerous correlations between the institutions as well as regulations known from the law on the one hand, and the legal practice as demonstrated by the papyri on the other. Finally, a short, polemical commentary is offered concerning the popularity of arbitration/mediation in Late Antiquity, a phenomenon frequently noted in literature.

Keywords: papyri, legal practice, Roman law, dispute resolution, arbitration/mediation, Late Antiquity, *P. Mich. XIII 659*, guarantee sales, Egypt.

Joanna Wegner

**THE BAWIT MONASTERY OF APA APOLLO
IN THE HERMOPOLITE NOME AND ITS RELATIONS
WITH THE ‘WORLD OUTSIDE’***

THE RENUNCIATION of worldly cares is a pivotal theme in the literary narratives depicting the Egyptian monastic movement in Late Antiquity. Monastic literature served many purposes, among which the preservation of tradition, construing and legitimising identities, and, last but not least, edification, were the most prominent. Rooted as they were in spirituality and imagination, these texts rarely ventured into the sphere of the daily lives of their heroes, and if they did, it was not to provide exhaustive and realistic accounts thereof. Interactions with the ‘outside world’, however, were an inevitable element of the monastic existence, especially since monastic communities began to amass wealth and became an element of

* The present text is a revised version of the fourth chapter of my doctoral dissertation *Monastic Communities in Context: Social and Economic Interrelations of Monastic Institutions in Middle Egypt (6th–8th century)* prepared under the supervision of Professor Tomasz Derda in the Department of Papyrology, Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw (manuscript submitted in January 2017). I am greatly indebted to Ewa Wipszycka, Tomasz Derda, and Todd M. Hickey for their remarks on the manuscript.

Greek and Coptic sources are cited after their respective editions. All translations of Greek texts are mine, unless indicated otherwise; all translations from Coptic are given after the texts’ editions and left in the original languages of the editions, unless indicated otherwise.

the economic and social networks of the Egyptian *chora* – a fact noticed and appreciated by James E. Goehring in his essay on the social and economic aspects of early monasticism in Egypt.¹ A monastic community was, first and foremost, a religious institution centred on a specific form of devotion and service to God. Through processes partially traceable in our sources, the communities established their presence in the Egyptian landscape not only in the spiritual, but also in the practical domain. These practical workings were connected mainly with the acquisition and use of worldly possessions and the ensuing fiscal and managerial responsibilities. It is only through the insight into the everyday functioning of monastic communities gained from documentary papyri and ostraca that the scale and importance of this engagement can be fully appreciated. Thanks to documents, scholars are able to explore a vital aspect of Late Antique monasticism which would largely escape them had they been confined to the literary record (this does not mean that one group of the sources contradicts the other, or that the documents render null and void the ideal expounded in the literary narratives; the question is one of focus and perspective, not of the value of the two groups of sources).

Taxpaying and various activities related to land acquisition and management, as well as circulation of goods within the communities and between the communities and ‘the world’ are predominant themes in documentary evidence from monastic centres.² All these activities were impracticable

¹J. E. GOEHRING, ‘The world engaged: the social and economic world of early Egyptian monasticism’, [in:] IDEM, *Ascetics, Society, and the Desert. Studies in Early Egyptian Monasticism*, Harrisburg 1999, pp. 39–52, esp. p. 41. Goehring builds his argument mainly on literary sources (the Pachomian and Shenoutean writings, the Apophthegms) but adduces also the testimony of early documentary texts related to monastic ownership of property (*P. Lips.* 28; *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3203). He emphasises the role of the *oikonomoi* of the Pachomian *koinonia* in property management and deployment of monastic workforce (p. 48). Goehring presents the social and economic position of the monasteries in terms of growing domination over local peasant populations which caused the monasteries to play a role analogous to that of the great estates (p. 49); this last statement is an exaggeration which does not find confirmation in papyrological sources.

²The largest collections of documentary material from monastic Egypt include the dossier of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit (which is my subject here), the groups of seventh–eighth-century texts from the monasteries of Apa Thomas in Wadi Sarga (*P. Sarga*)

without frequent and close contacts with lay society, represented by the officials of the State and the local village communities, tenants, workers, and business partners. The monasteries had to take their lay counterparties into account if they were to operate efficiently in the complex social and economic networks of the Egyptian countryside. The need to respond to the demands entailed in occupying a position among the economic units in the *chora* acted as a stimulant in the development of organisational structures in monasteries. If monastic spiritual profile was construed in sharp opposition to ‘worldly’ attitudes and concerns (as suggested by our literary sources), monastic institutions were a response to the necessity of collaboration with the ‘outside world’ on many different levels. Understanding the complexities of the institutional history of Late Antique Egyptian monasticism is impossible without considering how the communities and their members interacted with the surrounding world.

From this point of view, the documentary dossier of the monastery of Apa Apollo in Bawit (Hermopolites) presents us with a good opportunity to observe and analyse the interactions with the various strata of lay society and the role these interactions played in the monastery’s functioning.

and of Apa Apollo in Deir el-Bala’izah (*P. Bal.*, vol. II), and the documents from the region of Western Thebes which can be associated with several communities and anchoritic settlements (see E. WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés monastiques en Égypte (IV^e–VIII^e siècle)* [= *Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement* 11], Warsaw 2009, pp. 91–99). Another important group of texts is the documentary dossier of the monastic settlement of Deir el-Naqlun (Fayum), dated to the sixth–seventh centuries. This collection, however, is different, as it consists mainly of private letters of the community members and focuses on what we would call the monks’ individual business affairs, see *P. Naqlun* I and II; T. DERDA & J. WEGNER, ‘New documentary papyri from the Polish excavations at Deir el-Naqlun (*P. Naqlun* 35–38)’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 44 (2014), pp. 117–131; T. DERDA & J. WEGNER, ‘Πατέρες τοῦ ἁγίου Νεκλονίου. Functionaries of the Naqlun monastery in the first two centuries of its existence’, [in:] A. ŁAJTAR, A. OBŁUSKI & I. ZYCH (eds.), *Aegyptus et Nubia Christiana. The Włodzimierz Godlewski Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Warsaw 2016, pp. 73–87; T. DERDA & J. WEGNER, ‘Letter from Tebetny to the monks of Naqlun concerning fieldwork (*P. Naqlun* 39)’, [in:] *Mélanges Gascou* [= *Travaux et mémoires* 20], Paris 2016, pp. 133–150. An insight into the landowning-based business affairs of monasteries can be gained also through the sixth-century documents from the archive of Dioskoros of Aphrodite (the Aphrodite cadastre [SB XX 14669], and several leases and rent receipts which indicate the prominence of local and external monastic communities in the Aphroditan landowning structure).

The documents give us an insight into the contexts of these interactions and the strategies applied by the monastic administration in their dealings with officials and villagers. The necessity to run a fully operational enterprise dependent on a number of formal and informal links with the 'outside world' led to the development of channels of communication and unique structures whose traces are preserved in the documents produced in and for the monastery.

Another advantage of the Bawit texts consists in the fact that they illustrate the relations with laypeople on two different levels: that of the monastery and that of individual monks. Private business contacts maintained by the monks belonged to a sphere independent from the communal dealings of the monastic institution. These individual relations recorded in the documents are our most telling testimony to the economic independence of the monks. Their study is essential to our understanding of one of the key features of the Bawit community: the ability of the monks to keep and use their personal property.

Among the dossiers of monastic Egypt, the Bawit one is probably the richest and most comprehensive, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, providing scholars with hundreds of texts representing an exceptionally wide range of documentary types (for a presentation of the sources, see below, pp. 155–167). These features determine the perspective adopted in the present paper, which is based mostly on papyrological material. The contribution of other types of sources available for the Bawit monastery – literary accounts, archaeological data, and epigraphic material – to our understanding of the problems I intend to explore is less significant. I have already mentioned why monastic literature, with its ideological and religious frame of reference, is of little help when it comes to reconstructing the details of everyday life.³ Archaeological remains discovered at Bawit in

³ Additionally, as Ewa Wipszycka points out in her remarks on the Bawit monastery in *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 149–150, the chronological gap between *HM* 8, reflecting the activity of the fourth-century Hermopolite Apa Apollo, and the material vestiges at the site in Bawit is particularly large. Wipszycka says also that due to the fact that more than one Middle-Egyptian monastic community bore the name of Apollo, the name of the hero of *HM* 8 does not suffice to establish a secure connection between him and the site at Bawit.

the course of over a century of excavations and surveys provide us with some general (and, for that matter, very helpful) clues as to the community organisation which fit the data obtained from documentary sources (pp. 168–169). The value of the archaeological material is both informative and illustrative, but its state of research imposes serious limitations on its use for formulating more elaborate conclusions. The inscriptions found on the walls of different structures on the site at Bawit constitute a category apart. The Bawit inscriptions served mainly to commemorate living and deceased individuals and groups of individuals – male and female monastics (resident and visiting), as well as and lay men and women who visited the monastery. Monastics and lay people are not always easy to distinguish because many of the texts do not indicate the status of the commemorated persons.⁴ Pilgrimage, religious tourism and the related commemorative practices undeniably constitute an aspect of contacts between monasteries and ‘the world’; these phenomena had not only symbolic but also economic significance. On the one hand, the visitors’ gifts and offerings added to the monastery’s income; on the other, the inflow of people necessitated various arrangements on the part of the monastery’s administration in order to accommodate and feed the visitors.⁵ Unfortunately, the available archaeo-

⁴ Numerous visitors’ inscriptions were discovered in the so-called Hall 6, unearthed during one of the early campaigns at Bawit conducted by Jean Maspero; see J. DORESE, *Les anciens monastères coptes de Moyenne Égypte (du Gebel-el-Teir à Kom Ishgaou) d’après l’archéologie et l’habitiographie*, PhD thesis, Paris 1967 [= *Neges Ebrix. Bulletin de l’Institut d’archéologie yverdonnaise* 4], Yverdon-les-Bains 2000, p. 286; the inscriptions are reproduced in J. MASPERO & E. DRIOTON, *Fouilles exécutées à Baouît* [= *MIFAO* 59.1–2], Cairo 1931–1943, vol. I, pp. 63–120.

⁵ For pilgrimage to religious centres in Egypt in general, see D. FRANKFURTER, *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*, Leiden – Boston – Cologne 1998. Accommodation of pilgrims is mentioned in *HL VII.4 (xenodocheion* in Nitria). A planned installation for the accommodation of itinerant monks in a monastery is mentioned in *P. Cair. Masp.* I 67096 (573) – an Aphroditan document from the Dioskoros archive (ll. 26–31). A structure interpreted by Peter Grossmann as a hostel for visitors is located outside the wall enclosing the monastery of Apa Apollo in Deir el-Bala’izah (see P. GROSSMANN, ‘Ruinen des Klösters Dair al-Balaizā in Oberägypten’, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 36 [1993], pp. 171–205). Cf. also the mention of numerous visitors arriving at the monastery in Naqlun in *The Life of Samuel of Kalamun (Life 9; The Life of Samuel of Kalamun by Isaac the Presbyter*, E. ALCOCK [ed. & transl.], Warminster 1983, p. 83, Coptic text at pp. 8–9); the text is dated to the eighth century and describes events that took place few years before the Arab conquest.

logical and documentary data do not allow us to study these matters. References to offerings or services to pilgrims are absent from the documents (or they were recorded in a manner which does not enable us to recognise them for what they were), while the studies of the spatial organisation of the monastery are not advanced enough to allow for conclusions. Therefore, I decided to exclude religious interactions from the discussion.

The Bawit monastery was the most prominent monastic institution in the Hermopolites at the end of the Byzantine period and during the first century of Arab rule. The volume and complexity of the sources related to it and methodological challenges posed by them call for several introductory remarks before proceeding to their analysis and interpretation. The following sections of the paper will be devoted to the presentation of the site and papyrological sources; questions of monastic organisation and structure will be addressed subsequently, followed by an introduction to the crucial question of identifying laypeople in monastic archives. The final three sections will focus on the central questions of the paper: the monastery's relations with officials and local representatives, the monks' individual business activity, and the role played by laypeople in monastic economy.

1. SOURCES AND STATE OF RESEARCH

1.1. Location of the monastery and excavations on the site

The Bawit monastery was located 25 kilometres from the ancient nome capital Hermopolis Megale. Its main enclosure was situated on the level hilltop of a *kom* measuring 930 by 410 metres.⁶ Archaeological research on

⁶ For a general description of the monastery, see *Coptic Encyclopedia*, s.v. 'Bawit' (three articles: R.-G. COQUIN & M. MARTIN, 'History'; H. G. SEVERIN, 'Archaeology, architecture, and sculpture'; P. DE BOURGUET, 'Paintings'); WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 143–150. Literature on the excavations at Bawit and the monastery in general is vast, reflecting the significance of the site; see, among others, J. CLÉDAT, s.v. 'Baouit', [in:] *Dictionnaire de l'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*; M. KRAUSE & K. WESSEL, s.v. 'Bawit', [in:] *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*. The most comprehensive description of the site is found in DORESE, *Les anciens monastères* (cit. n. 4), pp. 270–360. Dorese's description gives

the site commenced in the beginning of the twentieth century and has continued with periodical interruptions until the recent years. The first phase of the excavations, conducted before the outbreak of World War I under the auspices of the IFAO, first by Jean Clédat, then by Jean Maspero, revealed a fair amount of architectural remains,⁷ including two churches,⁸ a refectory, and a number of vaulted edifices, some of which had once been multi-storeyed. In the southern part of the *kom*, Charles Palanque and Jean Maspero discovered structures with inscriptions and paintings which may point to the occupation of this part of the plateau by female monastics. The relation between the alleged female community and the community of Apa Apollo cannot be determined based on the available material.⁹

a detailed account of the excavation reports by Jean Clédat and Jean Maspero. For the history of excavations, see, among others, H. TORP, 'Le monastère copte de Baouît. Quelques notes d'introduction', *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia* 9 (1981), pp. 1–8; D. BÉNAZETH, 'Histoire des fouilles de Baouît', *Études coptes* IV, pp. 53–62; EADEM, 'Recherches archéologiques à Baouît: un nouveau départ', *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte* 43 (2004), pp. 9–24; S. MARCHAND, G. MAROUARD, M. MOSSAKOWSKA-GAUBERT, F. CALAMENT & C. MEURICE, 'Survey du monastère d'aba Apollô de Baouît: données archéologiques et analyses préliminaires de la céramique et du verre des ermitages "de la montagne"', forthcoming; G. HADJI-MINOGLU, 'Découvertes récentes à Baouît', [in:] *Copt. Congr. X*, vol. I, pp. 639–650. See also M. KRAUSE, 'Zu den nach Apollo benannten Klöstern in Ägypten', *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientalwissenschaft* 35 (2003), pp. 149–166.

⁷ See J. CLÉDAT, *Le monastère et la necropole de Baouît* [= MIFAO 12.1–2], Cairo 1904–1906; IDEM, 'Rapport de M. Jean Maspero sur les fouilles entreprises à Baouît', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres* 1913, pp. 287–301; IDEM, *Le monastère et la necropole de Baouît* [= MIFAO 39], Cairo 1916; MASPERO & DRIOTON, *Fouilles* (cit. n. 4); D. BÉNAZETH & M.-H. RUTSCHOWSCAYA (eds.), J. CLÉDAT, *Le monastère et la necropole de Baouît* [= MIFAO III], Cairo 1999.

⁸ Architectural elements of one of the Bawit churches have been transported to Paris and reassembled in the Louvre; see D. BÉNAZETH, *Baouit. Une église copte au Louvre*, Paris 2002. On the Bawit churches, see M. RASSART-DEBERGH, 'Notes sur les églises de Baouît: une relecture du dossier de Clédat', [in:] *Études coptes* VI, pp. 69–94, esp. pp. 78–88 with further bibliography.

⁹ See MASPERO & DRIOTON, *Fouilles* (cit. n. 4), vol. I, Introduction, p. vi. See also WIP-SZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 583–596. Female monastics are almost completely absent from Bawit documentary record, except for *P.Lond. Copt.* I 1130, where a nun named Ruth is said to receive thirty-six *kadoi* of wine. The amount is considerable (it equals the disbursement for three agricultural workers listed in the same document) and we can suspect that Ruth was representing her community to which the wine was actually given.

Some of the structures discovered in the beginning of the twentieth century were finely decorated with wall paintings and had windows with glass panes. Initially, Clédat interpreted them as chapels; Maspero and Maurice Martin, however, saw in them dwellings of the richest members of the community; their interpretation is widely accepted nowadays.¹⁰ The structures unearthed in this phase of excavation on the *kom* included also a number of small bread ovens – a feature which is important for the reconstruction of the community organisation (see below, p. 168).¹¹

After a major break, the excavations were resumed in 1976–1985 by the Egyptian Service des Antiquités. The most recent phase of archaeological research started in 2003, again under the auspices of the IFAO, and was joined by a team from the Louvre. Works executed during this phase included a geophysical prospection of the *kom* conducted by Tomasz Herbich between 2004 and 2007. As their result, Herbich elaborated a plan of the architectural structures on the *kom*.¹² His efforts to juxtapose the results of the non-invasive prospection with maps and plans drawn during the early excavations revealed inaccuracies in the older documentation. Geophysical scanning carried out in 2005 and 2006 by Sylvie Marchand encompassed the plateau 800 metres west of the *kom*, where a grouping of 36 hermitages grouped in four clusters, whose existence had been signalled already by Clédat, is located.¹³

Although the literary tradition connected with the monastery of Apa Apollo suggests a very early, fourth-century date of its foundation, the oldest remains discovered at the site can be dated to the sixth century;

¹⁰ See MASPERO & DRIOTON, *Fouilles* (cit. n. 4), vol. I, Introduction; WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), p. 146. Cf. KRAUSE & WESSEL, 'Bawit' (cit. n. 6), col. 569.

¹¹ See A. DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 85. For ovens at Bawit and in other Egyptian monasteries, see E. WIPSZYCKA, 'Resources and economic activities of the Egyptian monastic communities (4th–8th century)', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 41 (2011), pp. 159–263, esp. pp. 190–191.

¹² T. HERBICH & D. BÉNAZETH, 'Le *kom* de Baouît: étapes d'une cartographie', *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 108 (2008), pp. 165–204; the private version of the plan executed by Tomasz Herbich is reproduced in WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), between pp. 142 and 143.

¹³ CLÉDAT, *Le monastère et la nécropole* [= MIFAO 12] (cit. n. 7), pp. 190–191, fig. 2.

the site was abandoned in the twelfth century.¹⁴ Most buildings on the *kom* date to the sixth–eighth centuries, while the installations in the western cluster of hermitages functioned between the second half of the seventh and the first half of the eighth century. The chronology of archaeological material is consistent with the dates established or proposed for the documents of the monastery dossier. Documentary papyri connected with the Bawit monastery are dated to the sixth (texts written in Greek; mostly loan contracts) and seventh–eighth centuries (administrative and legal documents written predominantly in the Coptic language).

1.2. Documentary dossier of the monastery of Apa Apollo

Documentary evidence connected with the community of Apa Apollo has drawn much attention over the last twenty years. The enormous dossier of the monastery comprises administrative documents produced by managerial units of the community (mostly in Coptic), Coptic agreements concluded by the monks and related to the community's economic activities, and a group of loan contracts drawn up in Greek or in Coptic. The dossier includes texts retrieved during excavations and documents without known archaeological context which are scattered around the world in various collections. The documents of the latter group can be connected with the Bawit monastery thanks to such internal criteria as characteristic documentary formulas, recurrent toponyms, or anthroponyms.¹⁵ The painstaking task of reconstructing the Bawit archives was initiated by the prematurely deceased British Coptologist Sarah J. Clackson

¹⁴ See WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 27–28 and 150. The question of the establishment and abandonment of the monastery was discussed in H. TORP, 'La date de la fondation du monastère d'apa Apollô de Baouit et de son abandon', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* (1965), pp. 153–177. For a summary of the discussion, see DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 54–58.

¹⁵ On the reconstruction of the dossier, see S. J. CLACKSON, 'Reconstructing the archives of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit', [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXII, vol. I, pp. 219–236; EADEM, *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 9–14. For the history of the collections, see also introductions to the respective publications. On the documents which use characteristic phrasing and vocabulary particular to Bawit, see below, pp. 160–165.

and is continued by a number of scholars, including Alain Delattre, Anne Boud'hors, and Gesa Schenke.

The community of Apa Apollo appears in the documents under various names, e.g., 'the monastery of the mount of Titkois (*ΤΙΤΚΩΙΣ*; Copt. *ΤΙΤΚΟΟΨ*)', 'the *topos* of Apa Apollo (in the region of Shmoun = Hermopolis)', 'the *monasterion* of Apa Apollo', or 'the place (Copt. *ⲙⲁ*) of Apa Apollo'.¹⁶ The identification of the monastery of Titkois/Titkooh with Bawit was the subject of a long discussion but is now widely accepted in scholarship.¹⁷

Texts connected with the monastery of Apa Apollo in the Hermopolite nome and texts mentioning Titkois share several features. Both groups include the so-called '*aparche* collection texts', which constitute a

¹⁶ After CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 14–15. For an overview of the attestations of this and other monasteries named after Apa Apollo, see also N. KRUIT, 'Three Byzantine sales on future delivery: SB XVI 12401 + 12402, SB VI 9051, *P. Lond.* III 997', *Tyche* 9 (1994), pp. 67–88, esp. pp. 70–77.

¹⁷ Sarah J. Clackson initially identified the two institutions (CLACKSON, 'Reconstructing the archives' [cit. n. 15], pp. 222–223). However, in her major publication of Bawit documents, *P. Mon. Apollo*, she questioned the identification and listed the documents from Titkois separately in Appendix 3 (p. 143). Niko Kruit studied the designations of various monasteries bearing the name of Apa Apollo in the papyri and was inclined to think that Titkois was a separate monastic settlement (KRUIT, 'Three Byzantine sales' [cit. n. 16], pp. 70–71). Bawit and Titkois are treated separately also in KRAUSE, 'Zu den nach Apollo benannten Klöstern' (cit. n. 6), pp. 157–162. See also S. TIMM, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit: Eine Sammlung christlicher Stätten in Ägypten in arabischer Zeit, unter Ausschluss von Alexandria, Kairo, des Apa-Mena-Klosters (Dēr Abū Mīna), der Skētīs (Wādī n-Natrūn) und der Sinai-Regio*, Wiesbaden 1984–1992, pp. 2077–2080 (s.v. 'Ptoou n-Titkooh'). Ewa Wipszycka refrained from a definite conclusion invoking the lack of decisive proofs (WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* [cit. n. 2], p. 150). Alain Delattre believed that the Hermopolite monastery of Apa Apollo and the *topos* of Titkois were one and the same place. See DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 42–44, quoting Tito Orlandi (in: T. ORLANDI & A. CAMPAGNANO, *Vita dei monachi Phife Longino*, Milan 1975, p. 18), who considers Titkois the most ancient name of the monastery referring to the nearby village. After the monastery had become famous, the designation would have changed to Bawit (derived from the Coptic *ⲡⲁⲮⲏⲦ*, 'the monastery') which, with the passage of time, came to describe also the village itself. Delattre also connects all the Greek loan documents mentioning Titkois with Bawit in A. DELATTRE, 'Un contrat de prêt copte du monastère de Baouît', *Chronique d'Égypte* 79 (2004), pp. 385–389, esp. p. 385. Also Jean Gascou pronounced himself in favour of the identification, connecting the appearance of a number of texts mentioning Titkois on the antiquities market with the pillage of the Bawit site in ca. 1975 (J. GASCOU, *P. Sorb.* II 69, p. 81).

characteristic category of Coptic documents (see below, pp. 160–162). Also documentary formulas, toponyms, names of persons, and titles recur both in the texts of established Bawit provenance and in the documents mentioning Titkois. Therefore, it appears that the ‘Titkois dossier’ can be safely connected with the Bawit monastery.

The dossier of Apa Apollon is one of the largest collections connected with a single monastery from Byzantine and early Arab Egypt. It is also one that has profited greatly from the general dynamic development of Coptic studies. A significant part of the documentation is gathered in several major publications; many texts, however, have been published in separate articles in various journals and proceedings.¹⁸ Studies based on

¹⁸ Major publications: the edition of ostraca from Bawit (waybills and fragmentary lists and accounts) by Anne Boud’hors in BÉNAZETH & RUTSCHOWSCAYA (eds.), *Le monastère et la nécropole* (cit. n. 7), pp. 247–309; S. J. CLACKSON, *Coptic and Greek Texts Relating to the Hermopolite Monastery of Apa Apollo*, Oxford 2000 [= *P. Mon. Apollo*]; EADEM, *It is Our Father Who Writes: Orders from the Monastery of Apollo at Bawit*, Cincinnati 2008 [= *P. Bawit Clackson*]; A. DELATTRE, *Papyrus coptes et grecs du monastère d’apa Apollô de Baouît conservés aux Musées royaux d’Art et d’Histoire de Bruxelles*, Brussels 2004 [= *P. Brux. Bawit*]; A. BOUD’HORS, *Ostraca grecs et coptes des fouilles de Jean Maspero à Baouît: O. Bawit IFAO 1–67 et O. Nancy*, Cairo 2004 [= *O. Bawit IFAO*]; S. J. CLACKSON & A. DELATTRE, *Papyrus grecs et coptes de Baouît conservés au Musée du Louvre*, Cairo 2014 [= *P. Louvre Bawit*]; S. LOPIZZO, *Les ostraca grecs et coptes du monastère de Baouît conservés à la Fondation Bible + Orient de l’université de Fribourg (Suisse)* [= *O. Bawit Fribourg*], Cairo 2016; G. SCHENKE, *Kölner ägyptische Papyri. Band 2: koptische Urkunden der früh-arabischen Zeit* [= *P. Köln ägypt. II*], Cologne 2016, nos. 18–43. Articles: A. DELATTRE & M. J. ALBARRÁN MARTÍNEZ, ‘Un contrat de prêt copte du monastère d’apa Apollô à Baouît conservé à la collection Palau-Ribes’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 52 (2015), pp. 79–85; DELATTRE, ‘Un contrat de prêt copte’ (cit. n. 17); IDEM, ‘Une liste de propriétés foncières du monastère d’apa Apollô de Baouît’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 151 (2005), pp. 163–165; IDEM, ‘Une lettre copte du monastère de Baouît. Réédition de P. Mich. Copt. 14’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 44 (2007), pp. 87–95; IDEM, ‘Ordres de paiement bilingues du monastère de Baouît’, *Chronique d’Égypte* 83 (2008), pp. 385–392; IDEM, ‘P. Heid. inv. K. 98: Une nouvelle lettre de Baouît?’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 47 (2010), pp. 236–237; IDEM, ‘Trois papyrus du monastère de Baouît’, *Bulletin de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale* 112 (2012), pp. 101–110; IDEM, ‘Deux ordres du supérieur du monastère de Baouît. P. Duk. inv. 259 et 1053’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 49 (2012), pp. 167–174; IDEM, ‘Nouveaux papyrus du monastère de Baouît’, [in:] *Études coptes XII*, Paris 2013, pp. 61–75; A. DELATTRE & N. GONIS, ‘Le dossier des reçus de taxe grecs du monastère d’apa Apollô à Baouît’, [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 61–71; A. BOUD’HORS & S. J. CLACKSON, ‘Ostraca de Baouît conservés à l’Institut d’egyptologie d’Heidelberg’, [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 1–22; L. S. B. MACCOULL, ‘The Bawit contracts: texts and translations’, *Bulletin of the American*

the Bawit documentation were focused mainly on the internal organisation of the monastery and the fiscal and economic issues,¹⁹ but as yet there has been no comprehensive attempt to investigate the community's relations with 'the world outside'.

Society of Papyrologists 31.3–4 (1994), pp. 141–158; A. BENAÏSSA, 'A usurious monk from the Apa Apollo monastery at Bawit', *Chronique d'Égypte* 85 (2010), pp. 374–381; J. VAN DER VLIET in B. P. MUHS, K. A. WORP & J. VAN DER VLIET, 'Ostraca and mummy labels in Los Angeles', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 43 (2006), pp. 9–58, nos. 31–34, pp. 51–58; A. DELATTRE, P. PILETTE & N. VANTHIEGHEM, 'Papyrus coptes de la Pierpont Morgan Library I. Cinq documents du monastère de Baouït', *Journal of Coptic Studies* 17 (2015), pp. 33–53. A list and concordance of all texts associated with the monastery at Bawit published until 2014 is found in *P. Louvre Bawit*, pp. 133–175.

¹⁹ For an overview of the economic activities of the monastery, see WIPSYZKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 545–565 and EADEM, 'Le fonctionnement interne des monastères et des laures en Égypte du point de vue économique. À propos d'une publication récente de textes coptes de Bawit', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 31 (2001), pp. 169–186; for various aspects of the monastery's economy seen against the background of the Egyptian documentation in general, see also WIPSYZKA, 'Resources' (cit. n. 11), passim. On monastic administration at Bawit, see the introduction to *P. Brux. Bawit* by Alain Delattre (*P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 58–74). See also A. DELATTRE, 'Recherches sur le monastère copte d'apa Apollô (Baouït). L'organisation du monastère au VII^e et VIII^e siècles', *Orientalia d'hier et d'aujourd'hui* [= *Lettres orientales* 8], Leuven 2005, pp. 3–8; IDEM, 'L'administration de Baouït au VIII^e siècle. À propos des documents ΠΕΝΘΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΩΔ', *Chronique d'Égypte* 85 (2010), pp. 391–395. For the fiscal and administrative issues, see A. DELATTRE, 'Le monastère de Baouït et l'administration arabe', [in:] A. T. SCHUBERT & P. M. SIJPESTEIJN (eds.) *Documents and the History of the Early Islamic World. Third Conference of the International Society for Arabic Papyrology, Alexandria, 23–26 March 2006*, Leiden 2014, pp. 43–49; IDEM, 'Remarques sur la taxation au monastère de Baouït au début de l'époque arabe', [in:] A. KAPLONY, D. POTTHAST & C. RÖMER (eds.), *From Bawit to Marw. Documents from the Medieval Muslim World*, Leiden – Boston 2015, pp. 83–93. For the economic questions, see G. SCHENKE, 'Monastic control over agriculture and farming: new evidence from the Egyptian monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit concerning the payment of *aparche*', [in:] A. DELATTRE, M. LEGENDRE & P. SIJPESTEIJN (eds.), *Authority and Control in the Countryside, Continuity and Change in the Mediterranean 6th–10th Century* [= *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* 26], Princeton, forthcoming; EADEM, 'The monastery of Apa Apollo as landowner and employer', [in:] M. LANGELLOTTI & D. RATHBONE (eds.), *Village Institutions in Egypt from Roman to Arab Rule* [*Proceedings of the British Academy*], Oxford, forthcoming; EADEM, 'Micro- and macro-management. Responsibilities of the head of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit', [in:] *Copt. Congr.* X, vol. I, pp. 683–692. For the institutions, see A. DELATTRE, 'La traduction des institutions administratives dans les monastères égyptiens (VII^e–VIII^e siècles)', [in:] F. COLIN, O. HUCK & S. VANSÉVEREN (eds.), *Interpretatio. Traduire l'altérité culturelle dans les civilisations de l'Antiquité*, Paris 2015, pp. 213–228.

The Bawit dossier contains hundreds of texts on papyri and ostraka written mostly in Coptic. Greek documents are few and date mainly from the sixth century;²⁰ the majority of them are credit-related contracts concluded between monks and villagers from various locations in the Hermopolite nome, among which we find both ‘standard’ money loans and the so-called sales on future delivery. Loan contracts are found also among the Coptic documents from Bawit; the monks’ counterparties in these texts are both laymen and other monks.²¹ Other legal deeds include a sale of land to the monastery by the representatives of the village Poraheu (*P. Mon. Apollo* 24; eighth century), a property renunciation by Isak, a monk of Apa Apollo, addressed to the *dikaion* of the monastery (*P. Mon. Apollo* 25; eighth century), and a guarantee for beehives (*P. Mon. Apollo* 50; seventh century), which sheds light on the way the monastery ‘outsourced’ necessary services (in this case a layperson is charged with the care of bees most probably belonging to the monastery). Except for *P. Mon. Apollo* 26 (lease of monastery-owned land to two monks of Apa Apollo; eighth century), land leases are absent from the dossier, despite numerous indications that the monastery possessed extensive tracts of land in the Hermopolite nome and in other locations which must have been farmed also by tenants from the ‘outside world’ (see below, p. 192).

Legal deeds are heavily outnumbered by administrative documents of various kinds (lists, accounts, and short texts representing characteristic types; see below). Other important subgroup is constituted by texts related to fiscal matters. The dossier has also preserved several letters, which, despite interpretational problems inherent to this category of documents, reveal many interesting details concerning the everyday functioning of the monastery.²²

²⁰ See Appendix 3 in *P. Mon. Apollo*. On the proportion of the linguistic components in the dossier, see SCHENKE, *P. Köln ägypt.* II, p. 2, with n. 6; see also DELATTRE, ‘La traduction’ (cit. n. 19), p. 215. See also P. M. SIJPESTEIJN, ‘Multilingual archives and documents in post-Conquest Egypt, [in:] A. PAPAConstantinou (ed.), *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbāsids*, Farnham – Burlington VA 2010, pp. 105–124, esp. pp. 112–113.

²¹ On loans from Bawit, see the remarks of Alain Delattre in *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 241–252, with tables on pp. 257–259.

²² *P. Mon. Apollo* 16 (letter mentioning *aparche* collection; 7th century); *P. Mon. Apollo* 56

The Bawit dossier contains subgroups of documents distinguished by their form, their subject, or both. These subgroups are: texts related to the collection of *aparche*;²³ the so-called Ⲭⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲁ ostraca: Coptic waybills for various goods, mainly wine and wheat; and two types of orders issued by monastic superiors: Coptic texts beginning with the formula ⲡⲉⲛⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲡⲉⲧϩⲗⲓ (translated as ‘it is our father who writes’), and bilingual (Greek and Coptic) orders of payment.²⁴ The *aparche*-related documents were originally more extensive texts in the form of an agreement between two parties; the state of preservation of these texts is unfortunately bad in most of the cases. The Ⲭⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲉⲁ ostraca and the orders of payment are brief and provide detailed information without broader context. However, despite their brevity these texts illuminate important aspects of the monastery’s economy.

The *aparche*-related documents, dated to the seventh–eighth century,

(letter to a *topoteretes* [see below, p. 182, n. 79]; *P. Mon. Apollo* 57 (letter mentioning expenses; 7th–8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 73 (letter mentioning a *chartularius*; 8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 74 (letter to a prominent member of the Bawit community; 8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 79 (letter to a superior; 8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 80 (fragmentary ending of a letter; 8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 81 (letter mentioning travel and business transactions; 8th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 82 (fragmentary letter in Greek; 7th century); *P. Bawit Clackson* 86, 87, 88, 89, 90 (fragmentary letters dated to the 8th century); *P. Mich. Copt.* 14 (letter concerning the provision of animals for a *saqiya* belonging to a high-ranking official; 8th century); P. Heidelberg K.98 (letter concerning transport of wheat to the monastery; see H. FÖRSTER, ‘Der vergessliche Mönch und die Fürsorge. Edition von P. Heidelberg K.98’, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 11 [2009], pp. 139–150, attributed to the Bawit dossier in DELATTRE, ‘P. Heid. inv. K. 98’ [cit. n. 18]); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 39 (letter to the archimandrite George; 8th c.); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 40 (letter of Isaak to George, *proestos* and archimandrite; 8th c.); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 41 (Apa Pamoun to Apa Enoch; 8th c.); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 42 (Makare to Patermoute and Joseph; 8th c.); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43 (Apa Joseph to Apa Phoibammon on managerial matters; 8th c.); see also *P. Louvre Bawit* 38–61, the majority of which are only fragmentarily preserved. Attribution of *P. Köln* X 426 (letter of a village scribe; 7th–8th c.) and X 427 (letter of Pieou from Terot in the Hermopolite nome; 7th–8th century) to the Bawit dossier is uncertain (see below, p. 248 n. 166). All dates were established based on palaeographic criteria.

²³ The meaning of the term *aparche* and the related discussion are addressed in more detail below (see pp. 191–197).

²⁴ Orders of payment as a separate group of documents have been distinguished and studied by Alain Delattre; see the section on orders of payment in *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 159–225 (nos. 4–27) and DELATTRE, ‘Ordres de paiement bilingues’ (cit. n. 18).

have proven so far to be the most controversial texts of the Bawit dossier. In most cases they assume the form of an agreement in which individuals – monks of the monastery of Apa Apollo – arrange between themselves the collection of a payment called *aparche* and sums of money from the localities stated in the text. The *aparche* dossier is composed mostly of texts representing two categories distinguished by their first editor, Sarah J. Clackson: ‘tithe collection guarantees’ (*P. Mon. Apollo* 1–7) and ‘tithe collection contracts’ (*P. Mon. Apollo* 8–14).²⁵ Four recently published guarantees from the Cologne collection (*P. Köln ägypt.* II 30–33) can now be added to the dossier.

Monks undertaking the collection of *aparche* were also responsible for collecting other payments, called in the texts *pakton* or, more rarely, *demo-sion*. The words as we understand them refer to rent for leased land and land-tax respectively. The meaning of these terms in the *aparche*-documents and the status of land in the localities the monks received or ceded as their ‘assignments’ is directly connected with the questions of fiscal responsibilities of the monastery and its dealings with lay tenants, and will be addressed further on (see below, p. 192). The eponymous term in this group of documents, *aparche*, meaning literally ‘first fruit’, was variously interpreted since the texts made their appearance in scholarly discussions. The currently accepted interpretation sees in it an additional payment due from the tenants of monastic land besides their rent. Sarah

²⁵ In ‘tithe collection guarantees’, a monk of the monastery of Apa Apollo acknowledges to his fellow monk(s) the fact of receiving from them the responsibility for the collection of payments from a particular place. In ‘tithe collection contracts’, a monk cedes his responsibility for collecting the payments to another monk. On these categories, see G. SCHENKE, ‘Monastic control’ (cit. n. 19); see also EADEM, *P. Köln ägypt.* II, pp. 48–49.

The state of preservation of *P. Mon. Apollo* 15 was too poor to determine the type of the document; it was published as ‘tithe collection contract/guarantee’. Only two of the *aparche*-related documents published until now belong to neither of the two aforementioned groups: *P. Mon. Apollo* 16 (letter from a monk named Makare to his fellow monks, Apollo and Anoup, mentioning *aparche* collection in the region of Pousiris) and *P. Mon. Apollo* 17 (letter of introduction for an *aparche* collector addressed to a village representative by a certain Theodoros, a representative of the monastery of Apa Apollos). Cf. also *P. Louvre Bawit* 47, another letter of introduction, perhaps for an *aparche* collector, with expressions analogous to those featuring in *P. Mon. Apollo* 17.

Clackson's translation of *aparche* as 'tithe' has been abandoned in more recent publications; the word 'tithe' contains a strong suggestion that the payment constituted a tenth of the agricultural produce and is now thought to cause unnecessary confusion.²⁶

Another 'signature group' of the Bawit dossier are documents beginning with the formula $\pi\epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$, 'it is our/the father who writes'.²⁷ The texts were orders and instructions issued by high-ranking members of the monastic administration – who sometimes signed the documents with their names, but sometimes remained anonymous – to their subordinates. In most of the documents, the recipients are requested to provide various individuals with commodities and products, perhaps as payment for work for the monastery. Many of the texts pertain to issues connected with the poll-tax; these examples, addressed to the group of monastic functionaries called the 'brothers of the poll-tax', are mainly the superiors' instructions on how to proceed in extraordinary situations (e.g. tax exemption or the necessity to exchange a contribution in kind into money required for the tax payment).²⁸ One of the major problems connected with this category

²⁶ Clackson translated *aparche* as 'tithe' and believed that this payment was the only one collected by the monks, and that it was supposed to encompass money due as *pakton* or *demosion* (see *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 18; see also S. J. CLACKSON, 'Archimandrites and *andrismos*: a preliminary survey of taxation at Bawit', [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXIII, pp. 103–107, esp. p. 106). Ewa Wipszycka's interpretation of the term changed over time; first, she proposed to see in *aparche* an actual 'first-fruit' offering collected by the monks; later on, she suggested that *aparche* was a payment made to the monastery in addition to the 'rent-tax' (see WIP-SZYCKA, 'Le fonctionnement' [cit. n. 19], pp. 179–186; EADEM, *Moines et communautés* [cit. n. 2], pp. 559–561; EADEM, 'Resources' [cit. n. 11], pp. 205–206). See also T. S. RICHTER, 'The cultivation of monastic estates in Late Antique and early Islamic Egypt. Some evidence from Coptic land leases and related documents', [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 205–215, esp. pp. 210–212; DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 96–97.

²⁷ The edited part of the $\pi\epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ dossier is composed of seventy-one texts prepared for publication by Sarah J. Clackson (*P. Bawit Clackson* 1–71); three or four documents from the Brussels collection investigated by Alain Delattre (*P. Brux. Bawit* 1–3; 48 ?); P. Palau Rib. inv. 352 (see M. J. ALBARRÀN MARTÍNEZ, 'A new Coptic text from Bawit: P. Palau Rib. inv. 352', [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXVI, pp. 7–10; P. Duk. inv. 259 and P. Duk. inv. 1053 verso (see DELATTRE, 'Deux ordres' [cit. n. 18]). For a brief description of this documentary type and the differences between the $\pi\epsilon\eta\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ orders and the so-called 'orders of payment', see DELATTRE, 'Administration de Baouit' (cit. n. 19), pp. 392–393.

²⁸ The largest group of documents of this kind was prepared for publication by Sarah J.

of documents is the identity of their issuer(s). Since the moment when these documents became a subject of discussions, the opening formula ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΡΖΑΙ was interpreted as an indication that the orders were written in the office of the Bawit archimandrite himself. This view has been recently challenged by Gesa Schenke, who wants to see the issuers of the documents as heads of administrative subdivisions of the monastery.²⁹ Schenke's argument is based on the following points: (1.) the opening word ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ, literally 'our father' does not necessarily refer to *the* father, that is, the head of the whole community, but can be used in the same manner as ΠΑΧΟΝ, literally 'my brother', which in Bawit and other monasteries was used to express monastic affiliation of a person and is understood simply as 'brother', that is, a monk; in an analogous manner, ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ could mean 'a superior'; (2.) some of the superiors attested in the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΡΖΑΙ documents are otherwise unattested as archimandrites; (3.) the sequence of the issuers as reconstructed from the indictional years mentioned in the documents suggests suspiciously short tenures of the 'fathers'; if the documents form a series from one indictional cycle, some tenures would even overlap; (4.) the signatories of the documents consistently address matters pertaining to certain spheres of activity which may correspond to their fields of responsibility (e.g. Keri writes usually to the 'brothers of the poll-tax'; Daniel is concerned with food orders; Georgios deals with the distribution of grain and vegetables). As for the third point, the short tenures of the superiors – people who could attain their elevated position at a late age, after years of monastic career – do not come as a surprise. Moreover, the documents show that at least some among the superiors – Keri among them – did not remain in office for life (see below, p. 171). The consistency with which some of the signatories address particular matters is only apparent: Keri's dossier contains an order to distribute fish sauce to some

Clackson; they were gathered in the volume *P. Barwit Clackson* published already after Clackson's death. The group includes: *P. Barwit Clackson* 1, 4, 6, 14 (poll-tax receipts or orders to issue them); *P. Barwit Clackson* 3, 5, 9, 10 (waivers of poll-tax liability); *P. Barwit Clackson* 11 and 12 (order to delay the demand for *andrismos*, and order to sell rugs delivered as a poll-tax contribution). For general remarks on the documents, see the introduction to *P. Barwit Clackson*, and DELATTRE, 'L'administration de Baouït' (cit. n. 19).

²⁹ *P. Köln ägypt.* II, pp. 7–14; see also SCHENKE, 'Micro- and macro-management' (cit. n. 19).

monks (*P. Köln ägypt.* II 21), while Daniel addresses the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ in connection with a clearly fiscal matter (*P. Bawit Clackson* 14). On the other hand, I am convinced that Schenke’s understanding of the title ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ is acceptable. However, her observation that not all the signatories of ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ documents are otherwise attested as archimandrites is less compelling. First, we cannot be sure that other documents – papyri and inscriptions – record all the heads of the monastery who bore this title. Second, as the title of archimandrite was bestowed by the bishop as a mark of recognition of a monastic superior’s extraordinary qualities, there could be Bawit superiors who never bore the title at all. In the present state of documentation, I believe that the question should be left open to discussion; one should keep in mind that hierarchies in Late Antique monasteries were not always as rigid as our models make them appear, and managerial tasks could be shared by a number of people. The monastery was headed by the *diakonia* (see below, p. 171) – the most probable milieu in which the documents in question were produced. Some of the documents were subscribed by particular members of the ‘managerial panel’ (including the ‘general’ superior himself), while others were not (we also need to take into account a considerable number of ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ documents without any subscription). What is important from the point of view of the present discussion is the degree of control over the fiscal matters and the flow of goods through the monastery exerted by the monastic management.

Finally, the Bawit dossier contains around forty eighth-century bilingual orders of payment.³⁰ The texts were issued by members of the monastic administration (e.g. *oikonomoi*) and contain information on products (mostly wine and foodstuffs) destined for various recipients, both monks and laypeople. All information in these texts, apart from the names of the recipients, is conveyed in Greek. Despite its decline in legal documents, the Greek language remained in use in administrative contexts throughout the eighth century.³¹ The Bawit dossier includes numer-

³⁰ See *P. Brux. Bawit* 4–27, with a comprehensive introduction, and DELATRE, ‘Ordres de paiement bilingues’ (cit. n. 18).

³¹ See T. S. RICHTER, ‘Language choice in the Qurra dossier’, [in:] A. PAPAConstantinou

ous examples of ‘fossilised’ use of Greek in administrative documents; the orders of payment constitute its most striking example in terms of proportion of the information given in Greek and in Coptic. Greek, however, is also present in the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ orders in dates, scribal subscriptions, and sum-ups of the amounts of goods to be delivered. The date, the number of shipment, and the amount of the product shipped are sometimes entered in Greek also in the ΟΥΝΕ ΝΧΑ ostraca. We encounter the same phenomenon in numerous orders and waybills from the contemporary (seventh–eighth century) Wadi Sarga dossier, where, in spite of the deplorable grammar and orthography of the texts, Greek is still recognisable in fixed, ‘technical’ expressions which refer mainly to the transport and measuring of goods.³² In the texts associated with Bawit, the use of Greek extends also to other administrative documents, such as lists and accounts.³³ Moreover, some of the letters in the Bawit dossier were also written in Greek, which indicates that this language was a perfectly acceptable form of communication with the community members, also outside formal contexts.³⁴

These four groups of documents are not only the most characteristic but also the most numerous in the Bawit dossier. Another significant part of the dossier is constituted by administrative texts, mainly lists and

(ed.) *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the ‘Abbāsids*, Farnham – Burlington VA 2010, pp. 189–220, esp. pp. 215–216. See also K. A. Worp, ‘Studien zu spätgriechischen, koptischen und arabischen Papyri’, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 26 (1984), pp. 99–107.

³² On Greek in Wadi Sarga, see H. I. Bell, ‘Greek papyri. Linguistic and palaeographic notes’, [in:] *P. Sarga*, pp. 14–18.

³³ See, e.g., *P. Louvre Bawit* 28 (wine account; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 29 (list of *topoi*; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 28 (account of solidi and wheat; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 (account of *embole* of various *topoi*; 7th–8th c.). Greek phrases are routinely applied for sums, amounts and measures, and summing-up the accounts; see, e.g., *P. Mon. Apollo* 46 and 47; *P. Louvre Bawit* 25, 26, perhaps also 27; *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130 (= *SB Kopt.* IV 1780; order and list of wine deliveries; 7th–8th c.).

³⁴ See *P. Louvre Bawit* 48 (letter to a person styled τὴν σὴν ἀδελφότητα; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 49 ?; *P. Brux. Bawit* 36 (letter to a person styled ὑμετέρα θεοφιλεία with greetings for εὐλαβ(έστατος) μονάζων Ἰωάννης; 6th–8th c.); perhaps also *P. Brux. Bawit* 37 (6th–8th c.); *P. Bawit Clackson* 82 (letter to a community member; 7th c.).

accounts. They record the incomes of the monastery, products due as payment to people working for the community, or list toponyms whose relation to the monastery is not always easily understandable.³⁵ Some of them, like *O. Bawit* 73 and *P. Louvre Bawit* 28 (lists of wine deliveries), may provide a link between minor documents and compilations made on their basis. In a recent article, Gesa Schenke has underscored the ‘estate-like’ character of the monastery at Bawit as seen through the prism of its documentary dossier.³⁶ While the Bawit dossier is in many respects different from and incomparable to earlier collections of texts such as the Apion archive or the papers of *comes* Ammonios, it still reflects the workings of a fairly large rural enterprise.

In order to trace connections between the monastery and laypeople, we need to identify the latter in the documents. The task is difficult and

³⁵ *P. Brux. Bawit* 28 (list of payments in money and wheat; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 29 (poorly preserved account of wheat and money; 7th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 30 (poorly preserved account of wine; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 (account of *embole* from different locations; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 32 (list of items; 7th–8th c.); *P. Brux. Bawit* 33 (list of names; 8th c.); *P. Mon. Apollo* 45 and 46 (wine accounts; 8th century); *P. Mon. Apollo* 48 (money account; 8th century); *P. Mon. Apollo* 27 (list of *pakton* payments); *P. Bawit Clackson* 85 (list of payments; 8th century); P. Med. Copto inv. 76.22 (= *SB Kopt.* II 1031; an account listing people and amounts of fish measured in *lakootē*; 7th–8th c.; see S. PERNIGOTTI, ‘I papiri copti della Università Cattolica di Milano’, *Aegyptus* 65 [1985], pp. 67–105, esp. pp. 97–101); *SB Kopt.* II 1044–1046 (lists of names; 8th c.); *SB Kopt.* II 1047 (list of sheep; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 71 (account listing people and amounts of wine, analogous to P. Med. Copto inv. 76.22; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 72 (wine account; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 73 (notice of deliveries – *phorai*, and people responsible for them; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 74 (list of transports of wine from the *topos* of Nohe; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 75 (list of recipients of wine; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 76 (very fragmentary account of unknown character; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 77 (list of wine transporters; 8th c.); *O. Bawit* 79 (list of recipients of wine; 8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 25, 26, and 27 (very fragmentary accounts of money, and money and wine; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 28 (account of wine analogous to *O. Bawit* 73; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 29 (list of *topoi*; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 30 (list of *epoikia* and *choria*; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 31 (list of names/account; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 32 (account of money; 8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 33 (list of products; 8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 34 (list of utensils; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 35–37 (very fragmentary lists or accounts; 7th–8th c.); P. Duk. inv. 445 (list of toponyms; 7th–8th c.; see DELATTRE, ‘Une liste’ [cit. n. 18]). *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130 (= *SB Kopt.* IV 1780; bilingual document containing a letter – an order of payment of wine to various persons – and a list of wine disbursements; 7th–8th c.; see DELATTRE, ‘La traduction’ [cit. n. 19]).

³⁶ SCHENKE, ‘The monastery of Apa Apollo’ (cit. n. 19).

the outcome is not always satisfactory. Our understanding of some phenomena recorded in the Bawit dossier is obscured not only by the poor state of preservation of many of its documents, but also by the vague or imprecise way some of the texts are formulated. Finally, the problem of dating is not without significance: the chronology of only few texts can be established in a firm manner, while the majority are dated only by indiction and/or based on palaeographic criteria. In the absence of absolute chronology, we cannot attempt building a reliable diachronic picture of the community's relations with laypeople.

Before I proceed to my analysis of the relations of the monastic community at Bawit with 'the world outside', I owe the reader a brief explanation of the organisational, administrative and economic setting in which these relations were established and maintained. I will also discuss some of the aspects of the documentary formularies of the Bawit dossier which cause problems for our interpretation of the documents. In the following section, I will draw from the earlier literature on the subject but also develop some aspects of particular importance to my discussion which are somewhat marginal in the existing studies.

2. THE SETTING:

COMMUNITY STRUCTURES AND PROPERTY ORGANISATION

A study of the organisation and administration of the monastery of Apa Apollo, based mostly on documentary material, is to be found in Alain Delattre's introduction to the publication of Bawit papyri from the Brussels collection.³⁷ Delattre's study remains the most comprehensive overview of the community's functioning; some points, however, need emphasis as especially relevant to my present subject.

Considering the type of monastic community at Bawit, Delattre concludes, taking as his point of departure literary texts, documentary material, and archaeological remains: 'Dans une perspective historique, on peut proposer que le monastère aurait été au départ une fondation semi-

³⁷ *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 29-109, esp. pp. 58-74 (organisation) and 74-104 (economy).

anachorétique [...] qui se serait ensuite développée en *coenobium*, tout en gardant quelques caractéristiques anachorétiques'.³⁸ Delattre and other scholars emphasised especially the fact that the monks of the community of Apa Apollo were allowed to possess property (which is reflected, e.g., in private loan contracts concluded between the monks or between the monks and laypeople).

Archaeological sources give us some important clues about the monastic organisation at Bawit. The problem with their interpretation lies in our inability to estimate in a plausible manner how many of the structures on the *kom* at Bawit were in operation at any given moment. Only a small number of structures have been explored by archaeologists, while the existence of others was revealed only thanks to geophysical search, which, however useful for determining the total surface of built space and verifying the position of previously excavated buildings, does not allow us to date the structures. Therefore the possibilities of reconstructing spatial organisation of the monastery in different periods of its existence are significantly limited.³⁹ Peter Grossmann, who studied the differences between various types of monastic communities as reflected in their spatial layout, concluded that the community of Apa Apollo was characterised by a 'semi-idiorrhymische Lebensweise'.⁴⁰ The discovery of individual monastic dwellings, some of which were provided with kitchens, reflects a certain degree of autonomy of small groups of monks within the community in the sixth–eighth centuries. However, this picture is further nuanced by the results of the recent survey of the monastic agglomeration on the plateau west of the *kom*. These late-seventh- and early-eighth-century installations did not have kitchen and storage facilities which would

³⁸ P. Brux, *Bawit*, p. 36.

³⁹ Hence also the problem with estimating the community's size. 'Several thousands' of monks proposed by Gesa Schenke (e.g. *P. Köln ägypt.* II, p. 6) after Alain Delattre (*P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 55 with n. 139) are certainly an exaggeration. Some estimations have been proposed by Ewa Wipszycka for the Hermopolite community of Apa Apollo mentioned in *HM* 8 (WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* [cit. n. 2], pp. 430–432). Wipszycka, however, refrains from straightforward identification of the community in *HM* with the monastery whose remains are preserved at Bawit (see above, p. 150, n. 3).

⁴⁰ P. GROSSMANN, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten*, Leiden–Boston–Cologne 2002, p. 276.

assure their independent functioning; this feature may suggest their reliance on another unit, perhaps situated on the *kom* itself.⁴¹ The life of the Bawit monks could therefore be a mixture of independence and necessary collaboration, the modalities of which depended perhaps on the individual wealth of the monks, but also on their personal choices.

On the other hand, from the very beginning of the studies in Bawit documentation, much emphasis has been put on the visible centralisation of the monastic management which resembled the system encountered in coenobitic communities such as the Pachomian congregation.⁴² But the existence of a centralised administration does not translate inevitably into coenobitic character of an institution. A large community endowed with considerable assets and active in the local economy could develop an advanced management system while retaining elements of loose organisation of the body of its members.⁴³

The Bawit administration included numerous representatives and executives. Apart from the central ‘administrative panel’, the *diakonia*, endowed

⁴¹ See MARCHAND, MAROUARD *et alii*, ‘Survey du monastère’ (cit. n. 6), forthcoming. The question of the relation between the plateau settlement and the settlement on the *kom* was discussed in a draft of an article by Ewa Wipszycka, ‘Baouît, ermitages’, which I could read thanks to the Author’s kind permission.

A reservation must be made concerning the absence of kitchen facilities in archaeological material. Polish archaeologist Tomasz Górecki underscores the fact that kitchens serving for the preparation of modest meals necessary for monk’s daily sustenance need not have been complex structures that would have left distinguishable traces. A kitchen could consist of a makeshift hearth on which a pot could be placed.

⁴² See *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 63 and 77, n. 247.

⁴³ Cf., on a smaller scale, the community of Deir el-Naqlun in the sixth–seventh century; see DERDA & WEGNER, ‘Πατέρες’, (cit. n. 2). The Naqlun monastery was a semi-anchoretic community with no uniform spiritual leadership centred around an economic and ecclesiastic hub. In the seventh century, the community had a ‘managerial panel’ composed of a presbyter and three deacons, whom the representatives of the Fayumic village Tebetny addressed in a letter containing a request to help solve a conflictual situation and send monks to help with fieldwork during the harvest (*P. Naqlun* 39 = *P. Gascon* 29; see DERDA & WEGNER, ‘Letter from Tebetny’ [cit. n. 2]). These people seem to have represented the community before the ‘outside world’ and had the last word in such matters as the deployment of workforce. In the account of the events that took place in the 630s at Naqlun, *The Life of Samuel of Kalamun* mentions only one technical designation of a monastic functionary – the community’s *oikonomos* (*Life* 10; see *The Life of Samuel* [cit. n. 5], p. 84: English; p. 10: Coptic).

with *dikaion*, frequently translated as ‘legal personality’,⁴⁴ our documentation shows administrators of particular units of the monastery, e.g. its churches or ‘cells’ (τρι) – smaller subdivisions grouping monks who lived and perhaps also worked together.⁴⁵ Besides the ‘fathers of the cells’ papyri and inscriptions feature also other functionaries called ‘fathers’ (e.g. ‘father of the *diakonia*’; ‘father of the field’; ‘father of the cemetery’).⁴⁶

The monastery’s head exercised control over the finances and management of the institution. Numerous Bawit superiors are attested with the honorific title of archimandrite; our documentation contains also a variety of designations which could be applied to the community superior (πειωτ μπτοπος; πενοσ νειωτ; πενειωτ).⁴⁷ The title of *proestos* is not very

⁴⁴ See E. WIPSZYCKA, *s.vv.* ‘Diakonia’ and ‘Dikaion’, [in:] *Coptic Encyclopedia*. See also A. STEINWENTER, ‘Die Rechtsstellung der Kirchen und Klöster nach den Papyri’, *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung* 50 (1930), pp. 1–50, esp. pp. 31–34. The monastery’s *diakonia* is mentioned in the following documents: *P. Mon. Apollo* 1, l. 6; *P. Mon. Apollo* 3, l. 13 (?); *P. Mon. Apollo* 22, l. 2; *P. Bawit Clackson* 60, l. 2; *P. Bawit Clackson* 79, l. 3; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 30, l. 7; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 32, ll. 5–6. *Dikaion* is attested in *P. Mon. Apollo* 25, l. 1; *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, l. 2; [*P. Mon. Apollo* 37, l. 12 of fragment 1; reconstructed]; *P. Mon. Apollo* 38, l. 1; *P. Mon. Apollo* 56, l. 3; *P. Mon. Apollo* 59b, l. 1; *P. Mon. Apollo* 60, l. 2 (the last three texts are badly preserved fragments of scribal exercises); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38, l. 6.

⁴⁵ These ‘cells’ had at their head a representative called ‘the father of the cell’ (πενειωτ ντρι). See *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 29–30; *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 68–69, with n. 208 (numerous epigraphic attestations). Delattre invokes here an analogy with the Pachomian *oikoi*. In papyrological material the title is attested in *P. Mon. Apollo* 5, l. x+8. An unpublished text from the Ismailia Museum mentioned by Sarah Clackson (*P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 18 and 29) attests to the existence of a separate *diakonia* of a cell, mentioning ‘the father of the *diakonia* of the cell’ (ιωτ ντδιακωνια ντρι). *P. Mon. Apollo* 6, an *aparche*-related agreement, involves monks of the ‘cell of Apatore’. The first line of the document is available only in Crum’s paraphrase cited by Clackson: ‘πασον απλω writes to πασον σολομων, monks (sic) of τρι ναπατωρε’. If the ‘cell of Apatore’ was indeed a subdivision of the Apa Apollo monastery, the situation would be similar to that observed in the earlier, sixth-century documents of the semi-anchoritic *laura* at Naqlun, where community members are introduced in legal deeds as monks of particular *monasteria* – individual hermitages within the community (*P. Naqlun* II 21: Apa Neilos, monk and *proestos* of Pyrgos and St Phoibammon of Oros Kellon; *P. Naqlun* II 22: Abba Menas, monk of the *monasterion Kothau* of Oros Kellon).

⁴⁶ Father of the *diakonia*: *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 29, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 71; father of the field (πωτ μφοι): *P. Bawit Clackson* 52, *P. Bawit Clackson* 85; for the father of the cemetery, see *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 53 with n. 128.

⁴⁷ For a discussion of these designations, see *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 66–67, and, more recently,

frequent and the exact function of its bearer is unclear. What we know for sure is that the function was not necessarily held for one's lifetime, as indicated by P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M662 B (23b), which lists two *ex-proestotes* (l. 2 recto: ΓΕΩΡΓΕ ΠΑΠΟΠΡ[ΟΕΣΤΩΣ; l. 21 verso: ΑΝΟΥΠ ΠΑΠΟΥΠ[ΡΟΕΣΩΤΣ]).⁴⁸ The circle of the top-ranking members of the monastery centred around the superior constituted the Bawit *diakonia*, described by Alain Delattre as a 'bureau des affaires économiques'.⁴⁹ Among its members, it numbered administrative functionaries and scribes.⁵⁰ Their responsibilities included the management and supervision of the community property. This group could include also the representatives of the 'cells' and other units for which *diakoniai* and 'fathers' are attested.

The competences of monastic administrators as reflected in the documentation encompassed the control over incomes and expenses of the

DELATTRE, 'La traduction' (cit. n. 19), pp. 215–217. For archimandrite, see E. WIPSYCKA, s.v. 'Archimandrite', [in:] *Coptic Encyclopedia*; EADEM, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 329–331. Contrary to Delattre's statement in *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 67, the title was used not only for the heads of large monasteries (cf. the otherwise unknown community of Apa Hierax in the Oxyrhynchites represented by Ioannes, deacon and archimandrite in *P. Oxy.* LI 3640).

⁴⁸ For the attestations of Bawit *proestotes*, see DELATTRE, 'La traduction' (cit. n. 19), pp. 215–216, with notes (esp. n. 14, where Delattre quotes an inscription on a wooden lintel mentioning, side by side, a *proestos* and a 'father of the *topos*', which indicates that the two functions were separate). P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M662 B (23b) is a register of unknown purpose, listing men with their patronymic or profession, as well as clerics and monastic functionaries; see DELATTRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGHEM, 'Papyrus coptes' (cit. n. 18), pp. 45–51. The editors inform in note to l. 2 of the papyrus that the designation ΠΑΠΟΠΡ[ΟΕΣΤΩΣ appears in an inedited papyrus P. Palau-Ribes inv. 367, l. 5, in connection with Keri whom we know as the signatory of numerous ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΩΛΙ documents.

⁴⁹ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 76.

⁵⁰ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 67 (*proestos*) and 68 (*oikonomos*). At Bawit, if a *proestos* was granted the title of archimandrite, both designations could appear in a document (cf. Georgios, the *proestos* and archimandrite in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 40); *proestotes* with no additional titles are also attested (*P. Bawit Clackson* 22, l. 1: ΠΕΤΡΕ ΠΕΡΠΡΟΙΣΤΟΣ; *P. Mon. Apollo* 24, l. 3: ΨΑΧ ΑΘΑΝΑΣΕ <Π>ΠΡΟΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΝΠΜΟΝΑΣΤ(ΗΡΙΟΝ) ΝΑΠΑ [ΔΠ]ΟΛΛΩ). *Oikonomoi* are mentioned in a number of Bawit documents in various capacities, most often in connection with payments, disbursements or services. See *P. Mich. Copt.* 14; *P. CtYBR* inv. 1767 (Delattre, 'Une lettre copte' [cit. n. 18]); *P. Brux. Bawit* 13, 19, 22, 27, 44; *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 21. This function appears sometimes together with the ecclesiastic title of presbyter (see Delattre, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 175; connection attested in *P. CtYBR* inv. 1767; *P. Brux. Bawit* 27; *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16).

community. Monastic representatives, however, played also other roles: they were dealing with state officials and village representatives, and were sometimes addressed by laypeople seeking help and protection. In the following discussion I intend to explore the various facets of the social roles of the monastic representatives. In local networks of relations, the monastery, through its representatives, acted as landowner, employer, taxpayer, patron, and (business) partner; some of the contacts attested in our documents, however, escape this somewhat rigid classification. Many of these capacities developed as a direct result of the economic activities of the monastery, which, unsurprisingly, were connected chiefly with landowning and agricultural production. Therefore, a quick glance at the monastic estate and its composition may be useful for a better understanding of the background of the relations we want to investigate.⁵¹

We are, unfortunately, unable to determine how much land the monastery possessed. As for the manner of its acquisition, we can surmise that donations (*inter vivos* or testamentary bequests) were the main source of monastic landed property.⁵² The monastery could also acquire land by means of other procedures. No act of land purchase concluded on the community level has yet been identified and published in connection with Bawit.⁵³ *P. Mon. Apollo* 26 refers to a parcel acquired through an ‘exchange’

⁵¹ An overview of the monastery’s economic activities is found in *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 77–104, with a discussion of the monastery’s sources of revenue and expenditures. In the present argument, I will focus rather on the organisational issues connected with the monastic estate.

⁵² *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 78. For donations as one of the sources of ecclesiastic and monastic landholdings, see R. RÉMONDON, ‘L’Église dans la société égyptienne à l’époque byzantine’, *Chronique d’Égypte* 47 (1972), pp. 254–277, esp. pp. 272–273; E. WIPSZYCKA, *Les ressources et les activités économiques des églises en Égypte du IV^e au VIII^e siècle* [= *Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 10], Brussels 1972, pp. 36–37.

⁵³ *P. Mon. Apollo* 24 cannot be treated as a certain attestation of such a transaction. This deed of sale is addressed by the village community of Poraheu to ‘the scribe/master Athanase, (the) *proestos* of the monastery of Apa Apollo’. Clackson thought that Athanase represented his monastery in the transaction; Ewa Wipszycka refrained from conclusions, stating that due to the lack of explicit information we cannot be certain that Athanase acts in the name of the community and not his own. Alain Delattre shares her doubts (*P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 79 with n. 257). See WIPSZYCKA, ‘Le fonctionnement interne’ (cit. n. 19), p. 172:

(ll. 5–6: ‘eight waterless arouras from the fields of the small meadow which you [i.e. the archimandrite of the monastery acting on its behalf – JW] have exchanged with the men of Senesla’; $\bar{\nu}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\chi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\chi}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\kappa}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{i}\bar{\zeta}\bar{o}\bar{i}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}$). The verb $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}$ appears in Coptic contracts in the context of sale, but it cannot be excluded that another procedure – e.g., an exchange of one parcel for another – could be the case.⁵⁴ The document itself does not provide further clues as to the character of the transaction.

‘Si, dans un acte, une des parties est le *proestos* ou l’*oikonomos* d’un monastère, ce fait ne suffira pas, par lui-même, à nous donner la certitude que l’acte concerne des affaires économiques de la communauté prise dans son ensemble’, and 173: ‘dans les cas où les documents en question ne mentionnent ni le *dikaion*, ni la *diakonia*, ni le titre d’un fonctionnaire monastique comme représentant de la communauté, il y a lieu, en principe, de penser que l’affaire dont il s’agit dans le texte donné, concerne un moine en tant qu’individu’. Monastic representation is explicitly stated in other texts from Bawit: *P. Mon. Apollo* 25, ll. 1–2: ‘to the *dikaion* of the monastery of the *topos* of Apa Apollo through the God-loving, holy father Apa Daniel, the archimandrite and father of the *topos*’ ($\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}\bar{i}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\delta}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{o}\bar{\tau}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\delta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{i}\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\chi}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\Delta}(\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma})\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}[\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma]$); *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, ll. 2–3: ‘to the *dikaion* of the monastery through our father Apa Georgios the archimandrite and father of the *topos*’ ($\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}\bar{i}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}[\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma]\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{e}\bar{o}\bar{r}\bar{g}\bar{i}\bar{o}\varsigma\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}(\chi)\bar{\gamma}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\Delta}(\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma})\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}[\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{o}\varsigma]$); *P. Mon. Apollo* 38, ll. 1–3: ‘to the *dikaion* of the monastery through my God-loving father Apa Theodoros the archimandrite and father of the *topos*’ ($\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}\bar{i}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma)\bar{\zeta}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}[\bar{i}\bar{\nu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\delta}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}[\bar{o}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\omega}]\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}(\bar{i})\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\Delta}(\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma})\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\tau}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{i}\bar{\omega}\bar{\chi}\bar{\tau}$) [$\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{o}\varsigma$]). The formula opening *P. Mon. Apollo* 24 resembles rather the expressions found in private loan contracts between monks or between monks and laymen. Titles and functions as additional elements of identification are otherwise known from private documents of the Bawit dossier (*P. Amst.* I 47 and 48 [6th c.], two sales on delivery concluded by laymen with the archimandrite Serenos; *P. Mon. Apollo* 41, loan contract between Enoch from the *topos* of Apa Apollo and ‘scribe Hor, the monk of this same *topos*’). Cf., however, *P. Sarga* 161 from the monastery of Apa Thomas: a work contract concluded by an archimandrite named Daniel with a carpenter (ll. 1–2: $\bar{\delta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{i}\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\zeta}[\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}] \bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}(\bar{i})\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}[\bar{\mu}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\rho}(\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\varsigma})]\bar{\rho}\bar{e}\bar{\tau}\bar{e}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}[\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{o}\varsigma\bar{\rho}\bar{e}\bar{\delta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{e}$; ‘Daniel it is, by God’s mercy archimandrite, writes to Apa Paulos, the carpenter’). The formula of representation is missing, but the context of the document leaves little doubt that Paulos was hired by the monastic institution, not by Daniel only, as the archimandrite addresses Paulos in the following manner: ‘I appoint thee to do carpenter’s work for [...] of the monastery in this year of the twelfth indiction’ ($\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{r}\bar{e}\bar{\rho}\bar{e}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{r}\bar{e}\bar{k}\bar{r}\bar{\zeta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{m}\bar{e}\bar{\zeta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}$ [...] $\bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{i}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\tau}\bar{e}\bar{k}(\bar{\alpha})\bar{\tau}(\bar{\eta})\bar{i}\bar{\nu}\bar{\Delta}(\bar{i}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\tau}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu})\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{o}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}(\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{\nu})$); ll. 3–4).

⁵⁴ For $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}$ in deeds of sale, see commentary *ad loc* in *P. Mon. Apollo*; for documentary references, see FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.

Not only the size of monastic landholdings but also the precise location of the plots cannot be determined based on the documentation, even though our texts abound in toponyms which refer to fields described according to a particular nomenclature (see below) and villages. Thanks to cross-referencing some of these toponyms with documents from outside the dossier, we can at least say that a number of them can be connected with the Hermopolite nome, and, more precisely, its southern part.

As far as we can see in our sources, the land in the Hermopolite nome was held mainly by non-aristocratic landowners and lower aristocracy incapable of controlling the village landscape to such extent as, e.g., the Apions did in the sixth-century Oxyrhynchites.⁵⁵ It is thus among lower aristocracy and landowning villagers that we should look for the donors of landed property to the monastery, or for the former owners of parcels it purchased or exchanged. Monastic landed property would consist of many small parcels scattered throughout the nome, of various quality and agricultural profile.⁵⁶ Land could be cultivated by the monks (see below,

⁵⁵ See GASCOU, *P. Sorb.* II 69, pp. 60–62; for the structure of Hermopolite aristocracy, see J. BANAJI, *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity: Gold, Labour, and Aristocratic Dominance*, Oxford 2001; P. SARRIS, *Economy and Society in the Age of Justinian*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 127, 129, 131, 167, 170 and Table 9a at p. 232. For the distribution of land in the Hermopolite nome, see also T. M. HICKEY, ‘Aristocratic landholding and the economy’, [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.) *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 288–308, esp. pp. 298–299. For the fiscal and landowning profile of the Hermopolite village of Temseu Skordon in the sixth century based on the fiscal register *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1075 [= *P. Lond. Herm.*], see R. S. BAGNALL, ‘Village landholding in Aphrodite in comparative perspective’, [in:] J.-L. FOURNET & C. MAGDELAINE (eds.), *Les archives de Dioscore d’Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte: histoire et culture dans l’Égypte byzantine: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 8–10 décembre 2005*, Paris 2008, pp. 181–190, and R. S. BAGNALL, J. G. KEENAN & L. S. B. MACCOULL, *A Sixth-Century Tax Register from the Hermopolite Nome* [= *P. Lond. Herm.*], Durham 2011.

⁵⁶ The products most frequently mentioned in the documentation (wine $\omega\iota\eta\eta\epsilon$ ostraka, lists and accounts) are wheat and wine; while the omnipresence of the former is self-understood, the latter merits a few words of explanation. The vine was grown in the Hermopolite nome (although on a much more modest scale than in the Oxyrhynchites) also on monastic land (see D. DZIERZBIĆKA, *Wine in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, PhD thesis, University of Warsaw 2011). A monastery-owned vineyard in the Hermopolites, fully equipped with a water reservoir and irrigation machinery, is attested in the sixth-century *P. Giss.* I 56 – a sharecropping lease agreement between an unknown monastery and a tenant – which stipulated the monastery’s fifty-percent share in the yearly produce. However, as

pp. 259–260) or leased, either to monks (*P. Mon. Apollo* 26) or laypeople. Lease contracts with laymen do not survive in our documentation, but their existence can be assumed based on the dossier of the *aparche*-related documents (see below, p. 192). A more direct attestation of lease of monastic land to a layperson is provided by P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 B (6a) verso, a letter from the seventh–eighth century mentioning a lay tenant, a Jew named Eieleizerou.⁵⁷

Documents mentioning land parcels are numerous, but the terms used in them are often ambiguous. They include such designations as μα: literally ‘place’, sometimes translated as ‘estate’; ιωξ: ‘field’; or χοι: ‘field’. Names of plots which could belong to the monastic estate appear in the $\omega\text{I}\text{N}\epsilon\ \text{N}\alpha$ ostraca (as the places of provenance of the transported products), in registers, and in the $\text{P}\epsilon\text{N}\epsilon\text{I}\omega\text{T}\ \text{P}\epsilon\text{T}\epsilon\text{Z}\alpha\text{I}$ papyri.

Among the Coptic terms referring to fields in the documents from Bawit the most commonly used was μα. It also happens to be the most confusing, as it could refer not only to toponyms, but also monastic units connected with artisanal activities.⁵⁸ Most of its attestations, however,

noted in DZIERZBICKA, *Wine* (cit. above), the large amounts of wine flowing through the Bawit monastery do not necessarily imply extensive vineyard ownership, since a part of the wine could be purchased with advance payment. See also D. DZIERZBICKA, ‘Monastic vintages. The economic role of wine in Egyptian monasteries in the sixth–eighth century’, [in:] Louise BLANKE & Jennifer CROMWELL (eds.), *Monastic Economies in Egypt and Palestine, Fifth–Tenth Centuries CE*, forthcoming.

⁵⁷ Edited by L. S. B. MACCOULL, ‘P. Morgan. Copt.: documentary texts from the Pierpont Morgan Library’, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 24 (1979–1982), pp. 1–9, no. 3; for a recent reedition, see DELATRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGEM, ‘Papyrus coptes’ (cit. n. 18), pp. 39–42.

⁵⁸ On place names with the prefix $\text{P}\mu\alpha\ \text{N-}$ and their possible interpretations, see S. J. Clackson in *P. Bawit Clackson*, introduction, pp. 11–16. For instance, an expression $\text{N}\text{P}\text{Q}\text{I}\text{W}\text{H}\text{R}\epsilon\ \text{N}\text{N}$ $\text{P}\alpha\text{P}\text{M}\alpha\text{N}\epsilon\text{S}\alpha\text{S}\text{H}\text{T}$ (*P. Bawit Clackson* 13, a $\text{P}\epsilon\text{N}\epsilon\text{I}\omega\text{T}\ \text{P}\epsilon\text{T}\epsilon\text{Z}\alpha\text{I}$ order, ll. 1–2) can be translated either ‘his son NN of the place of the weavers’ (a section of the monastery concerned with textile production) or ‘his son NN of Pmanesast’ (an otherwise unknown toponym). In some of the cases, the identification of a unit called $\text{P}\mu\alpha$ as a part of the monastery is certain; see *P. Brux. Bawit* 1, ll. 1–2: $\text{N}\text{P}\text{Q}\text{I}\text{W}\text{H}\text{R}\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\delta\lambda\omicron\text{P}\text{[}\epsilon\text{]}\ \text{P}\alpha\text{P}\mu\alpha\ \text{N}\text{N}\epsilon\text{T}\omega\text{N}\epsilon$, ‘his son Theodore of the place of the sick’ (i.e. the infirmary). See also S. J. Clackson, commentary to l. 3 of *P. Mon. Apollo* 23, for toponyms derived from names of occupations but formed without the prefix $\text{P}\mu\alpha$.

Cf. a list of grain-producing places whose names are composed according to the $\text{P}\mu\alpha\ \text{N-}/\ \text{P}\alpha\text{Z}\omicron\text{I}\ \text{N-}/\ \text{P}\alpha\text{Z}\omicron\ \text{N-}$ pattern in the corpus of the $\epsilon\text{T}\mu\omicron\gamma\lambda\omicron\text{N}$ -ostraca, see A. DELATRE, ‘Les

refer to its ‘territorial’ meaning. P. Duk. inv. 445 is a list of toponyms connected with the estate of Apa Apollo. The list registers two types of toponyms: preceded by πμα (nine cases) or by ζοι (five cases).⁵⁹ One of the toponyms, απα ζοι, is not preceded by any designation. However, *SB Kopt.* I 227 and 228 (ϖινε νσα ostraca) attest the form πμα ναπα ζοι. Just like Apa Djoi, also other toponyms mentioned in the list recur in ϖινε νσα ostraca – a fact that allowed the editor of the document, Alain Delattre, to establish a connection between the list and the monastery in Bawit.⁶⁰ There must have been a difference between μα and ζοι, but it is difficult to grasp.⁶¹ ζοι could denote larger area within which smaller sections could be distinguished (cf. *P. Mon. Apollo* 26).⁶² *P. Bawit Clackson* 20 mentions a team of workers attached to the field (φοι) of Taparouou receiving aracus as payment (ll. 2–3: χε τι νιαρακε νειογοιε ν̄φοι νταπαρουγ). Other documents mention a ‘father of the field’, who most probably was a person directly responsible for cultivating monastic parcels and care of the equipment (*P. Bawit Clackson* 52 = *P. Köln* IX 386, ll. 2–4: χε τι ογκλομ̄ ν̄ζοῑ ν̄απολλω̄ πωτ̄ μφο̄ι, ‘give a field *kлом* to Apollo the father of the field’).⁶³ *P. Bawit Clackson* 85 lists two ‘fathers of the field’ in l. 10: μ̄ν̄ πωτ̄ μφο̄ι ([...] and the father of the field’) and l. 11: μφο̄ι μακαρε̄ μν̄ πωτ̄ μφο̄ι ([...] of the field of Makare and the father of the field’). The word ζοι

ostraca *etmoulon*. Quelques aspects du transport du blé dans l’Égypte copte’, [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 23–48, esp. pp. 25–26. Delattre concludes that the places mentioned in these documents ‘appartiennent selon toute vraisemblance à un “large estate”, un grand domaine, ou à un monastère’.

⁵⁹ See WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), p. 203. The document was edited by DELATTRE, ‘Une liste’ (cit. n. 18). The original purpose of the list cannot be determined, as the part of the document which most probably listed products or sums collected from the locations is not preserved.

⁶⁰ DELATTRE, ‘Une liste’ (cit. n. 18), p. 165.

⁶¹ See WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), p. 203: ‘Unfortunately, it cannot be determined if the difference between φοι and πμα lies in the size of the plot belonging to the monastery or if in both cases we are dealing with toponyms’.

⁶² *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, l. 5, speaks of ‘eight waterless arouras from the fields of the small meadow’ (ν̄ϖ̄μογνε̄ ν̄σετωζε̄ ν̄ατμογ̄ ρ̄ν̄ ν̄εωζε̄ ν̄πκογ̄ ζο̄ι).

⁶³ For the interpretation of the term *kлом*, see commentaries *ad loc.* in *P. Köln* IX and *P. Bawit Clackson*.

appears in connection with irrigated land in *P. Mich. Copt.* 14.⁶⁴ The connection is found also in *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130, where the same person is mentioned in Coptic letter as ἀπα ἰοῦστε πα πζοι (l. 10) and as ἄββ(ᾱ) Ἰούστε πατρ(ὸς) ὀργ(άνου) in the Greek account (l. 4).⁶⁵ Irrigated parcels required particular care and this is perhaps the reason why they remained under the supervision of separate ‘fathers of the field’. A group of workers could also be associated with a unit called ἰωζ. It appears in *P. Brux. Bawit* 26 and *P. Duk. inv.* 259 – orders of payment in kind to monks assigned to the field of Kame.⁶⁶

People associated with the μα-toponyms who appear in the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ documents and waybills are introduced without further details; there is also no administrative function associated with μα to match that of ‘the father of the field’.⁶⁷ μα can be treated as the equivalent of the Greek τόπος, relating to parcels of landed property.⁶⁸ Such a strong, perhaps even technical meaning of the term μα is characteristic of the Bawit

⁶⁴ *P. Mich. Copt.* 14, ll. 3–4: φοῖ νιογλε (see DELATTRE, ‘Une lettre copte’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 89–90). Alain Delattre translates the term ζοι as *sagiya*, which fits the context of the document mentioning a team of animals needed for operating a waterwheel (on this very important text, see below, pp. 205–206). Here ζοι is equivalent to Greek μηχανή, widely attested in Byzantine documents.

⁶⁵ Both texts preserved on *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130 pertain to the same situation (a disbursement of wine) and mention the same people in both languages, allowing us to observe how technical terms proper to the monastic milieu of Bawit were rendered in Coptic and in Greek. See DELATTRE, ‘La traduction’ (cit. n. 19), pp. 218–221.

⁶⁶ *P. Brux. Bawit* 26, l. 1: ΝΕΣΗΝΗ ΕΥΚΥ ΠΙΩΖ ΚΑΜΗ; *P. Duk. inv.* 259, ll. 3–4: ἀπα κολ[θ]ε εϋκϋ πιωζ κἀμη.

⁶⁷ See, e.g. *P. Bawit Clackson* 23: a poorly preserved document of unclear content addressed by a superior to ἠπρωρηε μῆνα παπμαῖλε (ll. 1–2; ‘his son Mena of Pmanle’); *P. Bawit Clackson* 29: an order to supply barley, in which a superior addresses ἠπρωρηε ε’ ταϋρινε παπμαῖλε (ll. 1–2; ‘his son Taurine of Pmanle’); *O. Bawit IFAO* 49, ll. 2–3: ζΙΤΗ ΜΩΝΗΣ ΠΑΠΜΑ ΝΗΣΑΙΝ (‘through Moses of the μα of Nesain’).

⁶⁸ See DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 235, comm. to l. 12 of *P. Brux. Bawit* 31: ‘Il s’agit probablement [...] d’une formation τόπος + nom propre, qu’on trouve en copte sous la forme πμα+ nom propre’. Cf. πμα κἀμη in *CPR* XX 19 and τόπος Καμμέτος in *P. Duk. inv.* 93, or τόπος Καμητος in *P. Mon. Apollo* 21; τόπος Ραειομ in *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 and πμα παιομ in *SB Kopt.* I 66, 182, and 201; τόπος Παῆσε in *O. Bawit IFAO* 40 and πμαπῆπῆσε in *O. Bawit* 12–17. See perhaps also τόπ(ος) νωρε in *O. Bawit* 74 and [π]μαῖνωρε in *O. Bawit* 26.

documentation; *μα* as a specific place designation is absent from the Wadi Sarga dossier, and the majority of attestations in *P. Bal.* point toward the most general meaning, ‘a place’.⁶⁹

Several *topoi* appear in *P. Brux. Bawit* 31; Alain Delattre suggests that this list written in Greek, whose heading mentions *embole* of the *ousia* of Koussai, concerns fiscal obligations in kind due from the monastery’s property in the vicinity of Koussai.⁷⁰ Besides *topoi*, there are two toponyms with no additional designation: Kamoul and Timi.⁷¹ The designation *topos* resembles the terminology of the sixth-century Aphroditan cadastre, where plots belonging to individuals and institutions were located in various *topoi*, the majority of which had been named after their former owners. The same practice recurs in the seventh- and eighth-century documents from Aphrodite.⁷² Since the names of all but two of the *topoi* in *P. Brux.*

⁶⁹ Only *P. Bal.* 186, 187, and 259 seem to use the word in a more specific manner. Cf. *P. Bal.* 186, ll. 25–30: ΠΝΟΣ ΗΡΩΝΕ ΧΟ ΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΦΑ<Ι>ΕΙ ΕΡΗΣ ΦΑΡΜΑ ΝΑΠΑ ΔΘΑΜ ΕΤΒΕ ΟΥΚΟΥΙ ΝΕΤΙΑ ΦΑΝΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΕΙ ΜΝΟΥ ΝΧΝΟΥ ΠΑΡΧ(ΩΝ) ΕΤΒΗΗΤΚ; ‘the superior is saying: I shall come south to the place of Αρα Atham for some small occasion and we will beseech him to ask the *archon* concerning you’. Kahle (see comm. *ad loc.*) sees in ΔΠΑ ΔΘΑΜ an individual; ΠΝΑ ΝΑΠΑ ΔΘΑΜ would be his place of residence. *P. Bal.* 187, ll. 10–11 features ‘the place of the emir’ (i.e. an official), where a letter was supposed to be handed, that is, perhaps, the office of a functionary. *P. Bal.* 259 is set in the context of monastic estate, but we do not know what kind of unit is meant (l. 4: ‘For you know that the works of the place [ΝΗΒΟΥΕ ΗΠΜΑ] require to be done’).

⁷⁰ *P. Brux. Bawit* 31, l. 1: λόγω ἐμβουλῆ(ς) οὐσία(ς) Κοουσσῶ(ν) (ὄπέρ) ἰνδ(ικτίων)ο(ς) ιβ; for the identification and interpretation of the text, see p. 232 in *P. Brux. Bawit*. For a commentary, see WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), pp. 203–204. The amounts of grain expected from the locations listed in the text as tax contribution are stated on the right-hand side of the papyrus (from 6 to 130 artabae of wheat and 6 to 20 artabae of barley).

⁷¹ Kamoul is otherwise unknown, while Timi appears as *topos* in *P. Duk. inv.* 93 (list of payments of wheat from *topoi* and a village; l. 5: *Επιφ ιε τόπ(ων) Καμμ(έτος) (καί) Τρακωνη (καί) Τιμει σίτου ἀρτ(άβαι) δ* (see N. GONIS, ‘Hermopolite locations and splinter nomes’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 142 [2003], pp. 176–184, esp. pp. 182–184) and in *P. Louvre Bawit* 29 (l. 7: *τόπ(ου) Διμυ*). It is possible that in *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 the word *topos* is lacking due to simple omission. M. DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite: toponyms et sites* [= *American Studies in Papyrology* 21], p. 137, treats *τόπος Κάμητος* as a monastery.

⁷² See GONIS, ‘Hermopolite locations’, (cit. n. 71), p. 182. WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), p. 204, commenting on *P. Brux. Bawit* 31, hesitates about the interpretation of the term

Bawit 31⁷³ are derived from personal names, we are most probably dealing with the same system. It is possible, however, that the list encompasses payments not only from plots of land belonging to the monastery, but also from parcels for which the monastery assumed fiscal responsibility without being their owner (for the fiscal implications of the document, see below, pp. 208–209). Therefore, *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 cannot be considered a reliable source of information on the organisation of the monastic estate.

P. Louvre Bawit 30 (seventh–eighth century) seems at the first glance to complicate the picture. It is a Greek list of places supplying commodities measured in *litrai* in the months of Mecheir and Phamenoth, including *epoikion* of Tilot (l. 1), *chorion* of Ekous (l. 5), *chorion* of Hermitarios (l. 10), *epoikion* of Georgios (l. 14), *epoikion* of Zoilos (l. 18), *chorion* (?) of Issos (l. 20). Three of the locations are attested in the toparchy of Leukopyrgites Ano in the Hermopolite nome (see commentary to the edition). Both terms, *epoikion* and *chorion*, although very frequent in Byzantine and early Arab documentation in general, are rare in the Bawit documents.⁷⁴ When they appear, they refer to locations external in respect to the monastery: in *P. Mon. Apollo* 24 the council of the *epoikion* of Poraheu (ΤΚΟΙΝΩΤΗΣ ΝΕΠΟΙΚ(Ι)Ο(Ν) ΠΩΡΑΧΗΥ) sells land to the *proestos* Athanase;⁷⁵ in *P. Mon. Apollo*

topos: ‘It is hard to tell what the term *topos* refers to: land cultivated by a specific farmer [...] or land in a given location that was cultivated by more than one farmer?’. I believe that the latter interpretation is closer to the truth.

⁷³ The exceptions are *τόπος Νέου Λάκκου* in l. 6, which most probably got its name from its characteristic feature – a cistern – and *τόπος ἄμα Σοφία* in l. 18, which may refer to a monastery (see *P. Brux. Bawit*, comm. *ad loc.*). In the latter case we cannot exclude that we are dealing with a tract of land formerly belonging to a nun. I am not thoroughly convinced that *τόπος Ἰερημίας* (l. 5) should be connected with a monastic institution. Gonis (‘Hermopolite locations’ [cit. n. 71], p. 184, commentary to l. 4 of *P. Duk. inv. 93*) mentions the monastery of Apa Ieremias (ΠΑΠΑ ΙΕΡΕΜΙΑΣ) recorded in inscriptions from Bawit and in *P. Mon. Apollo* 19, and suggests that a reference can be made here to ‘an area named after the monastery’. However, a plot of land named after an individual is not out of question.

⁷⁴ *Epoikion*: *P. Mon. Apollo* 24 and *P. Mon. Apollo* 35. *Chorion*: *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, l. 14: *χωρ ωρο* which Sarah J. Clackson proposed to read as *χωρίου Ὠρου*.

⁷⁵ For *κοινότης* in Coptic documents, see A. STEINWENTER, *Studien zu den koptischen Recht-surkunden aus Oberägypten* [= SPP XIX], pp. 52–53; IDEM, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden*, Munich 1955, p. 18. G. SCHMELZ, *Kirchliche Amtsträger im spätantiken Ägypten nach den Aus-*

35, a loan contract between a layman and a monk of Apa Apollo, the debtor comes from the *epoikion* of Posh n-Telke. Nothing in the documents suggests monastic ownership of these *epoikia*. *Chorion* in the Arab period designates a fiscal unit,⁷⁶ it is therefore probable that *P. Louvre Bawit 30* does not list income from monastic properties, but obligatory payments for the authorities. The document may be an ‘alien’ admixture in the monastic dossier, or it may point to the role the monastery played in tax-raising system in the region (see below, p. 210). Without support from other documents, however, *P. Louvre Bawit 30* cannot serve as a proof of the existence of monastery-owned *epoikia*.

Our documentation unfortunately does not allow us to reconstruct the organisation of the Bawit monastic estate, as the documents neither reveal any organisational hierarchy among the designations, nor are unequivocal as to the meaning of the terms and the relations between them. In some documents, μα clearly designates a territorial unit referred to in fiscal calculations; ροι and ιωϛ appear in contexts that point to their role as the units of work organisation. On the other hand, one place, such as the aforementioned Kame, can appear in various documents as μα,

*sagen der griechischen und koptischen Papyri und Ostraka [= Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete – Beiheft 13], Munich 2002, pp. 307–308, with references to Greek and Coptic examples, underscores the problem with the interpretation of the term. Koinotes and the similar term koinon could designate a group of village leaders or the ensemble of the inhabitants. In Byzantine documents, koina appear also as a designation of collectivities of farmers (see T. M. HICKEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State in Late Antique Egypt. The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus*, Ann Arbor 2013, pp. 66); cf. Apionic documentation and, e.g. *P. Naqlun I 8* (register of land parcels; 6th c.). The term koinon can also refer to professional associations.*

⁷⁶ For the role of *choria* in the fiscal system of Arab Egypt, see P. M. SIJPESTEIJN, *Shaping a Muslim State: the World of a Mid-Eighth-Century Egyptian Official*, Oxford 2013, p. 70, with n. 155 and 156, with further references. See also J. GASCOU, ‘Arabic taxation in the mid-seventh-century Greek papyri’, [in:] *Travaux et mémoires 17* (2013), pp. 671–677, esp. pp. 672–673. Gascou writes (p. 672): ‘In its post-conquest usage *chorion* means “district”, whatever the former status of the locality. It may apply to former villages, *komai* [...] but also (notably in the Arsinoite nome) to subdivisions of villages, e.g. hamlets, *epoikia*. As a result, *epoikion* and *chorion* may be treated as equivalent and used concurrently’. The appearance of the two terms side by side in *P. Louvre Bawit 30* suggests that in this case they pertained to different types of units; for analogous cases in the documents from the Arab period, see F. MORELLI, comm. to l. 6 of *CPR XII 1*.

τόπος, and ἰωλ (see n. 68), ροι can be referred to in a strictly territorial sense (cf. *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, l. 5), while μα can denote a person's affiliation. So far, no monastic *epoikia* are attested in the documentation. This may only result from the chances of preservation of our material, but it is also possible that the absence of concentrated settlements belonging to the monastery may be connected with the manner in which the monastery acquired and, in consequence, exploited its land. Like other religious institutions the community of Apa Apollo could benefit from donations and testamentary bequests which usually consisted of plots of land scattered in various locations, previously belonging to medium-scale landowners. Such plots of land could be either leased to villagers living in their immediate neighbourhood or farmed by the monks, and perhaps were not big or consolidated enough to guarantee the existence of separate settlements of permanent agricultural workers. On the other hand, we find individuals associated with particular toponyms (especially in the οἰνε νσα and πενειωτ πετραι documents); most often, however, we are at a loss as to whether they represent the Bawit monks or laymen working for the monastery, and, if the latter is true, what the conditions of their employment were. This last problem is connected with one of the greatest challenges posed by the Bawit dossier: that of sifting the 'outsiders' from the monks. The following section is devoted to the problems – frequently insurmountable – one can encounter while searching the documentation for traces of relations with the 'world outside'.

3. THE PEOPLE: DETERMINING IDENTITIES AND FUNCTIONS

The Bawit dossier contains hundreds of names of individuals: monastic representatives, ordinary monks, officials, people representing village communities, and common laymen. Some of them easily identifiable thanks to the mentions of their titles and functions; in many other cases, however, we are left with little to no clue as to the position of the individuals in question. Many persons are mentioned only by their names, while others are associated only with occupations or toponyms. In such

cases we often cannot distinguish monks from laypeople due to the lack of reliable criteria we could apply.

The monks of Bawit established and maintained relations with laypeople in, roughly speaking, three different spheres:⁷⁷ first, there were individual contacts of monks with laymen, reflected mainly in private loan contracts. Second, the documentation gives us an insight into the sphere of relations I would call official or public: the contacts with state administration (chiefly within the fiscal framework) and local representatives. The third sphere, which was particularly important for the Bawit community but unfortunately is the hardest to grasp, encompassed the relations resulting from the everyday economic activities: farming the land, transporting goods, and performing various services.

These three spheres differ in the ways their actors are presented in the documents. For the most part, private legal deeds provide us with clear information on the status of the parties involved; this was necessary in documents that were supposed to guarantee legal protection.⁷⁸ Official relations between communities of monks and communities of laypeople could be reflected in legal documents in which we could hope for easy identification of the parties (this, however, is not always the case; see above, p. 172, and below, p. 244). In other circumstances (e.g. in correspondence), titles by which laymen introduced themselves or were addressed by their correspondents, together with the situational context sometimes allow us to pinpoint non-monastic actors with more ease.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ The division is, of course, somewhat artificial, as human relations can rarely be strictly classified; in reality, the spheres of activity which provided context for the investigated relations often overlapped. In the presented division this is true especially of the sphere I call here 'official' and the sphere of economy. I exclude from my discussion the contacts which resulted from religious practice and performance, as the phenomena connected with visits to religious sites are not treated in the present text (see above, pp. 151–152).

⁷⁸ Exceptions, however, did occur; see P. Palau-Rib. inv. 354 (Coptic loan contract; 7th–8th c.), where the status of the debtor has raised doubts of the editors (DELATRE & ALBARRÁN MARTÍNEZ, 'Un contrat de prêt' [cit. n. 18]); see below, p. 244.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., *P. Mon. Apollo* 17, a letter of introduction for an *aparche*-collector, where the requested services and expected competences of the addressee allow us to identify him as a headman of a village, or *P. Mon. Apollo* 56, a letter to an individual introduced as *topoteretes*, a representative of the *dux* in the pagarchy capital; the office is attested in the papyri from

The group of administrative texts related to the monastic economy (our ‘third sphere’) is the most numerous also the most difficult to fathom. Administrators who drew up these documents were not overly diligent in conveying in writing what must have been otherwise clear to the interested parties: the monastic or lay status of the people mentioned in the texts in a number of capacities. Especially in lists, accounts, and a number of $\omega\text{I}\text{N}\text{E}\ \text{N}\text{C}\text{A}$ ostraca, laymen are often indistinguishable from monks due to the absence of unequivocal status indicators. References to the individuals’ occupations do not define their status, since we know that professionals were encountered not only in the ‘world outside’ but also in the monasteries (cf. numerous monastic builders mentioned in the inscriptions of Bawit, or Apa Phib, ἄρχων ἐλαιουργός of the monastery mentioned in *P. Athen. Xyla* 10 of 543, or representatives of various occupations in *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130).⁸⁰ We have the same identification problem with some of the recipients of payments in the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΡΕΖΑΙ documents where we encounter a number of professionals.

In some texts the identification is facilitated by the explicit mentions of functions or titles. This is the case of ‘the $\omega\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\gamma$ of Ptene’, mentioned

the sixth until the eighth century. See G. ROUILLARD, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*, Paris 1928, pp. 151–152; C. KUNDEREWICZ, ‘Les topotérètes dans les Nouvelles de Justinien et dans l'Égypte byzantine’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 14 (1962), pp. 33–50. For the functions of *topoteretes* in the Arab period, see R. RÉMONDON in *P. Apoll.* (see index, p. 223, s.v. ‘topotérète’). See also A. ΠΑΡΑΘΟΜΑΣ, *CPR XXV* 35, l. 17 comm. and B. PALME, *CPR XXIV* 31, l. 6 comm., with further bibliography.

⁸⁰ See *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 31–32, with further references; *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 92; *MIFAO* 12, no. 12; *MIFAO* 59, nos. 100 and 348; *P. Athen. Xyla* 10, ll. 6–8: Ἄπα Φίβις (l. Φίβι) μοναζοντος (l. μονάζοντι) καὶ ἀρχων (l. ἄρχοντι) ἐλαιουργος (l. ἐλαιουργῶ) τοῦ ἁγίου μοναστηρίου Ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος ἐν ὀρίῳ κώμης Τιτκόεως (l. Τιτκόεως). Ἄρχων ἐλαιουργός is a hapax; Basil Mandilaras, the editor of the document, translates it as ‘superintendent of the oil manufacturers’. The document would testify in an indirect manner to organised production of oil in the monastery already in the sixth century. Although oil is attested among the commodities circulating in the monastery (cf., e.g., *P. Bawit Clackson* 37; 54; 55; *P. Brux. Bawit* 11; 12), its production on the site is not confirmed by archaeological finds (see DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 87). *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130 lists, among others, carpenters, a *symmachos*, guards, smiths, and potters (see DELATTRE, ‘La traduction’ [cit. n. 19], table at pp. 219–220). In some monasteries, the monks used to continue to practice the professions they had learned before joining their communities.

in ll. 4, 12, and 15 of *P. Mon. Apollo* 45; *sbaliou* in the Arab period was an official concerned with fiscal matters, thus the disbursement for him most probably had something to do with the monastery's obligations towards the state administration.⁸¹

Individuals bearing Arab names (e.g. Razid/Rashid in *P. Mon. Apollo* 45; Salei/Saleh in *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16 and *P. Camb. UL Michael.* 1262; Amer in *P. Brux. Bawit* 27) were doubtless laypeople, most probably government officials.⁸² In the documents we also find designations of local functionaries (ἀπεγν, 'headmen' – a term frequently used in Coptic documents, designating village officials who perform various administrative functions, equivalent to Greek *πρωτοκωμηῆται*), who represented their communities in relations with the monastic authorities.⁸³ Other titles, such as *kyrios*, also refer to non-monastic individuals (e.g. *P. Bawit Clackson* 38: *kyrios* Sarapion and *kyrios* Iouliane; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 29: *kyrios* Megas; *P. Duk. inv.* 1053 verso: *kyrios* Petros the *chrysones*).⁸⁴ Some of the functions performed by the people mentioned in the documents may also point to their non-monastic status, as is the case with the *symmachoi*, mentioned, e.g., in *P. Mon. Apollo* 45 (ll. 9, 16, 19, 22). *Symmachoi* were usually couriers and letter-carriers and we would be tempted to regard them as laymen, but it is difficult to find a definite answer to the question.⁸⁵ Another problematic

⁸¹ See *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 25–26 with n. 131 for further references.

⁸² The documents mentioning Salei/Saleh and Amer are orders of payment issued by monastic authorities (see below); for general information on these documents, see *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 220–223; for a reedition of *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16 and edition of *P. Camb. UL Michael.* 1262, see DELATTRE, 'Le monastère de Baouît et l'administration arabe' (cit. n. 19).

⁸³ For general remarks on village leaders and their competences, see STEINWENTER, *Studien zu den koptischen Rechtsurkunden* (cit. n. 75), pp. 38–60; SCHMELZ, *Kirchliche Amtsträger* (cit. n. 75), pp. 296–309.

⁸⁴ Sarapion and Iouliane receive 8 measures of *tariche*; no further indication of their function is provided. In *P. Köln ägypt.* II 29, a superior (πενετωτ) is asking 'brothers of the haven' to settle a matter with *kyrios* Megas. Both the problem the monks were supposed to solve and the identity of Megas are unknown. *Chrysones* was a functionary with financial responsibilities (see DELATTRE, 'Deux ordres' [cit. n. 18], p. 174, comm. to l. 3 of the text). A *kyrios* is mentioned also in the docket of *P. Bawit Clackson* 19 (ⲛⲓⲕⲕⲣ). To my knowledge, *kyrios* is not used to refer to monks.

⁸⁵ Alain Delattre (*P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 170) refrains from determining whether the *symma-*

Byzantine texts).⁹¹ An example from the Bawit dossier, however, shows that both the *nomen* Aurelius and the patronymic of a monk could be retained for the sake of precision in a legal context (*SB XVI 12267* [540]; ll. 4–5: Ἀὐρ[η]λίω Ἀπολλῶτι ὄρου μονάζοντι [μοναστηρίου Ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος ἐν ὄρει] κώμης Τιτκώεως). Patronymics reappear next to the names of monks in the Arab period in documents issued by the state administration.⁹² In documents drawn up in the monastic milieu, however, the presence of a patronymic can be treated as an indication of non-monastic status, but again not without necessary reservations.⁹³

Indications of origin appear in legal documents for the lay parties, while in the case of monks reference is usually made only to their monastic affiliation (although, as always, exceptions do appear).⁹⁴ Alain Delattre

⁹¹ On the elements of personal identification in Byzantine and early Arab Egypt in general, see A. DELATTRE, 'Éléments de l'identification en Égypte (IV^e–VIII^e siècles)', [in:] M. DEPAUW & S. COUSSEMENT (eds.), *Identifiers and Identification Methods in the Ancient World* [= *Orientalia lovaniensia analecta* 229], Leuven 2014, pp. 153–162. For the omission of the *nomina* Flavius and Aurelius while introducing monks and ecclesiastics in Byzantine documents, see T. DERDA & E. WIPSYZKA, 'Emploi des titres *abba*, *apa* et *papas* dans l'Égypte byzantine', *Journal of Jurisitic Papyrology* 24 (1994), pp. 23–56, esp. pp. 46–50.

⁹² See, e.g. tax demands addressed to monks of Bawit: *P. Mon. Apollo* 28 (Pamoun son of Paule); *P. Mon. Apollo* 29 (Phinouke [son of?] Apollo); and *P. Mon. Apollo* 30 (Apollo son of George). Interestingly, patronymics appear also in fiscal documents produced inside the monastery; see the tax receipts from the Bawit dossier: *SB XXVI 16788* (= *P. Duk. inv. 498v*): Biktor son of Psouros, *μονάζων*; *P. Lond. V 1747*: Pamoun son of Onnophrios. The latter does not designate the taxpayer as a monk, but the document can be attributed to the Bawit dossier based on the signature of the person responsible for its issuing, Biktor (see DELATTRE & GONIS, 'Le dossier des reçus' [cit. n. 18], p. 62).

⁹³ See the commentary to a list of names from the Bawit dossier, P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M662 B (6a) recto, in DELATTRE, PILETTE, & VANTHIEGHEM, 'Papyrus coptes' (cit. n. 18), p. 42: 'Rien n'indique clairement si nous avons affaire à des moines ou à des laïcs, mais la mention d'un père et de son fils à la l. 10 plaide en faveur du second scénario, à moins que laïcs et moines ne soient mêlés dans cette liste'. In the same article, however (p. 45), the authors express the following opinion commenting on a register from the Bawit monastery, P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 B (23b): 'Le système d'identification des individus est assez disparate: parfois le scribe précise le patronyme de la personne, tantôt son titre, sa profession (πικα Ν-) ou son *origo* (introduite par Ντε-). Cette variété d'appellation s'explique sans doute par la nécessité de différencier les nombreux homonymes que devait compter la communauté monastique.'

⁹⁴ See *P. CtYBR inv. 1747* (566–567), a Greek loan contract between a layman and a monk

observed that places of origin are sometimes mentioned in lists drawn up by monastic administration, where they probably served to distinguish namesakes within the community.⁹⁵ Toponyms appear in connection with names in the $\omega\text{INE NC}\alpha$ and $\text{ΠEN}\epsilon\text{I}\omega\text{T ΠETC}\zeta\alpha\text{I}$ documents, but their interpretation is fraught with difficulties.

In order to analyse the role of laymen in the functioning of the Bawit community as reflected in our documents, we need to look carefully at the attestations of individuals and their actions in particular contexts. We must be aware of two serious hindrances that will reduce the conclusiveness of the search. First, as already said, uncertainty as to the status of some individuals will remain despite our efforts to identify the actors as precisely as possible. Second, the conclusions will show only general tendencies over a long period of time (the seventh–eighth century) but will not allow for a diachronic analysis of how the relations of the Bawit monks with local communities developed in the time of transition from the Byzantine to the Arab period. The sixth-century private loan contracts will be of little help here, as they are somewhat disconnected from the rest of the Bawit dossier which pertains to administrative and economic activities on the community level. I decided, however, to discuss them all the same, for they allow us to see the scope of the networks of individual contacts. Moreover, juxtaposed with

of the monastery of Titkois, ll. 5–7:]*a* $\Upsilon\alpha\kappa\upsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$ $\delta\rho\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu[\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ - -] ς $\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ $\tau\acute{\omega}$ $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\gamma\lambda\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\omicron\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}[\beta\beta\alpha$ $\text{\AA}\rho\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\omega}$ $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ $\acute{\epsilon}[\nu$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma$ $\text{\textit{T}}\iota\tau\kappa\acute{\omega}\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ (see BENAÏSSA, ‘A usurious monk’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 377–378, esp. p. 379). See also DELATRE, ‘Éléments de l’identification’ (cit. n. 91), p. 156.

⁹⁵ DELATRE, ‘Éléments de l’identification’ (cit. n. 91), p. 156–157; similarly in the case of P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 B (23b): DELATRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGHEM, ‘Papyrus coptes’ (cit. n. 18), p. 45 (see above, n. 93). In some of the cases, place names do not even refer to villages, but to land divisions. In such cases, we may suspect that the toponym indicates an estate unit in which the person worked (cf. *SB Kopt.* II 1045, a list mentioning several individuals in connection with various $\text{ΠM}\alpha$ N- and $\text{ΦO}\iota$ N- toponyms (e.g., l. 4: $\acute{\iota}\omega\delta\chi\eta\phi$ ZN $\text{ΠM}\alpha$ $\text{N}\delta\alpha\text{N}\delta\alpha\text{Z}$; l. 5: $\theta\epsilon\omicron\alpha\Delta\omega\text{P}\epsilon$ ZN $\text{ΦO}\iota$ $\text{N}\kappa\alpha\text{CTP}\omicron\text{N}$). The status of these individuals is impossible to determine. Cf. R. BURCHFIELD, “‘The man of Jeme’: designations of place and witness statements in Western Thebes’, [in:] *Copt. Congr.* X, vol. I, pp. 699–707. Some of the location designators discussed by Burchfield (e.g., PM- ; N- ; ZN-) recur also in the documents from Bawit, although their meaning can vary, depending on the context and local usage.

their later Coptic counterparts, these documents attest to a lasting feature of the Bawit community – the financial independence of the monks.

In the following section, I will proceed to an analysis of the testimonies beginning with what I called the official, or public sphere of relations. Further on, I will focus on the private loan contracts; last but not least, I will discuss the formidable administrative dossier of Bawit. The nature of the relations I will analyse is usually comprehensible from the documentary context: we know if we are in the sphere of fiscality, private business, or internal monastic administration. As already stated, the main problem in the majority of cases consists in identifying the actors and determining their roles in the relations. Guesswork will be inevitable, but it is anyway necessary to go through as large a number of documents as possible in order to find at least some patterns and gain insight into the role of laymen in the functioning of the monastery at Bawit.

4. THE MONASTERY, OFFICIALS, AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Both individual monks and the community as a whole were dealing with various officials: representatives of the state (Byzantine, and, throughout the majority of the period under scrutiny, Arab), village headmen, and other functionaries. Documents were produced in various circumstances and belonged to a wide range of types: administrative and fiscal orders, lists, protocols, legal agreements, petitions, or less formal correspondence. Fiscal matters loomed large among the subjects of these documents but such matters as keeping order, the execution of previous arrangements, and local business were also of importance.

The present section will be divided in two parts. In the first one, I will explore the documents of the Bawit dossier pertaining to the relations with state representatives. Unsurprisingly, almost all of these texts are related in one way or another to fiscal issues: the poll-tax paid by the monks, taxes in kind, obligatory services, and requisitions. The second part will be focused on the contacts with village functionaries. Here the fiscal matters were also vital but other issues, connected with business or

agricultural activities, were present too. Both parts draw information from official documents but the argument in some points has to rest on data obtained from correspondence. Letters were exchanged between monks and officials, but information about the public sphere can be found also in the internal correspondence between the community members. The frequency with which official contacts surface in these letters points to their importance in the everyday life of the monastery. Sometimes, however, a mere attestation of a phenomenon is all we can get from these texts, often badly preserved and notoriously vague.

4.1. Monks and officials: fiscality and services

Anyone who studied papyrological documentation is well aware of the fact that interactions with state officials very frequently took place in fiscal contexts. The situation did not change at all after the Arab conquest. The fiscal system was then based on four pillars: the land-tax (*demosion*), the grain *embole*, a maintenance tax called *dapane*, and the poll-tax (*andrimos* or *diagraphon*). Apart from them, there were various occasional requisitions and obligatory services (e.g. the naval service, or the compulsory work at building sites at Fustat).⁹⁶ A taxpayer – whether individual or institutional – had thus plenty of occasions to enter in contact with state officials responsible for the flow of money, goods, and people within the framework of the fiscal system. The monastery at Bawit and its residents were no exception, and this is well visible in our dossier.⁹⁷ So far, the

⁹⁶ For the fiscal system under Arab rule, see H. I. BELL in *P. Lond.* IV, pp. xxv–xxxii; K. MORIMOTO, *The Fiscal Administration of Egypt in the Early Islamic Period* [= *Asian Historical Monographs* 1], Kyoto 1981, which has to be read together with its review, J. GASCOU, ‘De Byzance à l’Islam: les impôts en Égypte après la conquête arabe’, [in:] IDEM, *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* [= *ACHCByz* 4], Paris 2008, pp. 99–112; GASCOU, ‘Arabic taxation’ (cit. n. 76). See also P. KAHLE, *P. Bal.* I, pp. 41–45 on the taxation of monasteries, and WIP-SZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), pp. 247–258; SIJPESTEIJN, *Shaping a Muslim State* (cit. n. 76), p. 99 (taxation of monasteries and monks) pp. 172–199 (fiscal system in general).

⁹⁷ For a general overview of the fiscal obligations of the monastery of Apa Apollo, see DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 101–104, with references to the sources.

Bawit dossier yielded attestations of all the basic tax payments; it also attests to interesting solutions applied by the monastic administration for handling them. The documents point to the existence of at least two groups of monastic functionaries who dealt with taxes: the *aparche*-collectors for the land-tax, and the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ for *andrismos*. Moreover, some among the documents suggest that the monastery may have played a role also as a tax collector for the state.⁹⁸

For the needs of the present argument I have – somewhat arbitrarily – created a ‘Bawit fiscal dossier’, selecting texts pertaining to various obligations of the monastery and its monks towards the state and its representatives. Among the Bawit documents, only few were produced as a result of direct contact with the officials, namely the small dossier of tax demands published by Sarah J. Clackson as *P. Mon. Apollo* 28, 29, and 30. Other documents either provide indirect testimonies of such relations, e.g. *P. Mich. Copt.* 14, which attests to correspondence with a pagarch concerning a requisition of animals, or the orders to disburse various products to the members of state administration issued by monastic administrators. Others were created in the course of administrative procedures devised to handle fiscal obligations (e.g. lists and accounts pertaining to taxes and other burdens; references to taxes in monastic correspondence; tax receipts issued by monastic representatives to monks; finally, the series of superiors’ orders addressed to the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’).

P. Sorb. II 69 of the first half of the seventh century refers to a fiscal contribution of a monastery of Apa Apollo (fol. 57 E, l. 3) – perhaps the one at Bawit.⁹⁹ If this identification is correct, the document would be the only pre-Conquest testimony of the fiscal liabilities of the community. *P. Mon. Apollo* 27 (seventh–eighth century) does not belong to the Bawit dossier, but mentions the monastery of Abba Apollon in line 11 among

⁹⁸ This is treated as certain in R. S. BAGNALL & D. RATHBONE, *Egypt from Alexander to the Copts. An Archaeological and Historical Guide*, London 2004, p. 177.

⁹⁹ On the date of the Hermopolite fiscal register (618–619 or 633–634), see the introduction by Jean Gascou in *P. Sorb.* II, pp. 15–17. For the identification of the monastery, see *P. Sorb.* II 69, p. 81, and *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 102. The entry reads δ(ιὰ) μον(αστηρίου) Ἀββα Ἀπολλ[λωτος] (ἀρτάβαυ) δ. [.

other contributors (lay and ecclesiastical) of *pakton*.¹⁰⁰ The contributions are expressed in carats and artabae of wheat and their exact character is difficult to determine. If the word *pakton* is used here in its primary meaning of ‘rent’, the list may record the monastery’s liability as a tenant of a parcel rather than a fiscal payment due from monastery-owned land (even though the payment could ultimately serve for covering the landlord’s fiscal obligations).¹⁰¹ The discharge of the monastery’s financial obligation – most probably a freight charge – through a village official is attested in *SB XVI 12266* (seventh century). The payment was collected as part of *merimos* of Hermetariou in the Hermopolite nome; the document thus indicates that the monastery possessed land in this village’s fiscal district.¹⁰²

Fiscality lay at the basis of the system reflected in the documents related to the collection of *aparche*. *Aparche* appears in these texts alongside with other payments labelled *pakton* or *demosion*. The terms are preserved, or can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty, in fourteen documents; out of these, ten feature the word *pakton*, while four refer to *demosion*.¹⁰³ The nuances of the technical vocabulary of the *aparche*-related documents and the connection between *aparche*, *pakton*, and *demosion* have been the subject

¹⁰⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo* 27, l. 1: διαφορο (l. διάφορα) πάκτων [- - -]; l. 11: δ(ιὰ) μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀβ(βᾶ) Ἀπολλῶς [] (sum unpreserved). Nothing in the document points to its association with monastic administration; it would be awkward for a monastic scribe to enter the contribution of his own institution in the register in the manner it had been done in this text. The attribution of *P. Mon. Apollo* 27 to the Bawit monastic dossier is rejected in J. GASCOU, ‘Notes critiques: *P. Prag* I 87, *P. Mon. Apollo* 27, *P. Stras.* VII 660’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 177 (2011), pp. 243–253, esp. p. 246.

¹⁰¹ ‘Fiscal’ interpretation of the document: GASCOU, ‘Notes critiques’ (cit. n. 100), p. 246 (‘le feuillet fiscal du début de l’époque arabe’); list of rents: W. E. CRUM, *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1078 (‘From an account book, relating to rents’); Clackson in *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 23, stating that ‘It may be that this text provides further evidence that the monastery took on unwanted land by renting it’. For *pakton* meaning ‘rent’ in Coptic documents in the Fayumic, Theban, and Hermopolitan evidence, see RICHTER, ‘The cultivation’ (cit. n. 26), p. 211.

¹⁰² See J. GASCOU, ‘Documents grecs relatifs au monastère d’Abba Apollôs de Titkôis (*SB XVI 12266* et *12267*)’, *Anagennesis* 1 (1981), pp. 219–230, esp. pp. 223–225, no. 1. For Hermetariou, see DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), s.v. ‘Ερμηταρίου’.

¹⁰³ *Pakton*: *P. Mon. Apollo* 6; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 21; 22; *P. CtYBR* inv. 5002; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 31. *Demosion*: *P. Mon. Apollo* 1; 2; 3; an unpublished *aparche*-collection guarantee from the Ismailia museum, cited in CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, table 2, p. 40 (x).

of sustained discussion in the literature.¹⁰⁴ I believe that Gesa Schenke's description in *P. Köln ägypt. II* summarises the consensus that can be reached on the subject of these documents and the procedure they reflect in the present state of our knowledge.¹⁰⁵ *Aparche* is now generally understood as an extra payment collected by the monks along with rents from land parcels belonging to the monastery. The parcels were located in the places mentioned in the documents as the monks' territorial 'assignments' and were most probably farmed by lay tenants. That land leases were in the background of the actions recorded in the *aparche* documents is indicated by the frequent use of the word *pakton*, which usually denotes rent.¹⁰⁶ However, the fact that in some of the documents the term *demosion* is used instead of *pakton* may suggest that the collected payments were ultimately destined to cover the monastery's fiscal liabilities as a landowner, as observed already by Sarah Clackson.¹⁰⁷ Gesa Schenke has observed that the monks of Apa Apollo who assumed the responsibility for the collection of money for the 'rent-tax' acted after the manner of tax-collectors.¹⁰⁸ The monastery was sending monks to various locations where parcels of land belonging to the community were scattered. In earlier interpretations the monks were thought to keep the products they collected as their income; those among the brothers who were well-off enough to manage without them could cede their assignments to the less fortunate community

¹⁰⁴ See CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 17–23; WIPSZYCKA, 'Le fonctionnement interne' (cit. n. 19), pp. 179–186; EADEM, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 556–565; EADEM, 'Resources' (cit. n. 11), pp. 204–206; RICHTER, 'The cultivation' (cit. n. 26), pp. 210–212; DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 96–97.

¹⁰⁵ SCHENKE, *P. Köln ägypt. II*, pp. 47–54.

¹⁰⁶ RICHTER, 'The cultivation' (cit. n. 26), p. 211.

¹⁰⁷ Clackson used the term 'rente-impôt', coined by Jean Gascou, to explain the procedure followed by the Bawit monks. In her interpretation, however, *aparche* was identified with the 'rent-tax' itself rather than understood as an additional payment; see CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 18–20. For the connection between rents paid by land tenants and fiscal obligations of landowners, see J. GASCOU, 'Les grandes domaines, la cité et l'état en Égypte byzantine: recherches d'histoire agraire, fiscale et administrative', *Travaux et mémoires* 9 (1985), pp. 1–90, esp. p. 15 (reprinted in IDEM, *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine*, Paris 2008, pp. 125–213, esp. p. 137).

¹⁰⁸ SCHENKE, 'Monastic control' (cit. n. 19) and *P. Köln ägypt. II*, p. 49. For a reconstruction of the collection procedure, see WIPSZYCKA, 'Resources' (cit. n. 11), p. 206.

members.¹⁰⁹ However, if we assume, after Tonio Sebastian Richter and, more recently, Gesa Schenke¹¹⁰ that the monks who undertook the collection of *aparche* and ‘rent-tax’ undertook with it also the fiscal responsibility in case of the tenants’ shortcomings, the situation becomes clearer. The monks most probably did not file individual financial declarations at the ‘administrative bureau’ of the monastery; thus, an assignment could fall on the shoulders of a person who was unable to handle it. Even if the monastery remunerated the monks for their effort of going to villages and collecting payments,¹¹¹ risks and profits were perhaps not balanced out. While ceding the assignment to someone else, a monk would not only give up the remuneration, but also rid himself of a burdensome and potentially risky obligation.¹¹² The diligence with which the transfers of assignments between monks were recorded can be attributed to the weight attached to record-keeping in the monastic milieu. Curiously, however, the majority of *aparche*-related documents do not mention any monastic representatives of the community level – a fact that raised objections as to the official character of the recorded arrangements.¹¹³ However, a recently

¹⁰⁹ WIPSYZKA, ‘Le fonctionnement interne’ (cit. n. 19), p. 185.

¹¹⁰ RICHTER, ‘The cultivation’ (cit. n. 26), pp. 210–212; SCHENKE, *P. Köln ägypt.* II, p. 49.

¹¹¹ Cf. *P. Bawit Clackson* 24, a superior’s order to hand ‘a *lebiton* and a small garment’ (ll. 2–3: ΟΥΛΟΥΒΙΤΟΥ ΜΗ ΟΥΚΟΥΪ ΝΗΘΙΤΕ) to Ammone, who was supposed to collect *aparche* at Pankalou. The document, however, does not state whether Ammone received the garments as an *aparche*-collector remunerated for his services, or for other reasons. *Lebiton* as an item delivered as a part of wages recurs in work contracts from Wadi Sarga (*P. Sarga* 161 and 164). It appears frequently in monastic literary sources as a designation of a part of monastic garment; papyrological attestations, however (including the Wadi Sarga examples, which refer to laypeople hired by the monastery of Apa Thomas), cannot be firmly connected with monastic contexts. See M. MOSSAKOWSKA-GAUBERT, *Le costume monastique en Égypte à la lumière des textes grecs et latins et des sources archéologiques (IV^e–début du VII^e siècle)*, PhD thesis, University of Warsaw 2005, pp. 153–175.

¹¹² The procedure can be described as tax farming; see R. MCCONNELL, ‘More land, more production, or more taxes? Growth and the Apion estate’, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 53 (2016), pp. 355–366.

¹¹³ In the first lot of *aparche*-related documents published by Sarah J. Clackson in *P. Mon. Apollo* only one, *P. Mon. Apollo* 1, mentioned ‘the fathers of the *diakonia*’ (l. 6). The opening section of this document is, however, badly damaged, and the phrase does not necessarily refer to the addressees of the document.

published *aparche*-collection guarantee, *P. Köln ägypt.* II 30, mentions ‘the fathers of the *diakonia*’ among the addressees of the document, while in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 31 the phrase can be reconstructed with high degree of probability.¹¹⁴

P. Mon. Apollo 2 and 3 allow us to glimpse some interesting procedural details. In the former, following the badly preserved *demosion* sum, we encounter the phrase ‘[I shall (?)] give them to the great brother’ (ll. 12–13: [... (N)TA]TAAY OYA ΠΝΟΘ ΝΣΟΝ). This suggests that a monk, having collected the payments, handed them over to senior brothers; what the capacities of a ‘great brother’ could be is open to question.¹¹⁵ *P. Mon. Apollo* 3, on the other hand, deserves our attention due to the special treatment it received. The document is an *aparche*-collection guarantee witnessed by three persons. However, the whole text is written in the same hand, described by Clackson as ‘an experienced, essentially majuscule hand with cursive tendencies’. The document had been rewritten, perhaps for administrative purposes, by a proficient scribe. Therefore, it is possible that the records of such documents were kept by the monastic administration. I thus believe that we can assume that some sort of official control over the *aparche* agreements existed also at the stage of the adjustment of the assignments. After all, most texts state explicitly that the payments were collected for the sake of the monastery of Apa Apollo;¹¹⁶ we would thus expect the community administrators to make efforts to secure an unproblematic transmission of

¹¹⁴ *P. Köln ägypt.* II 30, ll. 4–6: ἡ πασον φιβ ην πασον ταυριν[ε ηνπα]σον γεωρκε μονοχοσ ἡπιτοπ[οσ ἡουωτ] λγω ἡιοτε ἡταδιακονια; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 32, ll. 3–6: η] πασον εις ακ πμονουχ[οσ ηπιτοποσ] ηπφαγιος απα απολλω ηη [ηιοτε ηταδια]κονια.

¹¹⁵ The phrase ‘great brothers’ recurs twice in *P. Mon. Apollo* 25 (lines 4 and 7). In this document they play an advisory role and mediate in property renunciation. In *P. Mon. Apollo* 2 the ‘great brother’ is probably a monastic representative charged with the management of *aparche* and related payments. Since the renunciation of the responsibility for monastic property by a monk, as in the case of *P. Mon. Apollo* 25, could potentially have fiscal repercussions for the community, we are tempted to see in the Bawit ‘great brothers’ people who supervised matters related to the land-tax. In the monastery of Apa Apollo at Deir el-Bala’izah, ‘great brothers’ or ‘great sons’ (ηνοσ ησνηη; ηνοσ ησνηε), represented the monastery together with the superior (see *P. Bal.* 102, l. 4; *P. Bal.* 108, l. 2; *P. Bal.* 103, ll. 3–4).

¹¹⁶ *Aparche*-related texts mention also other monasteries as the recipients of the collected payments; see below, pp. 195–197.

fiscal responsibilities. This would be even more relevant if we assume that the *aparche*-collectors operated not only on monastic land, but were also involved in the collection of taxes from parcels which did not belong to the monastery (see below, pp. 208–209). Three among the *aparche*-related texts point indeed in this direction.

The documents in question feature other monastic institutions which relied on the Bawit community for the collection of *demosion*, *pakton*, and *aparche*.¹¹⁷ In *P. Mon. Apollo* 3, a monk from the monastery of Apa Apollo is collecting *demosion* and *aparche* for his own monastery and for the monastery of Apa Makare; the *demosion* of the two institutions due from

¹¹⁷ For general observations on other monasteries in the *aparche* documents, see *P. Mon. Apollo*, §3.3.9, p. 23. For the respective monasteries, see *P. Mon. Apollo* §3.12.1, pp. 32–33, with references to other attestations of the institutions in the documents. An *aparche*-related document is found also in the dossier of the monastery of Deir el-Bala'izah, *P. Bal.* 253. It is a letter from Apa Isaak to a village headmen mentioning 'small *aparche*' (l. 3: τκοῦι ναπαρχη). The document is, unfortunately, very poorly preserved.

The list of the monasteries for which *aparche* was collected presented in *P. Mon. Apollo* §3.3.9 includes the monastery of Apa Mena, supposedly mentioned in *P. Mon. Apollo* 16. A Middle Egyptian monastery of Apa Mena appears in the Bala'izah dossier (*P. Bal.* 119 and 140; see KAHLE, *P. Bal.*, vol. I, p. 25 for further references). A monastery (*petra*) of Apa Mena appears in *P. Mon. Apollo* 42 – a loan contract – as the place of provenance of the creditor (ll. 2–3: πασον ὡσι πατερα (l. πετρα) ναπα μνηα). However, I am not convinced that 'Apa Mena' in *P. Mon. Apollo* 16 refers to a monastic community. The text is a letter written most probably to monks of Apa Apollo and mentions other monks collecting *aparche* on behalf of Apa Mena in a Hermopolite location (ll. 4–5: ἡρενσνη ενοι νε ενηη πτωου πουσιρε ενσεκ απαρχη ρα πενμεριτ ἡεωτ απα μνηα · ρη πελετκμηε ('some brothers of mine who were in the region of Pousire collecting tithes for our beloved father Apa Mena in Peletkeme'). The adjective μεριτ, 'beloved', does not appear in the descriptions of monastic patrons when the monastery is introduced as an institution, while it is frequently used as an affectionate form of address and introduction of a third person. In *P. Mon. Apollo* 16 it appears five times: in l. 2 and 13 it describes the addressee of the letter, brother Apollo (παμεριτ νσον ενταεινη απολλω; ταας μπαμ'ερ'ιτ νσον απολλω); in l. 8 and 12 it is used to address Apollo again ('Now then my beloved brother' – τινου δε παμεριτ νσον; 'Farewell in the Lord, my beloved brother' – ουχα ρη παροικ παμεριτ νσον); finally, in l. 5 it describes 'the father' Apa Mena. I believe it possible that also in the last case the reference is made not to a monastic patron but to a living person – a monastic superior, ειωτ απα μνηα, who might have been the functionary who ordered the collection of *aparche* in Peletkeme. A *proestos* named Menas is attested in an inscription from Bawit; see *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 28 (quoting M. KRAUSE, 'Die Inschriften auf den Türstürzbalken des Apa-Apollon-Klosters von Bawit', *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont* [= *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* 20], Geneva 1988, p. 114, n. 37, no. 11).

land in a location whose name is largely unpreserved amounts to two solidi minus half a *tremissis*.¹¹⁸ *P. Mon. Apollo* 11 does not preserve the opening clauses, but it features three beneficiaries: the monasteries of Apa Apollo, Apa Anoup, and Apa Jeremias (ll. 5–8). The sum of *pakton* to be collected is high: sixteen solidi minus ½ each,¹¹⁹ ‘according to the measure of the *diakonia*’ (meaning perhaps the *diakonia* of the monastery of Apa Apollo).¹²⁰ The monastery of Apa Jeremias recurs also in *P. Mon. Apollo* 19. It is a fragmentarily preserved document connected with the *aparche* dossier based on the assignment formula (‘whereas we gave you’) preserved partially in lines 6–7. It was addressed by the ‘fathers of the *diakonia* of the μα of Apa Jeremias’ (ll. 2–3: ΝΕΙΟΤΕ ΝΤΔΙΑ[ΚΟ]ΝΙΑ ΜΠΜΑ ΝΑΠΑ ΙΕΡΕΜΙΑΣ) το πασον Κλουj and πασον Οuenober of the *topos* of Apa Apollo (ll. 4–6: ΜΠΑÇΟΝ ΚΛΟΥΧ ΜΕ ΠΑ[ÇΟΝ Ο]ΥΕΝΟΒΕΡ ΝΕΜΑΝΑΧΟΣ [ΠΜΤΟ]ΠΟΣ ΝΑΠΑ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ; I do not know if the switch from μα to *topos* is meaningful or the two words were simply used synonymously). The document, unfortunately, does not preserve any of the three terms of the standard ‘package’ of the *aparche*-related texts. It proves, however, that the members of *diakoniai* of other institutions could make assignment arrangements with the monks of Apa Apollo; the form of the document strongly suggests that these arrangements were made in connection with the procedures of the collection of *aparche* and *pakton/demosion*.

Concerning the monasteries of Apa Makare, Apa Anoup, and Apa Jeremias, Sarah Clackson wrote: ‘[...] far from being independent monasteries, they were subsumed into the general organisation of the monastery of Apa Apollo to the extent that they were considered subdivisions of that monastery’ (*P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 23). I believe that this statement is

¹¹⁸ *P. Mon. Apollo* 3, ll. 4–8: ‘Whereas we have agreed with each other and you have given me Τμου [—]μου and the places which belong to it so that I collect their tithe [...] and all the produce for Apollo and Apa Makare for this very year, the 11th indiction-year for their *demosion* which is two (solidi) less half a *tremissis*’ (ΣΕ <ε>ΠΙΤΗ ΑΝΦΕΜΙ[ΘΕ] ΜΗ ΝΕΡΗΟΥ ΑΚΤΙ ΝΑΙ ΝΤΜΟΥ[± 2]ΜΟΥ ΜΗ ΝΕΜΑ ΕΤ[ΗΠ Ε]ΡΟΣ ΕΤΡΑΣΩΚ ΤΕΥΑΠΑΡΧ[Η Μ]Η ΓΕΝΕΜΑ ΜΗ ΖΑ ΑΠΟ[ΛΛ]Ω ΜΗ ΑΠΑ ΜΑΚΑΡΕ ΖΑ ΤΙ ΡΟΜΠΕ ΤΑΪ ΙΑ ΙΝΔ(ΙΚΤΙ)Ο(ΝΟΣ) Ζ[Δ Π]ΕΥΤΕΜΟΣΙΩΝ ΕΤΕ ΠΑΪ ΣΝΑΥ ΟΔΑΤΕΝΟΥΠΑΟΥΤΡΕΜΗÇŃ).

¹¹⁹ The document does not specify the unit to be deduced; two options can be taken into consideration: *tremissis* and *keration*; see commentary to ll. 12–13 of *P. Mon. Apollo* 11.

¹²⁰ What is meant here is most probably the money standard used by the *diakonia* for its transactions. For standards, see below, pp. 245–246.

too far-reaching; the documentation does not allow us to determine the nuances of the relation between Apa Apollo and these institutions. The documents, however, indicate that an overarching system of collection of *aparche* and *pakton/demosion* for more than one monastery existed and was run by the monks of Apa Apollo. Such a system is perhaps easiest explainable if we assume that the role of the monastery at Bawit consisted in serving as a rent-tax collector for other institutions. It is all the more probable since we see monks of a monastery of Apa Jeremias – maybe the same as in *P. Mon. Apollo* 11 and 19 – ‘using’ the Bawit administration to discharge their *andrismos* (see below, p. 200 n. 135). We could imagine that the monks of Apa Apollo would receive an additional remuneration for their effort, but our documents leave us clueless as to how it was reckoned.¹²¹ It is possible that other monasteries were not reduced to a passive role in the system, but could commission monks from Bawit to collect the payments, as suggested by *P. Mon. Apollo* 19.

Our documents show that monks were held fiscally liable for their private landholdings. Individual fiscal liabilities can be traced in the small dossier of Bawit tax demands (*P. Mon. Apollo* 28–30). The three documents are addressed to members of the community by fiscal officers.¹²² Only one document preserves information about the character of the payment: *P. Mon. Apollo* 30 states that the monk, Apollo son of George, has to pay an unknown amount of money ‘on the first instalment in your [...] *demosion* for indiction-year five’.¹²³ The term *demosion* was comprehensive

¹²¹ Todd M. Hickey suggested to me that *aparche* could be a payment the monastery and the monks requested as tax-collectors. Of course, this extra income could be used by the monastic administration to remunerate the monastic collectors for their job; *P. Mon. Apollo* 3 and 11, however, suggest that *aparche* was collected for all monasteries mentioned in these texts, not only for Apa Apollo. Again, a part of the *aparche* that went to the other institutions could be put aside to pay for the services of the Bawit monks, but our documents do not give us any clue if such a procedure was indeed implemented.

¹²² The name of the issuer is preserved only in *P. Mon. Apollo* 28, which was sent by Abd Allah ibn Abd al-Rahman (l. 1: ἀβδ[ε]λλὰ πρῶτου ἀβδερμάνου); this official was probably a pagarch; see CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 25. For a new reading of the sums of money in *P. Mon. Apollo* 29 and 30, see N. GONIS, ‘Reconsidering some fiscal documents from Early Islamic Egypt II’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 150 (2004), pp. 187–193, esp. pp. 191–192.s

¹²³ *P. Mon. Apollo*. 30, ll. 3–4: ἔν τῳ ὀρτῳ ἐκατάβολῃ ἐν πρ(ε)4) [±2] εἰς δῆμοσιον <ᾱ>ι(ν)Δ(ικ-

enough to include various types of taxes (land tax, *dapane*, and poll-tax); in the Bawit dossier, it could serve particularly as a designation of the tax due from landed property (cf. the *aparche* documents).¹²⁴ While commenting on the dossier, Sarah Clackson observed: 'In 28–30 each monk is addressed individually and held liable for a small amount of tax by a representative of the Arab administration. This practice contrasts with evidence which shows monasteries as responsible for collecting taxes from their own monks [...]. Alain Delattre concluded that 'à Baouît, chaque moine était directement responsable de son *andrismos*'.¹²⁵ However, the Bawit dossier abounds in documents which illustrate how *andrismos* was handled by community representatives. How the payment procedure was handled in the case of the monks' *demosion* cannot be reconstructed in the present state of documentation. The only mention of an individual paying *demosion* outside the dossier of tax demands (*P. Bawit Clackson* 22) suggests some kind of involvement of the monastic administration. The document is a notice from Petre the *proestos* to his fellow monk Pshoi, accompanying 'a solidus which I [i.e. Petre] received for Bene's taxes' (ll. 2–4: $\chi\epsilon <\epsilon>\iota\varsigma \omicron\Upsilon\Upsilon\omicron\lambda\omicron\kappa\omicron\tau\eta \alpha\beta\iota \epsilon\tau\omicron\tau \chi\epsilon$ (sic!) $\mu\tau\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\epsilon \mu\beta\eta\eta\epsilon$). $\tau\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma\epsilon$ stands for *demosion* and the document associates its payment with an individual. It is perhaps reasonable to think that the developed fiscal apparatus of the monastery could, for the sake of convenience, facilitate the payment of different taxes by collecting money from individuals and forwarding them to the authorities.¹²⁶ In any case, we need to observe that the three

$\tau\iota\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$) ϵ ; for the propositions how to fill the lacuna (which do not change the interpretation of the document), see the commentary *ad loc.* *P. Mon. Apollo* 29 preserves only the ending of the name of the tax, $-\omicron\mu$ (l. 4), which can be reconstructed either as *demosion* or *diagraphon*. The part of *P. Mon. Apollo* 28 where the character of the payment was stated is lost.

¹²⁴ See CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, §3.5.1, p. 24.

¹²⁵ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 103 with n. 363.

¹²⁶ The involvement of the monastic administration in the payment not only of *andrismos*, but also other taxes (artisanal taxes and *embole*) by individual monks is well attested in the dossier of the monastery of Deir el-Bala'izah. There, monastic functionaries were issuing receipts to taxpaying monks (see *P. Bal.* 133–136, 139(?), 142–149) and appear in fiscal accounts as intermediaries through whom sums of money were paid (see *P. Bal.* 290, 291+292). However, *entagia* of the monks could be delivered also to the villages where they used to live or possessed land. In such cases, they had to be sent to the monastery by

entagia, *P. Mon. Apollo* 28–30, ended up in the hands of monastic administrators; all of them bear on their backs fragmentary accounts which can probably be connected with the administration on the community level.¹²⁷ We are, however, unable to determine if this was a result of a regular procedure which presupposed that individual *entagia* passed through the office of monastic representatives or not.

Among the fiscal matters handled by the monastic authorities at Bawit, the management of *andrismos* is by far the best documented. Under Arab rule, monks were subject to poll-tax since the beginning of the eighth century.¹²⁸ The responsibility for the payment rested with monastic authorities, who received information about the total amount of *andrismos* for an indictional year. The community managers then divided the sum among the monks.¹²⁹ Further procedures were handled by a group of monks headed by a superior, called the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’.¹³⁰ Their field of responsibility, which can be reconstructed thanks to the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ documents, included keeping updated lists of taxpayers, recording payments and issuing receipts, and converting into money the contributions in kind brought by the taxpayers who did not have liquid cash.¹³¹

family and acquaintances. The delivery of such an *entagion* is the subject of *P. Bal.* 244 – a letter sent by a layman to the monastery to which the *entagion* was presumably attached.

¹²⁷ *P. Mon. Apollo* 28: *P. Mon. Apollo* 47 (receipt for wine destined for ‘Markos the builder who is building the wall of the great house’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 29: *P. Mon. Apollo* 46 (account of wine disbursements to various people); *P. Mon. Apollo* 30: *P. Mon. Apollo* 48 (account of money, first edited as wine account; for the document, see below, pp. 210–211).

¹²⁸ For the discussion of the moment when poll-tax for monks was introduced in Egypt, see WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ (cit. n. 11), pp. 250–256, with further references, and N. GONIS, ‘Two poll-tax receipts from Early Islamic Egypt’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 131 (2000), pp. 150–154, esp. p. 152, commentary to l. 3 of P. Duk. inv. 498v. For the poll-tax in general, see GASCOU, ‘Arabic taxation’ (cit. n. 76), pp. 675–677.

¹²⁹ On the procedure of the poll-tax assignment, see GASCOU, ‘De Byzance à l’Islam’ (cit. n. 96), pp. 104–105.

¹³⁰ Thirteen documents in the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ dossier are addressed to ΝΕΚΝΗΥ ΝΠΙΔΝΔ-ΡΙΣΜΟΣ (*P. Bawit Clackson* 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 (?), 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 25; *P. Köln ägypt.* II 18 and 20). Out of these, eleven were issued by a superior named Keri; one was written by another superior, Daniel (*P. Bawit Clackson* 14), and one bears no signature (*P. Bawit Clackson* 25).

¹³¹ Items brought as poll-tax contributions had to be sold in order to obtain money, as the tax was supposed to be paid in cash. In *P. Bawit Clackson* 1 Keri sends ‘the brothers of the

It appears that their competences were chiefly executive, while the decision-making was in the hands of the superiors.¹³²

Similarly to the *aparche* assignments, the division of *andrismos* also needed adjustments. In several documents labelled ‘waivers of poll-tax liability’ by Sarah Clackson, the issuer asks the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ not to hold various individuals liable for the taxes of an indictional year. It seems that the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ had registers of taxpayers according to which they proceeded with the collection. However, an individual unable to pay the required amount could probably complain to a superior, who, in turn, waived his liability or allowed a delay.¹³³ Reassignments must have naturally happened afterwards, but unfortunately they are not recorded. It was also the superior’s task to decide whether to accept a contribution in kind and how to proceed with obtaining money in exchange for it. We would expect that the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ would issue tax receipts on a regular basis; however, in some cases they needed an extra order to do so, as in *P. Bawit Clackson 4*, where the payment is made in kind, or in *P. Bawit Clackson 6*, where the brothers were asked to issue a receipt for a certain Anoup whose poll-tax was paid by someone else.¹³⁴ It appears that the well-organised system at Bawit was

poll-tax’ a rug worth one solidus brought by a certain Kamoul; in *P. Bawit Clackson 4* the brothers are asked to issue a tax receipt to Mena the sack-weaver and to care for the proper evaluation of the sacks he brought as his contribution; *P. Bawit Clackson 14* records a contribution in kind (wine worth one solidus) by monks of the monastery of Apa Jeremias. *P. Bawit Clackson 12* is an order of Keri addressed to ‘NN the rug-dealer’ to sell two rugs in order to obtain money for the poll-tax.

¹³² We do not know whether the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ collected the tax themselves or had subordinates who did it for them; cf. *P. Brux. Bawit 6*, an order of payment of wine to νερωροεις εγαπεται ηπανδ(ρισμος) (‘les gardiens qui réclament l’*andrismos*’), with commentary to l. 2.

¹³³ Cf. *P. Bawit Clackson 5*, where the payment of the poll-tax by a certain ‘Phoibammon of the piggery’ is to be suspended until the matter is talked over by the superior Keri and the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’.

¹³⁴ *P. Bawit Clackson 6*, ll. 43–6: ‘David (?) has [...] poll-tax — he has paid for Anoup his son. I shall release this young son — give him (a) receipt for his son (αλλαγειτ [±4] αντρισμος αριτ[ι] ρα ανουπ περωηρε ειεκα πεικογι[ι] ωηρε εβολ τι εντακεν ναϭ ρα περωηρε). The commentary to the text reads: ‘If both are monks, David would have been Anoup’s spiritual, rather than natural, father’.

used also by smaller monasteries, as we can see in *P. Bawit Clackson* 14, in which Daniel orders the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ to accept wine worth one solidus ‘from the sons of Prashe, the men of the monastery of Jeremias of Pmanbete’.¹³⁵

As already mentioned, the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ were issuing receipts to taxpayers. A dossier of twelve such receipts has been preserved among the Bawit documents.¹³⁶ In nine cases, the taxpayers are explicitly called monks. The issuers of these documents are mentioned without any particular titles (except for a *katbegetes* in *P. Clackson* 36).¹³⁷ Alain Delattre and Nikolaos Gonis refrained from any decisive statements as to their function, although they hypothesised that the documents could have been issued by the superior of the community, based on the identification of one of the issuers with the signatory of two ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ documents.¹³⁸ As we have already seen, the signatories of the ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ orders could be involved in the procedure of issuing receipts, but it was the ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ who would normally deal with it. The *andrismos* receipts we have at our disposal were perhaps produced by them, and the people recorded therein as the issuers were none

¹³⁵ *P. Bawit Clackson* 14, ll. 2–4: Ⲭⲉ ⲗⲓ ⲠϢϢⲟⲗⲟⲕⲟⲧ’ ⲧⲏ ⲏⲏⲣⲓ ⲏⲧⲟⲟⲧϣ’ ⲏⲉⲱⲉⲏ ⲡⲣⲁⲱⲉ ⲏⲉⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲏⲡⲏⲟⲩ ⲓⲉⲣⲉⲙⲓⲁⲥ ⲡⲁⲡⲓⲙⲁⲏⲃⲉⲣⲧⲉ. Gesa Schenke suggested that the text does not pertain to *andrismos* itself, but records a payment in wine (*P. Köln ägypt.* II, p. 12). In my opinion, however, the situation is analogous to the one from *P. Bawit Clackson* 1 and 4, where the superior Keri accepts rugs in place of a money contribution.

¹³⁶ On this dossier, see DELATTRE & GONIS, ‘Le dossier des reçus’ (cit. n. 18), pp. 61–69. It is made up of the following documents: *P. Clackson* 36; *P. Clackson* 37; *P. Lugd. Bat.* XIX 24; *P. Lond.* V 1748; *P. Clackson* 38; *P. Clackson* 39; *SB* XXVI 16646; *P. Lond.* V 1747; *SB* XIV 11332; *SB* XXVI 16788; *P. Amst.* I 63. The recently published *P. Clédât* 89+90 issued to Biktor son of Faustos, a smith of the monastery, has now to be added to the dossier. See A. DELATTRE, ‘Nouveaux papyrus du monastère de Baouît’, *Études coptes* XII, pp. 61–73, esp. pp. 71–73.

¹³⁷ See DELATTRE & GONIS, ‘Le dossier des reçus’ (cit. n. 18), p. 63, and commentary to l. 5 of *P. Clackson* 36 on p. 65. *Katbegetes* was a “teacher” in a religious sphere; the title is attested in some of the Bawit inscriptions. Here it is probably used as a mark of respect towards its bearer.

¹³⁸ DELATTRE & GONIS, ‘Le dossier des reçus’ (cit. n. 18), p. 63 and 61 with n. 7. *P. Lugd. Bat.* XIX 24 was signed by a certain Germanos who appears also in *P. Brux. Bawit* 1 and *P. Bawit Clackson* 21.

other than the ‘brothers’ themselves. Interestingly, it appears that this section of monastic administration was using Greek which is the language of all tax receipts for *andrismos* we know. Although the Arab administration used Coptic for the purposes of administration and fiscality (see, e.g., the tax demands *P. Mon. Apollo* 28–30), it might have seemed proper to write the receipts (which the monks could be ordered to produce by an official) in the Greek language, which remained in use in the state administration.

Other obligations of the monastery towards the state included *dapane* – a tax destined for the maintenance of administrative officers – as well as various requisitions and services. *Dapane* is mentioned explicitly in only one document in an unclear context;¹³⁹ on the other hand, we have several attestations of disbursements of goods and money to people connected with the Arab administration. In *P. Mon. Apollo* 45, a *shaliou* of Ptene is recorded three times as recipient of *hepsema*, boiled wine – a commodity usually destined for Arab officials.¹⁴⁰ In *P. Barwit Clackson* 19, a ΠΕΝΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΡΩΙ document, the disbursements are received by people who may have worked for a *shaliou*. Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of preservation hinders our understanding of the text.¹⁴¹ Scattered mentions of various payments of undetermined character whose recipients were people connected with officials are found also in other documents. In *P. Duk. inv. 1053 verso*¹⁴² a ‘father’ gives the order to hand a small amount of vegetables and incense to a man belonging to the entourage of

¹³⁹ *P. Brux. Barwit* 39, a letter to the archimandrite Zacharias dated to the 7th–8th century. *Dapane* (ΤΑΔΑΠΑΝΗ) is mentioned in l. 9. The letter, which most probably transmits the orders of a pagarch (l. 1: ‘your son the pagarch’; ΠΕΤΡῆ ΟΥΡΗ ΠΑΓΑΡ[Χ]ΙΟΣ) speaks also of a shipment of grain, most probably in connection with fiscality (see below, pp. 205 and 210).

¹⁴⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo* 45, l. 4: one *kollathon* on 17 Mesore; ll. 12 and 15: the total of two *kollatha* on 18 Mesore. On the competences of *shaliou*, see *P. Mon. Apollo*, pp. 25–26. Sarah Clackson suggested also a different interpretation of the disbursement (*P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 26, n. 132): the wine could constitute the repayment of a debt the monastery had towards the *shaliou*; Clackson quotes *P. Bal. 102*, where the *dikaion* of the Bala’izah monastery of Apa Apollo borrows eight solidi from a *shaliou* named Amrou, to be repaid in kind.

¹⁴¹ *P. Barwit Clackson* 19, ll. 4–5: ΝΕΡΩΜ[Ε ±4 ΙΩ]ΣΑΝΗΣ ...ε[...]*ΠΕΩΛΙΟΥ* (‘the men ... Iohanes (?) ... the *shaliou*’).

¹⁴² See DELATTRE, ‘Deux orders’ (cit. n. 18), pp. 172–174.

an otherwise unattested Petros, a *chrysones*.¹⁴³ *P. Louvre Bawit* 32 juxtaposes quite randomly various expenses, including a payment of two solidi to ‘the lord Zacharias, son of the pagarch’, who can be identified with a high-ranking fiscal officer.¹⁴⁴ An extra contribution for a person assuming an office appears in a document from the Vatican collection, the unpublished *P. Vatic. copti Doresse* 20 (a communication from an Arab official, Rashid ibn Halid, to monks of a monastery of Apa Apollo, probably the one at Bawit).¹⁴⁵

Some of the administrative documents from the monastery mention individuals with Arab names. Most probably they were also representatives of state administration entitled to disbursements in kind. This is the case of Razid, mentioned in line 5 of *P. Mon. Apollo* 45 as recipient of a *knidion* of wine.¹⁴⁶ Among the orders of payments we find a ‘micro-dossier’ of three documents concerning disbursements of products to two men with Arab

¹⁴³ The office of *chrysones* appears in the papyri in the fourth century; in Late Roman and Byzantine period *chrysones* was a financial officer at the head of the provincial treasury (see introduction to *P. Würzb.* 15, pp. 86–87; J. LALLEMAND, *L'administration civile de l'Égypte de l'avènement de Dioclétien à la création du diocèse (282–382)*, Brussels 1964, pp. 190, n. 1, and 219). In Coptic documents, the term designates a fiscal official in charge of a district treasury (FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.).

¹⁴⁴ *P. Louvre Bawit* 32, l. 2: ΠΚΥΡ(ΙΟC) ΖΑΧΑΡΙΑC ΠΩΝ ΠΠΑΓΑΡΧ(ΟC) νο(μίσματα) β. On Zacharias, see the commentary *ad loc.* in the edition. The editors quote *P. Ryl. Copt.* 319, a document which mentions in line 1 a certain Zacharias, son of the pagarch Flavius Senouthios. *P. Ryl. Copt.* 319 is a letter written in a very imperious tone in which Zacharias, acting in the name of his father, instructs the headmen of some villages or *epoikia* about fiscal procedures to be followed.

¹⁴⁵ Briefly described by L. S. B. MACCOULL, ‘The Coptic archive of Dioscorus of Aphrodite’, *Chronique d'Égypte* 56 (1981), pp. 185–193, esp. p. 192. Rashid ibn Halid was the pagarch of Hermapolis in the first half of the eighth century. See N. GONIS, ‘Two fiscal registers from Early Islamic Egypt (*P. Vatic. Aphrod.* 13, SB XX 14701)’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 30 (2000), pp. 21–29, esp. p. 22–23, with n. 9 at p. 23. The document, which MacCoug connects, perhaps erroneously, with the Aphrodite dossier, is ‘a letter from Rashid son of Khaled (ΡΑΖΙΔ ΓΙΟ(Ο) ΞΑΛΕΔ) to Peter son of Cyrus “and the brothers, the men of the monastery of Apa Apollo”, with regard to the *katastasis* or collection of a sum upon an official’s assumption of office’.

¹⁴⁶ Not boiled wine, as is the case with the *shaliou* of Ptene in the same document and other Arabs attested in the dossier. S. Clackson (*P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 26) suggests that the disbursement could be ‘some sort of government levy, destined for distribution to non-Muslims’, for example the employees of Rashid recruited among the local people.

names.¹⁴⁷ *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16, issued by Serenos, presbyter and *oikonomos*, records one *kollathon* of boiled wine (*hepsema*) registered in the account of Saleh (ἐπιλογ(ος) σαλεϛ). The same account is mentioned in *P. Camb. UL inv.* 1262, again signed by Serenos; the payment consists of *hepsema* and honey. Serenos the presbyter signed also the third document of this group, *P. Brux. Bawit* 27: an order of payment of one *kollathon* of *hepsema* and one *kannion* of honey to the account of Amer (ἐπιλογ(ος) ναμεϛ). All three documents were written in the same month in the office of Serenos.¹⁴⁸ Serenos the *oikonomos*, who does not appear in any other orders of payment edited to date, could be in charge of the ‘accounts’ of Arab officials. Even though the mentions of Arab officials in the Bawit dossier are few and dispersed, the orders of payment suggest the existence of separate accounts dedicated to them, thanks to which monastic administrators could control the payments and avoid delays.

Delays, however, did occur, as is to be expected in a large institution with numerous obligations. Such a situation is attested in *P. Vatic. Aphrod.* 13 (late seventh–early eighth century), which is a list of arrears of requisitions of the monastery of Apa Apollo attributed to the Bawit dossier (l. 1: γνω(σις) λοιπ(ων) διανομ(ων) μον(αστηρίου) αββ(α) Ἀπολλῶ(τος)).¹⁴⁹ The list mentions considerable amounts of various goods, including cloth, sacks, nails, and boiled wine.¹⁵⁰

Orders of the Arab administration concerned not only goods but also services. Some documents in the Bawit dossier seem to hint at services being requested from the community. Out of the three attestations, however, two are extremely vague. *P. Louvre Bawit* 38 is a letter from Zacharias,

¹⁴⁷ On this micro-dossier, see DELATTRE, ‘Le monastère de Baouît et l’administration arabe’ (cit. n. 19). The article contains a reedition of two of its documents (*P. Yale inv.* 1866 [= *P. Brux. Bawit* 27], p. 44–45; *P. Hermitage Copt.* 16, pp. 46–47) and the edition of one new text from the Cambridge collection (*P. Camb. UL inv.* 1262, p. 45).

¹⁴⁸ See Delattre’s commentary to l. 2 of *P. Brux. Bawit* 27, p. 223.

¹⁴⁹ For a reedition of the document and an exhaustive commentary with further bibliography, see GONIS, ‘Two fiscal registers’ (cit. n. 145), pp. 21–25.

¹⁵⁰ GONIS, ‘Two fiscal registers’ (cit. n. 145), p. 22, observes that ‘the “arrears” are fairly high, which suggests a monastery of some size, and would suit the picture of the large monastic complex at Bawit’.

a high-ranking monk of the community, mentioning an individual going to Babylon. Unfortunately, since the document is extremely badly preserved, we cannot interpret it in a convincing manner.¹⁵¹ However, a prosopographical connection was made by the editors between the Zacharias of the Louvre papyrus and the archimandrite Zacharias, the addressee of *P. Brux. Bawit* 39.¹⁵² The Brussels papyrus is a letter mentioning *dapane*. Alain Delattre, in his interpretation of *P. Brux. Bawit* 39, points to the main focus of the text which is the transport of grain on a ship.¹⁵³ The superior was personally responsible for fulfilling the obligations of the monastery towards the state, hence his interventions in the situations where various services and requisitions were demanded. From the point of view of the monastery such obligations were perhaps especially troublesome, since every demand on the part of the Arab administration temporarily deprived the monastery of people and equipment. In order to guarantee unproblematic functioning of his monastic 'enterprise', the superior must have been keeping his finger on the pulse. He was assisted in this task by his subordinates, such as the anonymous writer of *P. Brux. Bawit* 39. It appears that it was the subordinate who had received the order of the pagarch (the beginning of the text, mentioning 'votre [i.e. Zacharias's] fils, le pagarque' seems to introduce the archimandrite into the details of the matter), but was unable to handle the matter without the superior's intervention.

¹⁵¹ Numerous papyri mention people sent to the capital to perform personal service or to deliver goods or payments. Cf., among others, *CPR* XXII 43 (requisition of carpenters, sailors, and soldiers); *CPR* XXII 46 (account of ropes sent to Babylon; l. 1: [- - - - -] μφθ(έντων) ἐν Βαβυλ(ῶνι) μετὰ Κοσμῶ Ἀποφουῶ); *CPR* XXII 49 (account of workers from various *choria*; l. 1: γνώ(σις) ἐργατῶν πεμφθ(έντων) εἰ(ς) Βαβυλ(ῶνα)); see also *P. Bal.* 240, mentioning people going north to Babylon (l. 3: ρηπτρῖβοκ ερητ εβαβγλω[η]) and making declaration about money gathered as taxes. Travel to the capital could disrupt important work in the people's place of residence, as we can see in *CPR* XXX 18 (ca. 643/644), where Menas *scholastikos* asks the pagarch Athanasios to relieve a builder of his service duty; otherwise the builder would not finish work at a cistern in a village, to the detriment of the fields, the taxes imposed thereon, and, finally, the pagarch himself (ll. 4-5: ἐπεὶ ἐὰν κατέρχεται οὐχ εὐρίσκει ποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτὴν δεξαμενὴν κ[α]ἰ [ἐν] ἀφῆσει μένουσιν τὰ γῆδια ὅπερ οὐ θέλετε).

¹⁵² See *P. Louvre Bawit*, p. 6.

¹⁵³ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 266.

A ‘showcase example’ of how requisition procedures worked ‘on the ground’ is found in *P. Mich. Copt.* 14, an eighth-century letter from a superior (πενειωτ) to Mena the *oikonomos*.¹⁵⁴ The situation presented in the text unfolded as follows. A certain *kyrios* Platon, an official, had drawn up an official request addressed to the monastery,¹⁵⁵ ordering to provide two teams of oxen to operate a water-wheel in an estate (ουκια) belonging to the *dux* (i.e., the emir). The superior, in turn, wrote to the *oikonomos* Mena, asking him to send a man to the *zoi* of Ioule and order the monastery’s ox-breeder Enoch to go to the *ousia* of the *dux* with the animals.¹⁵⁶ Platon shifted the responsibility for the logistics of the operation entirely onto the monks, much to the superior’s distress, which was apparently due to the shortage of time left for the completion of the task.¹⁵⁷ Delattre saw in the ‘father’ of *P. Mich. Copt.* 14 the archimandrite of the monastery. Even if we need to be careful in granting every Bawit superior this honorific title (see above, p. 164), it is certain that we are dealing with the head of the community, as he was the obvious person to care for the proper discharge of the obligations imposed on the monastery.

The Bawit dossier contains also scattered mentions of other taxes, e.g. *stichos* in *P. Louvre Bawit* 7 (l. 1) and 50 (l. 6), and *O. Bawit* 83.¹⁵⁸ In the first document, *stichos* is mentioned together with *demosion*; this intriguing but

¹⁵⁴ For a reedition with an exhaustive commentary, see DELATTRE, ‘Une lettre copte’ (cit. n. 18).

¹⁵⁵ Alain Delattre draws attention to the vocabulary of the letter. The phrase the writer uses to describe Platon’s action is σμη ογειπστολη, which in the light of numerous documentary analogies points to the official character of Platon’s request (see DELATTRE, ‘Une lettre copte’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 92–93). Direct attestations of correspondence addressed to Bawit by state officials have not yet been recorded in the dossier. P. Duk. inv. 1053 verso, a πενειωτ πετςρδαι document, was written on the verso of a bilingual (Greek-Arabic) protocol, perhaps opening an official letter (see DELATTRE, ‘Deux ordres’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 172–173). Unfortunately, the recto preserves nothing except for the traces of the protocol.

¹⁵⁶ A location mentioned as a source of fodder in MSG 1, an order of a superior; see X. M. VICENS, ‘Un papyrus de Baouit conservé à l’archive et bibliothèque épiscopale de Vic’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 185 (2013), pp. 232–234.

¹⁵⁷ *P. Mich. Copt.* 14, ll. 4–5: σΟΚΟΥ ΝΑΒ ΕΡΟΥΝ ΔΦΕΡΔΑΙ ΦΑΡ ΝΑΙ ΧΕ ΝΑΦΕΙΡΕ ΖΙΩΩΦ ΝΑΡΕ ΟΥΠΑΦΕ ΝΕΘΟΥ (‘Il [Platôn] m’a écrit qu’il ne fera rien pour cela. Puisse une demi journée suffire! [?]’).

¹⁵⁸ On the attestations of *stichos* in the documents, see *P. Louvre Bawit* 7, comm. to l. 1.

unfortunately fragmentary text is a contract pertaining to taxation which we are unable to interpret with any degree of certainty. *O. Bawit* 83 is perhaps a receipt for *stichos*, which could indicate that the payment of this tax was also handled by the monastery administration.¹⁵⁹ *P. Louvre Bawit* 50 is the most interesting of these three documents. The text does not mention the monastery (it is, however badly damaged; monastic representatives could appear in the lost part of the address formula) but was reused there for a writing exercise published as *P. Louvre Bawit* 64. It was addressed by the pagarch Flavius Kollouthos, acting through an intermediary whose name is unpreserved, to the headmen of some villages. The subject of the letter is taxation, or, more precisely, arrears, as indicated in lines 4–5 which speak of letters received by the pagarch ‘au sujet de l’arriéré des impôts’ (εΓΒΕ ΠΛΟΙΠΡΟΣ ΝΕΔΗΜΟΣΙΟΝ). The arrears include perhaps also a *stichos*-tax (l. 6: ‘et du reste de *stichoi*’; ΜΗ ΣΕΠΕ ΝΕΣΤΙΧΕ). If this text was addressed also to monastic representatives (in this case we would be dealing with one copy of the document out of several destined for various recipients), it would testify to the importance of the monastery to the local fiscal officials – importance which could be inferred anyway, given the extensive tracts of land possessed by the community and the ensuing significance of its fiscal contributions. This, however, is only a speculation, as the mystery of how and why the papyrus ended up at Bawit cannot be solved.

Our documents underscore the functions of the monastery not only as a taxpayer and contributor of requisitioned goods, but also as an intermediary link in a chain that connected other taxpayers with the fiscal apparatus of the state. We have already discussed the role of the monastic administration in ‘forwarding’ the payments of *andrismos* and other taxes (e.g. *demosion*) due from property-possessing monks (see above, pp. 197–202).¹⁶⁰ Mentions of the monasteries of Apa Jeremias, Anoup, and Makare in the

¹⁵⁹ On this text, see S. J. CLACKSON, [Review of] D. Bénazeth & M.-H. Rutschowskaya (eds.), J. Clédat, *Le Monastère et la nécropole de Baouît*, *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 39 (2002), pp. 189–204, esp. p. 202.

¹⁶⁰ This is underscored, e.g., by Petra Sijpesteijn in her discussion of the fiscal system in the Arab period; see SIJPESTEIJN, *Shaping a Muslim State* (cit. n. 76), p. 99.

corpus of *aparche*-related documents suggests that this intermediary role was assumed also for the collection of liabilities from the property belonging to other landowning monasteries, even though the details of the arrangements between the institutions escape us (see above, pp. 196–197). Apart from these examples, other documents from Bawit may also point to the involvement of the monastery in tax collection procedures. *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 (seventh–eighth century) mentions the wheat-and-barley *embole* of the *ousia* of Koussai (see pp. 178–179).¹⁶¹ *Embole* was a fiscal contribution in grain which in the Byzantine period was destined for the *annona civica* sent to Constantinople; it continued to be gathered under Arab rule and was consumed locally or sent to the Hijaz via Klyasma.¹⁶² The total rate of *embole* in wheat and barley estimated by Alain Delattre for the period under scrutiny amounted to ca. 1.2 artabae from aroura. The amounts of grain due from the locations listed in *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 oscillate between 12 and 130 artabae. A calculation based on the document gives the surface of ca. 724 arourae of land from which the *embole* would have been collected.¹⁶³ This, of course, is the minimum calculation, for not all of the entries preserve the amount of grain collected from particular *topoi*. Some of the toponyms appearing in the document are otherwise associated with the monastery (see above, p. 178), others, however, are not, and it cannot be excluded that the list encompasses *embole* raised not only on the monastic estate, but also

¹⁶¹ See *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 102, and commentary to the document. Four among the locations for which the amounts of grain are preserved made contributions in both wheat and barley (the amounts of barley are, as usual, much smaller than those of wheat). Another document similar to *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 is *P. Louvre Bawit* 29: a list of *topoi* written also in Greek and dated to the seventh–eighth century. Some of the toponyms (*topoi* Dimeï, Siderou, Ieremiou, and Gennadiou) appear in both documents, as observed by the editors of *P. Louvre Bawit*. Unfortunately, *P. Louvre Bawit* 29 does not preserve its heading and its right-hand portion, where we would expect sums of money or amounts of grain to appear, is also lost. It is possible that also P. Duk. inv. 445, a list of μα and φοι, had a similar function.

¹⁶² For Egypt's position as the supplier of goods for the Arab state, see, e.g. P. M. STJPE-STEIJN, 'The Arab conquest of Egypt and the beginning of Muslim rule', [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 437–459, with source references.

¹⁶³ Calculations presented in Delattre's communication 'Agricultural management and food production at the monastery of Bawit' at the symposium *Monastic Economies in Egypt and Palestine, 5th–6th Centuries CE* at the Oxford University (16 March 2016).

on landholdings of other owners in the region of Koussai.¹⁶⁴ The *ousia* of Koussai as an area of activity of monastic collectors appears in *P. Louvre Bawit* 41 – a letter to a Bawit archimandrite sent by his subordinates (the address preserves the names of Kyros and Jacob) staying at ‘the *ousia* of Kos’.¹⁶⁵ The reason why the monks stayed there was tax collection: the senders mention ‘our *demosion*’ and inform that they have already managed to collect six solidi which they now send to the ‘headquarters’ with one of them, Jacob (perhaps identical with Jacob mentioned in the address).¹⁶⁶

A seventh-century tax receipt from the Leiden collection, *P. Leid. Inst.* 78 signed by Daniel, identified with a superior of the Bawit monastery,¹⁶⁷ deals with a payment in gold and wheat (thirty-four gold solidi and eighty artabae respectively). Nikolaos Gonis associates the document with ‘a district’s contribution towards the *χρυσικὰ δημόσια* and *ἐμβολή* of an indiction year’.¹⁶⁸ Although the opening section of *P. Leid. Inst.* 78 is lost, the format of the document seems similar to that of the Bawit tax receipts for *andrismos*, and the document is treated by Gonis and Delattre as a proof that the monastery dealt with fiscal liabilities other than the

¹⁶⁴ The use of the word *ousia*, usually associated with someone’s landholdings, would be slightly confusing in a fiscal context (cf. FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. οὐσία 2: ‘Landgut’ and 3: ‘ein Ort? Landgut?’). *Ousia* as a designation of a district for which an individual was fiscally responsible appears perhaps in *ἐπιστάλματα τοῦ σωματισμοῦ* from Petra (see *P. Petra* I, p. 75: ‘We cannot even totally exclude the possibility that the transfer [of fiscal liability – JW] concerned not so much the individual holdings of the people but their responsibility for tax collection in some area which was called their “*ousia* and *homas*”’); for *epistalmata*, see below, p. 255.

¹⁶⁵ *P. Louvre Bawit* 41, verso: ‘archimandrite † Ses fils Kuros ... Jakôb dans l’*ousia* de Kôs’ (ἀρχιμ(ἀν)δ(ρι)της). + νκωηρε κγρος π[ἰ]ὰκωβ ρν τγσια κκωβ).

¹⁶⁶ *P. Louvre Bawit* 41: ‘nos taxes ... nous avons pu prendre 6 *holokottimoi* ... les envoyer par l’intermédiaire de frère Jakôb’ (ll. 1–3: []ενταρο ννεμΔημοσιον ερ []ρισε ντανωχι σοογ νρολοκ(ο)τ(τινος) ωα[]τνοογσογ ριτοοτγ νπαcon ἰακωβ).

¹⁶⁷ *P. Leid. Inst.* 78, l. 4: Δανυῆλ στηχῆ (l. στοιχῆδ). Daniel is a monastic superior identified with the issuer of some among the πνειδωτ πετςρα documents; see DELATTRE & GONIS, ‘Le dossier des reçus’ (cit. n. 18), p. 62. For a palaeographic analysis of Daniel’s signatures and subscriptions, see *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 149–150. For an overview of papyrological and epigraphical attestations of Daniel, see F. CALAMANT, ‘Du nouveau sur l’Apa Daniel, “Père du *topos*” à Baouît’, [in:] *Études coptes* XIII, pp. 91–105.

¹⁶⁸ N. GONIS, ‘Korrigenda Tyche 328. *P. Leid. Inst.* 78’, *Tyche* 14 (1999), p. 329.

poll-tax.¹⁶⁹ Incomplete as it is, the document cannot be connected with any particular tax payment, but nevertheless indicates the scale of financial operations effectuated by the monastic administration within the framework of fiscal obligations. Another text that can be quoted in connection with fiscality is perhaps *P. Louvre Bawit* 30 – a Greek account of products collected from various *epoikia* and *choria* (see above, p. 197). As we have already observed, *epoikia* are absent from the internal monastic documentation and no evidence points to the use of the term in connection with the monastic estate. *Choria*, on the other hand, referred to fiscal units under Arab administration. If the document belongs to the Bawit dossier at all, it cannot be connected with the internal administration of the monastery and should be linked to the collection of goods the monastery effectuated for the fisc. An interesting testimony is found in *P. Brux. Bawit* 39 – a letter to the archimandrite Zacharias in which a subordinate urges the addressee to take necessary actions in connection with the transport of grain on a ship, apparently at the request of the pagarch. As noted by Alain Delattre, the letter reminds us of the much earlier receipts from sixth-century Aphrodite and Hermopolis recording shipments of tax grain on boats belonging to the Metanoia monastery.¹⁷⁰ Delattre speculates whether the letter can be connected with the obligatory naval service which is attested for monks. I believe it possible that after the Conquest the Arab authorities, making the most of existing infrastructure and equipment, would use monastic boats to ship fiscal grain.¹⁷¹ A curious testimony is found in *P. Mon. Apollo* 48: a Greek text originally edited as wine account, which turned out to be an account of fractions of solidi followed by names of men listed with their patronymics: a feature that may point to their non-monastic

¹⁶⁹ DELATTRE & GONIS, 'Le dossier des reçus' (cit. n. 18), p. 62.

¹⁷⁰ For this dossier, see J.-L. FOURNET & J. GASCOU, 'Moines pachômiens et batellerie', [in:] Ch. DÉCOBERT (ed.), *Alexandrie médiévale* 2 [= *Études alexandrines* 8] (2002), pp. 22–45; R. RÉMONDON, 'Le monastère alexandrin de Métanoia: était-il bénéficiaire du fisc ou à son service' [in:] *Studi Volterra* V, Milan (1972), pp. 769–781; J. GASCOU, 'P. Fouad 87: les monastères pachômiens et l'état byzantin', *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 76 (1976), pp. 157–184.

¹⁷¹ On boats in Bawit, see DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 80 with n. 260.

affiliation.¹⁷² If the list – which was certainly produced in the monastery, as indicated by the fact that it was written on the back of an *entagion* addressed to a monk (*P. Mon. Apollo* 30) – registers sums collected from the men, it could be drawn up in connection with the monastery's tax-collecting activities (this is anyway implied by Gonis, who proposed his emendations to the reading of *P. Mon. Apollo* 48 in an article devoted to fiscal documents). A different interpretation – that, for instance, the list represents payments of money to the men – can also be taken into consideration.

Unfortunately, no documents produced on the community level survive to tell us how taxation matters were handled before the Conquest, which makes it impossible to assess which parts of the system we see in the texts of the Arab period continued earlier traditions and which were a new invention. The latter may be true of the *andrismos*-related segment of the monastic administration; again, however, we cannot say whether we are dealing with a novelty created from the scratch in response to a fiscal obligation imposed by the Arab government, or a new, specialised branch of an existing system.

In her discussion of the fiscality of the Arab period, Petra Sijpesteijn concluded that 'The monastery collected the taxes due from the monks, but monks also collected taxes in the villages and lands falling under the monastery's responsibility'.¹⁷³ Defining the scope of this responsibility would be crucial to our understanding of the monastery's role in the local fiscal system; it is, however, fraught with difficulties. The core of the payments made by the monastery to the fisc was constituted by taxes imposed on the monastic property; the *aparche* documents as we understand them now record the practice of the collection of rents that served to cover the land-tax obligations (*demosia*). We have already seen that the system extended also to other monasteries. Knowing the Arabs' pragmatic tendency to use pre-existing arrangements for their own administrative purposes we can suspect that the system was already in place before the takeover of Egypt in the 640s; no sources, however, exist to support these

¹⁷² See GONIS, 'Reconsidering some fiscal documents' (cit. n. 122), p. 192.

¹⁷³ SIJPESTEIJN, *Shaping a Muslim State* (cit. n. 76), p. 99.

speculations. Such documents as *P. Brux. Bawit* 31, with its considerable amounts of grain collected from vast land tracts within only one *ousia*, may point to the extension of the tax-collecting responsibilities also beyond the borders of the monastic estate. Again, we have no way to determine whether this (admittedly, hypothetical) extended responsibility was rooted in a pre-Conquest tradition or was added to the basic package of the monastery's fiscal responsibilities only after the Arab takeover. Such documents as *P. Brux. Bawit* 31 or *P. Leid. Inst.* 78 may also encompass fiscal contributions of the monks of the Bawit monastery which they made via their institution as individual, property-owning taxpayers.

4.2. The monastery and the representatives of local village communities

The process of the economic expansion of the monasteries and their ensuing integration with the local agricultural and social landscape was bound to bring the communities of monks in contact with the communities of villagers. This phenomenon is well attested in the Bawit dossier. Relations with villagers operated within different frameworks: local lay-people were bound to the community by lease agreements, were hired by the monastery, or borrowed money from the monks. In each of these cases an individual or a group of individuals, prompted by necessity or economic pragmatism, established a relationship with the institution or one of its members.

However, a number of documents from the Bawit dossier attest to another facet of relations with rural settlements. These texts feature functionaries and representatives of Hermopolite villages acting as 'spokesmen' for their communities. The degree of consolidation and self-assertion of rural communities in Late Antiquity is a matter of discussion; I have no space here to address the problem in a satisfactory manner.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁴ See D. BONNEAU, 'Communauté rurale en Égypte byzantine?' [in:] *Les communautés rurales. Deuxième partie: antiquité* [= *Recueils de la société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions*], Paris 1983, pp. 505–523. Bonneau reached the conclusion that for Byzantine Egypt it is

The contribution of the Bawit documentation to the debate is significant as our documents show how village representatives protected the interests of their communities in the relations with the monastery.

Our main interest here are the contexts of the interactions between the representatives of the monastery and their village counterparts. While reading the documents we see that their relations were based on common concerns (connected primarily with land exploitation), but also various forms of mutual reliance; some documents, however, hint even at some forms of control and supervision. The documents I will discuss are both formal agreements and less formal correspondence exchanged on various occasions.

As is to be expected in a rural landscape, landowning and land management constituted one of the spheres in which communities and their representatives could interact. Purchase of land from a village community is explicitly attested in *P. Mon. Apollo 24*; a transaction involving land is hinted at in *P. Mon. Apollo 26* (both dated to the eighth century). The first document is a deed of sale in which a certain $\epsilon\alpha\zeta \alpha\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\epsilon$, *proestos* of the monastery of Apa Apollo, purchases three arourae of fodder-land and twenty-five arourae of pasturage. The other party is identified in the following manner: ‘we, the council of the settlement ($\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\nu$) of Poraheu, through me, Eisitre the *hiereus*, son of Beiktor, and Petre the deacon, and Anoup the priest, and Shenoute, son of the late Phib, and the rest of the settlement’ (ll. 1–2).¹⁷⁵ Out of four representatives, one (the *hiereus*) was

impossible to speak of true ‘village communities’ defined as groups of people united by consciously perceived common interest; for her, the Egyptian sense of rural community can be reduced to fiscal solidarity. R. BAGNALL, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993, pp. 133–138, also underscores the role of fiscality in the definition of village communities and emphasises the absence of political organisation. For the development of village societies in Late Antiquity and Early Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean, see C. WICKHAM, *Framing the Early Middle Ages. Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800*, Oxford 2005, Part III: Peasantries, pp. 383–441. For rural authority in Late Antiquity and Early Arab Egypt, especially in the perspective of dispute resolution, see M. S. A. MIKHAIL, *From Byzantine to Islamic Egypt. Religion, Identity and Politics after the Arab Conquest*, London–New York 2014, pp. 154–157.

¹⁷⁵ $\lambda\eta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\iota\omega\tau\eta\varsigma \eta\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\tau\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\tau \alpha\lambda\omicron\kappa \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ (\gamma\varsigma) \pi\omega\tau\epsilon\upsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau \mu\eta \pi\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon \pi\lambda\alpha\delta\alpha\kappa\omega\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau \mu\eta \alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\phi \pi\tau\epsilon\ (\sigma\upsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma) \mu\eta \psi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon \pi\omega\tau\eta\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma \phi\iota\upsilon\tau \mu\eta \pi\tau\epsilon\epsilon\pi\epsilon \eta\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

a lay functionary charged with fiscal matters and keeping order,¹⁷⁶ one does not bear any titles, and two were clerics. Presbyters and deacons representing fellow villagers occur in Late Antique correspondence;¹⁷⁷ the present text points also to a more formal dimension of their leadership. The presentation of the sellers' side is interesting also in its effort to suggest the involvement of the whole village community in the action. Since on the other side there is nothing to balance out this lengthy introduction of the seller, it seems that the buyer, the *proestos* Athanase, was acting on his own behalf (see above, p. 172, n. 53).

P. Mon. Apollo 26 is an indirect attestation of a transaction involving land (a sale or an exchange of one plot for another) concluded between the villagers and the monastic institution. In the document two monks lease land from the monastery, addressing its *dikaion* through the archimandrite Georgios. The object of the lease is 'eight waterless arourae from the fields of the small meadow which you have exchanged with the men of Senesla' (ll. 5–6: $\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\nu}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma}\ \bar{\zeta}\bar{\eta}\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\ \bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\iota}\ \bar{\zeta}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\iota}\ \bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\ \bar{\eta}\bar{\mu}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\gamma}\ \bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}$). The transaction could have common traits with the one recorded in *P. Mon. Apollo* 24, but the land may have also been purchased from, or exchanged with individual farmers who had no means to invest in 'waterless arourae' so as to make them profitable.¹⁷⁸ The monastery could either invest in watering equipment

¹⁷⁶ See *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 77 and J. Gascou in *P. Sorb.* II 69, pp. 66–70. F. Morelli remarks that in some documents the term *biereus* is associated specifically with *epoikia*, while $\alpha\pi\epsilon$ appears in connection with villages ($\tau\upsilon\mu\epsilon$) (comm. to l. 6 of *CPR* XXII 1).

¹⁷⁷ E.g. *P. Naqlun* 39 [= *P. Gascou* 29] (7th c.); *P. Oxy.* LVI 3836; *P. Haun.* III 58. See DERDA & WEGNER, 'Letter from Tebetny' (cit. n. 2), p. 137 with n. 15.

¹⁷⁸ *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 85; an analogous document is *CPR* IV 117, also concluded between a monastery's *dikaion* and a monk. $\alpha\tau\mu\omicron\omicron\gamma$, 'waterless', is the equivalent of Greek $\acute{\alpha}\nu\upsilon\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, which was a designation of uninundated land which was not provided with watering equipment and had to rely on the machinery located on other plots; see D. BONNEAU, *Le fisc et le Nil: incidences des irrégularités de la crue du Nil sur la fiscalité foncière dans l'Égypte grecque et romaine*, Paris 1971, pp. 80–81 with n. 399; EADEM, *Le régime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine*, Leiden – New York – Cologne 1993, pp. 208 and 221–222; see also I. MARTHOT, 'Irrigation des terres du village d'Aphrodité à l'époque byzantine', [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XXVII, vol. III, pp. 1871–1885, esp. p. 1873; Bonneau and Marthot refer to the observations of Jean Maspero in *P. Cair. Masp.* I 67113, p. 10.

for the land or make use of pre-existing machinery.¹⁷⁹ In that latter case, we could imagine arrangements with owners or lessees of watering equipment on the neighbouring plots, which would account for further involvement of the monks in local networks.¹⁸⁰

In *P. Mon. Apollo 25* we see a Senesla headman involved in what appears to have been an internal affair of the monastery. In the document Isak, a monk of the *topos* of Apa Apollo, renounces to the monastery's *dikaion*, represented by the archimandrite Daniel, the responsibility for one of the two 'places' (μα κναγ) he had been in charge of. The renounced parcel, 'which was the cistern-half' (ττιαφε ἡτλιμνε; literally 'half of the *limne*') is assigned to another monk, Jeremias. The agreement is reached within the monastic community, with 'great brothers' (ll. 4 and 7: νοσ κκνηογ) playing the part of advisors and intermediaries between Isak and the *dikaion*. The witnesses included Apollo son of Abraham, NN son of the late Taurine of Taposh, and Lazaros of Senesla, all of whom were almost certainly laypeople. Lazaros, however, appears in a double role. He not only witnesses the deed (l. 20) but also states in the subscription under the main body of the document (ll. 19–20): 'I, the headman (παπε) Lazaros, of Senesla, at a good time I came to the pit of the basin/Τnout (πωηι ἡτνογτ) under the supervision (χα τεπλιρησι) of Apa Phoibam-

¹⁷⁹ With proper investment, waterless land could be turned into vineyards and orchards; see HICKEY, 'Aristocratic landholding' (cit. n. 55), p. 292. The monastery at Bawit was certainly a producer of wine (see below, p. 264–265) and might have been interested in expanding its vineland.

¹⁸⁰ BONNEAU, *Le régime* (cit. n. 178), p. 221–222 observes that 'une terre dite "sans eau", ἄνυδρος, ne signifie pas "terre non-inondée", comme ἄβροχος, mais une terre dépourvue d'appareils hydrauliques et pouvant cependant être irriguée grâce à des conventions avec les tenanciers d'appareils élévatoires de terres voisines'. Another possibility has to be taken into account: the monastery could already possess land in the vicinity and only expanded further into the Senesla area; in such case, it could probably make use of its own watering equipment. For an analogous example of expansion into areas with pre-established monastic presence, see *P. Lond.* V 1686 (7 XI 565), in which Flavius Dioskoros sells three arourae of waterless land to the monastery of Smine; the arourae are located 'in the great *georgion* of the same holy monastery of Smine' (ll. 12–14: ἀρούρας τρεῖς ἀνύδρου γῆς διακειμένας ἐν τῇ νοτίῳη πεδιάδι τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης Ἀφροδίτης ἐν κλήρω Ἰεράδος ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ γεωργίῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ) εὐαγοῦς μοναστηρίου) Ζμῖνος).

mon, the man in charge of the judgement (ἀποκρησις, I. ἀποκρισις). Some details need to be explained in order to understand the document and the role the Senesla headman played in the affair.

In the document, Isak states his inability to manage (τιηκε = διοικειν) both μα which fell under his responsibility. What did his ‘management’ consist in? A part of Isak’s duties is clear from the information we get about the settlement with Jeremias, who is said to receive the assignment renounced by Isak ‘so that he should be responsible for its *demosion*’ (ἐτρεβσδκ ρα νεσδημοσιον). Thus, the payment of taxes due from the land was the key question in the whole affair; on the other hand, there must have been also some profit involved (hence Isak’s renunciation of any future claims to the μα). Another question concerns the character of the plot Isak renounced. As we have seen, Lazaros’ action consisted in visiting ‘the pit of the basin/Τnout’, perhaps with the intention to inspect it after the reassignment. The statement contains some interesting elements. First, the document mentions Τnout, which is known from a number of ρινε να ostraca concerned with wine transports.¹⁸¹ Sarah Clackson connected τνογτ with λιμνη mentioned in lines 5, 6, and 8 on account of the two words’ being synonymous.¹⁸² I believe, however, that in this particular case it would be preferable to treat Τnout as a more general topographic designation, and consider λιμνη and ρηι as words used synonymously to refer to a water basin.¹⁸³ Sarah Clackson chose the translation ‘cistern’ for λιμνη ‘because [...] it conveys both of the nuances

¹⁸¹ *O. Bawit* 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47; *O. Bawit IFAO* 29, 38 and 39. See also P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M662 B(6a) recto, a list of disbursements of wine to various people, mentioning ρινογτε πα τνογτ in l. 1 (see DELATTRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGHEM, ‘Papyrus coptes’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 42–45).

¹⁸² *P. Mon. Apollo* 25, commentary to l. 19.

¹⁸³ In the Greco-Coptic dictionary from the archive of Dioskoros of Aphrodite, ρηι is equivalent to Greek λάκκος (see ΜΑΡΤΗΟΤ, ‘Irrigation’ [cit. n. 178], p. 1880–184, esp. p. 1881; W. CRUM, *Coptic Dictionary*, s.v. ρηι: ‘pit’, ‘cistern’, λάκκος, φρέαρ). It is possible that the scribe of *P. Mon. Apollo* 25 used the word λιμνη in ll. 5, 6, and 8 in the meaning which in Greek texts was usually ascribed to λάκκος: a water reservoir used for artificial irrigation, in this case located in a place named Τnout. Τnout itself could have received its Coptic name exactly on account of the presence of irrigation installations there. Cf. FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. ‘λάκκος’ and ‘λίμνη’, which can both be understood as ‘Zistern’.

of λίμνη as an artificial basin or a naturally formed wetland';¹⁸⁴ Krause and Richter translated λιμνη as 'Feuchtland' and 'swampy ground' respectively.¹⁸⁵ However, we need to take into consideration the role of the πωμη ἴτνουτ supervised by Apa Phoibammon and inspected by Lazaros from Senesla. The ωμη must have been crucial to the whole agreement, and we can assume that this installation was in fact a reservoir which provided land parcels with water. In *P. Mon. Apollo 25* we are dealing with a 'half of the *limne*'. Fractions of water-basins appear in several documents – mainly lease agreements – from the Byzantine period in connection with the term λάκκος; in such cases, the relevant clauses refer to the right to use a fraction of a water reservoir's capacity to water the leased parcels.¹⁸⁶ Isak's renunciation pertained to a tract of land burdened with particular fiscal liabilities, hence the intuition that τπαωε ἴτλιμνε means 'a parcel watered with half the capacity of a cistern'.

Another problem concerns the capacity in which Apa Phoibammon appears in *P. Mon. Apollo 25*. The phrase referring to his charge reads: 'the pit of the basin/Tnout under the supervision of Apa Phoibamon, the man in (charge of) the judgement' (πωμη ἴτνουτ ρα τεπιλιρσι ναπα φοιβαμων παταποκρησις; literally: 'Apa Phoibammon, the one of the *apokrisis*'). Our document provides us with the unique attestation of the word ἐπιτήρησις in a Coptic text; in Greek, the term is unattested in Byzantine documents; in any case, the translation 'supervision' proposed by the editor seems fitting; thus, Phoibammon was most probably a person responsible for the management of the water-basin, and, perhaps, the associated watering equipment. People charged with the care of water-machines appear earlier in Apionic documents referring to vine-land.¹⁸⁷ As already mentioned, a location called Tnout appears in the Bawit dossier in connection with

¹⁸⁴ *P. Mon. Apollo 25*, comm. to l. 5, p. 83.

¹⁸⁵ M. KRAUSE, 'Zur Edition koptischer nichtliterarischer Texte: P. Würzburg 43 neu bearbeitet', *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 112 (1985), pp. 143–153, esp. p. 152; RICHTER, 'The cultivation' (cit. n. 26), p. 210, n. 29.

¹⁸⁶ See, e.g., *P. Panop.* 8 (338); *P. Ross. Georg.* III 40 (511); *BGU XVII* 263 (513); *P. Coll. Youtie* II 90 (513); *P. Strasb.* VI 579 (521).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. HICKEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State* (cit. n. 75), p. 84. In the Apionic documentation such relation is expressed by the phrase ἡ μηχανή x ὑπό τὸν γ.

transports of wine to the monastery. *P. Mon. Apollo 25* speaks of an artificially irrigated plot, which could be a part of a vineyard. What is clear is the fact that Phoibammon's participation was important for the whole arrangement, as indicated by his designation ἀπα φοιβάμων παταποκρήσις. *Apokrisis* was translated by Clackson as 'judgement'; if we were to understand the term in this way, it would most probably refer to the process of accepting Isak's renunciation and reassignment of the parcel to another monk.¹⁸⁸ In Greek and Coptic documents the word ἀποκρίσις means 'answer' but also 'payment'.¹⁸⁹ The payment of the taxes due from the renounced parcel seems to have been crucial in the whole affair; we can thus hypothesise that Phoibammon's function as 'supervisor' of the plot was also connected with fiscal responsibilities. The question remains: on whose behalf Phoibammon supervised the plot? He could be a monastic functionary, ultimately answerable to the Bawit administration; if we assume that he was an 'outsider', it would imply the existence of an arrangement between the monastery – the owner of one half of the parcel irrigated from Phoibammon's cistern – on one hand, and Phoibammon (or his landlord or employer) on the other.

Last but not least, we need to consider the role of Lazaros of Senesla. In the text he appears with two titles: ἀπε and πρωτοκομητης.¹⁹⁰ This may suggest that he was acting in an official capacity, although it could also be that the titles served only for identification purpose. However, out of the three witnesses only Lazaros is said to have come to the place

¹⁸⁸ Isak's action is quite literally – and fittingly – called *apotage* (l. 23: ἀποδακη) in the document. The term appears in several Greek and Coptic texts in connection with the surrender of claims; see G. M. PARÁSSOGLOU, 'Three papyri from Upper Egypt', *Tyche* 2 (1987), pp. 155–160, esp. p. 158, comm. to l. 25 of P. Lond. inv. no. 2916; FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. 'ἀποταγή', with references to Coptic sources. The majority of the term's occurrences refer to goods pledged as a security for a loan; here, however, a more straightforward meaning of property renunciation is the case. Nothing in the document suggests that the land had ever been pledged, and the context points unequivocally to Isak's inability to manage the land and, first and foremost, to fulfil the fiscal obligations incumbent on it.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. PREISIGKE, *WB* I, s.v. and FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.

¹⁹⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo 25*, l. 19: ἀνοκ παπε λασαρος πρωμσενεσλα and σηνιον λασαρος σενεσλα πρωτοκομητος.

under discussion, which points to the special reasons he had to be involved in the affair. The location and position of Tnout in relation to Senesla is unknown. As attested in the $\omega\iota\eta\epsilon\ \eta\kappa\alpha$ ostraca, *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, and *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38 (see below, p. 221), the monastery maintained relations with both places. *P. Mon. Apollo* 26, recording a transaction with the villagers of Senesla that involved land suggests that the monks and the Senesla people were neighbours in the countryside. Also the plot of land renounced in *P. Mon. Apollo* 25 could border upon other plots held by the villagers; therefore, the headman of Senesla could be interested in the state of maintenance of the neighbouring property and the proper delimitation of its borders. Despite all its obscurities, *P. Mon. Apollo* 25 shows that the role of laypeople in monastic contracts could go well beyond mere witnessing as a third party.

Another proof that the monastic authorities had to take local leaders into account is found in *P. Mon. Apollo* 17, an eighth-century letter written by Theodoros, a member of the community of Apa Apollo, whose titles are unfortunately unpreserved.¹⁹¹ The information on the addressee's identity is also unpreserved, but the context suggests that he was a representative of an unknown village.¹⁹² He is requested to receive and help Makare, an *aparche*-collector sent to the village by Theodoros. Although the details of Makare's task are somewhat obscure (e.g. we find ourselves at a loss as to how to interpret the mention of farmers and sailors in line 7),¹⁹³ the heart of the matter is the help that the addressee was supposed to offer to the

¹⁹¹ The content of *P. Mon. Apollo* 17 made Sarah J. Clackson think that the letter was most probably written by a head of the monastery. Monastic functionaries named Theodoros are attested in a number of Bawit documents: *P. Mon. Apollo* 38 (an archimandrite representing the monastery in a loan contract); *P. Bawit Clackson* 24; *P. Brux. Bawit* 3 (πενειωτ πετσαῖ orders). Since we are dealing with a very banal name, it is impossible to identify the sender of *P. Mon. Apollo* 17 with any of these men in a certain manner; however, the context itself is sufficient to determine Theodoros' elevated position in the community.

¹⁹² *P. Mon. Apollo* 17, l. 3: 'and I enquire after the health of all your village [...]' (ἀλω τιωῖνε επεχαι ηπ[ε]τη ετιμε τηρεψ).

¹⁹³ Sarah J. Clackson (*P. Mon. Apollo* 17, p. 69) interpreted them as fiscal contributors. Such an interpretation raises little question as far as the farmers are concerned; in case of the sailors we would probably need to assume that they were leasing boats from the monastery and were obliged to pay contractual obligations in the same way as land tenants did.

collector. It is interesting to notice the religious tone perceptible in the letter, which is rarely so intense in Bawit correspondence in general. In invoking the blessings of Apa Apollo (l. 4), but also in inquiring politely after the health of the whole village community (l. 3) the writer seems to attempt a *captatio benevolentiae* of the addressee. The very necessity to send a letter of this type may point to expected problems which an *aparche*-collector could face. The system of *aparche*-collection in operation at Bawit was based on assignments of areas from which the monks were supposed to gather payments for an indictional year. As we cannot trace in our documentation the 'careers' of monks as *aparche*-collectors over longer periods of time, we are unable to say if the assignments changed yearly or could remain with the same person for more than one indictional year. In any case, there would always come a moment when a new collector arrived in a village, and the head of the monastery probably did his best to secure the newcomer a favourable reception.¹⁹⁴ *P. Mon. Apollo 17* assumes the form of a polite request, not an order issued from the position of power.¹⁹⁵

Documents from Bawit bring to light also a less known facet of the functioning of monastic institutions: the monastery's obligations towards

¹⁹⁴ Such documents could constitute an important part of the outgoing monastic correspondence; unfortunately, *P. Mon. Apollo 17* is the only example preserved well enough to allow for any conclusions. *P. Louvre Bawit 47*, a fragmentary text presenting analogous formulas of politeness and blessings, could possibly represent the same type (see commentary to *P. Louvre Bawit 47*, pp. 80–81), especially considering the inclination of the Bawit authorities towards using fixed formulas in particular contexts.

¹⁹⁵ This character of the letter has not escaped WIPSYCKA, 'Le fonctionnement' (cit. n. 19), p. 181: 'C'est une prière, et non pas un ordre, comme le dit S. J. Clackson'.

As I have already observed, based on the content of the texts related to *aparche* collection we cannot determine whether the collectors operated only on the land belonging to the monastery of Apa Apollo and three other institutions mentioned in the documents or ventured also to other, 'non-monastic' locations as tax collectors. *P. Mon. Apollo 17* may point in the latter direction. The tenants of the monastery would be prepared to face monastic collectors, as the mutual obligations of the lessor and the lessee would have been stated in their lease contracts. Resistance would be more understandable if the monks were arriving in the villages as collectors on behalf of the state. In this case, however, we would have to treat *aparche*-collection as an euphemism for the quasi-pagarchic duties of the monastery – an interpretation that, in my opinion, goes too far, especially since other documents of the *aparche* dossier are not equivocal as to the character of the procedure.

local communities and people. Although the documents are not explicit as to the character of the disbursements the monastery of Apa Apollo was supposed to make, they allow us to learn how they were received and what happened if the monks failed to deliver them. We do not know if such obligations worked also the other way round – namely if local communities were customarily obliged to deliver products to the monastery (apart from what was due on the basis of lease contracts; such deliveries were perhaps contained in the *aparche*). We do not know if donations which were not conditioned by contractual obligations were in any way ‘institutionalised’; most probably they followed patterns established by individual piety and generosity.¹⁹⁶ In case of the monastery’s obligations, we may suspect a contractual background to at least some of them.

The newly published *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38 (eighth century) is a wine receipt issued by people from Senesla to the *dikaion* of Apa Apollo represented by the ‘father of the *topos*’, Apa Germane. The lengthy opening formula is worth quoting in full: ‘We, the *koinon* of the people of Senesla, through David son of Enoch (?), and NN son of Phoibammon, and David son of Tiane, and Apanok son of Athanase, and all other landowners of the people of Senesla, are writing to the holy *dikaion* of Apa Apollo through Apa Germane, the father of the *topos* of Apa Apollo’ (translation mine).¹⁹⁷ After the opening, the issuers acknowledge the receipt of a modest amount of wine (two *lakoote*; l. 8: λακοοτε cñ[τε]). The text informs us that the wine was delivered to Senesla people as a customary payment (cγνηθεια) for the third indiction (the document itself was drawn up on 14 Pachon of the fourth indiction). The very existence of a customary obligation towards a whole village is striking, as is also its formalised character.

¹⁹⁶ ‘Institutionalisation’ of the offerings is visible in the sixth-century documents from the Oxyrhynchite dossier of Flavii Apiones and the dossier of the Aphroditan section of the estate of *comes* Ammonios (part of the so-called Dioskoros archive). These attestations, however, pertain to large customary offerings, well-integrated into the accounting systems of the estates. Such offerings constituted a part of the aristocratic landowners’ self-presentation and were intended mainly for redistribution among the poor and needy.

¹⁹⁷ *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38, ll. 1–8: + δηρον κοινονον ν̄ρ[ωμε σενε]cλα ριτη δαγειτ πωε ηεν[ωx μν?] πωε νφοιβαμμον μν δαγειτ πωε ντιανε μν απα νος πωε ναθανασε μν πλοιπει νεκτιτωρ τηρογ ν̄ρωμε σενεcλα ενcεcαι νπδικαιον ετογααβ ηαπαc απολλ[ω] ριτη απα γερμανε πωωτ νπτοπο[c η]απαc απολλω.

Another document attesting a formalised *synetheia* is *P. Brux. Bawit 3*: an order of payment signed by Theodoros, in which an unknown product is to be given to ‘[...] the one from Tabo according to annual custom’ (l. 1: [- -] πα τὰβω προς τερεσηθια κατα ρ[ομπε]). The document’s editor, Alain Delatre considered the *synetheia* in *P. Brux. Bawit 3* a ‘gratification habituelle’.

P. Köln ägypt. II 43 is another attestation of a *synetheia*-payment the monastery had to discharge. It also shows that slackness on the part of the monastery could put its representatives in serious trouble. The text is a letter from a monk, Apa Joseph, to his superior, Apa Phoibammon.¹⁹⁸ Joseph was staying away from the monastery in an unknown village ‘in the north’ where the monastery apparently had business. He was in charge of fieldwork in the area, and despite the initial troubles, he managed to carry on with the execution of his tasks. A problem arose when the village scribe (l. 21: ὕαζ μπτ᾽ ἡε᾽) approached him asking about an overdue *συνηθια* and the payment due for the current year. The situation became serious (the text suggests the possibility of Joseph’s arrest should the disbursement fail to be delivered) and the writer asked his superior to deal with the matter as soon as possible, and, interestingly, not to inform anyone about his troubles.

Since the text deals with a matter that was known to both the writer and the addressee, the nature of the *synetheia*-payment mentioned in it is not clarified. Gesa Schenke suggests a payment in money, translating *ωατλα* (ll. 24–25 and 26) as ‘(Geld-)Beutel’. Crum’s *Coptic Dictionary*, s.v. *ωατλα*, gives ‘bag or some such receptacle’. I believe that Schenke’s supplemented translation is superfluous. Other *synetheiai* we encounter in the Bawit dossier were all in kind. There is no reason to make the one in *P. Köln ägypt. II 43* a cash payment. In this case, we would expect a concrete sum rather than a somewhat vague mention of a ‘bag of money’. The *synetheia* was rather an agricultural product that could be transported in bags.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ Neither Joseph nor Phoibammon bear any titles that would allow us to determine their functions. Joseph calls himself simply ‘a monk’ (πμογν(α)χος) and addresses Phoibammon as ‘the beloved father’ (παμεριτ νικωτ).

¹⁹⁹ Perhaps even grain, as suggested by the context. After describing his problem and asking Phoibammon for help, Joseph goes on explaining that he needed ‘grain for the fields’

There is another document mentioning a neglected *synetheia*, this time of a different nature. *P. Mon. Apollo 55*, written by an unknown person from Pesou(te) to a member of the community of Apa Apollo,²⁰⁰ contains elements of a polite request and a letter of complaint. The subject of the letter are two textile objects called *maphortia* (l. 4: σΝΤΕ ΜΑΦΟΡΤΕ) which had not been delivered to the village by a subordinate of the addressee, contrary to a customary arrangement. The delivery, again, was supposed to happen on a yearly basis (l. 5: ΠΡΟΣ ΤΣΥΝΗΘΙΑ ΚΑΤΑ ΡΟΠΜΕ). Sarah Clackson proposed to see in the *maphortia* of *P. Mon. Apollo 55* either women's head coverings or cloaks for monks. If the former is true, they could be a charitable offering for poor women (not necessarily female monks, although this interpretation cannot be entirely excluded);²⁰¹ in the latter case, it would appear that the monastery at Bawit supplied another community with clothing.²⁰²

All of the quoted documents feature the word *synetheia*. It is encountered in late documents in connection with work contracts, where it designates an additional payment for a worker, or in land leases, where it refers to an extra delivery expected from the tenant.²⁰³ Contractual obli-

(ll. 29–33, as translated by Schenke): ‘Du hast zwar gesagt: “Öffnet keinerlei Türen!” Siehe, ich habe (aber) das Getreide für den Acker benötigt. Ich habe die Schatzkammer geöffnet. Ich sage noch einmal, dass er sich anschickte, meine Hand zu verschließen.’

²⁰⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo 55*, l. 10: ΘΕΟΤ(Ι)ΜΤ(Ο)C ΝΔΡΘΕΙC ΝΕΙΩΤ ΕΤΤ(ΔΙΗΥ); ‘(To my) God-honoured lord and honoured father’.

²⁰¹ Interpretation supported by Alain Delattre, see *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 186. See also Delattre's commentary to l. 1 of *P. Brux. Bawit 3* with the explanation of the term *synetheia* as used in the document: ‘cf. FÖRSTER, *WB*, p. 778, qui cite pour ce sens [i.e. ‘gratification habituelle’], à mon avis à tort, *P. Mon. Apollo 55*’. Delattre is convinced that the *synetheia* of *P. Mon. Apollo 55* had a charitable character and was not connected with the monastery's ordinary economic affairs; see *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 186: ‘Il semblerait qu'il s'agisse d'une donation à laquelle l'habitude aurait donné un caractère quasi obligatoire’. A trace of the monastery's charitable activity is probably to be found in *P. Brux. Bawit 9*, an order of disbursement of one *mega* of wine for the poor ([...] pauvre(s) par charité’, l. 1: + .ç. . ζΗΚΕ Ν. ΑΓΑΠΗ).

²⁰² *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 130. For *maphortia* in monastic contexts, see M. MOSSAKOWSKA-GAUBERT, ‘*Maforion* dans l'habit monastique en Égypte’, [in:] *Aspects de l'artisanat du textile dans le monde méditerranéen*, Lyon 1996, vol. II, pp. 27–37.

²⁰³ In lease contracts, *synetheia* was usually composed of agricultural products and paid besides the proper rent. Work contracts from the sixth and seventh century stipulate

gations might have constituted the background of the *syntheiai* mentioned in the Bawit documents; determining the character of these payments as recorded in the Bawit dossier involves, however, a considerable deal of guesswork, as our documents are devoid of explicit hints.

The case of *P. Brux. Bawit 3* is the most straightforward. In the document, a product is delivered according to the custom to one person, perhaps a worker hired by the monastery. The remaining three documents, however, are striking in that the *syntheiai* they mention are due to entire village communities. This is certain in *P. Köln ägypt. II 38*, where the *syntheia*-receipt is issued by the community representatives, and implied in *P. Köln ägypt. II 43* by the involvement of the village community representative, $\Upsilon\alpha\lambda \mu\pi\tau\mu\epsilon$. *P. Mon. Apollo 55* mentions 'our village Pesoute' (l. 3: $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\tau\mu\epsilon \pi\epsilon\sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon$), which suggests that also this text was written on behalf of a rural collectivity. In our search for the background of the situations described in the documents we need to think about arrangements in which the monastic community and the village community could appear as counterparties, and which could involve a *syntheia*. Two possibilities can be taken into consideration.

First, let us look at land leases. *Syntheiai* mentioned in land lease agreements accompany either the rent or the basic amount of crops to be shared with the landowner. Their composition might be related to the type of land farmed by the lessees (e.g. the leases of vineyards stipulate *syntheiai* in wine), but not only and not exclusively. They consist mainly of foodstuffs: bread, sometimes provided in large amounts (see, e.g., *SPP XX 218* where the landlord demands 100 *zeuge* of bread), cheese, milk, bales of

extra payments for the workers, also called *syntheiai*, paid on festal occasions or around harvest. See, e.g., *P. Jena II 32* (account of the vintage in *choria* Papnouthiou and Phibis; late 5th–6th c.), col. 1, l. 7: ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$) $\tau\rho\upsilon\chi(\eta\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu)$ $\kappa[(\alpha\iota)]$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\theta(\epsilon\iota\acute{\omega}\nu)$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa(\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma)$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta(\omicron\iota)$ ι [$(?)$]; col. 2, l. 16: [$(\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho)$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\theta(\epsilon\iota\acute{\omega}\nu)$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa(\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma)$ *vac.* ? $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\delta(\omicron\iota)$ $\kappa\delta$; *CPR XIV 43* (account of vintage costs; 5th c.), l. 3: $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\delta\iota(\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha})$ β ; *P. Oxy. XXVII 2480* (account of an Apionic *oinocheiristes*; 565–566), l. 45: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\sigma(\omega)$ $\mu\eta\chi\alpha\omicron\nu\rho\upsilon\rho(\omicron\iota\varsigma)$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda(\epsilon\omega\varsigma)$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\theta(\epsilon\iota\acute{\omega}\nu)$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\iota\delta$ $\iota\nu\delta(\iota\kappa\tau\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma)$ $\omicron\iota\upsilon(\omicron\upsilon)$ $\delta\iota(\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha})$ η .. However, in the Byzantine documentation we encounter also *syntheiai* in cash – considerable payments received by officials and integrated into the fiscal system (on these *syntheiai*, see HICKLEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State* [cit. n. 75], pp. 106–107). On *syntheiai* in Byzantine contracts, see K. A. WÖRPF, 'Deliveries for *συνήθεια* in Byzantine papyri', [in:] T. GAGOS & R. S. BAGNALL (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas*, Cincinnati 2001, pp. 51–68.

unthreshed wheat, animals (chiefly sows and piglets whose price is stated in the agreement), or oil. Other products (e.g. chaff) are more rare; there are no attestations of *synetheiai* in money. Lease agreements concluded by the monastery with village communities may have stipulated such extra payments, which could be modest if the land parcels were of insignificant size. We are accustomed to seeing the monastery as a landowner rather than tenant, but *P. Mon. Apollo 27*, with its mention of the monastery of Apa Apollo paying *pakton*, indicates that the institution could also exploit land in the latter capacity. The plots of land the village communities would lease were perhaps uncultivated and burdened the villagers with their taxes. Leasing them out would make them profitable again or at least reduce the fiscal burden.

Another option is that the *synetheiai* in the Bawit documents were connected with labour agreements. Among Coptic documents there is a group of texts called *lebeke* contracts.²⁰⁴ These texts were agreements between an employer (a 'lessee') and a village community (usually termed *koinon* or *koinotes*); the latter 'leased out' one of the villagers (a man or a woman) to the former. The 'leased' person was supposed to work for the 'lessee', who, in turn, was obliged to reimburse the village community rather than the worker. If the monastery was concluding this kind of contracts with local village communities, it would be obliged to pay them for the workforce they provided, while the villagers would have the right to execute arrears. In such case, the disbursement could be destined for the worker himself (which would explain the modest amounts of products we see in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38 and 43).²⁰⁵ The problem with this interpretation is, however, twofold: first, no such contracts are preserved in the documentary record from Bawit; second, the *lebeke* contracts stipulate payments in money made to the village *koinon/koinotes* and do not mention additional disbursements. While the absence of a documentary type does

²⁰⁴ See *CPR* IV 169 [= *CPR* II 140]; 170 [= *CPR* II 145]; 171 [= *CPR* II 149]; 172 [= *CPR* II 146]; 173 [= *CPR* II 147].

²⁰⁵ In any case, we cannot determine if the two *lakoote* of wine and one bag of an unknown product in the Cologne papyri represent the *synetheiai* in their entirety, or only parts thereof.

not imply the absence of a phenomenon (cf. land leases in the Bawit case), in order to dismiss the second objection we would have to assume the existence of a different type of arrangement concluded by the Bawit community which would include a *synetheia*. While this is not impossible, the whole reasoning is – and perhaps will remain – only speculative.

It is probable that there was no single rationale behind all of the cases and the *synetheiai* in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 38, 43, and *P. Mon. Apollo* 55 functioned in entirely different frameworks: a labour relationship, lease agreement, or charitable activity. What is important to us, however, is the fact that in case of non-compliance on the part of the monastery, the matter could be pursued by lay representatives using more or less polite means. Whether the discussed obligations were customary (as we might expect in the case of charitable distributions) or established through contracts, the monks were by no means a privileged party and were subject to all of the usual mechanisms of control and pressure. This was a matter of harmonious coexistence in the economic and social landscape of the Egyptian countryside.

Village representatives could intervene not only on behalf of their communities, but also of individuals. In *P. Köln* X 426, a village scribe (πκαρ ντμε) Pankraten is writing to a member of a monastic community, Apa Pkol, with a request for a letter of recommendation for another person.²⁰⁶ The letter is to be presented to another scribe, Ioannes. The details are obscure, but the document shows nevertheless that village representatives were willing to act on behalf of their fellow villagers to obtain help from

²⁰⁶ The name of the community is, unfortunately, unpreserved. The scribe Pankraten from Samalut – a village in the Hermopolite nome – addresses his monastic correspondent in the following manner (ll. 2–3): ετεκμητῆϊωτ εἰμπχ[οεic - -] πασον ἀπα πσωλ πνοσ ἡρωμε ἡρασ(ιοc) ἀββ[α name of the patron saint of the institution to which the addressee belonged]; (your Fatherhood in the Lord [...] brother Apa Pkol, the great man of the holy Abba NN'; translation mine). The letter, interestingly, features the designation πνοσ ἡρωμε, commonly used for heads of monastic and lay communities (see *P. Mon. Epiph.*, p. 131) but surprisingly rare in the Bawit dossier; see *P. Hengstenberg* 4 [= *SB Kopt.* III 1429], l. 1: πνοσ ἡρωμε εὔχι ἡτησ εἰπ τνοσ ἡωμη, translated by Alain Delattre as 'les grands hommes qui sèment les plantes dans le grand jardin'; see DELATTRE, 'Ordres de paiement' (cit. n. 18), p. 389; cf. also *P. Mon. Apollo* 25: 'other trustworthy great brothers of the monastery'; l. 4: ἡρενκενοσ ἡσνηοῦ ἡαζιοπιστοσ ἡτεπμοναστηριον.

the representatives of the monastery. Unfortunately, the text cannot be attributed with absolute certainty to the Bawit dossier.²⁰⁷

Three among the orders of monastic superiors indicate that village headmen were receiving money from the monastery. *P. Bawit Clackson* 7 and 8 are ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΩΙ documents – a category of texts notorious for the scantiness of information on the context they provide.²⁰⁸ For that reason we cannot determine why the ἀπηγε obtained money from the monastic ‘managerial board’. *P. Bawit Clackson* 8 explicitly mentions ‘brothers of the poll-tax’ and the tax itself; unfortunately, in the present state of our knowledge the connection between local headmen and the monastic system of poll-tax management remains unexplained. In the case of *P. Bawit Clackson* 7 the fragmentary state of the text and its general vagueness do not allow for reliable interpretation. The text mentions money, which is rare in the ‘our father’ dossier outside the fiscal context, and it is possible that also this document pertained to the sphere of taxation.²⁰⁹

P. Brux. Bawit 16 mentions ΤΑΠΕ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΠΑΔΙΟΙΚ(Η)Τ(ΗΣ) as recipient of various alimentary products. In his commentary to line 1, Alain Delattre writes: ‘Il semblerait dans ce cas que le terme ne désigne pas un chef de

²⁰⁷ The editor, Gesa Schenke, did not comment on the document’s provenance, stating only that both the mention of the Hermopolite village Samalut and the linguistic features of the document point to its Hermopolite origin (see the introduction to *P. Köln* X 426). In the commentary to the designation ΠΝΟΣ ἸΡΩΜΕ in l. 3, Schenke refers to an Apa Pkol invoked in an inscription on a stela from Bala’izah (ὁ [ἄγι]ος ἀπα <π>σων; see the inscription no. 7 on pl. LIII in W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, *Memphis* I, London 1909); however, she refrains from connecting the text with the monastery at Bala’izah. *P. Köln* X 426 has been ascribed to the Bawit dossier in the list of published documents connected with the monastery: *P. Louvre Bawit*, Annexe, pp. 133–175 (at p. 161).

²⁰⁸ *P. Bawit Clackson* 7 is a very fragmentary order signed by Keri. Half a solidus is to be given, i.a., to a headman of Titkoohe. In *P. Bawit Clackson* 8 Keri orders the brothers of the poll-tax to give half a solidus to Abraham, the headman of Titkoohe. The sum is to be reckoned as poll-tax; unfortunately, we do not have enough information to explain the procedure. See also P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 B (5b), an order in which village headmen are mentioned in an unclear context in connection with wine delivery (see DELATTRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGHEM, ‘Papyrus coptes’ [cit. n. 18], pp. 38–39).

²⁰⁹ Unless we assume that the money was paid to the village representatives in connection with contractual obligations the monastery had toward the village of Titkoohe; cf. above, pp. 224–225.

village, mais un supérieur de manière générale'. It is indeed difficult to interpret the meaning of the word ἀνε in this document. I believe that Pshere was a layman (in the vast dossier of the Bawit monastery ἀνε is never used to refer to monastic superiors or functionaries). Administrators of monastic property did not have to be monks; we can imagine that a village official could keep an eye on the monastic property in the area under his jurisdiction and receive wages.²¹⁰

The Bawit monastery was a significant link in the landowning networks of the Hermopolite nome, especially in its southern part. As we have already observed, its role in the local fiscal system – certainly as a taxpaying landowner, perhaps as a cog in the tax-collecting machine – was also not negligible. The documents we have at our disposal, however, show that this situation did not translate straightforwardly into absolute social dominance. Local communities could defend their interests if the monastery failed to fulfil its obligations; some actions undertaken within the community needed supervision on the part of lay representatives. Village representatives – members of the local elite – on one hand, and monastic figures from the managerial circles on the other provided channels of communication thanks to which the matters were dealt with as smoothly and profitably for both sides as possible. The monks not always had the upper hand, but this was a natural consequence of the integration with an environment full of scattered landed property, with many neighbours and many ensuing social ties (and, eventually, tensions). Curiously, the dossier is characterised by the absence of testimonies that would point to the monastery's role as intercessor and mediator; it is only in the uncertainly attributed *P. Köln X 426* that we see a monk asked to act on behalf of a third party.

²¹⁰ In *P. Brux. Bawit 16* we are most probably dealing with an administrative worker attached to a certain section of the monastic property. Cf. *P. Ross. Georg. III 48* (6th c.) mentioning Koursios son of Iosephios, *pronoetes* of the monastery of Apa Shenoute and apparently a layman, issuing a rent receipt to Aurelius Phoibammon, lessee of monastic land in Phthla near Aphrodite. We can suspect that Koursios was responsible for the land owned by the monastery in the region of Aphrodite.

4.3. Individual loan contracts: an unmediated relation between monks and laymen

The Bawit monks could retain their private property and make use of it the way they wished. The most conspicuous testimony to this capacity is the dossier of loans and sales on delivery concluded between Bawit monks and laypeople from various villages. In these documents, the monks are the party which provides cash as creditors in loan contracts or buyers in sales on delivery.

I decided to discuss both the Coptic loan contracts and the earlier Greek documents mentioning the monastery of Titkois/Titkooh, following the approach of Alain Delattre, whose proposition to identify the monastery of Titkois/Titkooh and the monastery of Apa Apollo seems to me entirely convincing (see above, p. 156). This choice was made not with the intention of sketching a cohesive diachronic picture of the activities of the monks of Apa Apollo as moneylenders, but rather to show some long-lasting general tendencies. We need to remember that the dossier is supposed to be chronologically scattered throughout three centuries (sixth–eighth), with the majority of the documents dated only on palaeographic grounds. The texts will not show us how many monks engaged in moneylending activities at a given moment; they point, however, to the lasting presence of financially independent monks in the community for over two centuries.²¹¹

Monastic loans from Bawit have already been a subject of analyses. In the edition of documents from the monastery of Apa Apollo, Sarah Clackson famously stated that ‘monasteries performed a public service by providing what appear to have been interest-free “banking” facilities for laypeople’.²¹² This view was challenged by Tomasz Markiewicz in his contribution to the

²¹¹ Financial independence of the Bawit monks is visible also in the archaeological material. As we have already observed (see above, p. 154), excavations at Bawit showed a number of carefully built and beautifully decorated monks’ dwellings, built most probably at the expense of their inhabitants. Architectural remains of monks’ houses on the Bawit *kom* show not only that the monks had financial means, but also that these means could be considerable, allowing the monks to maintain rather high living standards.

²¹² *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 26.

collection of studies published in honour of Sarah Clackson in 2009.²¹³ Markiewicz showed that monastic loans were not interest-free and fit the description of commercial activity. His view received support in the form of a recently published document, P. CtYBR inv. 1747, a loan contract between a monk and a layman, most probably mentioning interest on four solidi of the capital.²¹⁴ Formal and linguistic aspects of the loan contracts from Bawit have been explored by Alain Delattre in his introduction to the edition of *P. Brux. Bawit* 34 and 35. This study still remains the best general introduction to this category of documents, despite the fact that it is focused mainly on the Coptic part of the dossier.²¹⁵

If we take into consideration all credit-related documents from the Bawit monastery (thirty-five papyri),²²¹ we observe that contracts between monks and laymen (twenty-four examples; see table on pp. 232–235 for a summary of the documents' contents) outnumber those between monks. Interestingly, the whole Greek part of the dossier concerns transactions with laypeople; in the Coptic part, the majority of the documents record contracts between monks. Out of the twenty-four documents quoted in Table 1, thirteen are the so-called sales on future delivery and loans to be repaid in kind; goods mentioned in these texts include wine, grain, and oil.²²² The discussion of how to treat sales on delivery –

²¹³ T. MARKIEWICZ, 'The Church, clerics, monks and credit in papyri', [in:] *P. Clackson*, pp. 178–204.

²¹⁴ The formula is almost entirely restored, but the editor of the document, Amin Benaissa, states that the 'restoration is virtually inevitable'; see BENAÏSSA, 'A usurious monk' (cit. n. 18), p. 375.

²¹⁵ *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 241–252.

²²¹ The count is based on the tables compiled by Delattre in *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 257–259, with additions (*P. Athen. Xyla* 19; *P. CtYBR* inv. 1747; *P. Lond.* V 1899 descr.; *P. Palau-Rib.* inv. 354). I decided to exclude *P. Athen. Xyla* 17 (marked as dubious by Delattre in *P. Brux. Bawit*); this document bears no trace of any titles or other indications that people involved in the transaction were in any way connected with the monastery.

²²² For a list of sales on delivery and information on the documents' formulae, see *P. Heid.* V, pp. 296–339; see also R. S. BAGNALL, 'Prices in sales on delivery', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 18 (1977), pp. 85–96; A. JÖRDENS, 'Kaufpreisstundungen (sales on credit)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 98 (1993), pp. 263–282; N. KRUIT, 'Local customs in the formulas of sales of wine for future delivery', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 94

as loans or actual sales – turned out inconclusive, especially since the criteria applied by the scholars were frequently those of Roman law.²²³ In a compromise approach which takes into consideration the interests of both parties of the contract, these documents can be seen as a mixed type.²²⁴ I decided to treat this type of documents together with loans, as both documentary types share a feature that is crucial from my point of view: they record the activity of monks as sources of capital in the countryside. In other words, these documents point to a significant feature that distinguished the monks in the local economic structure: in contrast to villagers, they had surpluses of liquid cash.

In the following argument I will not dwell on the subjects already explored in previous scholarship, such as the economic matters or the formal aspects of the documents. The elements I intend to analyse include the identity of the creditors; the identity and provenance of the debtors; the witnesses, guarantors, and scribes; and standards and measures mentioned in the documents.

4.3.1. The creditors

Almost the entire corpus of Bawit loans and sales on delivery consists of deeds concluded between individuals. The only case where an institutional creditor appears is *P. Mon. Apollo 38* – a money loan given to a ‘monk of the holy Apa Apollo’ by the *dikaion* of the monastery acting through Apa Theodoros, ‘the archimandrite and father [of the *topos*]’. No such example is found among contracts involving laypeople. The creditors are monks of Apa Apollo monastery whose affiliation is stated in the opening sections of the documents, which in both Greek and Coptic variants

(1992), pp. 167–184; IDEM, ‘Three Byzantine sales’ (cit. n. 16), p. 67 with n. 1; E. JAKAB, ‘Guarantee and jars in sales of wine on delivery’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 29 (1999), pp. 33–44.

²²³ See BAGNALL, ‘Prices’ (cit. n. 222), p. 86, quoting the introduction of Boak and Youtie to *P. Cair. Isid.* 90.

²²⁴ BAGNALL, ‘Prices’ (cit. n. 222), pp. 85–88; Andrea Jördens speaks of a ‘Mischtyp zwischen Kauf und Darlehen’ (*P. Heid.* V, p. 332, quoting H.-A. RUPRECHT, ‘Vertragliche Mischtypen in den Papyri’, [in:] *MNHMH Georges A. Petropoulos II*, Athens 1984, pp. 273–283).

<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Creditor</i>	<i>Debtor</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Witnesses/scribe</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>P.Athen. Xyla</i> 18	487/8	NN, [a monk ?] 'of the holy Apa Apollos'	Aurelius Biktor s. of Olympios	6 sol. less 2 1/2 ker. each	Not preserved	Standard of the village of Pois (Koussite nome) Coptic subscription
SB XXII 15322 = <i>P.Athen. Xyla</i> 8+13	19 III 535	NN s. of Papnouthios, camel-driver of the monastery of Abba Apollos	Aur. Abraamis s. of Papnouthios and Nonna, with his guarantor, Aurelius Markare s. of Biktor and NN, both from Magdolon Megalou (Hermopolite nome)	1 sol. less 6 ker.	Aur. Phibis s. of Biktor, olive-maker; Hellos s. of NN; Phibis s. of Phoibammon; (all from the same village) Aurelius Phoibamon s. of Apollos (scribe?)	Coptic subscription
<i>P.Amst.</i> I 47	I II 537	Serenos, the archimandrite of the holy monastery of Abba Apollos in the territory of the village Titkois	Aurelius L...lnes s. of Bekios and NN, from a village in the Hermopolite	Equivalent of more than 250 <i>knidia</i> of must	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery
<i>P.Amst.</i> I 48	6th c.	Serenos, the archimandrite of the holy monastery of Abba Apollo in the territory of the village Titkois	NN from a village in the Hermopolite	Equivalent of 450 <i>knidia</i> of must	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery; empty jars provided by Serenos
<i>P.Athen. Xyla</i> 5	7 IX 539	Apa Anouphios, monk of the monastery of Apa Apollo in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois of the great Hermopolite nome	Aurelius Mathias s. of Pamounios and Tabiktor with his guarantor, Aurelius Abraamios s. of Danielios, <i>komarches</i> , both from Moirai (Koussite nome)	1 <i>holokottinos</i> (solidus)	Not preserved	Coptic subscription

<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Creditor</i>	<i>Debtor</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Witnesses/scribe</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
SB XVI 12267; ed. J. Gascou, <i>Anagennesis I</i> (1981), pp. 219– 230. esp. p. 226	13 VII 540	Aurelius Apollon s. of Horos, monk of the monastery of Abba Apollon in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois	NN <i>protokometes</i> from the village Sentryphis (Herm.)	wine (amount not preserved)	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery
<i>P.Athen. Xyla</i> 10	19 XI 543	Apa Phib, monazon and ἀρχων ἐλαουγρός of the holy monastery of Abba Apollon in the territory of the village Titkoos of the same Hermopolite nome	Aurelius Phoibam- mon s. of Mousaios and Pia from the vil- lage Demetriou (Her- mopolite nome)	7 solidus less 6 keratia each	Not preserved	Standard of Demetriou
P. CtYBR inv. 1747	566/7	Iakubios s. of Danielios from (the village?) NN, monk of the holy monastery of Apa Apollon in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois	Aurelius Amounis s. of Mousaios and Sanna from the vil- lage NN (Hermopo- lite nome)	4 solidi of gold	Not preserved	Standard of the vil- lage (of the debtor? The creditor?)
<i>P.Lond.</i> V 1899 descr.	18 VI 600	Abba Isaak pr(esbyter / <i>proestos</i> ?) [and monk] of the holy monastery of Abba Apollon in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois	Aurelius Kyriakos s. of Kollouthos and NN from the village Tanemois (Herm.)	Not preserved	Not preserved	The opening formu- la suggests a loan contract, but the further clauses are unpreserved.
P. Coptic Museum inv. 3512, ed. A. Hanafi, <i>Pap.Congr.</i> XXXVI, pp. 315–318	25 III 610	NN from the holy monastery of Abba Apollon in the <i>oros</i> of Titkois	NN s. of Apollon from the village Tanemois	140 <i>metra</i> of wine	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery
<i>P.Athen. Xyla</i> 6	6th c.	Not preserved	NN from the village Demetriou	Equivalent of 150 <i>metra</i> of new wine	Not preserved	Sale on delivery; standard of the monastery (attribu- tion based on the standard)

<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Creditor</i>	<i>Debtor</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Witnesses/scribe</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>P. Athén. Xyla</i> 12	6th c.	Apa Andreas (a monk?)	Aurelius Anouph s. of David	Not preserved	Sois s. of Biktor, a deacon; Al...[Kol-louthos s. Ioannes	The document mentions <i>tokoi</i> (l. 2) Coptic subscription
<i>P. Athén. Xyla</i> 19	6th c.	NN, monk of the most revered monastery of Apa Apollos in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Due to the state of preservation, the type of the document cannot be determined with certainty.
<i>SB</i> VI 9051 = <i>SB</i> XXII 15596; receded by Kruit, 'Three Byzantine sales' (cit. n. 16), pp. 80-83	6th c.	Abba Phoibammon from the [monastery / <i>topos</i> ?] of Abba Apollos in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois of the Hermopolite nome	Aur. Matheias s. of Theodoros and NN from the village Tanemois (Herm.)	Equivalent of 3 1/2 artabae of wheat	Aur. NN s. of NN; Mouis s. of Abra...]; Elias s. of Serenos; Aurelius Ioannes s. of Biktor, subscriber for the witnesses and the scribe	According to the measure of the monk. Greek subscription. Penalty: 14 keratia in the case of non-compliance
<i>SB</i> XXIV 16130 = P. Palau Rib. inv. 243a	6th c.	NN, <i>monazon</i> of the holy monastery of Abba Apollos in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
<i>SB</i> XVI 12401 + 12402 = <i>SB</i> XXII 15595	6th-7th c.	Abba Apollos, monk of the holy monastery of Abba Apollos in the <i>oros</i> of the village Titkois of the Hermopolite nome	Aurelius Anouphis s. of Ioannes and Thecharie from the village of Tanemois (Hermopolite nome)	Equivalent of 140 <i>metra</i> of must	Aurelius Enoch s. of NN; Biktor s. of Noumenios	Sale on future delivery
<i>P. Mon. Apollo</i> 36	1st half of 6th c.?	Apa Enoch, monk of the $\mu\alpha$ of Apa Apollo	Biktor s. of Mathias from Esou (Hermopolite nome) with surety, Pieou s. Papre	Equivalent of 30 <i>sextarii</i> of oil	Serene s. of Biktor; Pakob s. of George; Paulos s. of Ioseph, scribe	Sale on future delivery Enoch's measure; Greek subscription

<i>Document</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Creditor</i>	<i>Debtor</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Witnesses/scribe</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>P. Mon. Apollo</i> 33	7th c.	Apa Ienoch, monk of the <i>topos</i> of Apa Apollo on the mount of Titkooh	Pia d. of Dioskre and Dora, from Jahrouj (Iarouthis; Hermopolite nome)	Not preserved	Anoup s. of Silbane; Anoup s. of Ioannes; NN, scribe	Greek subscription
<i>P. Mon. Apollo</i> 34	7th–8th c.	Kosma, monk of the <i>topos</i> of Apa Apollo	Anoup and Kolthe, headmen of Migdol of the Four Villages (Hermopolite nome)	1 solidus (?) to be repaid with over 13 ounces of <i>lathanon</i> -oil and 10 artabae of wheat	Not preserved	Greek subscription
<i>P. Bawit Louvere</i> 16	7th–8th c.	[NN], monk of the <i>topos</i> of Apa] Apollo	George (layman?), see <i>P. Louvere Bawit</i> , p.28	280 <i>kouri</i> of sweet wine	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery
<i>P. Bawit Louvere</i> 18	7th–8th c.	Apa Kostantine, monk [of the <i>topos</i> of Apa Apollo]	Serne s. of Helias from Tan... (Tanemois?)	10 artabae of wheat and 5 ½ of barley	Not preserved	Sale on future delivery
<i>P. Palau-Rib. inv. 354</i>	7th–8th c.	[Brother Peret, monk of the <i>topos</i> of] holy Apa Apollo	Pekosh and his mother Maria	1 solidus and 1 <i>trimesion</i> of gold	Brother (<i>pason</i>) Laonte; NN, scribe and witness	Pekosh is described as <i>racon</i> in the Coptic subscription on the verso
<i>P. Mon. Apollo</i> 35	8th c.	NN of the <i>topos</i> of holy Apa Apollo in this [same] region [of Shmoun]	NN of the <i>epoiteion</i> of Posh n-Telke (Hermopolite nome)	Not preserved	Not preserved	Greek subscription
<i>P. Briux. Bawit</i> 52	8th c.	Apa Ounouber	[...]rkole and Pamei	3 solidi	Not preserved	

assume the form of epistolary salutation.²²⁵ The way in which monastic affiliation of the creditors is presented varies; the majority of the documents state that the creditor belonged to the monastery of Apa Apollo in the village Titkois/Titkooh. The toponym is absent from the Coptic documents (except for *P. Mon. Apollo* 33, ll. 1–2: ἀπα ἰενῶχ πμονοχος [μπποπος να]πα ἀπολλῶ [ε]ῖ πποογ ἡτιτκοοζε)²²⁶ and the Greek *P. Athen. Xyla* 18.

In the majority of the documents which preserve the opening clause, leaving little or virtually no doubt as to the status of at least one of the parties, the creditors are explicitly called *μονάζοντες*. Five contracts give additional information on their functions in the monastery: *P. Amst.* I 47 and 48 introduce Serenos the archimandrite; Apa Phib from *P. Athen. Xyla* 10 was a monk and the ‘chief olive-maker’ (ἄρχων ἐλαιουργός) of the monastery (see above, p. 183, n. 80); *P. Lond.* V 1899 descr. mentions either a clerical or administrative function, as the abbreviation in l. 8, ἀββᾶ Ἰσακίῳ πρ(), can stand for either *προεστῶτι* or *πρεσβυτέρῳ*. *SB XXII* 15322 differs from the other texts: it features NN son of Papnouthios, a camel-driver of the monastery (ll. 9–10: Παπ]νουθιω καμηλ[α]ριου [- - - μονασ]τηρ[ίου] Ἀββᾶ Ἀπολ[λ]ῶτος [χαίρειν]).²²⁷ Interestingly, the document does not call Pamouthios a monk and mentions his patronymic. In any case, the connection of the man with the monastery of Apa Apollo was strong enough to serve as the main element of his identification.

All these functions and titles are as elements of the creditors’ description and it seems that they have nothing to do with the content of the doc-

²²⁵ See DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 244.

²²⁶ Other Coptic documents from the dossier mentioning monastery at Titkooh: *P. Mon. Apollo* 1 and 2 (*aparche*-collection agreements; 7th c.); *P. Mon. Apollo* 43 (fragmentary debt acknowledgement; 8th c.); *P. Mon. Apollo* 61 and 62 (fragmentary documents opening with the ἀνοκ πασον formula, possibly debt acknowledgements; 7th–8th c.); *P. Louvre Bawit* 9 (fragmentary contract concerning *aparche*; 7th–8th c.); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 30 (*aparche*-collection agreement; 7th c.). The dates have been established on palaeographic grounds.

²²⁷ Read: [Παπ]νουθίου καμηλαρίῳ. The text was published for the first time in *P. Athen. Xyla* as two separate documents, 8 and 13. The two fragments were joined and re-published in B. KRAMER, ‘Urkundenreferat’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 40 (1994), pp. 177–227, esp. pp. 194–199. The lacuna before *νουθιω καμηλ[α]ριου* was considered too large by the editors to hold only the creditor’s name, hence the interpretation of [---]νουθιω as the ending of a genitive – the creditor’s patronymic.

uments. In the most striking of the cases, that of Serenos the archimandrite, nothing in the document suggests that he was acting on behalf of the monastery. *P. Amst.* I 47 and 48 speak of large quantities of must acquired by Serenos: at least 250 and 450 *knidia* respectively; it is possible that Serenos redistributed the wine in the monastery, but this would anyway count as private business.²²⁸ In any case, the monastery as institution had other means of securing wine deliveries for the community (see below, pp. 264–265); this sphere of activity on one hand and particular entrepreneurial activities as those of Serenos' on the other, did not necessarily overlap.

4.3.2. The debtors

Most of the documents under scrutiny preserve information about the debtors: their names, the names of their parents, or their places of origin. Except for the *protokometes* of the village Sentryphis in *SB XVI* 12267 (l. 3: [Αὐρήλιος ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος π]ρωτοκ(ωμήτης) ἀπὸ κώμης Σεντρύφειας) and the two headmen of Migdol in *P. Mon. Apollo* 34 (l. 1: ἀνογι μν κολθε ναππογε νμιγΔωλ), the debtors do not bear titles or designations of function. All of them originated from villages in the Hermopolites and the Koussites and most probably made their living as farmers – owners or tenants of plots of land, including vineyards, as attested by a number of sales of wine on delivery. A more precise description of their status is, unfortunately, impossible. Sarah Clackson attempted to establish a prosopographic link between two of the documents: *P. Athen. Xyla* 10 (543) and *P. Mon. Apollo* 33 (palaeographically dated to the seventh century). The former fea-

²²⁸ Cf. the case of Apa Neilos, the monk of the Naqlun *laura*, receiving 250 *kouri* of wine as a repayment of debt in *P. Naqlun* II 23 (590–596?). Serenos was also supposed to provide empty jars for wine, as is the case in the majority of sales on delivery (see S. GALLIMORE, 'A contract for the advanced sale of wine', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 49 [2012], pp. 151–165, esp. p. 161–163). Serenos could order the jars in the pottery workshop of the monastery (the monastery must have produced its own jars, including vessels for wine; this is indirectly confirmed by the mention of 'the measure of the *topos* of Apa Apollo in ll. 5–6 of *P. Athen. Xyla* 6). On the destination of wine purchased on delivery, see DZIERZBICKA, *Wine* (cit. n. 56), p. 197.

tures a certain Aurelius Phoibammon from Demetriou, son of Mousaios and Pia, as the debtor; in the latter, a certain Pia daughter of Dioskros (Dioskoros) from Tahrouj (Greek Tarrouthis) borrows money from a monk of the monastery of Apa Apollo. Clackson suggested to identify the former and the latter Pia and re-date *P. Mon. Apollo* 33 to the first half of the sixth century.²²⁹ While the fact that Phoibammon and Pia lived in two different villages does not exclude the identification (it is possible that an adult man would move to another, not very remote, village to establish his own family), I believe that the premise is in general too weak to build upon it.²³⁰

Villagers could seek credit with people or institutions possessing ready cash in order to fulfil their fiscal obligations. However, as observed by Alain Delattre, the sums mentioned in the contracts from Bawit exceed those which appear in fiscal documents. It is therefore possible that the debtors invested the borrowed money rather than spent it on taxes.²³¹ In the case of sales on future delivery we can imagine that the money borrowed from monks before the vintage was supposed to pay the cost of the vintage itself. In this manner, monks of the Bawit monastery would play a role in local economy investing money in agricultural production.

Out of the twelve documents which preserve the debtors' place of origin four (maybe five) mention the village Tanemois, and two Demetriou; other toponyms appear only once.²³² The data we have is unfit for any statistical reasoning and this proportion may as well be a matter of chance.

²²⁹ *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 26. Clackson suggested also a link with *P. Mon. Apollo* 36, where the creditor was a certain Apa Enoch from the monastery of Apa Apollo; she connected Enoch with Apa Ienoch of *P. Mon. Apollo* 33. *P. Mon. Apollo* 36 is dated palaeographically to the first half of the sixth century, which would support the earlier date for *P. Mon. Apollo* 33. Enoch, however, was a banal name, and this attempt at identification is only hypothetical.

²³⁰ For general information on the mobility of people in Egypt, see H. BRAUNERT, *Die Binnenwanderung: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit*, Bonn 1964.

²³¹ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 252.

²³² Tanemois: *P. Lond.* V 1899 descr.; *SB XXII* 15595; *SB XXII* 15596; *P. Bawit Louvre* 18 preserves only the beginning of the toponym: *Tave*[μοις?]. Demetriou: *P. Athen. Xyla* 10; *P. Athen. Xyla* 6. Magdolon Mega: *SB XXII* 15322. Moirai: *P. Athen. Xyla* 5. Sentryphis: *SB XVI* 12267. Tahrouj: *P. Mon. Apollo* 33. *Epoikion* Posh n-Telke: *P. Mon. Apollo* 35. Esou: *P. Mon. Apollo* 36.

Demetriou does not appear anywhere else in the monastic dossier;²³³ Tanemois, however, recurs both in another Bawit document and inscriptions from the site and its case – as well as the cases of other toponyms otherwise known from the dossier – deserves a closer look.²³⁴ In the epigraphic material, Tanemois is mentioned in connection with both monks and laypeople visiting the monastery. The monastery appears to have been a meeting point for the villagers of Tanemois and Bawit monks; the visitors to the monastery would get to know its residents learning of those among the monks who could and were willing to provide credit. On the other hand, the monks who originated from the village could either provide credit to their families and acquaintances whom they had left behind in ‘the world’ or at least help them obtain a loan.²³⁵ *P. Mon. Apollo* 53 (letter; eighth century?), although difficult to interpret, hints at further connections of the monastery with the village. The addressee of the letter is Iaanes, the monk of Apa Apollo; the sender is NN, ‘son of Eisak (and?) Lia, of Danaier (?)’. The subject of the letter was financial matters (the nature of which is obscured by the state of preservation of the text and its vagueness) in which ‘the people of Tanamneuou’, who had sent half a solidus to the sender, were involved. We will never know the destination

²³³ For this location, see DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), p. 90. Demetriou was an *epoikion* that at some point became an independent village (it is called both *kome*, like in our documents, and *epoikion*).

²³⁴ *P. Mon. Apollo* 53, ll. 4–5: ‘The people of Tanamneuou have sent (?) me (?) a half solidus to finish it (?)’. For the inscriptions, see CLÉDAT, *Le monastère* [= *MIFAO* 12] (cit. n. 7), p. 121, no. 8 and 9 (inscriptions from ‘Chapel XX’, commemorating monks bearing the designation ΠΡΗΤΑΝΕΜΟΥΣ); p. 78, an inscription in ‘Chapel XVII’ mentioning ΑΠΑ ΓΕΩΡΓΕ ΝΔΑΝΑΜΟΥΣ; see also ΜΑΣΠΕΡΟ & ΔΡΙΟΤΟΝ, *Fouilles* (cit. n. 3), vol. I, p. 49, no. 2 (inscription in Hall 1: ΖΑΧΑΡΙΑΣ ΜΗ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ ΠΡΗΤΑΝΕΜΟΥΣ); p. 64, no. 60, l. 10 (long inscription mentioning, among others, ΑΠΟΛΛΩ ΚΟΥΙ ΠΡΕΜΤΑΝΕΜΟΥΣ); p. 177, no. 388, l. 6 (long inscription mentioning, among others, ΑΠΑ ΦΟΙΒΑΜΩΝ ΠΡΗΤΑΝΕΜ[Ο]ΟΥΣ). On Tanemois, see DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), pp. 264–265.

²³⁵ Cf. *P. Naqlun* II 22 (593), where the creditor is a monk of the Naqlun *laura*, while the debtor, Aurelius Georgios, is son of Abba Apanakios, another monk of the same monastery. The document was discovered in the hermitage which can be identified with the residence of Apanakios; the contract was probably entrusted to the monk for safekeeping. The mention of the monastic affiliation of the debtor’s father in the document may point to the role of intermediary he played in arranging the loan for his son.

of the sum, but what we do glimpse is a ‘business’ connection of some kind between the villagers and monks. It would be interesting to know if the relation recorded here worked on the individual or community level; unfortunately, we are unable to determine it.

Migdol – a toponym attested in *P. Mon. Apollo* 34 – can possibly be identified with a place mentioned in several other written testimonies: an inscription²³⁶ and five documents. The mention in *P. Mon. Apollo* 51 (ΜΙΧΩΛ) is ambiguous. The document is an agreement mentioning the sum of three carats; two toponyms, Midjol and Nemhate, appear in lines 7 and 4.²³⁷ The text might have been connected with *aparche*-collection.²³⁸ If this is the case, it would follow from the document that the monastery possessed land in the vicinity of the two locations mentioned in the text, or perhaps assumed responsibility for tax collection in the region. Connection with Migdol is visible also in other documents, *CPR XX* 15 and 18, which are two waybills for fish preservatives (ταρική). People responsible for the transport are Salman and Ptauros from Mikdol/Migdol (*CPR XX* 15: ΣΑΛΜΑΝ ΜΙΚΔΩΛ; *CPR XX* 18: ΠΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΜΙΓΔΩΛ). *CPR XX* 15 is a typical *ϕΙΝΕ ΝΣΑ* ostrakon; *CPR XX* 18 has a different formulary, but it is certainly a waybill variant. Further attestations of the toponym are found in the corpus of Bawit ostraca from the Fribourg collection. *O. Bawit Frib.* 39 is a *ϕΙΝΕ ΝΣΑ* document concerning the transport of two bags of wheat by a man from Midjol, ΠΡΩΜΜΙΧΩΛ; the editor of the corpus reconstructs ΜΙΧΩΛ also in *O. Bawit Frib.* 47 (ll. 2–3: ΝΣΟΟΥΝΕ ΝΣ(ΟΥΟ) ΝΤΕ [ΜΙΧ]ΩΛ).

In *SB XX* 15322 we find a similar toponym, Magdolon Megalou. Its identification with other similarly sounding Hermopolite place names is problematic. Migdol/Midjol/Mikdol could perhaps be treated as one and the same place, while Magdolon Megalou would refer to another village. The editors of the documents featuring Migdol/Midjol/Mikdol point to

²³⁶ CLÉDAT, *Le monastère* [= *MIFAO* 12] (cit. n. 7), no. 2.17.

²³⁷ For Nemhate, see TIMM, *Ägypten* (cit. n. 17), pp. 1766–1767. The place is tentatively located in the Herakleopolite nome.

²³⁸ Sarah Clackson ascribed the document to the Bawit dossier based on its epistolary formula ΔΝΟΚ ΠΑΣΟΝ ΝΝ ΕΙΣΔΙ. This formula appears in internal monastic agreements, mainly those connected with *aparche*.

the possibility of identifying this place with Magdolon Mire, a settlement in the Hermopolite nome in the toparchy of Peri Polin Kato attested in a number of late documents.²³⁹ The connection, however, is uncertain, since ‘Migdol’ was a popular element of Egyptian toponyms. Nevertheless, it seems that a place called Migdol/Midjol/Mikdol was an important point in the Bawit network. Mikdol/Midjol is a source of alimentary products (wheat and preserved fish) in four φ INE NCA ostraca while *P. Mon. Apollo* 51 points to a connection between Midjol and financial operations effectuated by the monks. It would seem that the community of Apa Apollo played a double role for the people of Migdol: on an institutional level, the monastery was connected with the village as a landowner or a business partner, while on the individual level monks of the monastery acted as a source of credit for the villagers.

Other toponyms from the credit-related texts do not appear in the remaining documents of the Bawit dossier (Esou;²⁴⁰ Sentryphis;²⁴¹ and Tahrouj/Tarouthis²⁴²). Tahrouj features in a number of documents from Wadi Sarga connected with wine deliveries;²⁴³ it is also mentioned in *SPP XX* 241 (sixth–seventh century), a list of wine-producing *ktemata*.²⁴⁴ The case of Moirai²⁴⁵ is more ambiguous; it appears in *P. Duk. inv. 93*, which might be connected with the Bawit dossier.²⁴⁶

²³⁹ Magdola Mire; see DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), pp. 160–163; TIMM, *Ägypten* (cit. n. 17), pp. 1671–1673, s.v. ‘Migtul’, with variations of the toponym attested in different documents. The identification of the Coptic variant $\mu\iota\chi\omicron\lambda$ with Magdola Mire is considered certain by Serena Lopizzo (see *O. Bawit Frib.* 39, commentary to l. 4).

²⁴⁰ TIMM, *Ägypten* (cit. n. 17), pp. 917–918; DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), p. 135.

²⁴¹ DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), p. 245.

²⁴² DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), p. 264; cf. TIMM, *Ägypten* (cit. n. 17), pp. 493–495, s.v. ‘Dahrut’; see also CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, p. 8, where the two places are identified.

²⁴³ *P. Sarga* 218, 254, 255, 256, 288, 292, 313, 321, 330, 335.

²⁴⁴ *SPP XX* 241, ll. 1–2: Ⲡ σὸν θ(εῶ) ρύσι(ς) [κ]τημ(άτων) Βάνου διοικ(ήσεως) ζ ἰνδ(ικτίονος) [κ]τ[ῆ]μα Ταρρούθ(εως) μερ(ίδος) Τακυβίτου κουφ(ῶν) [- -].

²⁴⁵ DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), pp. 172–173.

²⁴⁶ In line 2 of *P. Duk. inv. 93* we find τόπος Καμμέτος (Επιφ θ τόπ(ου) Καμμέ(τος) σί(του) ἀρτ(άβα) β), which can probably be identified with toponyms mentioned in *P. Brux. Bawit* 26 (order of payment l. 1: ΝΕΣΗΗ ΕΥΚΥ ΠΩΡ ΚΑΜΗ, ‘the brothers assigned to the field of

What emerges from our documents is an extremely fragmented network of contacts which cannot be subject to quantification or even reliable diachronic analysis. The overlap between toponyms mentioned as places of provenance of the debtors/sellers in the credit-related documents and toponyms otherwise known from Bawit documentation is minimal. We need to have in mind the chronological gap between the majority of the credit-related documents involving laypeople, which date from the sixth century, and the administrative texts – our most important source of knowledge of the locations where the monastery had business – which are dated mostly to the seventh–eighth century. This gap may be, in fact, smaller, as the dates of the documents, based on palaeographic criteria, are not firmly established (this is true mostly of the Coptic texts, but is valid also for those among the Greek papyri which do not preserve absolute dates). In any case, in the present state of documentation we have no chance of knowing if the little correspondence between toponyms in the credit-related documents and the administrative corpus we witness reflects two disconnected circuits of interaction: one existing on the community level and the other on the individual one, or is a result of the deficiencies of our sources. The problem with dating translates into our inability to reconstruct the organisational development of the monastery and its structures, and the possible correspondence – or the lack thereof – between private monastic businesses and monastic economy on the community level.²⁴⁷

Kame’); P. Duk. inv. 259 (ll. 3–4: ἀπα κολ[θ]ῆ ἐκκγ πῖωρ καμη, ‘Ara Kolthe who is assigned to the field of Kame’); CPR XX 19, mentioning transport of *tariche* εἶτη ερωῦπο πα πμα καμη, ‘through Erouro of the μα of Kame’. A similar toponym appears also in *P. Mon. Apollō* 27 (list of *pactum* payments; l. 3: δ(ιὰ) τόπ(ου) Καμητος). Three toponyms recur in P. Duk. inv. 93 and *P. Brux. Bawit* 31: τοποι of Ieremias, Time, and Neos Lakkos. The latter document, however, may include locations which hosted not only parcels belonging to the monastery, but also parcels from which the monastery collected *embole* (see above, p. 208). The same might be true also of P. Duk. inv. 93.

²⁴⁷ The problem of how uncertain dating of the documents hinders our reasoning is well illustrated by the example of SB XXII 15280, a transport receipt for six *thallia* of grain written on an ostrakon, dated by the editor to the sixth century (+ ια φορ(ās) δ(ιὰ) Βί(κτορος) καμ(ήλια) β θαλλ(ία) 5). See R. PINTAUDI, ‘Ricevuta di trasporto’, *Analecta papyrologica* 5 (1993), pp. 143–144. To accept this early date would mean to admit that some

4.3.3. Witnesses, guarantors, and scribes

Alain Delattre has observed that the state of preservation of credit-related documents from Bawit rarely allows us to determine who drew up the text.²⁴⁸ This is especially true of the Coptic deeds concluded between monks;²⁴⁹ we are somewhat better off with the Greek documents involving laypeople. Here, wherever the relevant clause is preserved, we see that the documents were executed by scribes (only one text mentions a notary, which may reflect more difficult access to legal specialists in the *chora*). The Greek contracts are characterised by greater uniformity than the Coptic ones, reflecting more standardised scribal practices based on fixed formulas.²⁵⁰ Three Coptic examples involving laypeople also mention the involvement of a scribe.²⁵¹ This consistent use of external scribes by the parties in contracts between monks and laymen can be explained, according to Delattre, by the debtors' illiteracy.²⁵² In all documented cases the scribes were laymen, as indicated by the use of the *nomen* Aurelius in SB XX 15322 and SB XXII 15596, and patronymics which appear in all instances.

of the administrative solutions applied in Bawit developed already in the sixth century (e.g. the system of transport organised by *phorai*). However, Anne Boud'hors and Sarah Clackson rejected Pintaudi's dating and propose to place the document with the rest of Bawit transport ostraca in the eighth century. See BOUD'HORS & CLACKSON, 'Ostraca de Baouit' (cit. n. 18), esp. pp. 5–6.

²⁴⁸ DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 242, n. 6.

²⁴⁹ Of these documents, only *P. Mon. Apollo* 38 (concluded, interestingly, between a monk and the *dikaion* of the monastery) mentions explicitly that the document has been written by the debtor himself; the formula is largely reconstructed, see comm. *ad loc.* (l. 7: 'I wrote with my own hand'; [... ΔΙΣΤΑΙ ΖΗ ΤΑ]ΣΙΧ).

²⁵⁰ Elements of Greek contracts enumerated in DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 243.

²⁵¹ Greek texts: SB XXII 15322, l. 19: *Αὐρ(ήλιος) Φοιβάμμων Ἀπολλ(ῶτος)*; SB XXII 15596, l. 18: † *Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἰωάν(ης) Βίκ(τορος) [ἀξ]ιωθ(εις) ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γρά(μματα) μὴ [εἰδότηων - -]*; in *P. Athen. Xyla* 12, l. 14, we find the standard formula recurrent in documents executed by notaries: [+ δι' ἐμοῦ] *Κολλούθου Ἰωάννου ἐγράφη*. Coptic texts: *P. Mon. Apollo* 36, l. 6: *ἀνοκ παγλος πωρεν ιωχηφ δισται*. In *P. Mon. Apollo* 33 and P. Palau-Rib. inv. 354 the information on the scribes is only partially preserved (their names are lost).

²⁵² DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 247. This remark is based on the assumption that the initiative for the transaction rested with the debtors who would arrange the act of document-making according to their needs.

Witnesses were a necessary element of legal procedures; our documents preserve names and places of provenance of several among them. Some documents mention also guarantors – people undertaking the responsibility for the repayment of the debt. In almost all cases the patronymics of the witnesses and guarantors are mentioned (some of the sixth-century examples record also the *nomen* Aurelius), which points toward their identification as laypeople. The only odd one is $\pi\alpha\sigma\omega\iota$ Laonte of P. Palau-Rib. inv. 354. In this case, however, also the debtor, Pekosh, is called $\pi\alpha\sigma\omega\iota$ in the subscription on the verso. The editors of the document doubt whether a monk would act together with his mother as Pekosh does, and assume that the monastic title could possibly be a mistake of the scribe.²⁵³ However, if we look at the correspondence of the Theban hermit Epiphanius with his mother we find out that she played a crucial role in managing Epiphanius' affairs that still bound him to 'the world'.²⁵⁴ The involvement of a monk's family in his financial affairs is thus not surprising at all; the modest sum of the loan recorded in P. Palau-Rib. inv. 354 suggests that the money might have been needed for a tax payment. If Pekosh was still engaged in managing worldly affairs together with his family, he would not hesitate to obtain a loan with (or for) his mother.

The witnesses and sureties could often be neighbours of the debtors, as we observe in *SB XXII 15322*, where all four men involved on the debtor's side are said to hail, like the debtor himself, from Magdolon Megalou, and *P. Athen. Xyla 5*, where both the debtor and the guarantor were from Moirai in the Koussite nome. The documents preserve no traces of family connections between the participants on the debtors' side. The key according to which the sureties and witnesses were chosen

²⁵³ Moreover, in contrast to other monastic loans between monks of Apa Apollo, Pekosh is not styled a monk in the body of the document; see ALBARRÁN MARTÍNEZ & DELATRE, 'Un contrat de prêt' (cit. n. 18), p. 81.

²⁵⁴ See *P. Mon. Epiph.* 259 (Epiphanius to his mother asking her, among others, to send him a sum of money and sell some wine); *P. Mon. Epiph.* 336 (Kolodje, Epiphanius' mother, to her son informing him about problems with selling wine and promising to send him money as soon as she finds a buyer); *P. Mon. Epiph.* 397 (Epiphanius to his mother, asking her to take care of some financial matters for him).

escapes us; the creditor could insist on involving as many people as possible in the deed in order to ensure the repayment, but whether his role was limited to accepting people proposed by the debtor or presupposed his active involvement in their choice is impossible to say without the knowledge of the background of each of the contracts.

4.3.4. Money, products, and measures

Among the documents that preserve the subject of the transaction, twelve give additional information about the accounting standards (in case of money) and measures (in case of products in sales on delivery and loans to be repaid in kind).

Three texts mention local money standards: *P. Athen. Xyla* 18 (6 solidi, each minus 2 ½ keratia, according to the standard of Pois; l. 3: κεφαλαίου νομισμάτια ἕξ ἑκάστου παρὰ κεράτια δύο ἥμισυ σταθμῶ τῆς [κώ]μης Πύεως); *P. Athen. Xyla* 10 (7 solidi, each minus 6 keratia, according to the standard of Demetriou; ll. 13–14: νομισμάτια ἑπτὰ ἑκάστου [παρὰ κερά]-τια ἕξ σταθμῶ τῆς κώμης Δ(ημητρίου)); and *P. CtYMBR inv. 1747* (4 solidi according to the standard of the village; ll. 10–11: κεφαλαίου χρυσοῦ νο[μισμάτια τέσσερα ἐξοδιαζόμενα τῆς κώμης). The expression νομισμάτια x παρὰ κεράτια y σταθμῶ (or ζύγω) z recurs frequently in the documents and refers to the local exchange rate of the solidus. In the most popular documentary usage, these terms are synonymous with ἐξοδιασμός which appears in *P. CtYMBR inv. 1747*.²⁵⁵

Our three documents mention villages which had such local exchange rates: Pois (which can be located in the southern part of the Hermopolite nome),²⁵⁶ Demetriou, and a settlement the name of which is not extant. Demetriou is the place of origin of the debtor in *P. Athen. Xyla* 10; the

²⁵⁵ See K. MARESC, *Nomismata und Nomismatia. Beiträge zur Geldgeschichte Ägyptens im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Opladen 1994, pp. 12–13. See also BENAÏSSA, 'A usurious monk' (cit. n. 18), p. 380 (commentary to l. 11 of *P. CtYBR inv. 1747*). For gold standards, see now F. CARLÀ, *Loro nella tarda antichità: aspetti economici e sociali*, Turin, 2008, n.v.

²⁵⁶ DREW-BEAR, *Le nome hermopolite* (cit. n. 71), p. 228.

provenance of the debtor in *P. Athen. Xyla* 18, which mentions the standard of Pois, is unknown. As for *P. CtYMBR* inv. 1747, its editor, Amin Benaissa, hesitates about the identification of the *kome* in the text, taking into consideration both the village of the debtor and κώμη Τιτκώεως, or the location of the creditor's monastery.²⁵⁷ It is doubtful that a money standard of the monastery existed in the sixth century (later documents, however, mention a monastic standard, although in a different context).²⁵⁸ The information from credit-related documents is too scanty to indicate any preferences in choosing the standard. *P. Athen. Xyla* 10 indicates that the standard of the debtor's village could be used; we cannot be certain what was the solution applied in the two remaining documents. We can guess that if a monk wanted to impose his own standard, he would perhaps use the one of the village with which the monastery was associated (Titkois; this is a possibility in *P. CtYMBR* inv. 1747); the parties could also agree on a 'neutral' standard of another location.²⁵⁹

Four contracts from Bawit specify the measure to be used for the goods the debtor was supposed to deliver to the creditor. *P. Athen. Xyla* 6 speaks of 150 *metra* of wine according to the measure of the *topos* of Apa Apollo (ll. 5–6: μέτρῳ τοῦ τόπ[ου] - - -] Ἄπα Ἀπολλῶτος σου παρέχοντος τὰ κο<ῦ>ρα αὐτῶν νέα). Here, the mention of the measure was decisive for

²⁵⁷ BENAÏSSA, 'A usurious monk' (cit. n. 18), p. 380, comm. to l. 11 of *P. CtYBR* inv. 1747.

²⁵⁸ Coptic documents related to *aparche*-collection mention a standard of the *diakonia* (*P. Mon. Apollo* 11, ll. 14–15: νημαγε νητιακωνια; *P. Mon. Apollo* 22, l. 6: νημαγε [νη]τιακωνια). In both cases, the translation proposed by the editor is 'measure of the *diakonia*'; the expression, however, refers to *pakton* quota expressed in solidi, which suggests that 'standard' is meant. In *P. Mon. Apollo* 10, ll. 14–15, S. J. Clackson reconstructed νημαγε νητρι νε. ('according to the measure of?) the cell of (?)' in the lacuna after the sum of *pactum*. The text is too fragmentary to allow for conclusions; I believe, however, that such fragmentation of money standards within one institution is unlikely.

²⁵⁹ All options are attested in documents; see, e.g., *SB* X 10524 (531, Antinoopolis): debtor from the village of Tlethmis, creditor from Antinoopolis, debtor's standard (ll. 7–8: κεφ]αλαίου χρυσοῦ νομισμάδιον ἐν ἐξουδια[σμοῦ] - - ζυγῶ Τλη]θμεω[ς]; *SB* XIV 11601 (489, Oxyrhynchos): debtor from the village Mouchis, creditor from Oxyrhynchos, standard of the creditor (ll. 7–8: νομισμάτια ἀπλᾶ δεσπο[τι]κὰ δ[ό]κ[ι]μα [ἀ]ριθμῶ [- - - ἰδω]τικῶ ζυγῶ τῆς Ὁξυρρυχ[ι]τῶν πόλεως); *P. Köln* III 158 (599, Herakleopolis): debtors from Herakleopolis, creditor from the village of Tebetny in the Herakleopolite nome, standard of the Arsinoite nome (ll. 19–21: κεφαλαίου χρυσοῦ νομισμάτια δύο ζυγ(ῶ) Ἀρσινωίτου).

the attribution of the document to the Bawit dossier. In *SB XXII 15596* we read of three and a half artabae of wheat according to the measure of the creditor, Abba Phoibammon from the Apa Apollo monastery (l. 7: [γίνονται] σί(του) (ἀρτάβαι) γ ἕκάστην ἀρτάβην] τῶ σῶ μέτρ[ω]). *SB XXII 15595* refers twice to the measure of the *topos* for 140 *metra* of wine (l. 5: [οἴνου μ]ούστου [μ]έτρων [ἐκατὸν τε]σσεράκ[οντα] ἀπὸ ξηστῶ[ν] [τριῶ]ν τῶ<ν> ξηστῶν ἐν [τ]ρουλάτοις τοῦ τόπου; l. 7: ἐν ο[ἴ]νῳ νέου καλλίστῳ καὶ εὐαρέ[στῳ] μέτρῳ τοῦ πίτου).²⁶⁰ Finally, the Coptic *P. Mon. Apollo 36* speaks of 30 *sextarii* of oil according the measure of the creditor, Apa Enoch (ll. 2–3: ΝΜΑΒ ΖΗСТΕ ΝΗΖ ΝΠΕΚΩ). Sarah Clackson proposed to identify the measure of Apa Enoch with that of his monastery, which is a logical solution, and one that can be applied also for Abba Phoibammon in *SB XXII 15596*. Measures for goods mentioned in contracts refer to particular containers that were in use in monasteries, church estates, and other domains.²⁶¹ We would expect the monastery of Apa Apollo to have pottery workshops producing containers for the community.²⁶² Phoibammon and Enoch would refer to a measure that was, on one hand, best known to them, and, on the other, considered reliable by the debtors. In fact, all four documents show that the monastery had its own measures for various products: wine, oil, and wheat, which were used in loan contracts with laymen.²⁶³ The popularity of monastic (and ecclesi-

²⁶⁰ *Troulla* is another designation of a measure which recurs also in other documents. See the *editio princeps* of *SB XXII 15595*: H. HARRAUER & P. J. SIJPESTEIJN, 'Verkauf von Wein gegen Vorauszahlung', *Chronique d'Égypte* 57 (1982), pp. 296–302, esp. p. 300 (commentary to l. 6). See also J. M. DIETHART, 'Neue Papyri zur Realienurkunde' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 64 (1986), pp. 75–81, esp. p. 78. Μέτρον τοῦ πίτου appears here without any further designation (cf. *SB XVI 12401*, l. 8; *SB XVI 12490*, l. 4; *SB XVI 12492*, l. 17); in other documents the formula μέτρῳ τοῦ ὑμῶν πίτου is to be found (*BGU XII 2209*, l. 19; *SB XVI 12491*, l. 6). Georg Schmelz (*Kirchliche Amtsträger* [cit. n. 75], p. 271 with n. 83) suggests to interpret the measure as that of the creditor/buyer; this assumption is logical also for our text.

²⁶¹ SCHMELZ, *Kirchliche Amtsträger* (cit. n. 75), pp. 270–271.

²⁶² No such workshop, however, has been excavated to date at the site; the absence of archaeological remains of pottery workshops is commented by DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 92.

²⁶³ *P. Mon. Apollo 24* mentions also a monastic measure of land surface; see ll. 3–5: 'Whereas we agreed with you to sell you three good arouras of fodder and twenty-five arouras of

astic) measure standards was, according to Georg Schmelz, due to two factors. First, people had trust in honesty and impartiality of monks and ecclesiastics; second, and more practically, these groups possessed, or had access to, proper containers. This is visible, e.g., in *P. Athen. Xyla* 6, which states that the monastic creditor (buyer) was to provide new empty jars for the purchased wine. The use of measuring standards in Bawit loan agreements concluded by monks with laypeople was thus an outcome of a compromise in which both practical and symbolic considerations had a part to play.

A brief recapitulation is necessary at this point. The monks of Bawit – ordinary brothers and functionaries of the community – were concluding private loan contracts with laypeople from the villages in the vicinity of the monastery. These loans were granted to people who needed cash for tax payments or, in case of larger sums, investment in production. Monks, on the other hand, could derive profit from money loans which included interest. They could also utilise products bought on delivery for further redistribution; more modest amounts (see, e.g., *P. Louvre Bawit* 18, with 10 artabae of wheat and 5 ½ artabae of barley) could be used by the monks themselves. The creditors could also potentially profit from the debtor's insolvency if the latter had secured the contract with his own property. Only two of our documents preserve such security clauses,²⁶⁴ but we need to note that a large part of the papyri lack the bottom part where such clause is to be expected. Any assets obtained in this way would be added to the monks' private property.²⁶⁵ The Bawit documentation does not preserve any

pasturage in the meadow of our settlement, we allot you them (according) to the measure of the monastery'.

²⁶⁴ *P. Athen. Xyla* 6, ll. 13–15: ὑποκειμένης σοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χρέος πάσης μου τῆς ὑποστάσεως [καθά]περ ἐκ δίκης; *P. Athen. Xyla* 12, ll. 3–4 (largely reconstructed): κ[αὶ] ὑποκειμέν[ον] σοι πάντων μ[ο]υ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων]. For a similar security clauses in loan contracts between laymen and monks, see *P. Naqlun* II 21, ll. 16–20, and *P. Naqlun* II 22, ll. 16–17. For security clauses in loans to be repaid in kind, see A. JÖRDENS, 'Arbeitsverpflichtungen und Lieferungskäufe', [in:] *P. Heid.* V, p. 329, with a list of documents.

²⁶⁵ For probably the best-known case of a monastery trying to enlarge its assets as a result of the insolvency of a debtor, see *P. Oxy.* LXIII 4397 (17 III 545). In this case, however, the loan had been granted by the monastery's representative in the name of the whole community.

straightforward attestations of controversies or disputes resulting from moneylending activities of the monks.²⁶⁶

Nothing in our documentation suggests that monastic authorities exercised control over the monks' credit-based relations with the outer world. Monastic institutions (e.g. *diakonia*) are never mentioned in private contracts, nor do any monastic functionaries of rank appear as witnesses in the documents. The presence of the monastery in the background of these transactions is perceptible only in the use of monastic measures for goods delivered to the creditors; this phenomenon, however, can be explained in symbolic and practical terms (see above). The chronological span of the dossier of loan contracts connected with the community attests to the longevity of the economic freedom enjoyed by the monks.

A newly published document, *P. Köln ägypt.* II 36 suggests, however, that monastic authorities could be involved in loan contracts between monks, or at least they were informed about such contracts and probably received their copies. The document is a loan agreement between two

²⁶⁶ Such situations, however, could certainly take place, as we can see in the much earlier dossier of Nephros (*P. Neph.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 78). In this dossier, the leader of a monastic community is asked to intervene in a dispute between a layman and a monk, Papnouthis son of Horion (here, however, the monk is the debtor). An echo of a credit-based dispute is perhaps to be found in *P. Köln X* 427. This Coptic letter is dated to the 7th–8th century based on its script. The letter was written in the Hermopolite village Terot; its attribution to the Bawit dossier is only tentative. The addressee is 'our beloved holy father, a[pa NN]' (l. 2: πῆμμερίτ ἡϊωτ ετογαβ δ[πα ...]). The sender, Pieou son of Taurine from Terot, asks the addressee to help him deal with the 'matter of the scribe (καρ) Klauta'. Klauta has received a deposit from Pieou; the deposit was connected with a loan, as indicated by the presence of the verb κρωωσ[τε] (*χρωστέω*) in l. 3. Complications ensued and Pieou found himself incapable of handling the matter. The interpretation of lines 2–3 where the writer's request begins is problematic (see G. Schenke in *P. Köln X*, comm. *ad loc.*, who suggests the following: 'sprich in der Angelegenheit des Schreibers Klauta nicht gegen mich' ['sage nicht gegen mich aus', 'beschuldige mich nicht'], also an eine Bitte um Nachsichtigkeit'). The text, however, suggests at least an ongoing dispute of which the addressee was aware. The key to our interpretation is the identity of the scribe Klauta (see Schenke, *P. Köln X*, p. 236); if he was also a monk (the title καρ is frequently attested in monastic context, also at Bawit), the addressee would probably intervene from a position of authority in a dispute between a layman and a monk. If the scribe was a layperson (cf. the village scribe Pankrate in *P. Köln X* 426), the document would bear testimony to the involvement of respected monks in the affairs of people living in 'the world'.

monks of Apa Apollo, Mena and George. The address on the verso, however, states that the document is addressed by Mena to someone occupying a more prominent place in the community (ἄλλος ἡγούμενος ἡμεῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας) εἰς τὴν μὴνα πρεσβυτέρου). In the introductory note to the edition, Gesa Schenke wrote: ‘Durch die Nennung des Namens Mena als Absender (Verso) und Darlehensempfänger (Recto) scheint gesichert zu sein, dass beide Seiten zu ein und demselben Dokument zu gehören, was die Vermutung nahe legt, dass eine solche Darlehensurkunde als Kopie bei einem Verantwortlichen des Klosters hinterlegt wurde.’ Such practice is so far unattested in Bawit for contracts with laypeople. We know, however, that monks could be entrusted with their colleagues’ contracts concluded with laypeople, as was the case with *P. Naqlun* II 22 (593). The text is a loan concluded between Aurelius Georgios, son of a Naqlun monk Apanakios, and Apa Mena, Apanakios’ fellow monk from the same *laura*. The document, which was discovered in its original context together with two other loan contracts (*P. Naqlun* 21 and 23), was deposited in the hermitage where Apanakios resided. The Naqlun example, however, does not have any official touch to it (Apanakios was a colleague, not a superior, of Apa Mena), which, on the other hand, seems to have been the case with *P. Köln ägypt.* II 36. A monastic superior entrusted with a copy of a document could probably intervene should any litigation between his monks occur.

Far from the urban centre of Hermopolis Megale, monks of Bawit played the same role as a source of credit as the city-based creditors whom we see in a number of Byzantine contracts.²⁶⁷ The number of preserved loan contracts points to the scale of the phenomenon. Parallel with that, the community as a whole was consolidating its estates, administered in a minute and cohesive manner. However, as far as we can

²⁶⁷ For the role played by urban residents in providing credit to villagers in the earlier period, see BAGNALL, *Egypt* (cit. n. 174), pp. 73–75; see also J. KEENAN, ‘On village and *polis* in Byzantine Egypt’, [in:] *Pap. Congr.* XVI, pp. 478–485. A number of sixth–seventh-century credit related documents from the Hermopolite nome (including numerous sales on delivery) record transactions between city residents and people from various *komai* and *epoikia* (see, e.g., *P. Amst.* I 45 [501]; *P. Lond.* III 1001 [539]; *CPR* IX 31 [581]; *BGU* XVII 2694 [608]; *BGU* XVII 2695 [608]; *BGU* XII 2208 [614]; *BGU* XII 2209 [614]; *BGU* XII 2210 [617]).

observe in our sources, the monastery as institution did not provide credit facilities and was involved in local economies rather as a landowner and employer. The documents show that the various functions fulfilled by members of monastic communities in local structures were played out on different levels of community organisation.

5. LAYPEOPLE IN MONASTIC ECONOMY

The present section will focus on laypeople involved in the functioning of the monastery at Bawit as an economic unit. This involvement included work and service; there are no unequivocal testimonies to show that laypeople appeared in administrative capacities at Bawit. In order to understand the role played by persons from the ‘world outside’ in monastic economy we need to take a closer look at the organisation of economic activities in Bawit.

The first question one needs to ask concerns the model according to which the Bawit community functioned in the economic and social landscape. The most recent reflection on the subject is found in Gesa Schenke’s article ‘The monastery of Apa Apollo as landowner and employer’.²⁶⁸ Here, monasteries in general are described as an “‘alternative’ form of rural settlement’ that could assume ‘village-like character and structure’. Further on, the author proceeds to a comparison of the forty-hectare *kom* at Bawit to Fayumic villages; large churches and other sizeable edifices on the *kom* are recalled to emphasise similarities with rural settlements. I believe that this is an overstatement. In her article Schenke estimates, after Alain Delattre,²⁶⁹ that the Bawit community at the peak of its development (that is, the seventh and eighth centuries, thus the period from which the majority of our documents come) numbered ‘several thousand monks’, while the average number of the inhabitants is estimated at

²⁶⁸ Forthcoming (cit. n. 19); I would like to express my gratitude to the author for giving me access to the manuscript.

²⁶⁹ *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 55 with n. 139. Schenke repeats this statement also in the recent publication of papyri from the Cologne collection (*P. Köln ägypt.* II, p. 6).

around one thousand. Nothing, however, allows us to think that all of the structures on the large *kom* of Bawit were inhabited simultaneously, even in the period of the most dynamic development of the monastery. In any case, it is impossible to estimate how many monks lived at Bawit at any given moment (see above, p. 168, n. 39). As already observed, the *kom* has not been excavated in its entirety; however, even if it was thoroughly excavated we would obtain only a very general reconstruction of the fluctuations of the habitation patterns, as the material found on the site – mostly ceramics – gives only wide chronological spans.

If we remove thousands of monks from the picture, the idea of a crowded, village-like *kom* at Bawit becomes less pronounced. Schenke, however, in the same article proposes another approach which can prove more suitable for describing the monastery's functioning as reflected in our documentation. Schenke's statement that 'monasteries like that of Apa Apollo seem to function more like large estates though with a rural rather than an urban centre' is, I believe, a good starting point for the task I set myself in the present text. Of course, the Bawit dossier can hardly be compared to or used for the same research purposes as such groups of texts as the Apion archives, or even the Aphrodite papers of *comes* Ammonios, given the difference in their respective contents. For instance, the subject of economic rationality (or the lack thereof), which has become a recurrent theme in more recent publications which discuss the Apion archive, could be broached thanks to the existence of elaborate accounts of the estate administrators in the Oxyrhynchite documentation.²⁷⁰ Since such documents are absent from the Bawit dossier, no analogous discussion is possible for the monastery. On the other hand, despite the obvious differences between the dossiers, which result from differences in scale and organisation, I believe that the Bawit dossier and the texts related to great estates can be, at least to some extent, seen as complementary. While the Apions' or Ammonios' dossiers contain

²⁷⁰ See, among others, BANAJI, *Agrarian Change* (cit. n. 55); SARRIS, *Economy and Society* (cit. n. 55); HICKEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State* (cit. n. 75); J. BANAJI, 'Agrarian history and the labour organisation of Byzantine large estates', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 96 (1999), pp. 193–216.

detailed accounts compiled on the higher levels of the administrative apparatus, the Bawit documentation (especially the superiors' orders and waybills) helps us understand the everyday activities in an agricultural enterprise. The relative scarcity of accounts in the Bawit dossier can perhaps be explained in terms of the chances of preservation (as a matter of fact, accounts and lists do occur among the Bawit documents, although their state of preservation most often does not allow us to go further than determining the type of the document). The monastery's *diakonia* would need them in order not to 'drown' in minor documents, which abound in the dossier as we know it today, and to exert proper control over the incomes and expenses. However, the documents we have at our disposal reveal a significant degree of formalised, 'estate-like' control of the flow of goods through the hands of monastic administrators.

From the organisational point of view, the Bawit documentation suggests that the monastery combined various forms of land exploitation.²⁷¹ Gesa Schenke distinguished three ways of exploiting the land within the monastic community: first, monks could draw profit from their private landholdings;²⁷² second, they were working on parcels belonging to the monastery; finally, a part of the land owned by the monastery was leased out.²⁷³ The first option is inferred indirectly from our knowledge that at least some of the monks had assets which allowed them, i.a., to act as creditors, pay their personal taxes, and act as guarantors for land-tax payments for their own monastery. It is in this last aspect that the private property of the monks was important to the community as a whole; whatever monks did with it outside the fiscal sphere was probably not that much of a concern as long as their obligations towards the monastery were fulfilled. Monks working on the monastic estate are attested in some of the documents, while the involvement of lay tenants is surmised based on the dossier of the *aparche*-related documents (see above, p. 192).

²⁷¹ For general information on land exploitation by monasteries, see WIPSYCKA, 'Resources' (cit. n. 11), pp. 199–212.

²⁷² We would not expect the monks to farm their own parcels all by themselves; they most probably leased out their land and drew profit collecting its rents and *synetheiai*.

²⁷³ SCHENKE, 'The monastery of Apa Apollo' (cit. n. 19).

Only the second and the third of Schenke's options were directly related to the community's economic concerns.

Apart from land cultivation, the economic life of the monastery was full of other activities, such as transport, production of various goods and items, necessary repairs, etc. These jobs could be done (and in many cases most probably were done) by the monks, but the possibility of 'outsourcing' workforce cannot be altogether ruled out.

Laypeople engaged in the monastery's everyday functioning could be found in a number of spheres, including land tenancy, work done for the monastery on its premises and on the monastic estate, or production and services. On the following pages I will try to trace the non-monastic component in each of these spheres. I am well aware that the assessment of the scale of involvement of laypeople in monastic economy is impossible due to the obscure character of our main sources – brief notices, lists, and letters – the problems with identifying people mentioned in the documents (see above, pp. 181-187), and, last but not least, the uncertain chronology of the documentation. Still, I am deeply convinced that studying phenomena is by no means useless in our effort to understand Late Antique monasticism, even if broader patterns do and will escape us.

Land tenancy must have involved numerous laypeople, but, much to our distress, information about the tenants is almost untraceable in our documentation. P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 b (6a) verso²⁷⁴ is the most direct testimony of land lease to a lay tenant available for the Bawit monastery. It is a letter belonging to the internal correspondence exchanged between monastic functionaries, sent by Enoch and Mena to καὶ George, Helias, and Biktor. The text reads as follows: 'Puisse votre fraternité donner deux *setiôbe* de fourrage à Eieleizerou, le fils de Toual, [...], conformément à l'habitude que vous avez de les donner chaque année. Voici, en effet, un *holokottinos* qu'il a donné pour le monastère avec son *epistalma* pour la neuvième indiction'.²⁷⁵ The subject of the document

²⁷⁴ See DELATTRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGEM, 'Papyrus coptes' (cit. n. 18), pp. 39-42.

²⁷⁵ P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 b (6a) verso, ll. 1-5: μαρε τετηνεμντσοη τι σετιωρε εντε ηρε νειελειζεροη παηρε ητογαλ πα τεη ... ασαφα . προς τσενηοια ετηνετι ημοοη κατα

is the prolongation of a land lease to a layman. The prolongation – apparently not the first one – takes place only after the fulfilment of some financial obligations. The tenant is said to have delivered one solidus to the monastery, together with a document called *epistalma*. Delattre, Pilette, and Vanthieghem accept the interpretation of the first editor of P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 b (6a), Leslie MacCoull, who associated *epistalma* with a documentary type known from Late Byzantine Egypt, Nessana, and Petra, namely the ἐπίσταλμα τοῦ σωματισμοῦ. This *epistalma* was an application filed at the office of a tax collector or his representative with the purpose of transferring fiscal obligations due from a parcel of land from one individual to another. Such requests could follow a change in the ownership rights as a result of a land sale or donation, or arrangements between creditors and debtors or landlords and tenants.²⁷⁶ The identification of Eieleizerou's *epistalma* with such a request, however, is problematic. The Byzantine *epistalmata* implied a long-term, in many cases permanent transfer of fiscal responsibility, whereas the *epistalma* of P. Pierpont Morgan Libr. inv. M 662 b (6a) is explicitly said to have been issued for the ninth indiction year, which suggests that what the scribe of the text had in mind was a different, more ephemeral type of document. In fact, documents from the Arab period provide numerous attestations of the word in two main contexts. First, *epistalma* can refer to a written order, usually issued by the governor, which announced a requisition (in this context the word can be treated as synonymous with *entagion*).²⁷⁷ In other texts, it denotes the fiscal obligations of a taxpayer.²⁷⁸ The *epi-*

ρομπε. εις φολοκ(ο)τ(τινος) γαρ αχτααα επιμονακτη(ριον) μη περεπισταλμα γα εννάτης
 ἰνδ(ικτίωνος); see DELATTRE, PILETTE & VANTHIEGHEM, 'Papyrus coptes' (cit. n. 18), p. 41.

²⁷⁶ For *epistalmata*, see P. Petra 1, pp. 73–81 with table at pp. 80–81 gathering *epistalmata* from locations other than Petra.

²⁷⁷ See F. MORELLI in CPR XXII 54, comm. to l. 2, and comm. to l. 13 of CPR XXII 44; see also R. RÉMONDON in P. Apoll. 69, comm. to l. 4; H. I. BELL, introduction to P. Merton II 100. *Epistalma* as 'governor's order' is well attested in the Aphrodite fiscal dossier of the eighth century (see P. Lond. IV, index, s.v.).

²⁷⁸ See, e.g., O. Medinet Habu 298, ll. 1–6: 'A reckoned tremis has come to me from you, Mena (son of) Peter, as your share of *xenion* and the other assessments (χαπεκμερος ηξενιον μηνικεπισταλμα) in the fifth year, total one-third solidus'; O. Medinet Habu 292, ll. 1–6: 'A reckoned tremis has come to me from you, Georgios son of Isak, as your share of *xenion*

stalma brought by Eieleizerou to the monastery was most probably a document stating the amount of tax assessed in the ninth indiction on the monastic plot Eieleizerou leased. It is unclear whether the solidus brought by Eieleizerou was supposed to cover his rent only (in this case, bringing the *epistalma* to the monastery would mean that the tenant only notified the landlord of the assessment without necessarily undertaking the fiscal responsibility), or the rent and the taxes stated in the *epistalma*. In my opinion, the second option is more probable, as the text seems to suggest that the two actions of Eieleizerou – the payment of one solidus and the delivery of the *epistalma* – were connected. The document is an indirect attestation of a short-term contract of lease of monastic land. Leases of this kind occur frequently in earlier documentation; Jairus Banaji sees them as means by which the landowners ‘were simply maximising their freedom to recruit new labourers if they felt dissatisfied with existing ones’.²⁷⁹ We can imagine that should the tenant prove trustworthy (as was certainly the case with Eieleizerou), the landlord would renew the contract during several indictional years. The system was at work also at Bawit, but whether its application was widespread or limited, we cannot say.

Leasing in the Bawit monastery was not limited to landed property. Line 7 of *P. Mon. Apollo* 17 mentions ‘farmers (?) and sailors’ who most probably belonged to the body of *aparche* contributors of an unknown village. The presence of the sailors (ἡῤῥῆ) may point to the fact that the monastery leased out its boats (see above, p. 219, n. 193). *P. Mon. Apollo* 50 is a guarantee in which three monks, Helias, Pappoute, and Germane declare that they will protect Lazaros, a lay lessee of 214 beehives, against the claims of Enoch the beekeeper (perhaps a monastery employee). Nothing in the document indicates that the three monks were acting on behalf of the monastery. The guarantee, however, was drawn up only to secure Lazaros against a particular situation; we know that it was preceded by a lease agreement, and this may well have been concluded in the name of the

and other assessments (ἐξ πεκμερος ἡξενιον μη κκεπισταλμα) in the ninth year’; the same formula is found in *O. Vind. Copt.* 97, l. 4. See also FÖRSTER, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. ‘ἐπίσταλμα’.

²⁷⁹ BANAJI, *Agrarian Change* (cit. n. 55), p. 206.

community.²⁸⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo* 17 and 50 indicate that lease agreements played a role in the exploitation of monastic property other than land.

In the conclusions of the cited article, Gesa Schenke hypothesises on the status of the tenants of monastic land; by leasing land to people from outside the community, the monks, in her opinion, ‘enable landless villagers to make a living on monastic land which also serves the “holy monastic community”. In this way local farmers and their families might somewhat partake in a sanctified existence, albeit driven most likely by necessity than by religious considerations’.²⁸¹ The question of the tenants’ motivation put aside, there is simply no way to determine who they were. The *aparche*-collection documents mention places, but never people.²⁸² Most of the topographic references in these texts are badly preserved; it seems that the chief orientation points were particular settlements with their respective ‘places’

²⁸⁰ *P. Mon. Apollo* 50, ll. 6–8: ‘Whereas you have drawn up a lease for us for two hundred and fourteen bee(hive)s’ (ὡς ἐπέλεη ἀκσμεν οὐμικῶσις νᾶν ρᾶ φητ μεταβτε ἱνάβ ἱννεβιδ). The monastery needed honey, which appears to have been a standard element of disbursements to Arab officials (see *P. Brux. Bawit* 27 and *P. Camb. UL inv.* 1262; see above, pp. 203–204).

²⁸¹ SCHENKE, ‘The monastery of Apa Apollo’ (cit. n. 19).

²⁸² *P. Mon. Apollo* 3, ll. 5–6: ντμογ[±2]μογ μν νεμα ετ[ηπ ε]ρος (‘Tμου[...]μου and the places which belong to it’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 4, ll. 4–5: μπσακρ[] μπιον προς νεμα ετηπ ερογ (‘Psakh[...] of the wine-press/of the trench in addition to places which belong to it’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 6, l. x+2: μν τκοτς μπασολ (‘and the neighbourhood of Papkol’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 7, l. 5: πμᾶ[μρακοτᾶ] (the place [of Rakota?]), reconstructed based on the docket: τασφαλια νιωραῖνης ρᾶ τερωτ μῆ πμᾶ μρακοτᾶ (‘The guarantee of Iohannes for Terot and Pma m-Rakota/the region of Rakota’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 8, ll. 7–8: ντμογῖκοτερ μν π[] ἄγω τανφε (±3) μν π.[(‘Tmouikoteh and P[...] and Tanshe o(?) and [...]’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 10, ll. 6–8: τκοτς ντσεω [μν τ]κοτς νφεναρω [] παπτοου (‘the neighbourhood of Tsesh(-) [...] and the] neighbourhood of Shenaro [...] Paptou/the one belonging to the τοου’, i.e. the ‘mountain’, or the monastery); *P. Mon. Apollo* 11, ll. 1–4: [τκο]τς νῆκεμιλλεσ μῆ μα ετηπ ερος (‘[. the neigh]bourhood of Nkemilles (?) and places which belong to it’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 14, l. 2: ντῖλοχ (Tilodj); *P. Mon. Apollo* 16, ll. 5–6: εγσεκ ἀπαρχη ρᾶ πενμεριτ νειωτ ἀπα μῆνα . ρμ πελετκῆμε (‘collecting tithes for our beloved father Apa Mena in Peletkeme’); *P. Mon. Apollo* 19, l. 7: μπερσινσε(-) (Perkie(se?)); *P. Mon. Apollo* 22, l. 4: μπερεῖα (Pehna (?)); *P. Mon. Apollo* 23, ll. 2–3: ἀλσοκ ερητ επψακρᾶλωμ ντοκ μν πψαρ μακαρε (‘I have sent you north to Psakhalom, you and the scribe Makare’); *P. Köln ägypt.* II 30, l. 9: ντωρ[ε] (?) (Tohe (?)). For the discussion of the toponyms attested in the *aparche* documents, see CLACKSON, *P. Mon. Apollo*, §3.3.7, pp. 21–22.

(μα) or 'neighbourhoods' (κοιτε).²⁸³ As we have already seen, μα can be treated as the equivalent of Greek *topos*; here, we are reminded of the much earlier, sixth-century Aphrodite cadastre (*SB XX 14669*) with its numerous *topoi* containing often minuscule plots of land held by various tenants. But, in sharp contrast with the Aphrodite document, the only thing we see in the Bawit texts are territorial divisions. *P. Mon. Apollo 17* suggests that the tenants could live in independent village communities. We can hypothesise that when the monastery purchased or inherited parcels in dispersed localities, the acquisition comprised not only the land but also a network of connections with the previous owners or tenants.

In the *aparche*-related documentation lay tenants are virtually invisible. In other types of documents related to management and agricultural produce laypeople are frequently well hidden among the monks; suffice it to recall the editors' frequent remarks on their inability to determine the status of the individuals mentioned in the documents. The task I have set myself may thus appear hopeless; in any case, I will at least try to reflect on some cases in which the presence of laypeople seems probable. I believe, however, that before I proceed to a discussion of these cases I owe the reader a preliminary insight into some aspects of the work organisation in the monastery at Bawit. In what follows I will not focus on craftsmanship or the division of tasks within the community, as these questions have already been discussed in Delattre's introduction to *P. Brux. Bawit*.²⁸⁴ On the other hand, I will draw attention to some documents (including the newly published examples from the Cologne collection) which shed light on the management of the monastic estate.

While discussing land cultivation in the monastic milieu, Ewa Wiprzycka concluded that 'unfortunately, we do not find out if a monastery like Bawit managed a part of its landed property in a direct fashion'.²⁸⁵ Indeed, nothing in the extensive Bawit documentation allows us to deter-

²⁸³ For the origin of the term κοιτε, see commentary to l. x+2 of *P. Mon. Apollo 6*. For the formulary of the *aparche* documents, see *P. Mon. Apollo*, §3.3.6, pp. 20-21.

²⁸⁴ DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 88-93.

²⁸⁵ WIPRZYCKA, 'Resources' (cit. n. 11), p. 207.

mine the role of direct management in the economic activities of the monastery. We need to remember, however, that the definition of ‘direct management’ is not as self-understood as it may appear. Of course, in Bawit there can be no question of direct management with an *epoikia*-based, resident workforce (cf. above, pp. 179–181). The definition of direct management and leasing as opposite extremes is also problematic, especially in a situation when there are no preserved leases to instruct us on the conditions offered by the monastery to its tenants.²⁸⁶ On a more optimistic note, the Bawit documents offer us glimpses of the non-tenant workforce on the monastic estate and allow us to see how monastic administrators handled their managerial tasks.

Some of our texts refer to monks working in the fields. Concerning monastic workforce, Gesa Schenke wrote: ‘Even though the monastery of Apa Apollo seems to have had the manpower needed to cultivate their own land, this might often have seemed impractical or inconvenient due to large distances involved between monastery and property’.²⁸⁷ The distance, however, was certainly not the only criterion according to which workforce was engaged and distributed. On the other hand, the opinion that the monastery was able to provide all agricultural workers it needed from among its residents is certainly an exaggeration which, again, results from the bloated number of monks estimated by Schenke for the Bawit community in the period under discussion.

P. Brux. Bawit 26 and *P. Duk. inv. 259* mention monks connected with the ‘field of Kame’ receiving modest amounts of food (salted fish and bread respectively). The Brussels text describes the recipients as ‘les frères qui sont assignés au champ de Kamè’ (l. 1: ΝΕΣΝΗΥ ΕΥΚΥ ΠΩΡ ΚΑΜΗ), while the other document states that the payment was destined for ‘Apa Kolthe; qui est assigné au champ de Kamè’ (ll. 3–4: ΝΑΠΑ ΚΟΛ[Θ]Ε ΕΥΚΥ

²⁸⁶ Cf. BANAJI, ‘Agrarian history’ (cit. n. 270), p. 204: ‘Nor should the contrast between direct management and leasing be exaggerated, both because the more humble lessees were often simply labourers and the lease more like a labour contract (this was especially true of sharecroppers), and because “tenancy” could be integrated into a regime of direct management [...]’.

²⁸⁷ SCHENKE, ‘The monastery of Apa Apollo’ (cit. n. 19).

πῶς καμῆ). In *P. Brux. Bawit* 26 the use of the designation *σπῆγ* points to the monastic status of the workers; in the latter case the fact that Kolthe was a member of the monastic community is clear from the context. The formula used to express his assignment finds analogies not only in the Brussels document but also in *P. Bawit Clackson* 24, where it is found in connection with an *aparche* assignment.²⁸⁸ It could be a technical expression indicating an assignment of a task by a superior to a monk or a group of monks.

An interesting testimony of the mobility of monastic workforce is found in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 21. In this *πενειωτ πετροζαί* order the superior Keri tells Apa Anouph, an *oikonomos*, to give one *kollathon* of salted fish (*tarichion*) to ‘the brothers of the western workplace’ (l. 2: *νεσπῆγ ἱπμα ἱγῖσε νεμντ*).²⁸⁹ The key information follows: at the moment when the order was issued, the recipients were at a place called Rane where they had been assigned to work at harvest (ll. 2–3: *εγ[κη επμα]ἱρανε ἱχωωλε*).²⁹⁰ The involvement of monks in fieldwork during harvest is known from both literary and documentary sources.²⁹¹ Here, the work is

²⁸⁸ Cf. DELATTRE, ‘Deux ordres’ (cit. n. 18), p. 172 (commentary to l. 4 of *P. Duk. inv.* 259). In *P. Bawit Clackson* 24 (a superior’s order to deliver pieces of clothing to an *aparche* collector) the formula reads as follows (ll. 3–4): *ἡμῶνε εγκη επανκαλου νεωκ ἀπαρχ(η)* (‘to Ammone who is going to Pankalou to collect *aparche*’).

²⁸⁹ Gesa Schenke writes that the same phrase is found in an unpublished papyrus from Vienna, inv. K. 11426 (quoting Alain Delattre who is currently preparing the publication of the text; see *P. Köln ägypt.* II 21, commentary to ll. 2–3). On the possible interpretations of the phrase, see *ibidem*. Schenke mentions the proposition of Anne Boud’hors to interpret *γῖσε* not as the noun ‘work’ but as the verb ‘to spin’. Schenke herself translated the recipients’ affiliation as ‘Brüdern vom westlichen Arbeitsplatz’. If we accept the interpretation of Boud’hors, the essential meaning of the text, which lies in the fact that groups of monks associated with one place or unit could be sent to another place to work there, would not change.

²⁹⁰ *πῆμαἱρανε* is attested in three *οἶνε νεα* ostraca from Bawit in connection with wine (*O. Bawit* 21, 22, and 23). It is also mentioned in *P. Bawit Clackson* 49 (edited first as *O. Bawit* 81), together with other toponyms, Pmanlouga and Pmanallou. Anne Boud’hors proposed to reconstruct it also in *O. Bawit IFAO* 35, l. 3, which reads *οἶνου κν(ὲ)δ(ια) π τό(που) ρα[]* (see commentary *ad loc.* in *O. Bawit IFAO*).

²⁹¹ See WIPSZYCKA, *Moines et communautés* (cit. n. 2), pp. 487–489, for references to monks working in the fields found in the Apophtegms and John Moschos’ *Pratum*. Cf. DERDA &

done for the benefit of the monks' own community, which duly compensates their efforts with a payment in kind. According to Alain Delattre, one *kollatbon* corresponds to ca. 12.5 litres;²⁹² we do not know how many monks were supposed to share it. The document shows that teams of monks affiliated to particular organisational divisions could be sent to different places according to the current needs.

Workers of unknown status appear in clearly agricultural context also in *P. Bawit Clackson* 20. The document is an elaborate ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ order of payment of aracus and barley 'to cultivators of the field of Ταπαροου according to this list' (l. 3: ΝΕΙΟΥΘΙΕ ΝΦΘΙ ΝΤΑΠΑΡΟΥ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΓΝΩ(ΣΙΣ)). The list contains four names, and in its absolute lack of status indicators summarises perfectly one of the main interpretational problems posed by this type of documents. An analogous situation is observed in *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130, which records a disbursement of the total amount of thirty-six *kadoi* of wine to three farmers: Ioannes, Georgios, and another Georgios.²⁹³ Although we do not know who these cultivators were – monks or laypeople – the text still attests to the presence of agricultural workers whose wages were paid in kind in the economic landscape of the Bawit monastery.

Even though our most straightforward attestations of remunerated agricultural workers pertain to monks, we can also find examples of groups of laypeople receiving disbursements in kind, probably as payment for their work. *P. Köln ägypt.* II 22, a ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΖΑΙ order signed by Ioannes and addressed to the 'brothers of the garden of the community' (ll. 1–2: ΝΕΣΝΗΓ ΝΤΕΩΝΗ ΝΠΙΛΑΟΣ) refers to a disbursement of herbs and vegetables to 'the people of Terot' (l. 3: ΝΕΡΩΜ ΤΕΡΩΤ). The products were

WEGNER, 'Letter from Tebetny' (cit. n. 2), where a monastic administrator is asked to send his monks to a village whence they are supposed to be sent to St Eirene, perhaps a church *epoikion* (ll. 25–30: καὶ πέμψατε ἡμῶν τοὺς μονάζοντες τῆς ὑμῶν πατρικῆς διαθέσεως καὶ παρέχομεν τῇ Εἰρήνῃ; standardised transcription).

²⁹² *P. Brux. Bawit*, p. 173; see also N. KRUIT & K. WÖRZ, 'Geographical jar names: towards a multidisciplinary approach', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 46.1 (2009), pp. 65–146, esp. pp. 136–138, with further references.

²⁹³ *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130, l. 4: ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ ΠΟΥΘΙΕ ΜΗ ΓΕΩΡΓΕ ΜΗ ΠΚΕ ΓΕΩΡΓΕ (Coptic letter); ll. 26–28: Ἰωάννου γεγε, Γεωργίου γεγε, Γεωργίου γεγε (Greek account).

to be given to Apa Pkol, who apparently was an intermediary between the group of recipients and the monastery. Admittedly, neither the status of the recipients, nor the agricultural context are certain.²⁹⁴ However, I believe that the lay condition of the men can be proposed on account of their designation as ‘the people of Terot’, in contrast to the undoubtedly monastic ‘brothers of the garden’ in the same document. If we treat Pkol’s title ‘Apa’ as an indication of his monastic status (which is not certain, but probable, given the frequency with which it appears in Bawit in connection with monks)²⁹⁵ we would thus have a group of lay workers represented (and perhaps also supervised) by a monk.²⁹⁶

A monastic supervisor working ‘in the field’ is attested in the letter *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43 (see above, pp. 221–222). The sender, Apa Joseph, wrote from a village where he was apparently staying as an overseer. He reported to his superior, Apa Phoibammon, that he was occupied with the fields (the work he was charged with included sowing, as indicated in lines 30–31, where he explains that he was in need of ‘grain for the fields’). But this was not his only task; the text mentions earlier correspondence of Phoib-ammon and Joseph which was probably connected with problems the latter had faced. The text hints at the fulfilment of the wishes of the village community, most probably thanks to the instructions sent from the monastery.²⁹⁷ Joseph was thus not only a supervisor but also an intermediary between the monastic administration and the villagers. Unfortunately, the text does not state who farmed the land under Joseph’s

²⁹⁴ The document is dated to 22 Phaophi, thus to the period of the Nile flood. While fieldwork on arable land was obviously impossible, it was the moment of harvesting crops in orchards and preparing vineyards for winter (see BAGNALL, *Egypt* [cit. n. 174], pp. 21–22). The ‘people of Terot’ could be employed for such seasonal activities.

²⁹⁵ We ought to note, however, that the word sometimes appears with the names of laypeople as an honorific designation; see DERDA & WIPSZYCKA, ‘L’emploi des titres’ (cit. n. 91). In any case, in the Bawit dossier it is widely used not only as a title of address, but also as an element of personal introduction (cf., e.g., *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43, with the address on the verso: ΤΑΑΣ ΠΑΜΕΡΙΤ ΝΙΩΤ ΕΤΤΑΪΝΥ ΑΠΑ ΦΟΙΒΑΜΜΩΝ ΖΙΓΓΝ ΠΑΠΑ ΙΩΣΗΦ ΠΜΩΝ(ΑΧΟΣ)).

²⁹⁶ Gesa Schenke, the editor of the text, refrains from definite conclusions concerning Apa Pkol’s position; see *P. Köln ägypt.* II, introduction to no. 22, p. 28: ‘Ob Apa Pgol hier als Lieferant der Güter für die Einwohner von Terot fungierte, bleibt spekulativ’.

²⁹⁷ *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43, ll. 15–16: ‘Das Dorf wünschte es’.

supervision, tenants or wage workers.²⁹⁸ We know that the monastery was obliged to pay the village a *synetheia*, claimed rather harshly by a local scribe. The *synetheia* could be a result of contractual arrangement – a lease of land by the monastery or a lease of worker(s) from the village community (see above, pp. 224–225). Both options are equally hypothetical, but even if we choose one of them it would not bring us much closer to a reconstruction of the way the monastery managed its property in the village. Several strategies could be at work at the same time: monastery-owned land could neighbour with leased plots, and the land could be farmed by workforce employed on the basis of various arrangements.

P. Köln ägypt. II 41 is another letter from the milieu of the monastic managers. In the text, a monk named Pamoun addresses his superior Enoch with due reverence and informs him about problems in wine-producing units.²⁹⁹ Pamoun seems to have operated in two places: the ‘Gärten des Ortes Louka’ and the ‘andere Gärten’ (l. 4: ΝΕΒΟΟΜ ΝΠΜΑ ΝΛΩΚΑ; l. 7: ΝΕΚΕΒΟΟΜ). ΒΟΟΜ – a variant of ΒΩΜ – can also be translated ‘vineyard’, which suits better the content of the letter. The tone of urgency and the mention of a date (perhaps a deadline) prompted the editor of the text, Gesa Schenke, to suggest that the whole affair was connected with a tax payment in kind.³⁰⁰ A tax, *embole*, is mentioned in an unclear context in line 7 on the verso. *Embole*, however, was a grain tax, and its appearance here most probably has no connection with the main subject of the letter, which was the organisation of the vintage and collection of empty jars for the wine. In lines 6–7 we read (translation after G. Schenke): ‘Krüge (κοῦφον).

²⁹⁸ The fact that it was Joseph who was responsible for providing sowing-grain does not point toward direct exploitation model, since also in lease arrangements this responsibility could rest with the landlord.

²⁹⁹ The context is clear from the mentions of empty jars (ΝΚΟΥΦΗ, κοῦφον) in l. 6, and ‘Shenoute the vine-dresser’ in l. 9 (ϠΗΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΜΗ(Ε)Λ(ΟΥΡΟΣ)).

³⁰⁰ See the introduction to *P. Köln ägypt.* II 41, p. 87: ‘In diesem Schreiben geht es um das Einsammeln vermutlich eines Erntebeitrags bzw. der Naturalsteuer an einem dafür festgelegten Tag des Jahres’. Schenke connects Pamoun’s activity also with the collection of *aparche*. For a commentary on the document, see also D. DZIERZBIČKA, ‘Monastic vintages’ (cit. n. 56). I would like to express my gratitude to the author for giving me access to her manuscript.

Es gibt nichts anderes. Dieses genügt jenem. Hundert [Maß Wein? ...] Auch nicht aus den anderen Gärten [i.e. vineyard – JW] gibt es irgendetwas Großes'.³⁰¹ In her description of the process of wine production, Dorota Dzierzbicka underscores the importance of vessels, which needed to be collected and prepared before the vintage.³⁰² It is exactly this task that Enoch could have been dealing with on behalf of his superior.

From the collection of the $\omega\text{v}\text{i}\text{n}\epsilon\ \text{n}\epsilon\alpha$ waybills we know that large amounts of wine and must were arriving at the monastery from different locations. It was widely assumed that these documents attest to the vital role played by wine production at Bawit.³⁰³ However, the proportion of wine produced on the monastic estate to wine purchased from other producers cannot be estimated. The $\omega\text{v}\text{i}\text{n}\epsilon\ \text{n}\epsilon\alpha$ documents, which are the main source of knowledge about wine transports to the monastery, say nothing about the manner of wine acquisition, stating only its amount, the date of transport, or the type of the wine (e.g. a series of ostraca edited in *O. Bawit* mention 'old wine', $\eta\text{p}\text{i}\ \text{n}\alpha\text{p}\alpha\sigma$).³⁰⁴ Some of the texts would probably represent wine acquisitions following sales on future delivery; some wine could also be bought in the ordinary way.³⁰⁵ We do not know

³⁰¹ $\eta\text{K}\text{O}\gamma\text{F}\eta\ \mu\eta\ \text{K}\epsilon\text{O}\gamma\alpha\ \text{p}\alpha\iota\ \gamma\omega\omega\ \epsilon\text{p}\epsilon\iota\ \lambda\gamma\omega\ \omega\text{p}\epsilon\ \eta\lambda\lambda[\text{K}\text{O}\text{O}\text{T}\epsilon\ \eta\eta\text{P}\text{i}\ (?)]\ \text{O}\gamma\lambda\epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\text{N}\text{O}\varsigma\ \eta\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\ \gamma\eta\ \text{N}\epsilon\text{K}\epsilon\beta\text{O}\text{O}\text{M}$.

³⁰² DZIERZBICKA, *Wine* (cit. n. 56), p. 150. The author quotes, among others, *P. Oxy.* L 3588 (AD 157) mentioning 7,165 vessels that had to be prepared before 13 Mesore, that is, in the period of vintage.

³⁰³ See, e.g., S. BACOT, 'La circulation du vin dans les monastères d'Égypte à l'époque copte', [in:] N. GRIMAL & B. MENU (eds.), *Le commerce dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Cairo 1998, pp. 269–288, esp. pp. 272–273.

³⁰⁴ *O. Bawit* 1–6, 8–9, 11, 15–18, 21–23, 29, 31–32. Cf. *O. Clackson* 16, ll. 1–3: $\tau\acute{o}\text{p}\text{o}\upsilon\ \nu\text{o}\tau(\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\upsilon\upsilon)\ \delta(\acute{\iota}\alpha)\ \text{T}\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\ \omicron\acute{\iota}(\nu\omicron\upsilon)\ \text{p}\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\ \mu(-)\gamma(-)\ \omicron$. For the reconstruction of the measure (*metra* according to S. Clackson, *megala* or *magarika* according to A. Boud'hors, see BOUD'HORS & CLACKSON, 'Ostraca de Baouît' [cit. n. 18], p. 21, comm. to l. 3 of the document).

³⁰⁵ As we have seen in the section on the loans from Bawit (see above, pp. 231), only one of the loan contracts from Bawit (*P. Mon. Apollo* 38, where the debtor was a monk) was concluded on behalf of the whole community. On the other hand, the $\omega\text{v}\text{i}\text{n}\epsilon\ \text{n}\epsilon\alpha$ waybills, due to the absence of information on the identity of their issuers, cannot be firmly connected with a concrete unit of the monastery, even though it seems logical to ascribe them to the 'central' monastic administration wielding control over the flow of wine through the monastery. Therefore, it appears that there is a gap in the sources which we cannot fill in the present

how much wine was consumed by the monks, but the needs of the monastery were certainly great, given the fact that wine served as payment to workers and was a part of other disbursements.³⁰⁶ Bought wine could constitute an important addition to the monastery's resources, but the monastery certainly produced at least a part of its wine on its own estates. Vine-dressing was a type of agricultural activity which required investment in vine-plants, the equipment (especially watering devices, as vineyards could not be planted on inundated land), and, last but not least, skilled labourers. A rich monastery, capable of bearing elevated maintenance costs, would make a good candidate for vineyard landowner, in the same manner as medium and large estates did.³⁰⁷ Pamoun's concerns in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 41 are best explained if we assume that the vineyards he was dealing with were monastic property. As the letter mentions an *ampelourgos*, the vineyards visited by Pamoun were most probably leased out to professionals, as suggested by Dorota Dzierzbicka.³⁰⁸

Careful reading of the Bawit documents broadens our perspective on the administration of the monastery property. First, we see both monks and laypeople involved in the work for the monastery. The deployment of monastic workforce for farming monastic land may be considered a variation of the direct management system. Workforce outsourced by the monastery must have comprised both permanent cultivators and seasonal

state of our knowledge. We need to take into account the possibility that the monastery as institution concluded loan contracts, including sales on delivery, and that individual monks made use of the monastic infrastructure for transporting products they purchased.

³⁰⁶ On the use of wine in monasteries, see D. DZIERZBICKA, 'Wine consumption and usage in Egypt's monastic communities (6th–8th century)', [in:] A. ŁAJTAR, I. ZYCH & A. OBLUSKI (eds.), *Aegyptus et Nubia christiana. The Włodzimierz Godlewski Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Warsaw 2016, pp. 99–111.

³⁰⁷ Cf. the role of monasteries in olive-oil production in Syria-Palestine: T. WALISZEWSKI, *Elaion. Olive Oil Production in Roman and Byzantine Syria-Palestine*, Warsaw 2014, esp. pp. 245–252; 256; 275–276; see also index, *s.v.* 'monasteries'. For the role of aristocratic landowners in the development of vineyards, see HICKEY, 'Aristocratic landholding' (cit. n. 55), pp. 292–294; see also BANAJI, *Agrarian Change* (cit. n. 55), pp. 60–61 for the role of monasteries ('Monasteries and aristocrats were in the forefront of the revival of wine economy').

³⁰⁸ DZIERZBICKA, 'Monastic vintages' (cit. n. 56). For contracts with *ampelourgoi* in the Hermopolite documentation, see HICKEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State* (cit. n. 75), pp. 75–77.

workers; leased lay workforce can also be taken into consideration, but its presence on the monastic estate is only hypothetical. Both monks and laypeople were remunerated from the resources at the disposal of the monastery's *diakonia*.³⁰⁹ The monastery had a group of 'field representatives' who acted as intermediaries between the institution and groups of people maintaining various relations with the monastery: monastic and lay workers, the monastery's tenants and perhaps the 'lessors' of workforce. The representatives passed the remuneration on to their subordinates, as Apa Pkol did for 'the people of Terot' in *P. Köln ägypt.* II 22, and dealt with the villagers and their representation, sometimes with varying degrees of success (cf. *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43). These administrators could stay at least temporarily in the places where monastic property was located, like Joseph of *P. Köln ägypt.* II 43; the same can be logically assumed for the two men in *P. Brux. Bawit* 15, Apa Ioannes and Apa Kosma, *dioiketai* of the nome of Antinoe.³¹⁰ The mention of Antinoe shows that landed property of the monastery extended beyond the borders of the Hermopolite nome and corresponds well the information found in the sixth-century dossier of Aphrodite, with its mentions of local representatives of monastic absentee landowners.³¹¹ In the correspondence sent to Bawit by the 'field functionaries' we see the mobility of this group of monks engaged in the administration of the monastic estate.

³⁰⁹ For general remarks on the system of remuneration in kind at Bawit, see DELATTRE, *P. Brux. Bawit*, pp. 183–186. Monks receiving remuneration are found in *P. Brux. Bawit* 28, l. 2: (ὑπερ)μισθ(οῦ) μοναζ(όν)τ(ων).

³¹⁰ *P. Brux. Bawit* 15, ll. 1–2: [+ επι]λογος ναπα ιδα(νηης) μη απα [κο]σμα νεδιοικ(η)τ(ης) νιτρου αντινοου.

³¹¹ The Aphrodite dossier attests to the presence of monasteries among the absentee landowners possessing land in the village. The Pachomian monastery at Smine, the monastery of Shenoute, and the Panopolite monastery of Apa Zenobios held plots of land registered in the Aphrodite cadastre (*SB XX* 14669). The monastery of Smine purchased land in Aphrodite from Dioskoros in 565 (*P. Lond.* V 1686) and sub-leased land in the village (*P. Lond.* V 1690); a residence of a monastic *dioiketes* in Aphrodite was damaged by the people of the pagarch in 567 (*P. Cair. Masp.* I 67021). Damage was inflicted on the Aphroditan property of the monastery of Shenoute in 567/568 (*P. Cair. Masp.* III 67319); Dioskoros' cousin, Phoibammon son of Triadelphos, leased land in Phthla near Aphrodite which belonged to the monastery of Shenoute (*P. Ross. Georg.* III 48).

As we have already seen, the Bawit dossier is characterised by the presence of large groups of administrative documents representing a number of characteristic types (see above, pp. 160–165). As these documents refer to such matters as the transport of agricultural products to the monastery (ⲱⲓⲛⲉ ⲛⲥⲁ waybills) or payments (ⲡⲈⲚⲈⲘⲐⲦ ⲡⲈⲦⲐⲘⲁⲓ documents and orders of payment), they offer us a valuable insight into the flow of goods through the monastery, its scale and dynamics. Unfortunately, their usefulness for researching lay involvement in the functioning of the monastery is limited.

The ⲡⲈⲚⲈⲘⲐⲦ ⲡⲈⲦⲐⲘⲁⲓ orders concerning payments and the so-called orders of payment are notorious for their lack of, first, unequivocal status indicators, and second, information why the payments were made. Thus, even if in some (very rare) cases we do catch a glance of individuals who were or could be laypeople, the reasons why they received the disbursements escape us.³¹² For the same reasons, using lists and accounts from Bawit for my purpose is also fraught with difficulties. Lists from Bawit do not introduce clear distinctions between laypeople and monks; moreover, they do not state (or do not preserve) the reason why the disbursements were made. In some documents the occasion for the disbursement is described in a very general manner; for instance, *P. Mon. Apollo* 46 mentions ‘the account of the people of Ten(-?)’ (l. 1: ⲉⲡⲓⲟⲗ(ⲟⲘ) ⲛⲈⲚⲠⲘⲤⲈⲛⲈⲡⲐⲟⲓ),³¹³ who receive, among others, *kollatha* of wine ‘for the festival’ (l. 2: ⲗⲁ ⲡⲱⲗ ⲟⲓⲛⲗ ⲕⲓ). This information can be connected with the mentions of extra disbursements for workers found in other documents.³¹⁴ Other laypeople seem to

³¹² Unless it can be inferred, sometimes only tentatively, from the rest of the document’s content, like in the case of, e.g., *P. Bawit Clackson* 19, where the recipients are ‘men of Ioannes the *shaliou*’ – employees of a local official, entitled to receive payments by virtue of their function, or the monastic *dioiketai* in *P. Brux. Bawit* 15. In any case, we need to take into account that not all of the distributions recorded in administrative documents were payments; at least some of them could have to do with charity (see above, p. 223, n. 201).

³¹³ In her commentary to this place in the text, Sarah Clackson made a careful proposition that ⲉⲡⲟⲓ [] in the text could possibly be interpreted as the beginning of the word *epoikion*.

³¹⁴ Cf. *SB* I 4490 (641 or 656), ll. 23–24: λαβεῖν δ’ ἐμὲ καὶ τὰς ἐξ ἔθους συνηθείας τῶν τε τρυγῶν καὶ ἐορτῶν (‘and I shall receive the customary *syntheia*-payments of vintage and feasts’). The document is a service contract between a *paramonarios* Theodoros (for the term, see HICKEY, *Wine, Wealth, and the State* [cit. n. 75], p. 129; H. FÖRSTER, ‘Neueditionen koptischer Texte aus der Wiener Papyrussammlung’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und ver-*

feature in *P. Mon. Apollo* 45: ‘the men of Ptoh Pemom’ (l. 3: $\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\pi\omega\zeta\ \pi\epsilon\mu\omicron\mu$) and ‘the men of Micholeos’ (l. 8: $\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\mu\iota\chi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$) could possibly be teams of workers originating from (or working at) the listed places.³¹⁵

A number of people working for the monastery are mentioned in the $\omega\iota\eta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\varsigma$ waybills as the persons responsible for the transport of goods from different domains to Bawit; their identity, however, is usually as obscure as in other administrative documents. Many among the $\omega\iota\eta\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\varsigma$ texts mention solely the names of the transporters. On the other hand, a number of transport-related documents feature people styled Αρα , *Abba*, or $\pi\alpha\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\eta$, who were or could be monks of the community.³¹⁶

Less clear are the mentions of people (usually described as $\pi\mu\alpha\lambda\eta\text{-}\beta\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$, ‘camel-drivers’) connected with units which could be parts of the monastery.³¹⁷ In an overview of the monastic production and con-

wandte Gebiete 44 [1998], pp. 285–298, esp. p. 292, commentary to l. 5 of *CPR* IV 168a) and Flavius Athanasios, an *ekdikos* from Arsinoiton Polis. Cf. *SPP* III 96 (640 or 655), a receipt for *misthos* in wheat and money and an unspecified *syntheia* paid to the stableman Ioannes by the *katholike ekklesia* of Arsinoiton Polis. See also above, p. 223, n. 203.

³¹⁵ I believe that the term ‘the people of ...’ can point to the non-monastic affiliation; see above, pp. 261–262. Cf., however, *P. Bawit Clackson* 14, where the expression refers to monks of a monastery of Jeremias. In the bilingual *P. Lond. Copt.* I 1130, the same man is identified once as $\pi\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\ \pi\rho\omicron\mu\ \sigma\iota\mu\omicron\upsilon$ (l. 3, Coptic letter) and *Παμουὴν διάκ(ονος)* (l. 3, Greek account); see DELATTRE ‘La traduction’ (cit. n. 19), p. 221: ‘[...] ainsi Pamoun est décrit comme originaire de Simou dans la lettre copte, mais c’est son titre de diacre, plus officiel et plus prestigieux, qui a été retenu dans le compte grec’. Pamoun’s relation to the monastery is obscure; he could be a member of the community or a deacon of a village church at Simou. On the other hand, the formula ‘X man of Y’ is found in *P. Mon. Apollo* 50, a guarantee for beehives issued by three monks, Helias, Papnoute, and Germane, to ‘Lazaros son of Apollo, beekeeper, of Tbahe’ (ll. 5–6: $\lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\omega\eta\eta\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\ \pi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\ \pi\rho\omega\mu\tau\beta\alpha\kappa\epsilon$), where Lazaros is almost certainly a layman leasing beehives from the three monks (or the monastery; see p. 256). The epigraphic usage is of little help. First, the inscriptions in the monastery – chiefly visitors’ graffiti – were executed by various people and thus would not correspond with the monastery’s documentary usage. Second, the discussed expression is used inconsistently also in the epigraphic material. Among the graffiti in the so called Hall 6 it is used for both monks and laypeople; in the majority of cases, the identity of the commemorated person is impossible to determine. See MASPERO & DRIOTON, *Fouilles* (cit. n. 3), vol. I, pp. 53–120 (esp. nos. 114, 128, 252, 253, 261, 262, 263, 275, 305).

³¹⁶ Αρα : *O. Bawit* 10, 24, 46, 50, 54, 68; *O. Bawit IFAO* 21; *O. Bawit Frib.* 11, 12. *Abba*: *SB Kopt.* II 1028. $\pi\alpha\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\eta$: *O. Bawit* 63, *O. Bawit IFAO* 4, 6, 14; *SB Kopt.* I 228.

³¹⁷ E.g. Phib the shoemaker (*O. Bawit Frib.* 13), called also ‘Phib of the shoemakers’ place’

sumption of wine, Seyna Bacot assumed that the monastery at Bawit transported goods using its own animals and personnel.³¹⁸ In 2006 Jacques van der Vliet published several ostraca from the Los Angeles collection.³¹⁹ One of these, a $\omega\text{INE NCA}$ ostrakon LACMA inv. M.80.202.174, speaks of thirty-three *megala* and thirty-three *knidia* of wine to be delivered by ‘Pamoun of the camel stable of John Kam’ (ll. 4–6: $\text{ΠΑΜΟΥΝ ΠΑΠΚΑΜ(ΗΛΩΝ) ΝΤΕ ΪΩΗΑΝΝΗΣ ΒΑΜ}$). The same man is perhaps mentioned in LACMA inv. M.80.202.186 (here only as $\text{ΠΑΜΟΥΝ ΠΑΠΚΑΜ(ΗΛΩΝ)}$). Van der Vliet observes: ‘In any case, the assignment of individual drivers to stables run or owned by a third party, John Qam or others, shows the development of this branch of transport’. He claims further that ‘in the light of the involvement of these stables, Bacot’s statement that at Bawit the monastery was its own transport firm may need qualification’. The $\omega\text{INE NCA}$ ostraca show that various monastic units had camel drivers associated with them (whether they were only monks or also outsiders hired to serve a particular unit is uncertain), but at least some of the transport services seem to have been outsourced.

Finally, a number of ostraca give the names of transporters associated with various toponyms.³²⁰ Some of the place names can be connected with Hermopolite villages (which sometimes are otherwise attested, like

(*O. Bawit Frib.* 3, 9, and 38), or ‘Phib the camel driver of the shoemakers’ (*O. Bawit Frib.* 31); finally, he can be also identified with ‘Phib the camel driver’ from a document of the same collection (*O. Bawit Frib.* 32). See also Apanok the camel driver of ‘the garden of our father’ (*O. Bawit Frib.* 26); camel-drivers of the cemetery and the baker (*O. Bawit Frib.* 27); Jacob the camel-driver of the cemetery (*O. Bawit Frib.* 29); Phoibammon the camel-driver of the infirmary (*O. Bawit Frib.* 55), and others.

³¹⁸ BACOT, ‘La circulation’ (cit. n. 303), p. 278.

³¹⁹ See MUHS, WORP & VAN DER VLIET, ‘Ostraca and mummy labels’ (cit. n. 18), p. 55, with n. 17.

³²⁰ The connection between the two elements can be made in a number of ways. First, and most frequently, by a simple juxtaposition of the name and the toponym, e.g. in *O. Bawit* 57: ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕ ΜΑΡΗΣ , Epiphane (of/from) Mares, or *O. Bawit* 55: ΩΙΝΟΥΓΤΕ ΜΑΙΟΥΜΑ , Shenoute (of/from) Maiouma. Second, with a genitive, see, e.g. *CPR* XX 4: $\text{ΠΚΟΛΟΒΟΣ ΝΤΜΟΝΟΥΧΕΪ}$, Pkolobos of Tmonouhei, or *CPR* XX 29: ΨΑΟΥΑ ΝΤΙΤΚΚΟΡ , Psaoua of TitkooH. A considerable number of documents use the formula ‘X πα Y, literally ‘X, the one from/of Y’, e.g. *CPR* XX 1: ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΠΑ ΤΕΡΩΤ , ‘Petros, the one from/of Terot’.

e.g., Senesla in *CPR XX 11*); others are toponyms constructed according to the ΠΜΑ Ν- scheme. These toponyms refer most probably to the provenance of the people in question or to their assignment to a part of the estate. We can assume that at least some among those people were villagers hired to supplement the insufficient monastic workforce, but sifting them out of the material is impossible without further hints – the more so as the use of toponyms with monks' names in order to avoid confusion between homonymous individuals was a common practice in the monastic milieu. (see above, pp. 186–187).

The reading of the Bawit administrative dossier with the intention of finding out how important laypeople were for the monastery's everyday functioning may result in pessimistic conclusions. As we saw, groups of people are somewhat better identifiable than individuals; the latter – unless they are labelled with straightforward designations of office or status – are mixed up with monks to the point of being undistinguishable. Our problems with fishing laypeople out of the mass of names that appear in the documents lead to the conclusion that monastic administrators felt no need to maintain a clear distinction between monastic and non-monastic contributors and beneficiaries in the documents they produced. Laymen – most probably workers – appear in the same types of texts as monks (orders of payment, ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ ΠΕΤΣΞΑΙ documents). On the other hand, we see indications that officials or groups of laypeople could have their separate 'accounts' ran by the monastic administration (cf. the accounts of the two Arab officials mentioned in *P. Brux. Bawit 27*, *P. Hermitage Copt. 16* and *P. Camb. UL Michael. 1262*, and the 'logos of the people of Ten(-?)' in *P. Mon. Apollo 46*). The three orders of payment referring to Arab officials were all connected with one monastic administrator and create a 'micro-dossier'; the character of these disbursements, destined for people who were perhaps members of the state apparatus, could account for the creation of separate *logoi* for them. The uniqueness of *P. Mon. Apollo 46*, on the other hand, makes it an unreliable source; we have no guarantee that groups of monks – perhaps living in the same units or belonging to the same working team – did not have separate accounts too.³²¹

³²¹ We have already seen that a monastic subdivision (ἑπί, 'cell') could have its own *dia-*

Monks, laymen, and officials drew income from the same sources, administered by the monastic *diakonia*. *P. Mon. Apollo* 45, an account drawn up by a single person for the monastic administration, in which monks and clerics neighbour with Arabs and groups of villagers, indicates that the same functionaries handled disbursements for various groups of people – at least on the administrative level. This proximity on the managerial plane could, at least in some cases, reflect the physical proximity in which monks and laypeople existed. We know that, aside from monks, monasteries were inhabited by groups of laypeople, including workers and servants.³²² Not all of these people were permanent residents; we may suspect that some of them lived in the monastery only while executing their contracted tasks.³²³ A physical separation of the living and sleeping quarters of monks and lay residents can be assumed, but both groups would be, nevertheless, parts of one economic organism. In some of the cases laymen could be subordinate to monastic administrators, but in other spheres the interactions could be based on collaboration (perhaps in transport, where the services of private stable-owners were used by the monastery). Since the documents do not describe the work for which the payments were made or the periods for which the disbursements were supposed to suffice, we cannot say whether lay workers were treated better or worse than their monastic counterparts. The information we can read from the dossier indicates, however, that laypeople (but also – to a

konia (see above, p. 170, n. 45), which implies also the existence of separate assets and related paperwork within the subdivision.

³²² An example is found in the description of the Naqlun monastery in *The Life of Samuel of Kalamun*, which is said to have housed 120 monks and 200 *kosmikoi* (*Life* 9). The figures are almost certainly exaggerated, but they give us the idea that the lay presence in monasteries was considered so natural that information about laymen outnumbering monks in a monastery could be given without any further explanation.

³²³ Cf. *P. Sarga* 161 (work contract with a carpenter) and *P. Sarga* 164 (work contract with a preservative maker) from the monastery of Apa Thomas in Wadi Sarga. The workmen hired by the monastery were expected to arrive there from the ‘world outside’ to perform their tasks, as indicated by the amounts of fodder assigned for the animals they were supposed to use for transportation (see WIPSZYCKA, ‘Resources’ [cit. n. 11], pp. 196–197). Since their tasks could take more than one day to complete, we would expect them to stay at the monastery during the time they were working.

certain extent – Arab officials) were an integral part of the ‘monastic enterprise’ as viewed from the offices of the *diakonia*.

The dossier of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit is a showcase example of the contribution papyrological documentation can make to our understanding of Egyptian monasticism in Late Antiquity and the various aspects of its functioning, including its relations with laypeople. A monastery, which was an entity endowed with movable and immovable property which had to be administered, worked, and taxed was bound to become entangled in multiple relations with other entities. Monastic organisation served in the first place to secure the uninterrupted functioning of the community. In the rural landscape – the setting in which our story unfolds – this inevitably meant assuming the roles of landlord, manager, employer, and taxpayer. Operating the network of contacts with institutional and individual actors of ‘the world outside’ must have consumed much time and energy of the monastic administrators and constituted one of their main fields of activity. By looking at the workings of these relations we have a chance to gain a better understanding of the communal organisation. What we see is a system in which partial centralisation – visible especially in the fiscal matters and the relations with the state, where neglect and lack of control could prove particularly detrimental – went hand in hand with shared responsibility for day-to-day management. This is visible especially on the executive level, where we see not only the specialised groups of monks with well-defined tasks, such as ‘the brothers of the poll-tax’, but also ‘field managers’ – community members who roamed the *chora* overseeing monastic estates and fulfilling obligations toward lay communities on behalf of the monastery. Based on our present documentation it is impossible to say to what extent the responsibility was shared on the decision-making level. In a system where no monastic rule imposed fixed patterns of behaviour, the solutions applied within the accepted traditional framework could vary from one superior to another. Our documentation suggests that superiors could change with considerable frequency (see above, p. 163), and the executive organisation must have been ready for continuous adjustments.

The position of the monastery’s fellow players: the state and its representatives, village communities, and finally the individuals with various

links to the monastery was defined and secured by a wide range of factors: laws and regulations and the ensuing obligations, but also customary devoirs and common-sense rules of peaceful neighbourly coexistence. The monastic and the lay side maintained the relations through collaboration and negotiations – not always unproblematic – between their representatives.

Apart from the community level, there was also the sphere of the monks' individual activity; it is exactly here where papyrological documentation belies in the most striking manner the clear-cut models of the literary narratives. Monastic literature presents on the one hand the anchorites who could retain property but were expected to avoid any attachment to it,³²⁴ and the coenobitic monks who renounced private possessions and relied on the monastery for their subsistence on the other. Papyrological documentation, however, shows us the mixed-type communities such as Bawit, where monks who shared the same physical space and affiliation to the same monastic organisation had financial means of their own which they could invest, lend (sometimes on interest), or spend on their own needs.³²⁵ Archaeology and papyrological record suggest that the community of Apa Apollo included people of means (the Bawit monastery is a striking testimony that, e.g., the desire to inhabit a relatively comfortable and neatly decorated house whose construction and furnishing must have been costly, was not alien to the monks). We can expect that, armed with their experience of the worldly affairs, they would not only continue to pursue their individual social and economic

³²⁴ A model example was an anchorite who went to work as day-labourer during harvest and, having forgotten that he had ever possessed any earthly property, was hired by his own tenant and toiled on his own field without even realising it (*Apophthegmata Patrum*, alphabetical series, Isaac 4). The question of distancing oneself from one's property as expounded in monastic ideology is discussed in J. E. GOEHRING, 'Monasticism in Byzantine Egypt: continuity and memory', [in:] R. S. BAGNALL (ed.), *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 390–407.

³²⁵ A similar model of monastic organisation with financially independent monks within a broader monastic organisation is observable in the seventh–eighth-century dossier of the monastery of Apa Apollo at Deir el-Bala'izah and the earlier (sixth–seventh century) dossier of Deir el-Naqlun (see above, pp. 148–149, n. 2)

roles (e.g. as the providers of credit), but also assume new roles, working for their community as representatives and administrators as a part of the the networks connecting the monastery and 'the world'. For the time being, however, these considerations must remain hypothetical.*

Joanna Wegner

University of Warsaw
Institute of Archaeology
Department of Papyrology
NCN Project: 'Monks and Monastic Communities
in the Eastern Mediterranean (4th–8th c.)'
Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warsaw
POLAND
e-mail: jnnwegner@gmail.com

* The present article is part of the project 'Monks and Monastic Communities in the Eastern Mediterranean (4th–8th Centuries)' carried out under the direction of Ewa Wipszycka at the University of Warsaw and funded by the National Science Centre, Poland (Maestro 7 funding scheme, UMO-2015/18/A/HS3/00485).