

P.Oxy. 18.2195

Several corrections have already been made to this extensive account of an Apionic *pronoetes*.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 / Παρακωτε, “the man of Alexandria” (see *P.Lond.Herm.*, p. 61).

9 . . φιμου Ἰουλίου → Μαξίμου Ἡλίου Ἰουλίου

22 Κύρρα Κ. . . [ → Κυριακοῦ . [

28 Πάμοκ → Παβοκ; the name is new.

51 Σεμόρη → Τεμορη; the name is new.

62 Ἀφοῦτος → Ἀφοῦτος Πέτρου

112 Ἀκαρῶνι → Ἀβαρῶνι; the name is new.

172 Πανεῖ → Παννεε, presumably a new form of the known name Pane (see *P.Lond.Herm.*, p. 61)

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

An ἐποίκιον attested exclusively in this document is Ἄμωκος, read in lines 59, 60, and 103; this however must be deleted from the toponomastic repertories, since the papyrus has Ἄμβικος. This confirms that Ἄμβικος is a toponym in *SB* 22.15603.19,<sup>3</sup> 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 Ἐρύθεως → Τερύθεως

168 Π(ε)δ(ιάδ)ος → Παχος

<sup>1</sup> See *BL* 6.106, 7.146, 8.255, 9.194, 11.160; T. M. Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt* (Ann Arbor 2012) 183.

<sup>2</sup> 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/>.

<sup>3</sup> See P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 222.

A question of grammar comes up in l. 79, γί(νονται) αἱ ὀφειλ(όμενα) ἠνέχθ(ησαν) δι(ὰ) Κόμιτος<sup>4</sup> προ(νοητοῦ) | Σκυταλίτιδος σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) κτλ. The indicative ἠνέχθ(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) ἠνεχθ(ῆναι) (l. ἐνεχθῆναι); cf. *P.Oxy.* 16.1916.43 λοι(πὰ) τὰ ὀφειλ(όμενα)<sup>5</sup> ἐνεχθ(ῆναι) εἰς τοῦτον τὸν λόγον.

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

ὑπὲρ μεταφορ(ᾶς) σίτου τοῦ κτήμ(ατος) Νεκώνθεως βληθ(έντος) εἰς τὸν αὐτ(όν) διὰ  
 νο(μ.) α γ´ π(α.) ε □´  
 τοῦ προ(νοητοῦ) μηχ(ανῆς) Ἄσασι ὑ(πὲρ) τῶν γεωρ(γῶν) σίτου (ἀρτ.) σμ □ χο(ίν.) ε  
 καὶ νο(μ.) ιη [γ´ μη´ ρς´] π(α.) 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 διὰ with the line immediately following, which however needs revision: read μὴ δέξασθαι, not μηχ(ανῆς) Ἄσασι. 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 τό + inf. in another Apionic account, see *P.Oxy.* 55.3804.283ff. Another problem is the phrase βληθ(έντος) εἰς τὸν αὐτ(όν); it will be natural to associate τὸν αὐτ(όν) with the *comes* Iustus who is mentioned in l. 103 as the recipient of wheat and money for an irrigated farm of his,<sup>6</sup> 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, ἀπομείναντ(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.<sup>7</sup>

A curious spelling occurs in l. 189, συνεχωρήθ(η) Παπνουθίῳ Σαρᾶ ἀπὸ Τοῦ ἀνηκούστι τῆς(ς) ἀγί(ας) ἐκκλ(ησίας), with “l. ἀναγνώστη” given in the apparatus. The papyrus has ἀνήκοντι.<sup>8</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> The reading is new; κόμιτος ed. pr., Κόμιτος *BL* 6.106.

<sup>5</sup> Here too it may be preferable to expand ὀφείλ(οντα).

<sup>6</sup> τῷ αὐτῷ κόμε(τι) Ἰουστῷ Εὐδαίμωνος ὑ(πὲρ) τῆς(ς) δοθ(είσης) αὐτοῦ (l. αὐτῷ) μηχ(ανῆς) κτλ.

<sup>7</sup> We are grateful to Todd Hickey for discussion of this passage.

<sup>8</sup> As the anonymous reader of the journal points out, the usual construction of ἀνήκω 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  $\frac{47}{96}$ ." The scribe and the editor missed a fraction each. The total at l. 105 without the minus carats reads  $\eta$  [ $\gamma\acute{\mu}\eta\acute{\rho}\zeta$ ], but if we add the sums in this column the total is  $18\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{48}\frac{1}{96}$ , that is,  $\frac{1}{2}$  more than the sum restored in the edition. The fraction could be easily inserted into the lacuna: read  $\eta$  [ $\square\gamma\acute{\mu}\eta\acute{\rho}\zeta$ ]. With the addition of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , the total of the sums in lines 105, 129, and 150 is  $91\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{24}\frac{1}{96}$ , i.e.,  $\frac{1}{96}$  higher than the figure written by the scribe in l. 143 ( $\rho\alpha$   $\square\gamma\acute{\kappa}\delta'$ ).

Other minor corrections are listed below:

10 σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) γ δ' → σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) ις  $\square$

νο(μ.) α κδ'μη' → νο(μ.) α ζ<sup><</sup>κδ'μη'

17 σίτου γ → σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) γ ; (δηνάρια) → (δηναρίων μυριάδες)

27 Πρανοῦτος σίτου → Πρανοῦτος ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ 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 καί, with ἄπα Ὀρου starting l. 54.

66 [ $\eta$ ] → [ $\eta$  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 Δωσιθέο(υ) → Δωσιθέου (l. Δωσιθέου; same spelling in l. 127)

101 κ(αγκέλλω) ρε → κ(αγκέλλω) (ἀρτάβαι) ρε

113 δικαίο(υ), l. δικαίω: δικαίου is correct

131 The entry on this line continues (γίνονται) σίτου κ(αγκέλλω) (ἀρτάβαι) γφπε  $\square$  χο(ίνικες) θ νο(μισμάτια) κθ η'ρζ', which was omitted from the edition.

129 π(αρὰ) ζ → π(αρὰ) ζ; the scribe's total of the 'minus carats' in l. 143 in fact assumes 'minus 7' here.

135 γεωρ(γόν) → γεωρ(γούς) (γεωρρ  $\square$  pap.; the same abbreviation occurs in l. 105)

136 ναουί(ων) → ναουί(ων) (l. ναουί(ων))

144 τῆ(ς) αὐ(τῆς) ἰνδ(ικτίονος) → τῆ(ς) αὐ(τῆς) ι ἰνδ(ικτίονος)

161 ἰνδ(ικτίονος) → ἰνδ(ικτίονος) οὐ(τως)

168 (ἀρτάβαι) και λς → (ἀρτάβαι) λς

169 Φιλίππου Κολλο(ύ)θο(υ) → Φιλίππου καὶ Κολλούθου

184 τῶν ἐκ Νεκώνθεως → τῶν ἐν Νεκώνθεως

186 τῆ(ς) αὐ(τῆς) ἰνδ(ικτίονος) → τῆ(ς) αὐ(τῆς) ι ἰνδ(ικτίονος)<sup>9</sup>

190 πλινθε(ύουσιν) → πλι( ν) θε(ύουσιν)

<sup>9</sup> The line contains a heading, ἐξ ὧν ἀνηλώθ(η) ἐπὶ τῆ(ς) αὐ(τῆς) ἰνδ(ικτίονος). The anonymous reader observes that the scribe wrote a small epsilon over the theta of ἀνηλώθ, 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.