

# The Cynopolite Nome in the Delta ... Did it really exist?

Mohamed Abdel Ghani

Greek and Roman History and Civilization

Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University, Egypt

Mohamed.abdelghani@alexu.edu.eg

## Abstract

The key issue of this paper focuses on the specific question of whether a “lower Cynopolite Nome” existed in the Egyptian Delta – as well as the well attested “upper Cynopolite Nome” in the Heptanomia – under the Roman rule, or not. This issue has been raised through the various interpretations by scholars of the relevant papyrological documents in which these geographical locations occurred. The paper is an attempt by the researcher to clarify this argumentative question through a comprehensive study of the related documents and previous interpretations and reaching a more convincing conclusion – from the view point of the researcher – to this controversial issue.

## Keywords

Lower Cynopolite, Upper Cynopolite, Delta, Heptanomia

Documentary and literary evidence about the Cynopolite nome in Middle Egypt (the Heptanomia) dating from the Ptolemaic and Roman times encouraged me to compile an article about that nome in Arabic.<sup>1</sup> While I was engaged in the study of the papyrological documents of that topic, a controversial issue related to the main subject of this research attracted my attention and I deemed it worthy of an independent treatment in the current paper. It's key point is the hypothesis that there were – under the Roman rule in Egypt – two nomes bearing the name Cynopolite: one in the Heptanomia, referred to in the documents as ὕνω (the Upper), and the other in the Delta styled as κάτω (the Lower).

This issue was raised in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century when the documents about the Cynopolite nome were limited in number. P.Oxy. X 1256, published in 1914 is a document dated late 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. which contains a list of the minor sons of the priests in the village of Laura and other neighbouring villages in the Cynopolite nome. That list was compiled by two comarchs of Laura

---

<sup>1</sup> Abdel Ghani 2013, 241-270.

and other villages and addressed to two of the keepers of the public records of the Κ]υνοπολείτου ἄνω. Grenfell and Hunt translated the phrase as follows: «to [...] and [...] son of Sarapion, both keepers of the public records of the upper division of the Cynopolite Nome».<sup>2</sup> It is understood from this translation that the editors approve of two divisions (upper and lower) inside the same well known nome of Middle Egypt.

The same scholars, however, published another document later in vol. XIV (1708) of the same series (1920). It is dated 311 A.D. and comprises a contract of sale of a male donkey in the market of the Upper Cynopolite (ἄνω Κυνοπολίτης). In the introduction to this document the publishers retracted the view which they previously adopted in the former document (1256) (of an upper division of the Cynopolite nome)! They surmised, instead, a different interpretation of the same identification: an Upper Cynopolite Nome as opposite to a Lower Cynopolite one in the Delta.<sup>3</sup> It is noteworthy that they changed their mind without a convincing justification and without a detailed account of a Cynopolite Nome in the Delta in a literary or documentary source!

In another document,<sup>4</sup> however, published by Hunt later on in P.Oxy. XVII 2136 a Κυνοπολίτης κάτω was mentioned; Hunt translated it as «[...] the lower division of the Cynopolite nome». Thus, it is clear that Hunt realized that his translation of such geographical sites in 1256 was more accurate than that in 1708 where he suggested an “Upper” Cynopolite nome as distinct from a lower one in the Delta. This intentional correction by Hunt and his conviction of his latest interpretation in our current document is confirmed by his note on l.3 of this document<sup>5</sup> in which he refers to his translation of the issue in P.Oxy. X 1256.

To this extent, it seems that this controversial issue of two distinct Cynopolite nomes has been resolved long ago by the same scholar who raised it; that argument’s conclusion was in favour of one single Cynopolite nome in the Heptanomia divided into “lower κάτω” and “upper ἄνω” divisions. Henry Gauthier,<sup>6</sup> however, took the occasion of the mention of a Κυνοπολίτης κάτω in the last of the above documents (2136) to support the hypothesis of a distinct Cynopolite (nome) in the Delta. He reinforced his viewpoint by a mention of Cynopolite in the Delta by Strabo, which occurred in Strabo’s Geography after “Busiris” (Abou Sir Banna) near el-Mahala el-Kobra nowadays. Thus, Gauthier's view revived the argument about the issue once more and it seems that his demonstration acquired further recognition.

---

<sup>2</sup> P.Oxy. X 1256, (Cynopolite, 282 A.D.), II 3-5:

[.]λος Σαραπίωνος αμφο[τ]εροι βιβλι-οφύλαξι (Read: ἀμφο[τ]έροις βιβ[λιο]φύλαξι) δημοσίων λόγων [του] [Κ]υνοπολείτου ἄνω.

<sup>3</sup> P.Oxy. XIV 1708, (Cynopolite, 311 A.D.).

<sup>4</sup> P.Oxy. XVII 2136, (Oxyrhynchus, 291 A.D.).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., I 3 and note in which he confirmed his translation of the phrase as reported in P.Oxy. X 1256 and suggested that the same translation should perhaps be applied and explained as such in a document containing a similar phrase: P.Oxy. VI 902.

<sup>6</sup> Gauthier 1935, 193-194 (Le Nome Cynopolite Inférieur).

In 1980, long after Gauthier's monograph, the publisher of one of the documents of P.Oxy. XLVII 3345 adopted Gauthier's view in this concern. In this document we encounter a reference to «the royal scribe of the upper Cynopolite». In this context the publisher alludes to the Κυνοπολίτης κάτω in P.Oxy. XVII 2136 – the same document in which Hunt renounced his previous hypothesis of a Cynopolite nome in the Delta expressed in P.Oxy. XIV 1708 – to assure that the viewpoint presented by Grenfell and Hunt in P.Oxy. XIV 1708 was «absolutely correct. Thus, the publisher of 3345 was clearly inclined to the view of two Cynopolite nomes: one in the Delta and another in the Heptanomia, disregarding Hunt's renunciation of that hypothesis as shown in 2136. He also adopted H. Gauthier's view on the issue, adding that in (2136), the Leontopolite nome in the Delta is reported, which reinforces his hypothesis.<sup>7</sup>

The last related document in this concern is P.Oxy. XLIX 3477. It is a request for the investigation (*anakrasis*) of a slave girl who was sold in the city of Antinopolis; the purchaser was from the «lower Cynopolite», while the seller (a woman) was from Coptos, and the man assisting her was from Antinopolis. The publisher confirms that ὁ Κυνοπολίτης κάτω could mean nothing else but the «Cynopolite nome in the Delta».<sup>8</sup>

Thus, it became a firmly established conviction of the publishers of the Oxyrhynchus papyri subsequent to Grenfell and Hunt that the term Κυνοπολίτης κάτω refers to a «Lower nome» in the Delta, while Κυνοπολίτης ἄνω indicates an «Upper Cynopolite nome» in the Heptanomia (Middle Egypt).

After this brief exposition of the previous arguments of the scholars on this controversial issue, let us try to examine the original documents relevant to the topic as thoroughly as possible in an attempt to show whether their conviction of the argument presented above was credible and justified, or that another more plausible and more convincing argument could be concluded.

The first significant general point to be focused on is that “all” the above - mentioned documents cited in support of the main arguments of the topic emanated from the Oxyrhynchite nome in Middle Egypt (Heptanomia); that nome was located on the west bank of the Nile, almost opposite to the Cynopolite nome (Sheikh Fadl nowadays) on the east bank. This fact boosts the hypothesis that such documents pertain to the Cynopolite of the Heptanomia, even if there were another nome of the same name in the Delta.

Now, let us deal with each particular document of those referred to above according to the chronological order of their publication in the series of Oxyrhynchus Papyri. This order seems to me the better one in this treatment as it displays clearly the phases of the scholarly views on the topic. P.Oxy. X 1256, dated 282 A.D. is addressed to two keepers of the public archives of the

<sup>7</sup> P.Oxy. XLVII 3345, (209 A.D.), col. II, 1. 50 and note.

<sup>8</sup> P.Oxy. XLIX 3477, (270 A.D.), introduction, and note on 1. 5.

«Κυνοπολείτου ἄνω», translated by the publishers as the «upper division of the Cynopolite nome» as above. This translation would logically conform with a «Cynopolite nome» in the Heptanomia referred to in an Oxyrhynchite document, a nome which was divided – some times in the third and early fourth centuries – into two divisions, or even nomes (inside the Heptanomia), one to the north κάτω and another to the south ἄνω.<sup>9</sup> The village of Laura and its neighbouring villages belonged to the upper / southern division of that Cynopolite (nome). What might support this view is that when Laura was mentioned again later in the document, it was identified as «Laura of the Cynopolite (nome)»,<sup>10</sup> without further specification of an “upper” or “lower” district. This almost implies that “one” nome with two administrative units is meant, and since that unit (τοπαρχία) was defined as ἄνω earlier in the document, there was no need for repetition. If, on the contrary, there existed two separate nomes bearing the same name (Cynopolite): one in the Heptanomia (ἄνω) and another in the Delta (κάτω), the accurate identification of the nome to which Laura belonged must have been stated once again to distinguish that nome from its homonym in the Delta.

As for P.Oxy. XIV 1708, dated 311 A.D., we have seen above that Grenfell and Hunt renounced their former view in 1256 of two divisions of the Cynopolite nome of the Heptanomia in favour of the theory of two Cynopolite nomes in the Heptanomia and the Delta. This change of mind, however, was precarious since it lacked any concrete evidence whether literary or documentary. The publishers themselves deemed their change of mind as a «mere probability» and described their former identification of the situation in 1256 merely as «less likely».<sup>11</sup>

Such uncertainty was, most probably, what made Grenfell and Hunt rethink of the issue to pave the way to reach a more plausible conclusion in a forthcoming related document. This took place in their publication of P.Oxy. XVII 2136 where they dropped their modified, undocumented interpretation of 1708 and reverted to their previous understanding of the situation as expressed in their translation of 1256. Let us understand the content of that last document (2136) more deeply: it is a contract of sale in the form of a long lease for 50 years of a Greek Nilotic boat, of which the cargo was 70 artabae. The two parties of the contract are: the lessor / vendor «Aurelius Nemisias» from «the lower division of the Cynopolite nome» – Hunt’s translation – who is temporarily residing in the metropolis (of the Arsinoite nome),<sup>12</sup> and the lessee(s)/ purchaser(s), the two brothers «Aurelius Bates and Aurelius Aniketos from the Oxyrhynchite nome». The contract was concluded at Ptolemais Euergetis (Madinet El-Fayum).

---

<sup>9</sup> This point will be dealt with later in this paper; see below.

<sup>10</sup> P.Oxy. X 1256, II. 15-16:.... ἱερῶν πρωτολογίων τῶν ὄντων ἐν Λαύρα Κυνοπολείτου) «of the temples of the first class in Laura of the Cynopolite nome».

<sup>11</sup> See note 3 above.

<sup>12</sup> P.Oxy. XVII 2136, II. 2-3: ὁμολογεῖ Αὐρήλιος Νεμεσᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ] Κυνοπολίτου κάτω κα[ταμ]έγων [ἐ]ν τῇ μητροπόλει πρὸς τῷ Ἀκανθείῳ.

In this document (2136) Hunt asserted that the adverbs of place ἄνω / upper, and κάτω / lower refer to two administrative divisions of the Cynopolite nome of the Heptanomia, rather than to two homonymous nomes in the Heptanomia and the Delta. This view could be supported in our document by the fact that the incidents of this contract of sale of the Nilotic boat took place in Middle Egypt (Heptanomia) and its extension to the west in the Arsinoite nome, as we have seen above. This context of a Heptanomian environment is not challenged by the fact that the scribe of the contract on behalf of the vendor identified himself as a former gymnasiarch at Leontopolis (in the Delta).<sup>13</sup> This fact does not provide a reasonable proof of any connection between the parties of the contract with the Delta; in a few cases some individuals could assume honorary offices outside their home nome, while that was almost normal for the official offices.<sup>14</sup> After the end of their term of office they would almost return to their original nomes.

Gauthier ignored the last standpoint expressed by Hunt in his commentary on P.Oxy. XVII 2136, and adhered to Hunt's former commentary on P.Oxy. XIV 1708 which adopts an «Upper Cynopolite nome» in Heptanomia as opposite (counter) to a «Lower Cynopolite nome» in the Delta. Consequently, Gauthier considered P.Oxy. XVII 2136 the only documentary example – till then – that informs us of the «Lower Cynopolite nome». In his attempt to consolidate this piece of argumentative evidence, he pointed out that the capital (metropolis) of that Cynopolite nome in the Delta was the city of Cynopolis, mentioned in Strabo's Geography after Busiris, the capital of the Busirite nome.<sup>15</sup> But, against this argument, one would wonder why did Strabo not mention a «Cynopolite (nome)» in this location?! He only reported of a Busirite nome that included the city of Busiris (certainly the metropolis after which the nome was named) and a city called Cynopolis (where the god Anubis was worshipped). This phrasing of the sentence of Strabo with the conjunction καί between the names of the two cities of Busiris and Cynopolis clearly indicates that they both were included in the Busirite nome referred to in that same phrase in Strabo's text.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., I 17: Αὐρ(ήλιος) Κοπρῆς γυμνασιαρχήσας τῆς Λεόντι[ων πόλ(εως) ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδ(ότος) γρ(άμματα).

<sup>14</sup> See for example: Rowlandson 1998, 120-124 (nos. 92-99: The archive of Apollonius the strategos of Apollonopolis Heptakomia, whose nome of origin was Hermopolis Magna); Breccia 1911, no. 78 where an Alexandrian citizen held the honorary post of gymnasiarch in Xoitōn polis (Sakha in the Delta).

<sup>15</sup> Jones 1967, 17.1.19: ... ἡ Βούσιρις πόλις ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτῃ νομῷ καὶ Κυνὸς πόλις.

Cf. Yoyotte / Charvet 1997, p.112. In his commentary on this sentence Yoyotte does not affirm that this Cynopolite in the Delta was a (nome), it is just a «city of the Dog»: homologue de Kynon polis («Cité des Chiens») de Haute Égypte (no. 227).

<sup>16</sup> Ball 1942, 63 where John Ball identifies Cynopolis in the above phrase of Strabo (17.1.19) as Abu Sir / Banna, near Sammanoud, He also identifies Busiris with the same identification and locality, an identification which indicates that the two towns were in close proximity to one another inside the geographical domain of the Bousirite nome Cf. also Gauthier's explanation (p. 194) of the alteration of the name of Cynopolite in the Delta during the Christian era to the name Benna in Coptic. Hence the mixture of the new name with the neighbouring Busiris produced the compound name of Abu Sir Banna under the Arab rule. It was not strange in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt to find more than one city bearing the same name (especially those named after a certain god or hero). This does not mean that each of such homonymous cities was necessarily a capital of a certain nome. We encounter in Strabo – and other Classical Geographers, as well as in documentary sources – more than one Diospolis (city of Zeus), Hermopolis and two towns bearing the name of Cynopolis where the Egyptian god Anubis in the shape of dog was worshipped (Ball 1942, 63-64). Among these examples only the bigger cities constituted nome capitals such as Diospolis Magna (Thebes), Hermopolis Magna (El - Ashmonien), Cynopolis (the reputed one in the Heptanomia / sheikh Fadl). The smaller homonymous

The publishers of the consequent volumes of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* adopted the interpretation and theory of Henry Gauthier (argued above) whenever they came across a document mentioning the Cynopolite nome, i.e., the two distinct nomes: one «Upper Cynopolite» in the Heptanomia, and another «Lower Cynopolite» in the Delta. In vol. 47 of that series (edited by R. A. Coles and M. W. Haslam, with contributions from 8 others) in document no. 3345,<sup>17</sup> the phrase *παρὰ Ἀμμωνίου βασιλ(ικοῦ) γραμματέως Κυνοπολείτου ἄνω* (col. II 50) was translated by the publisher as «from Ammonius, the royal scribe of the upper Cynopolite nome».

In his commentary on this line, the publisher adopted Grenfell and Hunt's commentary on P.Oxy. XIV 1708 and rejected their later interpretation of 2136 of a «lower» and «upper» (divisions) of one and the same Cynopolite nome in the Heptanomia. He advocated the theory of two Cynopolite (nomes) in the Heptanomia and in the Nile Delta. He pointed out that his viewpoint is «surely correct», adding that it is confirmed by P.Oxy. XVII 2136 in which a Cynopolite nome is mentioned followed by the adverb of place *κάτω*, as well as the reference to the Leontopolite nome in the same document; points which have been discussed above.

All the documents in which the locative adverbs *ἄνω* or *κάτω* occur before the name of the (Cynopolite) nome are dated to the third and fourth centuries A.D., which could suggest that the Cynopolite nome of the Heptanomia was divided at that time into two divisions. In his attempt to disprove this supposed argument (i.e. the division of that nome into two administrative units), he points out (in his commentary on the same line 50) that in some documents from that period a (Cynopolite nome) is reported without a further specification by a locative adverb *ἄνω* or *κάτω*. As a counter-argument to this view one could put forth the possibility that the accurate specification of the location in the documents could mostly take place when there is need for that. Sometimes the precise identification of the location (inside) the nome is pinpointed in some part of the document, followed in a later part of the (same) document by a general identification of the nome without exact specification (P.Oxy. X 1256 above is a clear example). Another counter argument could also be added: in case of a general identification of a (Cynopolite nome) in some document, how could we know which of the two nomes in the Heptanomia or the Delta is meant? The fact that the frequency of documents of *Κυνοπολίτης ἄνω* contrasted with the rarity of those from the *Κυνοπολίτης κάτω* – according to the publisher – could cast some doubt on the division of the Upper Cynopolite nome into two divisions, and could, furthermore, stand in support of the suggestion of two distinct Cynopolite nomes: one in the Heptanomia whence the documents are more abundant, and another in the Delta from which the documents are rare. Although this argument is plausible in general, one cannot ignore that papyrological discoveries in Egypt are – to

---

cities, or rather towns, were famous for worshipping this god or that without being a nome capital, a case which most probably applied to Cynopolis of the Delta as argued above.

<sup>17</sup> P.Oxy. XLVII 3345, col. II 50, note.

an extent – random discoveries and are subject to change at any given time. More particular in this concern to justify the multiplicity of documents from the «Upper Cynopolite / Κυνοπολίτης ἄνω» is the fact that there existed in the (upper division) of that nome in the Heptanomia during the third and fourth centuries A.D., a renowned market of pack animals (especially donkeys), and a lot of the published documents from that nome are relevant to this topic.<sup>18</sup>

Last but not least in this controversial issue is that the content, context and surroundings reported in the few or rare documents in which the Κυνοπολίτης κάτω / Lower Cynopolite is reported indicate the environment of Middle Egypt and do not include – explicitly or implicitly – any reference to the Delta, as shown above in discussing P.Oxy. XVII 2136.

Finally, let us turn to another vital document related to our controversial issue, i.e., P.Oxy. XLIX 3477. It is an application presented to the acting nomarch of the great city of Antinopolis in Middle Egypt by Aurelius Theon son of Dionysius «from the capital of the lower Cynopolite nome: ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως τοῦ κάτω Κυνοπ[ολί]του νομοῦ»<sup>19</sup> for the interrogation of a slave girl whom he purchased from a woman from the capital of the Coptite nome (in the Thebaid). That the interrogation was intended to take place in Antinopolis is apparently justified by the fact that the assistant and guarantor of the vendor (the woman from Coptos) in the process of sale: συνεστῶτος αὐτῆ καὶ συμβεβ[αιοῦντος] τὴν πρᾶσιν (ll. 10-11) was an Antinopolite who was possibly a relative of her.

This important document raises more than one issue about our topic. It is the first time to come across explicitly a «Lower Cynopolite (Nome)», with its metropolis in a document. That this Lower Cynopolite Nome is located in the Delta is almost improbable as we are going to perceive from the thorough discussion of its contents alluded to above. First of all, one would logically wonder what could compel a man from one of the nomes of the Delta to take pains to cover the lengthy and arduous distance to Antinopolis in the south for the interrogation of a slave girl whom he purchased from a woman from the Coptite nome further south?!<sup>20</sup> How could they have met and agreed upon the sale of the slave girl and performing the process of interrogation in Antinopolis in spite of the very remote distance between the residences of the two main parties of sale?! The more plausible alternative is that the purchaser was from the lower division of the Cynopolite nome of the Heptanomia which seems to have turned to become a distinct nome in itself at the time of the application, and, possibly, earlier. The Cynopolite nome (of the Heptanomia) was apparently

<sup>18</sup> See Abdel Ghani 2013, 264-265.

<sup>19</sup> P.Oxy. XLIX 3477, 270 A.D., ll. 5-6.

<sup>20</sup> This situation was perplexing for the publisher who stated in the Introduction: «In the present document it is not at all clear why the anacrisis is requested in Antinopolis, since the buyer and seller come from Cynopolis in the Delta and Coptus in Upper Egypt respectively, and the only Antinoite involved is Aurelius Basilides, who assists the seller». In his attempt to solve this apparent contradiction he set forth two: «One theory is that the anacrisis took place where the (birth certificate) of the slave was registered, another that the location of the sale determined that of anacrisis» ... neither provides a convincing argument.

divided into two administrative divisions (could be two toparchies) – for some unknown reasons – at least from the beginning of the third century A.D. (P.Oxy. XLVII 3345, 209 A.D. is the earliest available document in this concern), if not earlier. The initial administrative division of that Cynopolite nome in Middle Egypt seems to have developed in 270 A.D. (the date of our document) – possibly earlier – to form two distinct (nomes): “lower” and “upper” in place of the two (divisions/ or toparchies). Hence, our current document refers – I strongly think – to that recently created Lower Cynopolite Nome in the Heptanomia, and has nothing to do with the Delta.

Another problematic point in P.Oxy. XLIX 3477 is that the document was found at Oxyrhynchus, although nothing in it points to any connection with that town. In the publisher’s attempt to try to tackle this problem, he theoretically supposed that the acting nomarch of Antinopolis – to whom the application was presented – was originally an Oxyrhynchite, and that after the completion of his term of office in Antinopolis he returned to his nome of origin, taking his papers with him. Although the matter is hypothetical it could be challenged by two remarks, first: it is not easy to accept that the high offices of the autonomous Greek cities in Egypt (including Antinopolis) were held by officials from other (nomes) in Egypt; these offices must have been assigned to citizens of those cities. I think that the service of a high official outside his nome of origin applied to the (nomes) and not to the Greek (cities) which had their peculiar constitutions and rules of administration. The second remark is that if we suppose that the acting nomarch of Antinopolis was an Antinopolite citizen of an Oxyrhynchite origin – and might have been one of the landlords at Oxyrhynchus – it could have happened that he brought back to his nome of origin (the Oxyrhynchite) copies of the work papers of his Antinopolite office. In analogy, one can point out the archive of Apollonios, the strategos of the Heptakomia which he brought back with him to his nome of origin in Hermopolis magna, after completing his term of office. This huge archive (232 documents) covered a wide span of public as well as private issues which took place during his term of office in the Heptakomia.<sup>21</sup> Here, however, in the case of our Antinopolite nomarch and his probable Oxyrhynchite origin, the problem is that the matter is quite hypothetical without any concrete evidence to cement that affiliation. Since the whole interpretation is conjectural I would rather suggest another alternative which seems to me more appropriate. I would suppose that the purchaser of the slave girl – from the capital of the lower Cynopolite nome of the Heptanomia, as concluded above – might have temporarily lived at Oxyrhynchus – in the proximity of his nome of origin – and kept for himself there copies of his papers including our document.

The publisher also attempted to confirm the responsibility of the nomarch of Antinopolis for the completion of the procedures of the sale of slaves through the preliminary step of interrogating the

---

<sup>21</sup> Elarga, M. R., *The position of the Greek High Class in the Egyptian Countryside under the Roman rule, the Archive of Apollonios, strategos of the Heptakomia as a case study*. (Forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation, in Arabic. Faculty of Arts, Cairo University). It is under the author’s supervision.



slaves; he made use of a similar document. That document<sup>22</sup> is an application presented to the nomarch of Antinopolis for the examination ἀνάκρισις of a slave girl by a enjoys woman from Oxyrhynchus, the purchaser of the slave, together with her husband and guardian who enjoys the Alexandrian citizenship. The vendor was a woman from the Herakleopolite nome, acting without a guardian through the *ius liberorum*. The similarity of this document with P.Oxy. XLIX 3477 is clear in presenting both applications about the same topic to the nomarch of Antinopolis. It is noteworthy that the contracting parties in both applications belong to the Heptanomia, with no mention of the Delta. Thus, the nomarch of Antinopolis might have been in charge of the preliminary examination of the slaves for sale in the area of Heptanomia. I might suppose that his role in this process was particularly urgent when a citizen of Antinopolis or another Greek city in Egypt – who might have been temporarily residing in or near Antinopolis in the Heptanomia – is involved (in P.Oxy. XII 1463, the husband and guardian of the female purchaser from Oxyrhynchus was an Alexandrian citizen).

From all the above discussion and in conclusion, I am almost convinced that the Lower Cynopolite Nome after its creation belonged to the Heptanomia, and that no other homonym nome existed in the Delta.

### Bibliography

- Abdel Ghani, M. 2013, “The Cynopolite nome during the Ptolemaic and Roman Eras” (in Arabic), Bulletin of the Centre of Papyrological Studies and Inscriptions, Ain Shams University 6, 241-270.
- Ball, J. 1942, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, Cairo.
- Breccia, E. 1911, *Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes: Musée d’Alexandrie*, Alexandrie.
- Gauthier, H. 1935, *Les Nomes d’Égypte depuis Hérodote jusqu’ à la Conquête Arabe*, Le Caire.
- Jones, L. 1967, *Strabo, Geography*, Loeb Classical Library 267, Harvard.
- Rowlandson, J. 1998, *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt*, Cambridge.
- Yoyotte, J. / Charvet, P. 1997, *Strabon, Le voyage en Égypte, un regard romain*, Paris.

<sup>22</sup> P.Oxy. XII 1463, 215 A.D., Introduction.