

T. M. HICKEY

NOTES ON SOME CAIRO PAPYRI FROM BYZANTINE OXYRHYNCHUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 123 (1998) 161–164

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON SOME CAIRO PAPYRI FROM BYZANTINE OXYRHYNCHUS

(Part I)

Between February and June 1997, I was able to conduct autoptic examinations of most of the “late Byzantine” (i.e., fifth-seventh century) papyri from *P.Oxy.* I and XVI that belong to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. The results of these investigations will be presented in a series of short communications, of which this is the first. Mention of a text in this first installment does not imply that I have exhausted my notes concerning it.*

P.Oxy. I:

125.9: τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος σλζ σς → τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους σλζ σς

127 vo: At the end of their introduction to 127 recto, Grenfell and Hunt note, “On the *verso* is a list of payments, in two columns.” The first column might be more accurately described as “scratch”; there are calculations and valuations of quantities of commodities in sums of *nomismata*. Column II is a list of payments of κεράτια (always 27.5 or 13.75). The entries are in the form δ(ιὰ) τῶν ἀπὸ GN; among the places mentioned are Adaiou, Episēmou, Pleein, Posompous, Senokōmis, Seryphis, Sephō, and Ōphis.

137.5: τοῖς εὐφουεστάτοις διαδόχοις → τοῖς ὑπερφουεστάτοις διαδόχοις, as may be seen clearly in pl. 4 of *P.Oxy.* LVIII. [I have since noticed that the correct text is presented without comment by Roberta Mazza in both “Ricerche sul pagarca nell’Egitto tardoantico e bizantino,” *Aegyptus* 75 (1995) 237, and “Φλ. Ἀπίων γενόμενος πρωτοπατρίκιος,” *Simblös* 2 (1997) 215.]

140.9 (= *W.Chr.* 438.9): ἐπὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα → ἐφ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα. See Gignac, *Gram.* I, 135, for such false aspiration.

141 (= *Stud. Pal.* VIII 1155): The hand of the signature (ll. 6-7) of this text is the same as that of *PSI* VIII 957 (ll. 6-7), which is also an order addressed to an οἰνοχειριστής named Phoibammōn. The latter text thus should date to 29.i.504 (forty-one days after I 141), and not, as has been asserted recently [D. Montserrat, G. Fantoni, and P. Robinson, “Varia descripta Oxyrhynchita,” *BASP* 31 (1994) 72], to “a twelfth indiction which must be 593.” (I must thank Professor R. Pintaudi and Dr. R. Coles for the images that respectively triggered and then confirmed my recollection.)

***PSI* VIII 957.6:** πρὸς ἀπαί(τησιν ?) → προσάπαξ (kindly indicated to me by Professor R.S. Bagnall).

146.2 (= *Stud. Pal.* III 280): ἀπὸ γεουχικ(ῆς) χορτοθήκ(ης) → ἀπὸ τῆς γεουχικ(ῆς) χορτοθήκ(ης)

P.Oxy. XVI

1854.1: ἴνα ἵππον ὄν ἔλαβαν → ἴνα τὸν ἵππον ὄν ἔλαβαν

1864.8: συνήθως μέγιστά μοι → συνήθως τὰ μέγιστά μοι

1868.6: προειρημένος ἀνὴρ → προειρημένος καθοσιωμένος (l. καθοσιωμένος) ἀνὴρ

1908.8: δ(ιὰ) τῶν ἀπὸ Σευήρου → δ(ιὰ) τῶν ἀπὸ Λευκίου. With this emendation, the last attestation of the Oxyrhynchite ἐποίκιον Σευήρου may be removed from Calderini, *Diz.* IV.3, 270. (For *PSI* IX 1056, see *BL* VIII 405.) The proposition (in F. Gomaà, R. Müller-Wollermann, and W. Schenkel, *Mittel-*

* My research in Egypt was generously funded by the United States Information Agency (USIA); I am most grateful to the Agency, and to Director Mark Easton and his staff at the American Research Center for their kind support during my fellowship. I would also like to thank Dr. ‘Ali Ḥasan (then Secretary General, Supreme Council of Antiquities) and Dr. Muḥammad Šāliḥ (Director General, Egyptian Museum) for their kind permission to work with the papyri; and Mr. Sayyid Ḥasan al-Sayyid (Chief Curator, Sixth Section, Egyptian Museum), Mr. Maḡdi Aḥmad Ismā‘il (Assistant Curator, Sixth Section), Ms. Khulūd Muḥammad Aḥmad (Assistant Curator, Sixth Section), and Mr. Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Ġawād (Curator, Fourth Section), for their friendly assistance and hospitality during my work at the Museum. I am also grateful to Mr. M. Pomerantz (University of Chicago), who provided much practical guidance during my stay in Cairo, and to Mr. Nico Kruit (Rijksuniversiteit Leiden), who furnished an advance copy of some relevant material from *BL X*.

I was fortunate to be able to complete my work on this report during a Junior Fellowship in Byzantine Studies at Dumbarton Oaks. I remain grateful for the very generous support that I received during this period.

ägypten zwischen Samalūt und dem Gabal Abū Šīr, Wiesbaden 1991, 87) that the ἐποίκιον Σευήρου might be modern az-Zawṣra is untenable.

1911: The author has provided Dr. Roberta Mazza (Università di Bologna) with his notes on this text, and he directs the reader to her article (“P.Oxy. XVI, 1911 e i conti annuali dei *pronoetoi*,” *ZPE*, in press) for additional material.

1911.66: σίτ(ου) (ἀρτ.) κς → σίτ(ου) κ(αγκέλλω) (ἀρτ.) κς, cf. *P.Oxy.* LV 3804.138. These are the additional cancellus artabas that appear in ll.68-69.

1911.72: Ἐρουθίνου → Π[α]κιάκ (contra *BL IX* 190).

1911.73: Ἄντᾶ → Ἰσίου Παγγᾶ (contra *BL IX* 190).

1911.87: ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) σιτι[κ]οῦ → ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) γηδίου, cf. 3804.159.

1911.104: ὑπὲρ (ἀρου.) β → ὑπὲρ (ἀρου.) γ

1911.105: ἐπὶ τῆς ὦν ε ἰνδ(ικ.) → ἐπὶ τῆς νῦν ε ἰνδ(ικ.)

1911.106: (ἀρτ.) L d → (ἀρτ.) ε L d, cf. n. to ll. 105-6 in ed. pr.

1911.110: νο(μ.) L d → νο(μ.) γ L d, as in 3804.199.

1911.112: νο(μ.) L d → νο(μ.) L, as in 3804.198.

1911.117: (ἀρου.) ε ἀφόρ(ου) γῆς [νο(μ.) γς κδ ρς] νο(μ.) γς κδ ρς → (ἀρου.) ε d, φόρ(ου) τῆ (ἀρού.) α νο(μ.) L ιβ μῆ ρς, νο(μ.) γς κδ ρς, a correct equation.

1911.125: Φοιβάμμωνος διακ(όνου) → Φοιβάμμωνος Ἰσὰκ, cf. 3804.81.

1911.128: ἐδάφ(ους) Καμηο..... → ἐδάφ(ους) Καμηῆ [cf. *BL IX* 191] (ἀρ.) η´, undoubtedly followed by a now illegible καὶ ὑπὲρ.

1911.143: αὶ καὶ ἐξ (ἐκατοστῶν) (ἀρτ.) ιε → αὶ κ(αγ.) (ἀρτ.) ἐξ (ἐκατοστῶν) (ἀρτ.) ιε

1911.147: [ὑπ]ὲρ νο(μ.) ν π(αρά) ε → ὑπὲρ νο(μ.) ν π(αρά κερ.) σ

1911.158: αὐτῶν χωρ(ίων) ορίου καὶ Ταρουσέβ → μηχ(ανῆς) Τῶν Χωρ(ίων) (cf. *BL IX* 191) τοῦ κτήμα(τος) Ταρουσέβ, cf. 3804.221.

1911.161: Νοτινοῦ διὰ Ἰσὰκ → Νοτίνου ὑπὸ Ἰσὰκ

1911.184: ἐδόθη(η) is preceded by ἀφ´ (ῶν); τοῖς αὐτ(οῖς) ἀμπελουρ(γοῖς) β κτημ(άτων) → τοῖς αὐτ(οῖς) ἀμπελ(ουργοῖς) τῶν β κτημ(άτων).

1911.185: τὰ δοθ(έντα) αὐτ(οῖς) παρὰ τῶν κεραμ(έων) Ἄρποκρᾶ κοῦφ(α) → τὰ δοθ(έντα) δι(ὰ) Σουροῦτος τῶν κεραμ(έων) Ἄρποκρᾶ κοῦφ(α). For Sourous, see ll. 181 and 187.

1911.186: τῶν κούφ(ων) ρ α L χο(ίν.) ζ, *vacat* (ἀρτ.) κβ L χο(ίν.) ζ → τῶν κούφ(ων) ρ (ἀρτ.) L χο(ίν.) δ, *vacat* σίτ(ου) κ(αγκ.) (ἀρτ.) β L χο(ίν.) ζ. The equation in ll. 185f. is now correct.

1911.191: ὑπὲρ κούφ(ων) → ὑπὲρ τῶν κούφ(ων)

1911.195: Ἄνουθίου (ἀρτ.) L → Ἄνουθίου (ἀρτ.) γ L

1911.197: Κουεινεχοσὺν (ἀρτ.) α χο(ίν.) δ → Κουεινέχος (ἀρτ.) α χο(ίν.) ζ, cf. *BL IX* 191. With this correction and the correction for l. 195, the sum of the artabas in ll. 195-205 now matches the total given in l. 194.

1911.203: Ἄνδρέου → Ἄνδρέα

1911.206: σίτ(ου) κ(αγκ.) (ἀρτ.) /ασ(?)ιδ L χο(ίν.) ζ → σίτ(ου) κ(αγκ.) (ἀρτ.) /αφιδ L χο(ίν.) α, contra *BL III* 140. The amount in the emendation happily equals the sum of the grain expenditures reported in ll. 99, 127, 154, 183, 186 (see above), and 194. When it is subtracted from the receipts in grain (l. 207 + *BL IX* 191), there is a remainder of 20.5 artabas and 4 choinices. This figure conflicts with the ed. pr., where a remainder of 20.5 artabas and 1 choinix is reported (l. 208). Unfortunately, the condition of the papyrus did not permit me to confirm either reading, and, as the editors note, the surcharge calculation in l. 208 suggests an even higher number of choinices than 4.

1912.22: σίτου μέτρ(ω) οε d → σίτου μέτρ(ω) (ἀρτ.) οε d

1912.50: σίτου μέτρ(ω) (ἀρτ.) *vacat* νο(μ.) [→ σίτου μέτρ(ω) (ἀρτ.) κη L χο(ίν.) β νο(μ.) [

1912.61: π(αρά) Ἰ λ καὶ Πέτρου χαλκ(έων) → π(αρά) κληρ(ονόμων) Πέτρου χαλκ(έως)

1912.68: φόρ(ου) [] → φόρ(ου) φ[οινίκ(ων)]

1912.71: ἀποτάκ[τ(ου) φ]όρ(ου) → ἀποτάκ[τ(ου) χ]ώρ(ίων)

1912.74-78: The payments of grain in ll.74-78 are in cancellus artabas, not metron artabas. In l.78: / (ἀρτ.) ρβ L → / (ἀρτ.) ρη L, i.e., the payment in l. 72. The total number of cancellus artabas in this column (to be supplied in the lacuna in l. 78) is 71.

1912.89: [π(α.) τῶν] αὐ(τ.) γεωργ(ῶν) καὶ ἀμπελουρ(γῶν) ὑπ(ἐρ) αὐ(τῶν ?) νο(μ.) η → [π(α.) τῶ]ν αὐ(τ.) γεωργ(ῶν) καὶ ἀμπελουρ(γῶν) ὑπ(ἐρ) ἀπ(οτάκτου χωρίων) νο(μ.) η seems probable, though the abbreviation for ἀπότακτον χωρίων is irregular, contra, e.g., ll. 81, 136-37.

1912.123: ὄμ(οῦ ?) → (μυριάδες), so elsewhere in the line, and in XVI 1910.5 (x2). (The latter papyrus is in the Ashmolean.)

1913, col. I: Not much of interest is preserved, though the remains of an entry for the wages of brickmakers and a builder (cf. *P.Oxy.* LV 3804.151-53) reveal that the rarely attested Καθηγητοῦ and Ἴβοεῖς (see P. Pruneti, *I centri abitati dell'Ossirinichite*, Florence 1981, s.vv., and add 3805.65) were concerns of this account.

1913.4: ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῶν κτημάτων → ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτῶν κτηνῶν

1913.10: The οὕτως above this line actually belongs to col. I.

1913.26: εἰς τροφ(ῆν) τῶν πούλλων → εἰς τροφ(ῆν) τῶν πουλλίων. πούλλος should be removed from S. Daris, *Il lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*², Barcelona 1991, s.v.

1914.10: Φαρμουῦθι ιη → Φαρμουῦθι κη

1914.14: ἐνταγί(οις) αὐτ(οῦ) → ἐνταγί(οις) οὔσ(ι)

1915.6-7: δημ(οσ.) νο(μ.) ιβ, [] | ὑπ(ἐρ) ἐνχόρ(του) ἀμπέλ(ου) → δημ(οσ.) νο(μ.) ιβ, | ἐξ (ῶν) ὑπ(ἐρ) ἐνχόρ(του) ἀμπέλ(ου), cf. the editors' note to this line.

1915.13: γί(νονται) (ἄρου.) ζ → γί(ν.) ὑπ(ἐρ) (ἀρουρῶν) ζ

1915.21: καὶ ἀμπέλ(ου) ο [] (ἄρου.) δ → καὶ ἀμπέλ(ου) (ἄρου.) [δ, cf. the editors' note to this line.

1917.15: σίτ(ου) (ἀρτ.) ρλθς' κδ' → σίτ(ου) (ἀρτ.) ρλβς' κδ'. With this emendation, the number of artabas reported in 1917.24 equals the sum of the grain entries written on the leaf.

1917.93: σίτ(ου) (ἀρτ.) ρλβ L ι' → σίτ(ου) (ἀρτ.) ρλβ L η', cf. the editors' note to this line.

1917.117: κηπολαχανίας ἐσαῦθ(ις ?) τοῦ ἐποικ(ίου) → κηπολαχανίας ἔσωθ(εν) τοῦ ἐποικ(ίου), cf. the editors' note to this line.

1937.1: παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀδελφότητος → παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρας γνησίας ἀδελφότητος, cf. *P.Oxy.* XVI 1845.3.

1987.13-14: ἐξῆς ὑπογράφ[ων τῆ | ἰδία χειρὶ → ἐξῆς ὑπογράφ[ων | ἰδία χειρὶ

1999.3: τρίτης ἐπινε(μήσεως) νομίσμα(τα) ἐπτὰ → τρίτης ἐπινε(μήσεως) χρυσοῦ νομίσμα(τα) ἐπτὰ

2012.2: γί(ν.) ὀνόμ(ατα) μ → γί(ν.) (ὑπὲρ) ὀνομ(άτων) μ

2015.1: τῶν μοναζ(όντων) ἀββᾶ Ἀνδρέου → τῶν μοναζ(όντων) μοναστηρ(ίου) ἀββᾶ Ἀνδρέου, as *P.Oxy.* I 146 (= *Stud. Pal.* III 280), *SB XVIII* 14061-63.

2018.4: Παταῶ → Πατεῶ, so also ll. 7 and 10, and, no doubt, 15 and 16. The editors report, "...the copy has Πατβῶ, but as the β is in all cases marked as doubtful and Παταῶ is certain in 2036, the latter form is no doubt to be read here also." Πατεῶ is also attested in *P.Oxy.* XVIII 2197.62. Pruneti, *Centri*, 137, states that Παταῶ and Πατεῶ are very probably the same place.

2018.8: Following Ἐπεῖφ, the text actually continues ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ε (ὑπὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) ζ ἰνδ(ικ.).

2018.20: ἐν κόμ(η) Κλεειη → ἐν κόμ(η) Παγνευεί. The editors suggested that Πλεεῖν might be read. Κλεειη should be removed from Pruneti, *Centri*, s.v.

2020.24: (ἀρτ.) /αρξε d η' → (ἀρτ.) /αλξε d η'

2020.25: (ἀρτ.) /αλξε d η' → (ἀρτ.) /αυζ L d η'

2025.5: κ(αγκ.) (ἀρτ.) υιζ L → κρ(ιθῆς) (ἀρτ.) υιζ L, so the editors' original transcript. They object that "l.5 must evidently agree with l. 34, where κ(αγκ.) was read," but in l. 34 I read κριθ(ῆς) for καὶ κ(αγκ.). Similarly, in l. 3 I read κρ(ιθῆς) for κ(αγκέλλω). These corrections give some consistency to the entries; with them, wheat always appears before specie, while barley is always booked after specie.

2025.9: σίτ(ου) is written before (ἀρτ.).

2028.4: π(αρὰ) Στατευὸ χαρτου(λαρίου) → π(αρὰ) Πατευῶ χαρτου(λαρίου). The former name should be deleted from the *Onomasticon*, s.v.

2037.5: ζύμης → -νεμησ-. There is illegible writing before this that the editors do not note in their text. The legible remains suggest that τῶν ἐπινεμήσ(εων) should be read, and the sum of money directly following confirms the reading, cf. ll. 2, 7, 15, 17-18, 24, 28-29.

2037.6: Once again, traces of writing (±5 letters) have been omitted from the ed. pr.; following ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L, one should probably read γ´ κδ´ μη´ (as in l. 2). (For an identically worded item in l. 18, the editors report ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L γ´ κδ´ μη´ ρς´. I was unable to confirm the ρς´, as the relevant part of the papyrus is now damaged.)

2037.12: νο(μ.) κς d → νο(μ.) μς d

2037.13: σίτου (ἀρτ.) λε L χο(ίν.) δ νο(μ.) β β´ η´ μη´ → σίτου (ἀρτ.) λθ L χο(ίν.) δ νο(μ.) β β´ ηο´ μη´ ρβ´.

2037.15: ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) φοινίκ(ων) ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L γ´ ιβ´ μη´ → ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) φοινίκ(ων) ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L γ´ κδ´ μη´, as elsewhere in the text [ll. 7, 20-21, 24 (see below), 29].

2037.22: νο(μ.) α L d → νο(μ.) θ L d, cf. notes in ed. pr.

2037.24: ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) φοινίκ(ων) ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L γ´ η´ μη´ → ὑπὲρ φόρ(ου) φοινίκ(ων) ἀπὸ νο(μ.) ζ L γ´ κδ´ μη´, as elsewhere in the text [ll. 7, 15 (see above), 20-21, 29].

2037.26: (ἀρτ.) μα L χο(ίν.) δ → (ἀρτ.) μθ L χο(ίν.) δ, cf. notes in ed. pr.

2037.30: ὑπὲρ τιμ(ῆς) βύρσης → ὑπὲρ τιμ(ῆς) βύρσας. The phrase τιμῆς βύρσας also appears in *P.Oxy.* VII 1057.2-3 (A.D. 362) and *P.Fuad I Univ.* app. II 322 vo.2 (IVth century?). These “irregular” genitives are the result of an analogic leveling of the declension, cf. Modern Greek, where the genitive of βύρσα is in fact βύρσας.

2039.15: οἰκονόμου → ἐποίησαν οὐ(τως)·

2055.24: Πατβαουῦτε → Παπβαουῦτε. The former name should be deleted from the *Onomasticon*, s.v.

2058.97: νο(μ.) β´ → νο(μ.) α L

2058.111: νο(μ.) β´ → νο(μ.) α γ´

2058.124: Πάπτου → Πάππου (written παπ´που). The former name should be deleted from the *Onomasticon*, s.v. (I have since noticed that the correct text appears on PHI CD 7!)

2058.140: νο(μ.) γ → νο(μ.) γ´

2058.152: This line actually reads γί(ν.) ῥ(μοῦ) νο(μ.) πδ λοιπ(ὰ) νο(μ.) β ἰδ(ιωτικῶ) ζυγ(ῶ). With the emendations in ll. 97, 111, and 140, this total is correct.

Notes on two papyri not in Cairo:

P.Oxy. XLIV 3204.11: Ναμίθας → Ταβιθᾶς. *NB*, s.v., reports that Ταβιθᾶ is indeclinable, but one does encounter the genitive in one of St. John Chrysostom’s homilies on Genesis (*PG* LIII, p. 276, l. 56). I am grateful to Dr. Revel Coles, who kindly furnished the photograph that enabled me to confirm my suspicion.

PSI VIII 953.6: ὑπὲρ τ[ο]ῦ μεγάλ(ου) ορ[.....] ὄξους δι(πλᾶ) ρ → ὑπὲρ τ[ο]ῦ Μεγάλ(ου) Ὀρ[ους] ὄξους δι(πλᾶ) ρ. The same place is mentioned in *P.Oxy.* LV 3804.284. There the editor thought that the Western Desert might be meant, but the entry in the Florentine account indicates that his second hypothesis (“a monastery or a community of cells called Μέγα Ὀρος”) is the correct one. Cf. also *P.Oxy.* XXVII 2480.119-120 and *P.Leid. Inst.* 80.7 and n.