The fragments of this roll have text on both sides. Hence, as they could not be glued on Japanese paper, their condition is very poor. The main part of the roll comes from fragments labeled F. The core is found in successive folds consisting of frs. F18–F34 (frs. F33–F34 contain nineteen folds). The term “fold” is used here for a half-revolution of the original roll (see P. Petra IV, p. 42). The fragment stack F3–F17 represents the outer folds (see below). Additional assemblies F1 and F2 consist of loose fragments, and pieces from several rolls have evidently been mixed in. None of the F1 pieces has the same hand or contents as our document. F2 includes pieces from another roll, too, but quite a number belong in the present document and can be placed to join other F fragments.

Fragments labeled E mostly belong in another roll per the drawing in the conservation notes. However, frs. E4.1 and E4.2, as well as E3.4, seem to have text from this document.

The text is a lengthy list of toponyms written transversa charta along the fibers. Only the beginnings of the lines with the left margin are extant. The length of the lines cannot be assessed, and, in a list where every line begins a new entry, the lines may well have been of different size. The document seems to break at the roll’s core, and the same holds for the text on the recto (63). The last sheet or sheets (kollemata) were evidently detached before the document was rolled up for the last time. The fact that this text was labeled by the conservators as verso probably indicates that it was on the outer side of the papyrus. Nevertheless, we assume that the list represents the roll’s final use. It was probably left on the outer side because the curved sheets could not easily be rolled up the other way around.

The position of the verso text emerges from the fact that when the pieces are arranged so that the list of toponyms runs logically in the same writing direction (towards the roll’s core), the recto text on frs. F18–F34 has the same direction, whereas the recto text on frs. F3–F17 is upside down. Therefore, the document on the verso cannot have been written on an intact recycled roll, but sheets from several documents must rather have been glued together to form the new roll. We believe that the number of different texts on the recto was two or more likely three (published as 63 A, B, and C).

The arrangement of the roll fragments meets a problem with the fragment stack F3–F17, which clearly includes layers either from the upper or, more probably, from the normally better-preserved lower part of the flattened roll. Of the layers from the opposite side, only tiny pieces have been attached to the upper or lower edge of the main frs. F7–F17. The fragment numbers obviously show the order in which the conservator separated them, but we do not know whether she had the recto or verso side up. The height of the fragments decreases from F17 (2.9 cm) to F3 (2.2 cm), suggesting that F3 was closer to the roll’s core, i.e., the end of the list. At the core, the fold height is 1.1 cm. Based on these measures, the edited text begins with fr. F17, followed by F16–F3,
and finally F18–F34. The chosen sequence is not quite certain, but, in a list where every line forms a separate item, the alternative order (simply F3–F34) would not really change our basic understanding of the document.

In both cases, the fragments F17–F3, with their missing counterfolds, give the first 28 folds of the reconstructed roll. The approximate length of these folds is 70 cm. The better-preserved core of the roll in frs. F18–F34 gives 45 folds with an approximate length of 66 cm. The extant remains of the document thus measure approximately 135 cm, the first part covering 57 lines, the latter part only 63 lines, due to the decreasing distance between lines. This length suggests that both parts consist of four sheets, but no sheet-joins (kolleseis) have been detected in the fragile material. Furthermore, there is no indication that the document once began with F17 and, as mentioned, it did not originally end with F34, which is now at the roll’s core.

The hand is upright and the letters written in a regular, medium-sized cursive. Towards the end, the hand loses some of its regularity.

The document lists plots of grainfield, σπορ(ίμη), and vineyard, ἀμπελών, one for each line. Three points of interest arise from the list: the great number of Arabic plot-names, the three quality-classes of both grainfields and vineyards, and a few subtitles which must somehow reflect the way the plots were arranged in the list. Unfortunately, none of these is enough to establish the document’s nature and purpose.

The list offers fifty wholly and twenty-five partly preserved Arabic place-names, always preceded by the abbreviation tau with a dot above it, standing for τόπος. When discussing another Petra document with rich toponomastics, 17, we concluded that such toponyms belong to single agricultural plots (P. Petra II, pp. 70–74), and the same interpretation fits well this list. The Arabic of the toponyms in 17 is treated in P. Petra II, pp. 23–48, and the whole valuable material of pre-Islamic Arabic offered by the Petra archive is discussed in the Introduction of this volume, pp. 35–55. As the toponyms of the present document are fully analyzed there, they are not dealt with in the commentary here.

After the toponym, the type of land is given as either a grainfield or a vineyard, followed by the letter alpha, beta, or gamma. These letters must give the land’s quality-class. The best documentation of such a classification system comes from the Syro-Roman Lawbook, §121. It refers to Diocletian’s reign and gives the different areas corresponding to one taxation unit (iugum) as follows: five iugera of vineyard, twenty iugera of first-class grainfield or forty iugera of second-class grainfield or sixty iugera of third-class grainfield. Epiphanius of Cyprus also recognizes the classification, but gives different figures: one iugum contains five arurae of first-class grainfield or six arurae of second-class grainfield.1

As essential as this classification would seem to be for the taxation of agricultural land, ancient documents themselves bear minimal evidence of it. In the census registers of Asia Minor, connected with Diocletian’s fiscal reforms,2 only those of Lesbos show the classification, and, even there, only one of the seven preserved lists (IG XII.2 79). This shows that the classification system concerned not only grainfields but also vineyards, for which at least the first- (a 2, 8) and second-class (a 11) were recorded.

In our list, both grainfields and vineyards seem to be divided into three quality-classes. What is interesting, the same plot may contain land in more than one quality-class. In these cases, the second and the possible third entry begin with τόπος τὸ αὐτό—the combination “topos and Arabic name” is clearly understood as a neuter. We have examples of three quality-classes in one plot in ll. 7–9 (grainfield) and ll. 75–77 (vineyard), for two quality-classes in ll. 16–17 (grainfield), 18–19 (grainfield), 20–21 (unknown), 25–26 (grainfield), 36–37 (grainfield), 40–41 (unknown), 72–73 (vineyard) and 103–4 (grainfield).

After the quality-class, the size in iugera follows. Most lines have not been preserved to the extent that the size would remain visible. Thus, the total size of the listed property cannot be estimated. The plots must nevertheless have been quite small, as in 17 (see P. Petra II, pp. 69, 89): we can see eight plots of one iugerum

---

1. Schilbach, Quellen, 48.6; Metrologie, 71. See also Kaplan, Les hommes et la terre, 208–9; Frank, Economic Survey, 144–46.
(plus possibly a fraction), one of three iugera (l. 92), and one, called Lasaeib, of five iugera of grainfield, of which three are of the second class and two of the first class (ll. 103–4).

The rest of the entries, after size, cannot be reconstructed. The longest line, 106, seems to continue with δ(ιά), possibly followed by εἴρη [μεν (from a separate fragment). The same preposition recurs in ll. 109 and 115, and in the subtitles in ll. 23, 28, 38, and 98. In l. 115, we can read δ(ιά) της ἄγιο(τάτης) ἐκλησίας ("through the most holy church") and in ll. 38 and 109 δ(ιά) αὐτῆς. In the census registers, such as, e.g., the cadaster of Aphrodito (P. Freer 1–2), the person or institution giving the declaration of a property is usually indicated by a similar phrase. The extant part of the list does not contain any personal names. The whole property may have been owned by one person, mentioned in the lost heading, or the owners were specified later in the entries through the διά phrase. Instead, the list records the towns of Petra (l. 98) and Augustopolis (ll. 13 and 117) as well as an unknown village (l. 83). Furthermore, the local adverb ἐκεῖ ("there"), quite unusual in such lists, appears in ll. 23, 28, and 38, followed by δ(ιά) αὐτῆς, while, in ll. 98 and 117, it is found in connection with the towns of Petra and Augustopolis.

The appearance of Petra and Augustopolis in the same list is not surprising. The collection of taxes from these two municipalities had been at least partly combined, as 19 1–2 shows: χρυσοδέκταις τής διὰ τῶν δ’ αὐτῆς ἐξ όμάδος Ἀγγεουστοπόλεως ὅριο(ν)ιον. The preserved lines offer the following subtitles:

13 † δεικ( ) Αὐγ(ουϲτο)π(όλεωϲ) ἰ(ούγερα) ζ[
23 ἐκ(εὶ) δ(ιά) αὐτῆς [
28 ἐκ(εἰ) δ(ιά) αὐτῆς [
38 ἐκ(εἰ) δ(ιά) αὐτῆς [
83 † ἐν κόµ[η[
98 † ἐκ(εἰ) Πέτρων δ(ιά) τ[ ι[117 † ἐκ(εἰ) Αὐγ(ουϲτο)π(όλεωϲ) ἐκεῖ[

The abbreviation δεικ( ) in l. 13 presents a problem. No form of the verb δείκνυμι seems to give a suitable meaning. The word ὁριοδεικτία, used in Karanis in Egypt, with the meaning "(taxation) district," usually in the phrase θηϲαυρὸϲ ὁριοδεικτίαϲ Καρανίδοϲ, would make sense, but not without ὁρι-. Another Petra document, a lease of a vineyard, seems to have the same word in a similar context, ἐν τῳ Ζακ(ο) κ[ο]ι[ν]ῳ (59 12).

The abbreviation might be understood here, too, as δεικ(αια), despite the spelling δεικ(. ). This term was used in Egyptian documents for land plots which, per a recent analysis, were acquired and possessed by a new owner, but still registered under the former owner. In the Apion accounts, the term was also used for properties situated in one administrative location but appearing on the register / cadaster for another location. In l. 13, then, these particular plots might have been signaled as part of the register for Augustopolis. Line 13 may give a total of the preceding list, if the character after ἰ(ούγερα) is really a sigma, but it may as well be the subtitle for the following entries.

The abbreviation εξ( ) of ll. 98 and 117 has been attested in a similar context in the tax receipts 7 3, 8 2, 9 3, and 10 3: εξ( ) Πετρῶν καὶ εξ( ) Ἀγγεουστοπόλεως. In P. Petra I, εξ was understood as a preposition, but it was already noted that the form εξ oddly enough appeared before Πετρῶν too, where we should have had ἐκ. In his review, Jean-Luc Fournet noticed the abbreviation mark crossing the tail of the xi, offering the following plausible explanation for the abbreviation. 6

---

3. We are indebted to Peter Thonemann for this suggestion.
5. We are indebted to Todd Hickey for this suggestion.
The Novella 12.4 of Tiberius II distinguished between three categories of land, χωρία ἐλευθερικά, ἐξακτωρικά, and βουλευτικά. The law gave no explanation for these terms, but ἐλευθερικά is commonly understood as land owned by private, “free” owners (as opposed to imperial tenants), who paid their taxes through local curiales.7 The term ἐλευθερικόϲ had not appeared connected with land in any papyrus document before our six requests for transfer of taxation (3 6 , 8 , 9 , 11 , 4 12 , 5 3 , 19 6 , 23 13 , 24 2) and an exchange of land (50 98 , 107). The two other terms, ἐξακτωρικά and βουλευτικά, had remained even more obscure, being absent as well from Egyptian papyrus documents. Now, the first term may lie behind the abbreviation εξ( ) in 7–10, and the appearance of the same form in this list seems to confirm the hypothesis. The Petra texts do not help to assess what kind of land ἐξακτωρικά might mean. We can only say that the terms ἐλευθερικά and ἐξ(ακτορικά) are never used in the same document.8 The word εξακτορικά is naturally connected with the title ἐξάκτωρ (Lat. exactor). This title does not occur in the Petra archive, though we have ἐξακτορία in three documents (30 187, 31 204, 249, 269, 35 25), always without further context. However, the tax receipt 33 3–4 may explain the term to a certain extent: [πάντα τά] ἐξακτορευόμενα δι’ αὐτῶν ἐξ ὁμάδ(οϲ) [Αὐγουϲτοπόλεωϲ. The taxes covered by that receipt were paid annually to the curiales of Augustopolis, while, in Egypt, ἐξακτορική τάξιϲ seems to have been a group of landowners responsible for the collection of taxes in communities adjacent to their large estates.9

In any case, the term ἐξακτορικά in our list may connect it to taxation, and this impression is reinforced by the quality classification of the plots. Such an arrangement would be more difficult to explain if it had been written only for private purposes. The logic behind the order of the plots cannot be determined, especially as the fragments’ exact sequence remains uncertain. Since the order is not alphabetical, however, it may well be geographical. There are some homonymous plots or, less probably, the same plot appears twice in the list, perhaps because it contained both grainfield and vineyard. Thus, we have the vineyard Asmatha in l. 3 and the grainfield Asmatha in l. 99 (cf. also Dabar Esar[ in ll. 18 and 27). As the list was written on a roll composed of recycled sheets, it presents at most a draft of an official list. The connection with Theodoros and his family remains open. The roll was found in the smaller deposit, separate from the bulk of the papyri (see P. Petra I, p. 6, Fig. 4, and p. 1 of this volume), so it may not have been part of his personal papers at all.

7. See P. Petra I, p. 76, with further references.
8. While ἐξακτορικά is the form appearing in the Novella cited above, ἐξακτορικώϲ is more correct.
9. See 33 3–5 comm., with further references.
τό(πος) Ουαδη Σαμμ[αρ
traces
16
[  
τό(πος) τό αὐτό επορ(ίμης) [  
τό(πος) Δαβ[αρ Eαρ[  
τό(πος) τό αὐτό επορ(ίμης) [  
20
[ . . . . ]ε, εἰμι[
τ[ό(πος)] τό α[ὐτό
tό(πος) Εραμαεια [  
ἐκ(εἰ) δ(ώ) αὐτῆς [  
24
[  
τό(πος) τό αὐτό επορ(ίμης)  
τό(πος) Δαβ[αρ Eαρ[  
28
ἐκεῖ δ(ώ) αὐτῆς [  
[  
τ[ό(πος)] Μαλ Γρ, [  
τό(πος) Κει[βα άμπ(ελόνων) [  
32
τό(πος) Σα[ρ]γ[α] Ενεν[  
[  
τό(πος) λα-Λαρνεικ επορ(ίμης)  
τό(πος) Κοτομανα[  
36
[τό(πος) . . . ]θαγ[  
τό(πος) τό α[ψ]τ[ό επορ(ίμης) [  
ἐκεῖ δ(ώ) αὐτῆς [  
[τό(πος) . . . ]βαδειαν, [  
40
[  
τό(πος) τό αὐτό άμπ(ελόνων)  
τό(πος) Δαβ[αρ Сароθ] [  
44
[τό(πος) Сα[ρ][α][θ] [  
τό(πος) Сароθ Νατα[  
[  
48
τό(πος) Μαθ Беви[ , ζ] еп(εξορίμης)  
[  
[traces
52
τό(πος) Μαθ Кαμμ[  
[  
τό(πος) Мαλ Λο[  
56
τό(πος) [  
[  
τ[ό(πος) , , ]μαλ Καια . . . [  
τό(πος) Мαλ Μαξίζα[  
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60 το(ποϲ) Μαλ Κακαδεν κπ[σρ(ίμηϲ)
το(ποϲ) Μοραθ Ζεν[ 
το(ποϲ) α]λ-Ρακαιλ[α] κπ[σρ(ίμηϲ)
το(ποϲ) Εβαλ ελ-Γορον ἀ[μπ(ελώνων)
64 το(ποϲ) Μαρβας Αλεβ[οє][υϲ
το(ποϲ) Μαλ Νακα κπ[σρ(ίμηϲ)
το(ποϲ) Μαλ Καδε[ι ςπ[ορ(ίμηϲ)
το(ποϲ) Μοραθ Ζεν[ 
[το(ποϲ)] Κουαβα[ι]
68 το(ποϲ) C[.,],[.,]ξλ[.,]ρα,[,.,][ 
[.,.][,.[ 
[το(ποϲ) Μ[.,,]ραμ_ςιαق[ 
72 το(ποϲ) Α[ 
[το(ποϲ)] το αὐτό ἀμπ(ελώνων) [ 
το(ποϲ) Τσλακεν ἀ[μπ(ελώνων) [ 
[το(ποϲ) ?]μπή εμάθ ἀ[μπ(ελώνων) α 
76 το(ποϲ) το αὐτό ἀμπ(ελώνων) β ἰ(ούγερα) [ 
[το(ποϲ)] το ἀμπ(ελώνων) γ ἰ(ούγερα) [ 
το(ποϲ) Ουαθε [.,.] ἀμπ(ελώνων) α ἰ(ούγερα) [ 
το(ποϲ) Ελ-Κεμβε[α (?) ἀμπ(ελώνων) γ [ 
80 το(ποϲ) Νααρ Εμα Βε[. [ 
το(ποϲ) Μαλ Νεμαλ_ ἀμπ(ελώνων) [ 
το(ποϲ) [ c. 7 ] ῥα ε[π](μπ[ς] [ 
† ἐγ κόμη[ 
84 το(ποϲ) ΜαλΕ Ζεαθ_ , κπορ(ίμηϲ) [ 
το(ποϲ) Αλμαθ κπορ(ίμηϲ) β ἰ(ούγερον) α τρίτον ?] 
το(ποϲ) Μαλ Σαμμαρ κπ[σρ(ίμηϲ) [ 
το(ποϲ) Μαλ Ζαδει κπορ(ίμηϲ) [ 
88 [το(ποϲ)? Μαβ[ Γαλ_ [ 
το(ποϲ) Γαλ[.,.,.,.,.]φίλα κπορ[β(ίμηϲ) [ 
το(ποϲ) λ-Αλεβεκ κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερον) α . .[ 
το(ποϲ) Α[ c. 9 ] κπορ(ίμηϲ) β [ί(ούγερα) [ 
92 το(ποϲ) Μαθ Σηρ κπορ(ίμηϲ) β ἰ(ούγερα) γ . [ 
το(ποϲ) Ουαθ Επαθ κπορ(ίμηϲ) β [ 
το(ποϲ) ΓελθΒ Βηρ κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερα) [ 
το(ποϲ) Νακβατα κπορ(ίμηϲ) α [ 
96 [το(ποϲ) Μ]γαλ Τουβ κπορ(ίμηϲ) β [ 
το(ποϲ) Εβαλ Γορον κπορ(ίμηϲ) [ 
† ἐκει ἐξ(κτορικά) Πέτρον δ(ιὰ) τ[ 
το(ποϲ) Ακμαθα κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερα) α [ 
100 [το(ποϲ)] Μαθ Λουθ κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερα) [ 
το(ποϲ) Μαθ ελ-Ουαδει κπορ(ίμηϲ) 
το(ποϲ) Βαιγα κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερον) γ [ 
το(ποϲ) λ-Αλεβιβ κπορ(ίμηϲ) β ἰ(ούγερα) γ [ 
104 το(ποϲ) το αὐτό κπορ(ίμηϲ) α ἰ(ούγερα) β [ 
το(ποϲ) Καβιβ ελ-Αλεβιβ κπ(μπ)[ίμηϲ) [ 
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1. The plot Math [ . . . ], grainfield . . .
2. The plot Kagoroph, grainfield . . .
3. The plot Asmatha, vineyard . . .
4. [The plot . . . ]oureb, vineyard . . .
5. The plot Araa Nik, grainfield [of the first class, x iugera . . .]
6. The same plot, grainfield of the second class, [x] iugera . . .
7. The same plot, grainfield of the third (?) class, x iugera . . .
8. [The plot . . . ]oureb, vineyard . . .
9. The plot Eramaeia . . .
10. There, through the same [ . . .]
11. The plot Mal Gr[ . . .]
12. The plot Keisba, vineyard . . .
13. The plot Ouadē Sammar . . .
14. The same plot, grainfield . . .
15. The plot Dabar Esar[ . . .]
16. There, [through] the same . . .
17. The same plot, grainfield . . .
18. The plot Mal Gr[ . . .]
19. The plot Keisba, vineyard . . .
20. The plot Ouadei . . . , vineyard of the first class, x iugera . . .
21. The plot el-Keisba (?), vineyard of the first class . . .
22. The plot Naar Ega Be[ . . .]
23. The plot Male Zaeid[  
24. The plot Admath, grainfield of the second class, one and a third (?) iugera . . .
25. The plot Mal Sammar, grainfield . . .
26. The plot Mal Sadaei, grainfield . . .
28. The plot Gal[   
29. The plot laphth [ ]ebath, vineyard [of the first class . . .
30. The same [plot], vineyard of the second class, [x] iugera . . .
31. The same plot, vineyard of the third class, [x] iugera . . .
32. The plot Ouadei . . . , vineyard of the first class, [x] iugera . . .
33. † In the village . . .
34. The plot la-Ara Neik, grainfield . . .
35. The plot Kotomana[ . . .]
36. [The plot . . .]thakh[ . . .]
37. The same plot, grainfield . . .
38. There, through the same . . .
40. (42) The plot Dabar Saroth . . .
42. The plot Saroth . . .
43. [The plot Nata[ . . .
44. The plot Math Ben[ . . .]
45. The plot Math Kaum[ . . .]
46. The same plot, grainfield . . .
49. (61) The plot Morath Zen[ . . .
50. (62) The plot al-Rameila, grainfield . . .
51. (63) The plot Ebal el-Goron, vineyard . . .
52. (64) The plot Marbas Alebo[us . . .
53. (65) The plot Mal Nasa, grainfield . . .
54. (66) The plot Mal Sadel[ . . .
55. (67) [The plot] Kouabel[ . . .
56. (68) The plot S] . . .
57. (71) The plot M[ . . .
59. (73) The same [plot], vineyard . . .
60. (74) The plot Tollauen, vineyard . . .
61. [The plot] laphth[ ]ebath, vineyard [of the first class . . .
62. (75) The same [plot], vineyard of the second class, [x] iugera . . .
63. (76) The same plot, vineyard of the third class, [x] iugera . . .
64. (77) The plot Ouadei . . .
65. (78) The plot el-Keisba (?), vineyard of the first class . . .
67. (80) The plot Naar Ega Be[ . . .
68. (81) The plot Mal Neimal, vineyard . . .
69. (82) The plot [ . . .]
70. [The plot] ra, grainfield . . .
71. (83) † In the village . . .
72. The plot Mal Zaeid[ . . .]
73. The same plot, grainfield . . .
74. (84) The plot Mal Sammar, grainfield . . .
75. (85) The plot Admath, grainfield of the second class, one and a third (?) iugera . . .
76. The plot Mal Sammar, grainfield . . .
77. The plot Mal Sadaei, grainfield . . .
79. (87) The plot Mal Sadaei, grainfield . . .
(90) The plot l-Aselei, grainfield of the first class, one iugeron . . . (91) The plot L[ . . . , grainfield of the second class, [x] iugera . . . (92) The plot Math Sēr, grainfield of the second class, three iugera . . . (93) The plot Ouadei Eirath, grainfield of the second class . . . (94) The plot Geleth Bēr, grainfield of the first class, [x] iugera . . . (95) The plot Nasbatha, grainfield of the first class . . . (96) [The plot] Mal Toub, grainfield of the second class . . . (97) The plot Ebalgoron, grainfield . . .

(98) † There, the exactoric fields of Petra, through . . . (99) The plot Asmatha, grainfield of the first class, one iugeron . . . (100) [The plot] Math Louse, grainfield of the first class, [x] iugera . . . (101) The plot Math Ouadei, grainfield . . . (102) The plot Baseiga, grainfield of the first class, one iugeron . . . (103) The plot l-Asaeib, grainfield of the second class, three iugera . . . (104) The same plot, grainfield of the first class, two iugera . . . (105) The plot Kasb el-Asaeib, grainfield . . . (106) The plot B . . ke, grainfield of the first class, one iugeron . . . (108) The plot Mal . . . , grainfield of the second class, one iugeron . . . (109) [The plot?] al-Ber Arabais, through the same . . . (111) The plot Math al-Asekh, grainfield of the first class, [x] iugera . . . (112) The plot el-[ . . . , vineyard of the second class, [x] iugera . . . (114) The plot Throda . . . , grainfield of the second class . . . (115) The plot Mal B[ . . . , through the most holy church . . . (116) [The plot] Math Saemen[ . . . , grainfield . . .

(117) † The exactoric fields of Augustopolis, there: (118) The plot Aksab, grainfield of the first class, one and a half iugera . . . (119) The plot Padamath, grainfield of the first class, one iugera . . . (120) The plot Mal [ . . . , through the most holy church . . . (121) [The plot] Mal B[ . . . , vineyard of the second class . . .

COMMENTARY

1 Μ[θ] χ[ . . . , cxopol(μς)]: the second part of the plot name remains unknown, but the traces of the second letter seem to suit only a chi. Of cxopol(μς), only the typical abbreviation stroke crossing the lower part of rho is visible. We write the word in the feminine, as it was used in 17. It was followed by the quality-class (α–γ), the siglum for iugeron and the number of iugera.

3 Ακμαθα: see Introduction, p. 43. The name reappears in l. 99 but as the name of a grainfield and probably in the district of Petra, while here it may rather be located in Augustopolis (cf. l. 13). We read άαη( ) as άαη(ελώνων), the form met in 17.

4 , θουρεβα: or alternatively , θουρεβ ἀμπ(ελώνων). The space is sufficient for Μαθ Ουρεβ. The meaning of the name remains unknown.

5–7 The size of the gap is estimated assuming that the height of the fold is roughly the same as that of the main fragment F17, while the loose fragment below belongs to the lost counterfold. This gives the best sequence for the increasing fold height, running from the roll’s core towards its outer parts.

7 Αραανικ: see Introduction, p. 42. The same name may reappear in l. 34 λα-Αραανικ.

8 τό(πος) τό αὐτό: the document treats τό(πος) + Arabic name as a neuter.

9 cxopol(μς) γ(?): this plot contained grainfield in three quality-classes. The second entry (l. 8) is the only one where the number for the class (β) is preserved. It is possible, albeit unlikely, that the list gave the third class before it and the first class in the last place. Cf. ll. 103–4, where the second class precedes the first one. In the mutilated ll. 75–77, the vineyard classes seem to come in the order first–second–third.

13 δεικ( ): for a possible supplement, see Introduction above. The line may sum up the preceding entries, as after Augustopolis follow the normal siglum for iugeron and possibly the number 200 (letter sigma), or alternatively cxopol(μς). In any case, the words were in a different order than in the normal entries.

14 ΟυαδηϹαμμ: cf. ΜαλϹαμαρ in l. 86. See Introduction, p. 50.

18 Αβαρ Εϲαρ: also in l. 27. See Introduction, p. 43.

23 ἐκ(εί) δ(ι) αὐτή(ς): cf. ll. 28 and 38. διά was commonly used in census and tax lists for the person who gave the declaration or paid the tax, especially when there were several proprietors.
62. LIST OF AGRICULTURAL PLOTS

29 The conservator placed between F11 and F10 a tiny fragment with ἰμνως, which might belong in this line, possibly τὸ (ποϲ) Μαγ Μα.

31 Κειϲβα: cf. ελ-Κειϲβα (?) in l. 79. See Introduction, p. 44.

34 λα-Αρανικ: the form λα of the article appears in Petra also in λα-Αβλα (20 2); see Introduction, p. 39. Cf. Αρανικ in l. 7, and see Introduction, p. 42.

41 The broken word was more probably ἀμπ (ελώνων) than ςπ (ίμηϲ).

42 ΔαβαϹαροθ: cf. ll. 44–45, and see Introduction, p. 44.

52 There seems to be a line drawn above this line (if it is not a kollesis).

54 Above τὸ (ποϲ) of l. 55, there seems to be the lowest end of a diagonal. If this is ink, it does not fit an entry beginning with τὸ (ποϲ), but possibly ἐκ (εῖ), as in l. 23.

58 τ吉林省 , μαλ Καια 吉 吉: see Introduction, p. 45. An alternative word division is 吉 吉 μαλ καὶ αλ-Ν, which would offer the only double plot-name containing καὶ in the present document. In other Petra texts, this type, as well as the names with ἑις, were common.

63 Εβαλ ελ-Γορον: cf. Εβαλ Γορον in l. 97, and see Introduction, p. 44.

65–66 Between these lines from two different fragments, there may have been one more line, as the trace below the sigma of Ναϲα in l. 65, which looks like the top of a beta, does not fit in l. 66.

67 Κουαβελ: on the unplaced fr. 1 (E3.4), the same name may appear: τὸ (ποϲ) Κουαβελ. See Introduction, p. 45.

68–72 These lines come from the messy assembly of pieces F22. There are two left margin pieces with the same format, which may come from subsequent odd folds (Folds 35 and 37), while the even fold (36) is evidently missing. The arrangement of the small strips with parts of toponyms is very uncertain.

75–76 Again, F24 is disorderly, and there may be pieces from more than two lines. The fragment ἱμνως is placed in l. 75 just on the basis of its format. One piece of F24, with letters ημα, could not be placed.

77 ἰμνως (ἐλώνων) γ: this sole entry, containing a third-class vineyard, remains uncertain, because the line is split between F24 and F25. As the fragments are now arranged, we seem to have eight subsequent vineyard entries (ll. 75–82) followed by fourteen grainfield entries (ll. 83–97). This supports the view that the list was topographically arranged.

83 † ἐκούη: this subtitle seems to give the village where the following plots were located. However, if the fragments are correctly joined, there is a strange loop in l. 84 above nu. It cannot come from any letter, so it may mark an abbreviation εν ( ); instead of nu, even vi, ἡξ (ακτορικά), or lambda, ἡξ (πυθμαρικά), might be possible, but these are less likely. The mention of a village is unique; the other entries with a local connotation begin with the word ἐκεῖ. If the arrangement is correct and the next subtitle comes in l. 98 † ἐκεῖ ἐξ (ακτορικά) Πέτρον διὰ τὴν, the word ἐκεῖ there should refer to this village.

84 Μαλε Ζαιδ: cf. Μαλ Ζαια in l. 87, and see Introduction, p. 46.

85 ἰουγερων α τῆς νοῦ: as we have only the left part of the lines, we do not know how the entries continued after the amount of iugerum. There may have been fractions of iugerum, but it is uncertain whether they were expressed with symbols or written in full. In l. 118, there seems to appear the symbol for one half, while in l. 120 we read tentatively τῆς τοῦ.

86 Μαλ Σαμμαρ: cf. Όωνοθ Σαμμαρ in l. 14, and see Introduction, p. 47.

90 ἰουγερων α: if the small piece giving ἰ ντο[ρ] (ἰμς) in l. 89 is correctly placed, we have here, following one iugerum, the upper parts of three letters. They do not seem to fit any fraction. The middle one could be a theta.

92 ἰουγερων γ: a tau seems probable before the gap and may give τῆς τοῦ; cf. l. 85 with comm.
97 Εβαλ Γορον: cf. Εβαλ ελ-Γορον in l. 63, and see Introduction, p. 44.

98 † ἐκεῖ ἐξ(ακτορικά) Πέτρον: cf. l. 117, and see Introduction above. For ἐκεῖ, see note to l. 83.

99 Αϲμαθα: cf. the same name in l. 3 with comm.

106 δ(ιὰ) ε̣ἰ̣ρ̣η̣[μεν-]: the characters after the amount of iugera are ambiguous. The letter with the abbreviation mark does not look like delta (maybe rather like epsilon), but the shape and the abbreviation mark closely resemble δ(ιά) in ll. 23, 38, and 98. The three last letters come from a loose fragment; if they are from ε̣ἰ̣ρ̣η̣[μένου, the article would be expected.

107–20 The core of the carbonized roll was so tight that the conservator only succeeded in tearing off stripes from it. The order of the lines remains uncertain, in some cases also the connection of the left and right parts (especially in l. 114).

109 [τό(ποϲ)] α̣λ-Βερ Αραβάϲ δ(ιὰ) αὐτῆϲ [\: see Introduction, p. 43. When compared with the preceding line, there may not be enough space for τό(ποϲ). Moreover, the missing specification of the land and size of the plot make this line look more like a subtitle, where δ(ιὰ) αὐτῆϲ normally appears (ll. 23, 28, 38; cf. 98).

110 The fold is nearly blank, probably because the written layer could not be separated. This seems also to be the case with l. 113.

115 τό(ποϲ) Μαλ Β... δ(ιά) τῆϲ ἀγιοι(φήτηϲ) ἐκλ[ηϲίαϲ: the δ(ιά) phrase is on a separate fragment and may form another line. In that case it may present a subtitle, perhaps connected with the following entry; † ἐκεῖ δ(ιά) is a possibility.

117 † ἐξ(ακτορικά) Αὔγ(ουϲτο)π(ὀλεωϲ) ἐκεῖ: the subtitle resembles that of l. 98, though ἐκεῖ here follows the name of the town. For ἐξ(ακτορικά), see Introduction above. Augustopolis is recorded also in l. 13. Of the cross, only part of the vertical is visible.

120 ἰ(ούγερον) α τρ[ tome: the fractional value is not certain. Part of the traces after alpha may come from the line above.
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