

« WE ASK YOU TO SEND... » – A REMARK ON SUMMONSES AND PETITIONS FOR SUMMONSES

Christina M. Kreinecker

The following article deals with the use of verbs in the so-called summonses and petitions for summonses. Starting from the two typical forms of summonses in the Arsinoite and the Oxyrhynchite nome from the first to the third centuries AD, the two verbs, ἀναπέμω and πέμω, will be examined in petitions for summonses, in an attempt to gain new insights into the dispersal of the technical use of these verbs in Egypt and the Roman Empire. Furthermore, petitions of summonses will prove themselves to be of major importance when it comes to giving actual reasons for summonses.

1. Summonses

A lot has already been said and written concerning the so-called summonses (« Überstellungsbefehle »). There is no need to repeat the valuable results of important analyses such as those of Ursula Hagedorn or Hans-Joachim Drexhage. In a nutshell and as a starting point, one may summarize as follows : summonses were usually issued in the *strategos*' bureau on petitions¹ ; they contain at least the names of both the addressee and the person who is supposed to be summoned. Quite often, the petitioner or accuser is also mentioned, whereas the name of the sender, the reason for the summons, and dates are usually missing². In the typical procedure of the first to third centuries AD, the claimant appealed directly to the *strategos* of the nome, whose bureau then had a formal summons written to a local police official³. There was no need to mention the official sender of summonses, because it was the *strategos* himself⁴. The administration was reorganized in the mid-third century AD and the forms of police power also changed⁵.

Papyri tell us that men as well as women, both in the singular and in the plural, and having all different kinds of professions, were summoned : we see officials next to fishermen, farmers, weavers, slaves etc. Sometimes an escort is mentioned, e.g. SB XII 11107 (II AD) and SB XVI 12706 (first half of III AD). The reason for an explicit mention of an escort is unclear ; Drexhage suspects either especially serious accusations, or actual imprisonment⁶.

¹ See Hagedorn (1979) 61.

² See Drexhage (1989) 102–118.

³ From the third century BC to the first century AD local police officials include the ἐφόδος (in Ptolemaic times also the ἀρχιφυλακίτης) and from the mid-first century on the ἀρχέφοδος (the ἀρχέφοδος was the head of the police duties in a village ; for further information, see Oertel [1917] 275), whose liturgical charge is part of the δημόσιοι κόμης ; see Drexhage (1989) 107–111. On the military's involvement in this kind of civil duties, see Alston (1995) 86–96 ; Palme (2006) 316–328.

⁴ See Drexhage (1989) 105. From the third century AD on this changes gradually ; superior police officials within villages such as ἐπίτροπος, εἰρηνάρχης, ἑκατοντάρχης and others appear as sender, who by then become necessary to mention within the document ; see P.Oxy. LXI, p. 90.

⁵ By then addressees of the summonses are the λητοπιαστής (liturgical office) and mainly the κωμάρχαι, who have a central position in the villages' police structure (see Oertel [1917] 153), and also the ἐπιστάτης τῆς εἰρήνης, who assists the κωμάρχης and to some extent replaces the ἀρχέφοδος ; see Oertel (1917) 278 ; Drexhage (1989) 111–112.

⁶ Next to the standard form, a few exceptions are worth mentioning : from the first century AD on, examples can be given for an appendix, that the one responsible shall summon a person or shall appear himself instead (probably for the purpose of inquiry) ; see Drexhage (1989) 110. Only once, namely in P.Osl. II 20 (second half of III AD), paying money is given as an alternative to the summons ; see P.Lund. VI, p. 121–123.

1.1. The major forms of summonses in the Arsinoite and the Oxyrhynchite nomes

Ursula Hagedorn has pointed out in her analysis of the so-called summonses that two main forms can be identified in the Roman administration in Egypt before Diocletian⁷. One comes from the Arsinoite, the other one from the Oxyrhynchite nome⁸. The general form of the first is : [address] ἀνάπεμψον τὸν δεῖνα ἐγκαλούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος ἐξουτῆς « [to N.N.], send up N.N., who is accused by N.N., at once » ; of the latter : [address] πέμψον τὸν δεῖνα ἐντυχόντος τοῦ δεῖνος « [to N.N.], send N.N. following the petition of N.N. ». Where the verb ἀναπέμψω is used in the Arsinoite nome, the simple verb πέμψω occurs in the Oxyrhynchite. In the Arsinoite form a conjunct passive participle identifies the plaintiff ; in the Oxyrhynchite, the plaintiff is given by a genitive absolute. Initially, the adverb ἐξουτῆς is found only in the Arsinoite nome.

While the Arsinoite form did not change until the third century AD in all of the three *merides*, and thereby, kept the verb ἀναπέμψω as its primary technical term, the Oxyrhynchite form changes shortly before AD 256⁹. The hitherto unused verb ἀναπέμψω finds its way into the official form of summonses. This change is supposed to have taken place within a process, so the different forms most likely did not coexist, but were in use one after the other. The later form in the Oxyrhynchite nome was customary until the fourth century and distinguishes itself from the earlier one in several points : (a) often the sender is mentioned – a fact that leads to the conclusion that the bureau of the *strategos* was no longer necessarily the sender of the summonses ; furthermore (b), the adverb ἐξουτῆς, which is well known from the Arsinoite nome, finds its way into the wording, although – unlike in the Arsinoite form – usually not at the end of the sentence ; and finally (c), ἀναπέμψω is used next to other verbs¹⁰.

Two recently published documents from the Oxyrhynchite nome, however, do not seem to follow that pattern. On the one hand both of these Oxyrhynchite texts follow the earlier pattern, putting the addressee (ἀρχεφόδος) at the beginning and not mentioning the sender, which leads to the conclusion that the *strategos* – or the bureau of the *strategos* – is the sender ; on the other hand, both texts use ἀναπέμψω, which belongs to the later pattern.

P.Oxy. LXXIV 5003 (II AD) : ἀρχεφόδωι Πακερκῆ. ἀνάπεμψον | τοὺς πρεσβ(υτέρους) | Πατέρμουθιν Διογάτος, μη(τρὸς) Ἀμμωναρίου ὄ, | Κοπρέαν [Ὀ]φελλίου, μη(τρὸς) Ταύριος. « To the *archepodos* of Pakerke. Send up the *presbyteroi* : Patermouthis, son of Diogas, mother Ammonarion. Kopreas, son of Ophellios, mother Tauris. »¹¹

P.Oxy. LXXIV 5004 (III AD) : ἀρχεφόδω Τακωνα. ἐξουτῆς ἀνάπεμψον | Ἀκύλαν Ἀποληγίου ἢ τὸν πατέρα ἐχ[γ]υη[ῆν] | αὐτοῦ ὄντα ἢ εὖ αὐτὸς ἀνελεθε. « To the

⁷ Hagedorn (1979) has also shown very clearly that the older term « order to arrest » is both misleading and not adequate to describe the character of those documents : for they do not refer to an imprisonment, particularly not in a modern sense, but to the sending of a person – or a group of people – with the intention of interrogation ; see also Sijpesteijn / Gagos (1996) 79–80.

⁸ Sijpesteijn / Gagos (1996) 81–82, made evident that, for lack of evidence, it is unrewarding to claim that different regional practices can be assumed from the way in which the papyrus was written on. Nevertheless, it remains a fact that most of the summonses are written on elongated rectangles, and against the fibers. For the discussion of a probable mass-production of summonses that would result in the same form of the documents, see Hagedorn (1979) 82–85. Another peculiarity quite often attested in summonses consists of strokes or crosses at the end of the text, meant to avoid later additions.

⁹ On the situation in the Arsinoite nome, see Hagedorn (1979) 73.

¹⁰ Examples for this later wording with the verb ἀναπέμψω come from the Oxyrhynchite nome : P.Oxy. XII 1507 (III AD) ; XLII 3035 (AD 256) ; LXXIV 5010 (III/IV AD). All three occurrences display παρά with the genitive at the beginning in order to introduce the sender, and have ἐξουτῆς and ἀναπέμψω. PSI XV 1552 (second half of III AD ?) originates from the Hermopolite nome and also has ἀναπέμψω (3–4), preceded by the adverb ἐξουτῆς (3).

¹¹ Transl. H. Maeno in P.Oxy. LXXIV, p. 137.

archepodos of Takona. Send at once Aquila, son of Apolegius, or his father who is his guarantor, or else come up yourself. »¹²

These documents probably reflect the transition from the earlier to the later pattern. This seems especially true in the case of P.Oxy. LXXIV 5004, where the adverb ἐξουτῆς can also be found. If such an interpretation is correct, these two examples give evidence of the development and the process of the changing of the form. As previously mentioned, Hagedorn stated that they did not coexist but were in use one after the other. Further evidence of the transition of the forms is likely to be found in SB XVIII 13854 (I AD), a summons that has the verb ἐκπέμπω, but the adverb ἐξουτῆς, and SB XVI 12649 (II AD), where the simple verb πέμπω and the adverb ἐξουτῆς can be found¹³.

Although other verbs such as ἐκπέμπω or μεταπέμπω are used in summonses, summonses in the Arsinoite mainly display ἀναπέμπω and summonses in the Oxyrhynchite prefer πέμπω from the first to the mid-third centuries AD. Therefore, the following observations will focus on these two main verbs. It will thus be determined whether this preference for the use of different verbs in summonses can also be seen in petitions asking for summonses.

2. Petitions for summonses

As previously mentioned, summonses normally do not give the reason why someone is to be summoned. The opposite is true of petitions for summonses. The misdeed of a person is often expressed in detail in order to make sure the addressee acknowledges one's mistreatment and will guarantee justice. Sometimes these petitions include a remark written by a second hand that a summons is to be initiated¹⁴. Therefore the following examples in most cases do not tell us whether a summons has actually taken place. But since we are interested in the verbs used to express a summons, this need not bother us. In the previous section we identified two typical verbs in summonses, namely ἀναπέμπω in the Arsinoite and πέμπω in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Now petitions will be presented that contain either πέμπω or ἀναπέμπω in order to ask for a summons.

2.1. The verb ἀναπέμπω in petitions for summonses

In documentary papyri, ἀναπέμπω appears in four different meanings, which of course can overlap. Firstly, it can simply mean to « send something or somebody back ». Secondly, it can be understood geographically, meaning « to send something or somebody up ». More technically it refers, thirdly, to the delegation of a matter or an issue to higher or lower (!) authorities and is very often used in the forwarding process of all kinds of petitions. Fourthly, ἀναπέμπω is used as the technical term in the previously mentioned summonses, in the Arsinoite nome, and from the mid-third century on, also in the Oxyrhynchite nome. One must consider the simple fact that the Greek language has one word for these four different situations or occurrences, while modern languages offer different translations and, thereby, also different interpretations of these situations. This is important, in as far as ἀναπέμπω, of course, could very often been translated in a literal – geographical – sense,

¹² Transl. P.M. Pinto in P.Oxy. LXXIV, p. 138.

¹³ See P.Oxy. LXXIV, p. 138.

¹⁴ This can be seen in the following examples coming from the Arsinoite nome. All of them are written to the *epistates phylakiton* and contain the note ἀρχ(εφόδος) · ἐκπεμψ(ον) « to the *archepodos* : send over » written by second hand. See SB XX 15182, 21 (later than May 17, AD 29, 30 or 31 ; petition on behalf of damage to animals) ; P.Ryl. II 132, 19 (July 10, AD 32 ; petition on behalf of damage to property) ; 136, 17 (May 4, AD 34 ; petition on behalf of theft and assault) ; 145, 21 (December 29, AD 38 ; petition on behalf of assault) ; 150, 16 (October 19, AD 40 ; petition on behalf of insult) ; 151, 19 (October 17, AD 40 ; petition on behalf of theft and assault) ; 152, 19 (April 4, AD 42 ; petition on behalf of damage to property ; the addressee in addition to the *epistates* is also the *strategos* himself).

especially in documents coming from the Arsinoite nome, where everything and everyone going to the capital had to go « up ». But although this is the case, at the same time the geographical meaning does not necessarily exclude a more technical meaning. One may even argue that the geographical conditions offer a plausible explanation of how the term ἀναπέμπω could become a highly understandable technical term.

Only a few petitions contain the verb ἀναπέμπω itself. The earliest example dates from the Ptolemaic period and thus by far precedes the summonses from the Roman period shown above. Nevertheless, this early occurrence in particular could suggest that a technical understanding of the word has a long history.

The petition P.Petr. III 32, recto (g) (b) from the Arsinoite nome is dated to December 217 BC and is addressed to the *oikonomos* Poseidionios. Ptolemaios complains about two men called Kalliphon and Sokmenis who, without permission, allowed his cattle to graze on Ptolemaios' property. Ptolemaios now asks Poseidionios to write to the *strategos*, who in turn is to send a summons to the ἐπιστάτης from Persea, the place where Kalliphon is currently living. 9–11 (with BL VII 161 and XII 159): ἀξιοῦμεν οὖν ἐν γράψαι Πωσειδίωνι[ωι] τῶι στρατηγῶι | ἐπιτεῖλαι τῶι ἐν Περσέαι ἐπιστάτη ἀναπέμψαι Καλλιφόντα | καὶ Σοκμήην ὅπως τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν ποιήσῃ « We therefore request that you write to Poseidionios, the *strategos*, to command the *epistates* in Persea to send up Kalliphon and Sokmenis in order that you may investigate the matter. »¹⁵

I have not been able to find further examples of petitions coming from the Arsinoite nome in which a summons is expressed by the verb ἀναπέμπω. Strictly speaking from this evidence, no equivalent within the relevant timeframe can be given for the summonses presented in the first section. Nevertheless, ἀναπέμπω is attested in other nomes, e.g. in the petition P.Fam.Tebt. 37 (AD 167) from Antinoopolis, to the south. This petition has a close connection with the Arsinoite nome. The brothers Lysimachos and Philosarapis write to the *epistrategos* about their slave Martilla, whom they own together with their brother Philantinoos through inheritance from their mother. Martilla is said to have been kidnapped while she was working in the Arsinoite nome, where the brothers' property lay. The suspected kidnapers are the brothers Sarapammon and Dios, to whom Philantinoos is indebted. Lysimachos and Philosarapis ask the *epistrategos* to send for the two kidnapers and to summon them from the Arsinoite to the Antinoite nome for further investigation. 17–21 : κελεύσαι γραφήναι τῷ τῆς | Θεμίτου καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων στρατ[η]γῶ ἀναπέμψαι αὐτοὺς ἔνθα εἰς τὴν Ἀντινόου πόλιν (l. πόλιν) | ἐπὶ τὴν εἰς τοῦ κυρίου διάγνωσιν περὶ ἧς ἐποιήσαντο | βία καὶ ἀπο[ε]παρμόυ τῆς δούλης « (...) to have a letter written to the *strategos* of the Themistos and Polemon divisions [in the Arsinoite nome] enjoining him to send them hither to the city of Antinoos for your, the lord's, inquiry concerning their act of violence and the kidnapping of the slave. »¹⁶ Based on later documents, we know that Lysimachos and Philosarapis are mistaken, because their own brother Philantinoos has rented Martilla, and kept the money – together with the information – for himself. Of course he had no right to do so, given the fact that he owned only one third of the slave¹⁷.

Another example for a technical meaning of ἀναπέμπω can possibly be seen in a letter from a *strategos* to his colleague in the official correspondence P.Oxy. LX 4060 (AD 161), which is technically speaking not a petition, but nevertheless, a request for the transferring of people. Apollonides, the *strategos* of Peri Thebas, writes to Phokion, the *strategos* of the Oxyrhynchite nome, asking him to be on the lookout for two men who have fled Peri

¹⁵ The purpose of the request for a summons in P.Petr. II 32 (2a), 25–27 (November 18, 217 BC) is also to ask for further inquiry.

¹⁶ Transl. adapted from B.A. Van Groningen in P.Fam.Tebt., p. 134.

¹⁷ See P.Fam.Tebt. 38 (AD 168) and 40 (August 20, AD 173 – beginning of March, AD 174).

Thebas after they have been summoned for breaking into a house – or so it seems¹⁸; he asks him also to summon them to Peri Thebas. 75–76 : ἐὰν εὔρεθῶσι ἀνα[πέμψη]c « if they are found, send them up ».

Although the verb can, of course, be perfectly understood in a mere geographical sense, the context makes it quite clear that the sending of these people is in some way official (like a summons), not in the least because the two suspects have to be questioned. It is quite remarkable that the addressee is asked for a summons by use of the verb ἀναπέμπω, a word he himself – being a strategos – obviously never used in the summonses coming from his own bureau in the Oxyrhynchite nome. But we may not be mistaken in assuming that Phocion understood quite well what his colleague was asking for and, thereby, that he had some kind of understanding of ἀναπέμπω as a technical term.

Later and from a different geographical area comes P.Euphrates I 3 (AD 252–256). This document is notable because it gives evidence that ἀναπέμπω was used in a technical way to indicate summonses for a hearing in Coele Syria. In P.Euphrates I 3 (with a copy in P.Euphrates I 4), Aurelius Abidsauta accuses a certain Philotas, along with his slave Sibbaraios, of raping him. He asks for a hearing to which the two and he himself will be summoned. 11–16 : ἀξιῶ καὶ δέομέ (l. δέομαί) c[ο]ν τῆς | φιλανθρωπία[c] ἐπὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα | ἃ ἐγκαλοῦμε (l. ἐπεὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα ἃ ἐγκαλοῦμαι) μείζ[ον]ος δικαστοῦ ἐπιδε|όμενα ἐξετασθῆνε (l. ἐξετασθῆναι) ἀναπέμψαι αὐτοὺς | σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ τὴν ὑπα|τείαν διέ[π]οντος Πομπωνίου Λαιτιανοῦ « I ask you and beg your philanthropy – the misdeeds on which I accuse him make it necessary to be investigated by a higher judge – to summon them together with me in front of your greatness Pomponius Laetianus exercising your consular power. »

The preceding examples allow only for rare occurrences of ἀναπέμπω in petitions for summonses. Nevertheless, those few examples tell us at least one thing for sure : contrary to the usual practice of summonses, where ἀναπέμπω appears for the most part only in the Arsinoite nome in the first to mid-third centuries AD, the petitions quoted above show that ἀναπέμπω must have been understood in a technical sense also outside the Arsinoite. The very early example from Ptolemaic times and the later one from Syria suggest that the technical meaning of the verb cannot be strictly confined temporally or geographically.

Above all, events occurred within those petitions that were considered by people to be worth further investigation and, thereby, worth a summons. But, as already stated before, we mostly do not know, simply on the basis of the documents themselves, whether these petitions truly led to a summons. Examples of such situations are trespasses, kidnapping of a slave (even if it turns out that technically there was no kidnapping), flight after a break-in and the use of force.

2.2. The verb πέμπω in petitions for summonses

In the previous section, we have seen that the use of the verb ἀναπέμπω with a technical meaning to express summonses is not limited to the Arsinoite nome. On the contrary, it is most likely that ἀναπέμπω was understood beyond its borders. The same seems true for the simple verb πέμπω in the Oxyrhynchite, because its use to note summonses is not restricted to this nome. In fact, I cannot identify a single petition from the Oxyrhynchite nome in which πέμπω is used to ask for a summons. All the examples derive from other nomes, including the Arsinoite.

In three petitions from the Arsinoite nome, people ask for summonses using the simple verb πέμπω, a form which was never used in the official summonses in this nome¹⁹. But the

¹⁸ At least in one instance the mentioned offence is connected to a violent form of opening a door; see P.Oxy. LX 4060, 72 n.

¹⁹ The petition P.Diog. 17 (II/III AD), most likely addressed to the prefect, comes probably from the Arsinoite nome. The petitioner obviously has trouble with his property that is encumbered with a mortgage. The

following examples make it rather clear that *πέμπω* must have been comprehensible in a technical way.

In P.Louvre I 2 (Soknopaiou Nesos, Arsinoite nome, AD 133), a certain Satabous writes to the prefect, probably knowing well that his petition will be forwarded to the *strategos*; traces of this may occur in lines 38–39, written by a third party. By writing to the highest authority, Satabous nevertheless ensured somehow that the prefect was informed about his case. Unfortunately, the papyrus is too fragmentary to allow full certainty about the case itself. A man whose name is lost is accused of breaking into the house of Satabous' grandfather and of taking away several things from a sealed room. Satabous requests the prefect « to order the *strategos* to make investigations in regards to the act of violence that was committed by him against me; and if it is proven, that this was the case, to summon him in your holiest juridical hearing, because I cannot do anything against him at this place. » 24–32 : [τ]ῶι | ετρα[τηγ]ῶι [δια]λαβ[ε]ῖν περι τῆς γ[ε]ινο[μέ]νη[ς] (l. γινομένης) μοι βί[α]ς ὑπ' [α]ὐτοῦ, [καὶ ἐὰ]ν καταλάβ[η]ται ταῦθ' ο[ὗ]τως ἔχ[ο]ντα, | πέμ[ψ]αι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἱε[ρ]ω-τ[άτ]ην σο[υ] διάγν[ω]σιν, | οὐ δύναμέν[ου] μ[ο]υ ἐπ[ὶ] τῶ[ν] | τόπων πρὸς αὐτό[ν].

In P.Amh. II 77 (later than August 15, AD 139), Pabous, priest and guard at the customs-house of Soknopaiou Nesos, complains that the customs-house officials, Polydeukes and Harpagathes, defrauded the customs-house and beat him up, as he was handing in the information about the accounts in order that they be checked. Pabous now asks for the following. 29–33 : καὶ ἀξι[ῶ] ἐὰν δ[ό]ξῃ σοι [πέ]μψαι [πρὸς ε] καὶ | τὸν Πολυδεύκη καὶ τὸν Ἀρπα[γάθην τὸ]ν | κρᾶτιςτον τοῦ κακοῦ καὶ προσεπίτροπο[ν (?)] ἵνα | δυνηθῶ τὴν ἀπό-διξι[ν] (l. ἀπόδειξι[ν]) ἐπ' αὐτοὺς π[ο]ιησ[ά]μενο(ς) | τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ εὐεργεσίας « (...) and I request, if you think fit, that you should send for Polydeuces and Harpagathes, the chief cause and prime mover in the mischief, in order that I may produce the proofs against them and obtain your beneficence. »²⁰

In P.Mich. VI 425 (Karanis, Arsinoite nome, AD 198), a certain Gemellus, a.k.a. Horion, writes to the *epistrategos* to whom he was sent after having written a petition to the prefect. In the original writing, as well as in the attached copy of the first petition, Gemellus, who has sight only in one eye, requests that Kastor be summoned after having attacked both Gemellus and his mother and destroyed their house, although no fiscal reason can be given for this behavior. 17–18 : καὶ κατενηνεγμένων ἡμῶν μηδὲν [ὀφειλόν-των] | τῷ ταμείῳ « and we were beaten although we owed nothing to the fiscus ». In both occurrences, Gemellus uses the simple verb to ask for a summons. 4–7 : ἀξιῶ, ἐάν σοι | τῆ τύχῃ δόξῃ, γράψαι τῷ διακειμένῳ ἐν τῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτῃ ἑκατοντάρχη πέμψαι | τὸν ἀντίδικον (l. ἀντίδικον) ἐπὶ τὴν εἰς διάγνωσιν καὶ ἀκοῦσάι μου πρὸς αὐτὸν ὅπως τύχω | τῶν δικαίων « I request, if it seem good to your Fortune, that you write to the centurion stationed in the Arsinoite nome, that he should send (for ?) the defendant for your examination and that you hear my complaint against him, in order that I may obtain justice. » In the forwarded first petition, Gemellus phrases his request as follows. 20–22 : ἀξιῶ ὑπὸ σοῦ, κύριε, | ἀκουσθῆναι καὶ ἐγδικηθῆναι (l. ἐκδικηθῆναι) ἵν' ὧ εὐεργετημένος, τὸν δὲ ἀντίδικον πεμ[ψ]θῆναι ἐξ αὐθεντίας σοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν εἰς διάγνωσιν « I request, my lord, that I be heard and avenged by you, so that I may be the object of your beneficence, and that the defendant be sent for your examination by your authority. »²¹

creditor now wants his money back. Over this issue the two come in conflict and both write petitions to the prefect on their behalf. On the interpretation of this document, see also Schubert (2007) 87–88. In the copies of these petitions, the *strategos* is asked to summon the accused person. 33–34 : ἀξιῶ (l. ἀξιῶ) αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ετρα(τηγοῦ) πεμψθῆ[ναι]. The mention of the Arsinoite nome and of Antinoopolis may refer to the privilege of its inhabitants to force accused people to come to Antinoopolis even if the damage occurred elsewhere. On the use of *πέμπω* in the Arsinoite nome, see Hagedorn (1979) 62.

²⁰ Transl. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt in P.Amh. II, p. 96.

²¹ Transl. H.C. Youtie and O.M. Pearl in P.Mich. VI, p. 130.

The petition P.Fam.Tebt. 43 (Antinoite nome, AD 182) is an example from another nome in which *πέμπω* is used in a technical way to refer to summonses. The nomarch of Antinoopolis, Artemidoros, writes to the *strategos* of the Themistos and Polemon divisions in the Arsinoite nome, because the following matter has been forwarded to him by the *epi-strategos* : Lysimachos, a.k.a. Didymos, has lent 240 drachmae to a certain Dios, but he has not received his loan back. Now that Dios is dead, the guardian of his heirs, Serenos, refuses to pay him back the 240 drachmae. All in all, a summons has been requested in this document, once in the actual petition, twice in the forwarded copy. 10–12 : ὅπως πέμψη ἐνθάδε τὸν δι' αὐτοῦ δηλούμενον Cερῆνον κριθόμενον κατὰ | τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀντινοέων διατεταγμένα « (...) in order that you send hither Serenos whom he mentioned, to be brought to trial according to the rules laid down for Antinoites ». 23–27 : ἀξιῶ σε ἐπιτεῖλαι τῷ | τῆς Θεμίτου καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων τοῦ Ἀρσινοεῖτου | στρατηγῷ πέμψαι ἐνθάδε τὸν δι' αὐτοῦ δηλούμενον | κριθόμενόν μοι κατὰ τὰ ἐπ' Ἀντινοέων διατεταγμένα « I request that you give orders to the *strategos* of the Themistos and Polemon divisions in the Arsinoite nome to send hither the man who is mentioned in it, to be brought to trial on my behalf according to the rules laid down for Antinoites. » 43–47 : δέομαι, ἐάν σου τῆ τύχῃ δόξῃ, κελεῦσαι γραφῆναι | τῷ τῆς Θεμίτου καὶ Πολέμωνος μερίδων τοῦ Ἀρσινοεῖτου στρατηγῷ πέμψαι τὸν προγεγραμμένον Cερῆνον ἐνθάδε εἰς τὴν Ἀντινοῦ κατὰ τὰ ἐπ' Ἀντινοέων διατεταγμέ[ν]α « I request, if it seems right to your fortune, that you have a letter written to the *strategos* of the Themistos and Polemon divisions in the Arsinoite nome, with a view of sending hither to Antinoopolis the aforesaid Serenos, to be brought to trial on my behalf in this question, according to the rules laid down for Antinoites. »²²

The few examples given of the use of *πέμπω* to express a summons in petitions demonstrate that the simple verb, although mainly used in summonses from the Oxyrhynchite nome, was not at all common in petitions for summonses from this nome²³. We can again see, however, that the technical meaning of the verb is not limited to a single nome, but was obviously understood and used in other parts of Egypt as well.

3. Conclusion

Earlier analysis of the so-called summonses identified in the period between the first and the mid-third century AD two main standard forms, which – among other things – differ from each other in the use of a technical verb : *ἀναπέμπω*, as a term for summonses, is found only in the Arsinoite nome ; *πέμπω*, on the other hand, occurs only in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

The present observations on the occurrence of these two verbs as technical terms for summonses have shown that this no longer holds true, for neither of these verbs is restricted to a single nome. This has been established on the evidence of petitions for summonses. In fact the petitions make clear that both verbs must have been understood and used in a technical way in more than just one nome. This leads to the conclusion that both *ἀναπέμπω* and *πέμπω* enjoy a wider dispersion as technical terms than was thought hitherto, when summonses were studied in isolation. At the same time, those petitions offered a wide range of reasons explaining why people think that a summons is appropriate, such as problems relating to property, inheritance, taxes, attacks, leases, theft, and so on.

Furthermore, the one example given from Coele Syria suggests that *ἀναπέμπω*, as a technical term, was known and in use in the Roman Empire, not only in Egypt, but also

²² Transl. B.A. Van Groningen in P.Fam.Tebt., p. 148.

²³ If one searches for verbs used in petitions for summonses in the Oxyrhynchite nome, ἄγω is worth mentioning. The request ἀξιῶ ἀχθῆναι τὸν δεῖνα can be found in P.Fouad 27 (AD 43) ; P.Oxy. XIX 2234 (AD 31) ; II 282 (AD 37) ; SB X 10239 (AD 37) ; 10244 (AD 50) ; P.Oxy. X 1272 (AD 144) ; I 69 (AD 190) ; SB XX 14975 (II AD) ; P.Oxy. XXXIII 2672 (AD 218) ; SB VI 9421 (III AD). The verb ἐκπέμπω occurs in the petitions P.Oxy. II 283 (AD 45) and XLIX 3468 (I AD).

outside of this province. In order to strengthen this argument a final, non-documentary, example will be adduced. According to the *Gospel of Luke*'s special material in the passion narrative, Jesus was sent from Pilate to Herod Antipas and back from Herod to Pilate. The word used to describe this kind of transfer is ἀναπέμω, which does not appear in any other canonical gospel²⁴. Even if we expand the date of origin of the *Gospel of Luke* generously to AD 80–100, we are right in the middle of the relevant timeframe for our observations from the papyri. Although we do not know exactly where the *Gospel* was written, its language and readership show quite clearly that it stood within the Greco-Roman sphere of influence. This suggests that the verses quoted above offer another example of a technical use of ἀναπέμω outside the Arsinoite nome.

This argument can be strengthened by pointing at other similarities with the papyrological evidence. As is the case in the papyri, the summoning of Jesus is ordered by authorities, among whom the procedure can be delegated (1)²⁵. The purpose of summonses is further investigation – the papyri have made this quite evident. When a summons is issued, no verdict is given, or even intended. This seems also true in the *Gospel of Luke* (2), when Herod sends Jesus back to Pilate, who then claims that neither he himself, nor Herod, has found in Jesus what he has been accused of (*Luke* 23, 14–15). As is the case in the petitions, concrete accusations (3) are brought forward against Jesus by a group of, more or less, identifiable people (4). Therefore, we have both reasons and accusers. The accusations can be found in *Luke* 23, 2, where Jesus is said to have perverted the nation, forbidden men to give tribute to Caesar, and to have said that he himself is Christ a king. As accusers (*Luke* 23, 1–2), we find the mention of a multitude that contains at least Judas, a servant of the high priest, chief priests, captains of the temple, and elders (*Luke* 22, verses 47, 50 and 52) and the mention of an assembly of the elders of the people, the chief priests, and scribes (*Luke* 22, 66). For these reasons, we may draw the conclusion that, on the basis of the papyrological evidence, ἀναπέμω is used in a technical way also in *Luke*. This is but one example of how the consideration of papyrological material may provide additional insight into biblical texts.

This article has shown that attention restricted to the so-called summonses may offer a distorted, or limited, picture of the use of the technical terms ἀναπέμω and πέμω. By enlarging the picture to include other documents like petitions, the wide dispersal of the technical meaning of these words becomes quite evident.

Bibliography

- Alston, R. (1995), *Soldier and Society in Roman Egypt : A Social History* (London / New York).
- Arzt-Grabner, P. (2003), *Philemon (Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament 1, Göttingen)*.
- Drexhage, H.-J. (1989), « Zu den Überstellungsbefehlen aus dem römischen Ägypten (1.–3. Jahrhundert n.Chr.) », in Drexhage, H.-J. / Sünskes, J. (Hrsg.), *Migratio et Commutatio : Studien zur Alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben Thomas Pekáry (...) dargebracht* (St. Katharinen) 102–118.
- Hagedorn, U. (1979), « Das Formular der Überstellungsbefehle im römischen Ägypten », *BASP* 16, 61–74.
- Oertel, F. (1917), *Die Liturgie : Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens* (Nachdr. 1965, Leipzig).
- Palme, B. (2006), « Zivile Aufgaben der Armee im kaiserzeitlichen Ägypten », in Kolb, A. (Hrsg.), *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis : Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich. Akten der Tagung an der Universität Zürich, 2004* (Berlin) 299–328.
- Schubert, P. (2007), *Philadelphie. Un village en mutation entre le II^e et le III^e s. ap. J.-C.* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 34, Basel).

²⁴ The same redactor uses ἀναπέμω also in *Acts* 25, 21 to refer to the deferring of Paul to the Emperor in Rome. On ἀναπέμω in *Philemon* 12, see Arzt-Grabner (2003) 105–108 and 215.

²⁵ A question that remains open is why the redactor of the *Gospel of Luke* presents Herod Antipas as a – seemingly Roman – authority, or whether something like a juridical principle of local priority was in effect at the time of Pilate that he had to take into consideration. One might suspect that the redactor nevertheless invokes a historic possibility that he knew as a legal one (and maybe so from his own time).

Sijpesteijn, P.J. / Gagos, T. (1996), « Towards an Explanation of the Typology of the So-Called “Orders to Arrest” », *BASP* 33, 77–97.