P.Oxy. 18.2195

Several corrections have already been made to this extensive account of an Apionic pronoetes.¹ A fresh examination of the text (on the basis of images, with occasional checks of the original) has revealed numerous other problems, though most of them are rather small.² A digest is given below.

We begin with personal names; the reading of several of them, mostly not known otherwise, requires correction, while a few others were not transcribed.

2 Ἰωάννου → Ἰωάννου Παρακατε; the name Παρακατε in this form is new, but has been attested as Παρακοτε/Παρακώτε, "the man of Alexandria" (see P.Lond.Herm., p. 61).

9 . . φιμοῦ Ἰουλίου → Μαξίμου Ἡλίου Ἰουλίου

Moving on to toponography, we find κώμ(ης) τοῦ Τρύφωνος in l. 38; the editor notes: "This village is probably to be identified with Τρύφωνος Ἰσιήου (Ἰσίου) ἐποίκιον." The presence of the article is problematic; there is enough room to restore [Ἰσίο]ν Τρύφωνος, though this settlement is not known as a κώμη in this period.

An ἐποίκιον attested exclusively in this document is Ἀμβακος, read in lines 59, 60, and 103; this however must be deleted from the toponomastic repertories, since the papyrus has Ἀμβικος. This confirms that Ἀμβίκος is a toponym in SB 22.15603.19,³ its only other occurrence in papyri.

Another unique place name was thought to occur in l. 122, where the editor read τὰ ἀπὸ Μειναστ( ) ἐνεχθ(έντα) καὶ συνεχωρηθ(έντα), but the papyrus has τὰ ἀπομείναντ(α) (or ἀπομείναντα, if the character written over τ is α). The verb ἀπομένω is used for money in the Apionic P.Oxy. 62.4350.12 and 4351.10.

There are many mechanai attested in the text; the names of three of them should be read differently:

102 Τώφατε → Ταψατε
162 Ἐρυθεως → Τερυθεως
168 Π(ε)d(ιά)δος → Παχος

² The high number of omissions suggests that the transcript of this account, written in a very legible hand, was not rechecked. The introduction to the volume refers to the difficulties caused by the outbreak of WWII, but apparently the volume was sent to the printers before that. There are also numerous entry errors in the DDbDP version of this text accessible at http://www.papyri.info/ddbdp/p.oxy;18;2195/.
A question of grammar comes up in l. 79, γί(νονται) αἱ ὀφείλ(ὸμεναι) ἤνεχθ(ησαν) δι(ὰ) Κόμιτος⁴ προ(νοητοῦ) | Σκυταλίτιδος σῖτου (ἀρτάβαι) κτλ. The indicative ἤνεχθ(ησαν) does not fit into the syntax. The standard construction of ὀφείλω (active) is with the infinitive, and we may consider reading αἱ ὀφείλ(ουσαι) ἤνεχθ(ήναι) (l. ἤνεχθήναι); cf. P.Oxy. 16.1916.43 λοί(πὰ) τὰ ὀφειλ(ὸμεναι)⁵ ἤνεχθ(ήναι) εἰς τοῦτον τὸν λόγον.

A more complex problem arises in lines 104–105, which were printed as follows:

ὑπὲρ μεταφορ(ᾶς) σῖτου τοῦ κτήμ(ατος) Νεκόνθεως βληθ(έντος) εἰς τὸν αὐτ(ὸν) διά νο(μ. α) γ’ π(α. ε) και δο(μ. η) τη [γ’ μη’ φζ’] π(α. κς) κς’

The editor notes (105 n.): “At the end of this line are given the totals for this column; the amount paid for the last item has been placed in l. 104.” The scribe was pressed for space as he was approaching the lower edge of the papyrus roll, but it is not exactly true that the total for the column was placed at the end of 105; this should have been given in a new line in the edition, with the amounts moved from the end of 104 to the end of 105. This arrangement would have made it easier for the reader to connect διά with the line immediately following, which however needs revision: read μὴ δέξασθαι, not μηχ(ανής) Ἀσασι. It might be possible to read τὸν προ(νοητήν) instead of τοῦ προ(νοητοῦ), but either way the grammar is problematic: the infinitive cannot construe with the genitive, and we need to supply the article to justify the accusative, διὰ <τὸ> τὸν προ(νοητήν) μὴ δέξασθαι. The latter option is more likely; for διὰ τὸ + inf. in another Apionic account, see P.Oxy. 55.3804.283ff. Another problem is the phrase βληθ(έντος) εἰς τὸν αὐτ(ὸν); it will be natural to associate τὸν αὐτ(ὸν) with the comes Iustus who is mentioned in l. 103 as the recipient of wheat and money for an irrigated farm of his,⁶ but we do not expect to find a person after βληθ(έντος) εἰς. The abbreviation is also ambiguous: what is written over τ is similar to what could be taken as α in l. 122, ἀπομείναντι(α). Whatever the case, the action described by βληθ(έντος) had some connection with payments mentioned earlier, and may have been occasioned by the fact that the pronoetes did not receive the wheat.⁷

A curious spelling occurs in l. 189, συνεχωρήθ(η) Παπνουθίῳ Σαρᾶ ἀπὸ Τοῦ ἀνηκοῦστε τῆ(ς) ἀγί(ας) ἐκκά(ληςιας), with “Ἰ. ἀναγνώστη” given in the apparatus. The papyrus has ἀνήκοντε.⁸ The expression is novel, but might be paralleled by the δοῦλος τῆς ἀγίας Θεοτόκου that we find in early seventh-century Fayum (see CPR X, p. 30).

---

⁴ The reading is new; κόμιτος ed. pr., Κόμιτος BL 6.106.
⁵ Here too it may be preferable to expand ὀφείλ(ὸντα).
⁶ τὸ αὐτὸ κόμι(α) Τιοστὼν Εὐδάμιον(ος) ὑπέρ(πὲρ) τῆς δοθ(είσης) αὐτοῦ (l. αὑτὸ) μηχ(ανής) κτλ.
⁷ We are grateful to Todd Hickey for discussion of this passage.
⁸ As the anonymous reader of the journal points out, the usual construction of ἀνήκοντε would imply changing the following genitives to datives, though “the way τῆ has been written, with eta written above tau, may rule against this.”
As is to be expected in an account of this length, there are a very few small problems with the scribe’s arithmetic, pointed out by the editor in the notes. In one case, however, the picture is slightly different. 143 n. reads: “The total of solidi in this line (which consists of the column totals of ll. 105, 129, and 150) exceeds the totals of the individual items by \(4/96\).” The scribe and the editor missed a fraction each. The total at l. 105 without the minus carats reads \(η [\gamma \mu ζ]^\prime\), but if we add the sums in this column the total is \(18\frac{1}{2}/48\frac{1}{96}\), that is, \(1/2\) more than the sum restored in the edition. The fraction could be easily inserted into the lacuna: read \(η [\gamma \mu ζ]^\prime\). With the addition of \(1/2\), the total of the sums in lines 105, 129, and 150 is \(91\frac{1}{2}/24\frac{1}{96}\), i.e., \(1/6\) higher than the figure written by the scribe in l. 143 (φα \(γ\) κδ’).

Other minor corrections are listed below:

10 σίτου (άρτάβαι) γ δ´ → σίτου (άρτάβαι) ι ς

11 νο(μ.) α κδ’ μη´ → νο(μ.) α ις κδ’ μη´

17 σίτου γ → σίτου (άρτάβαι) γ: (δηναρία) → (δηναρίων μυριάδες)

27 Πραυούτος σίτου → Πραυούτος άπο τού αυτού σίτου

53–54 are represented as one line but are not separately numbered, which suggests this is a typo. There is a line break after Κολλούθου και, with ἰπα Ὄρου starting l. 54.

66 [η] → [η γ]

What appears as line 66 are two lines, divided after the deletion. This has affected the numbering of all remaining lines in the text.

78 Δωσιθέου(υ) → Δοσιθέου (I. Δωσιθέου; same spelling in l. 127)

101 κ(αγκέλλω) ρε → κ(αγκέλλω) (άρτάβαι) ρε

113 δικαίο(υ), I. δικαίο: δικαίο is correct

131 The entry on this line continues (γίνονται) σίτου κ(αγκέλλω) (άρτάβαι) γροπε \(γ\) \(χο(ινικες)\) θ νο(ματα) κθ η ζ, which was omitted from the edition.

129 π(αρά) ζ → π(αρά) ζ: the scribe’s total of the ‘minus carats’ in l. 143 in fact assumes ‘minus 7’ here.

135 γεωρ(γόν) → γεωρ(γόος) (γεωρρ pap.; the same abbreviation occurs in l. 105)

136 ναυοί(αν) → ναυο(VALUE) (I. ναυόν)

144 τή(ς) α él(τής) ἱνδ(ίκτιονος) → τή(ς) α(τής) ἱνδ(ίκτιονος)

161 ἱνδ(ίκτιονος) → ἱνδ(ίκτιονος) oöl(τως)

168 (άρταβαι) και λξ → (άρτάβαι) λξ

169 Ψυλίππου Κολλα(υ)θο(υ) → Ψυλίππου και Κολλάθου

184 τόν έκ Νεκάνθεως → τόν έκ Νεκάνθεως

186 τή(ς) αώτή(ς) ἱνδ(ίκτιονος) → τή(ς) αώτή(ς) ἱνδ(ίκτιονος)

190 πλινθε(ύουσιν) → πλι(ν) θε(ύουσιν)
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9 The line contains a heading, ἐξ ὧν άνηλθόθ(η) ἐπὶ τή(ς) αώτή(ς) ἱνδ(ίκτιονος). The anonymous reader observes that the scribe wrote a small epsilon over the theta of ανηλθοθ, but this does not affect the expansion of the abbreviation (only theta is suprascript in l. 83, in a similar heading). Cf. P.Oxy. 19.2243a.4–7, etc., where a suprascript epsilon is used for abbreviated κόμη and κόμης.