NIKOLAOS GONIS

NOTES ON MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS VII


© Dr. Rudolf Habert GmbH, Bonn
87. BGU I 190

The verb εἰϲαποδίδωμι, ‘repay, refund’, is cited in LSJ from BGU I 190 fr. 2.3–4, ἔτιν δὲ μὴ ἰκανοῦ ὁποτικάτω παραχρήμα, an Arsinoite loan from the time of Domitian. DGE adds an example from PCair. Zen. Π. 59327.16 (post 249 BC) [εἰϲαποδέδωκεν χαλ[κοῦ ν]. The reading of the latter passage seems secure, but this does not hold for the Berlin papyrus. The clause ἔτιν δὲ μὴ ὑποκεῖϲθαί ὁποτικάτω is standard in loans, and this text offers no exception (we may recall that it was published in the 1890s). To judge from the online image, the scribe wrote ἔτιν δὲ μὴ – ἵ ὁποδοῦ, with a superfluous τ after μη, followed by a line-filler. Apart from fr. 2.3–4, the scribe added such iotas in fr. 1.2–3 and fr. 2.13. He was not alone in writing μὴ ὁποδοῦ; cf. BGU XI 2216.5 (26/25 BC) or SB XVIII 13783.8 (83/4). There may be line-fillers also in fr. 1.4 and fr. 2.16.1

The document has been dated to 81–96, but this should be narrowed to 84–96: Domitian bears the victory title Germanicus, which was still unknown in the Fayum at the beginning of 84 (year 3); see A. Martin, Pap. Congr. XVIII (1988) i 470.2

88. BGU I 323

This is an Arsinoite surety addressed to a dux of Arcadia in 651 (see CPR XXIV p. 204 n. 12). A village headman (μειζων) undertakes to arrest all foreign persons in his village and deliver them to the authorities by a certain date; if he fails to act by the deadline, he will have to pay a pound of gold for every missing person and be liable to the capital penalty. The reference to the latter punishment contains a textual difficulty, though the sense is not in doubt: μετὰ καὶ ὑποκ[εῖϲθαί τῇ] κεφαλητικῇ τιμωρίᾳ (II. 16–17). The online image shows that what looks like με is followed by a short high semi-horizontal that curves downwards at the end, before rising upwards to join the adjacent τ. This suggests μετα, i.e., μετά τῷ (τ. τοῦ) καὶ ὑποκ[είϲθα] με τῇ. The construction recurs in several tax declarations from Hermopolis of the early years of Arab rule (cf. J. Gascoy, ZPE 177 (2011) 248 with n. 26): P.Stras. VII 660.11 μετά καὶ τῷ (τ. τοῦ) ὑποκεῖϲθαι με τῷ τῆς ἐφειορκίαϲ ἐγκλήματι, P.Laur. III 117.8 μετά τῷ (τ. τοῦ) καὶ ὑποκεῖϲθαι κτλ; sim. P.Laur. III 112.10, 113.14, 114.18, 115.18, 116.14, 119.8 (μετά τοῦ), 120.5, PWürzb. 20.12. It is reasonable to assume that this is administrative language introduced immediately after the Conquest.

89. BGU XI 2018

The declarant in this census return of 188/9 from Karanis describes himself as ὁ προγεγραμμένος Πετσοραπίς (ἐτών) ν ἐργάτης (l. 8). The editor noted that the lowly profile of an ἐργάτης does not tally with the number of house properties in Petsoraipis’ possession. The apparent incongruity seems to have been removed after the reading of the end of the line was emended to (ἐτών) νς λαοὶ(γραφούμενος) (BL X 22), which has resolved one other difficulty: ‘Arsinoite village declarations … do not usually give occupations, so the revised text is in better conformity with the standard formula’ (R. S. Bagnall, BASP 29 (1992) 114). Yet the emendation is not without its problems: λαοὶ(γραφούμενος) assumes a misspelling, and the left leg of the purported lambda is an upright, unlike other lambdas in this hand. The letter looks more like gamma, as read previously; it has the same shape as the first gamma of προγεγραμμένος, and in fact that

---

1 This correction has been anticipated in P.Giss. II 127.45 n. (but the passage is wrongly cited as BGU I 290.2–3).
2 In this light, we may re-date BGU XI 2121, CPR I 236, P.Oxy. II 265, and SB XXVIII 16906 from 81/2–96 to 84–96. P.Oxy. II 334, ed. ZPE 170 (2009) 173ff., assigned to c. 81–3 on prosopographical grounds, cannot be earlier than 84.
gamma is linked to the next letter, ε, in the same way as gamma joins the next letter here. This has been read as alpha, but we may read epsilon instead, which will yield γεω( ), and then γεω(γός).

Instead of a propertied ἐργάτης, we have a propertied γεωργός. This is surely a shortening for δημό-ς ποιό γεωργός, not necessarily a distinct group in this period. To name an important parallel, the archive of Horos and Tapekyis from Bakchias (TM Arch 101) illustrates a relatively well-off family of public farmers. It is interesting that these farmers state their occupation in their census declarations: P.Mich. III 177.19–20 (104) Π[ετε]βρος ὁ προγ(εραμμένος) δημό(ός) | [γεωργ(ός)] (ἐτῶν) μδ; 178.17 (119) Ὡμος ὁ προγ(εραμμένος) δημό(ός) γεω(γός) (ἐτῶν) μη.3

90. P.Corn. 36
This is an account of payments from Oxyrhynchite villages, assigned to the third century. 'The list was made at the request of a curator civitatis': ἐπιςήυτος(νως) Προ[ , , , ]υ λαγιτο(υ) ] (l. 1). The reference to a curator civitatis suggests a later date than the third century. More interesting is the official's name. As we may see on the image, the first letter is eta, not pi, and the letter after rho is certainly alpha. The name then starts Ἡρα-. If we compare the traces and space with the way Ἡρακλέιον is written in l. 6, we have a perfect match: Ἡρα[κ][λε][ιο][ν]υ. This must be Heraclius, curator civitatis of Oxyrhynchus in 346 or 347 (P.Harris II 217). The account will be of the same date.

The payments are made in talents and minas. The editors printed μν[ , μ[,] , μ] in l. 4–6, noting that 'presumably μν Çünkü is to be supplied', but there is no other option. These would refer to a product such as meat; cf. e.g. P.Oxy. XXIV 2422 = SB XXVI 16570 (290).

91. P.Laur. III 93
This short list was originally assigned to the sixth century; more recently, L. Berkes, Dorfverwaltung und Dorfgemeinschaft in Ägypten von Diokletian zu den Abbasiden (2017) 246, placed it in the seventh on the basis of the hand, and probably in the Arab period. It was read as follows:

† το(ίς) γρ(αμματεύς) το(ίς) Ἡρακλειον(ος)
το(ίς) με(ίζονιν) Ἀπολυτάς
το(ίς) με(ίζονις) Διονυσιάδος
δι(ίτω) Φιλοθέου υ(ίοις) Σερήνου ἄρχ(ων) ς(υμμαμ(ά)χ(ου)

Ἡρακλειον(ος) was taken to be a misspelling of Ἡρακλέιον(ος), and Διονυσιάδος of Διονυσιάδος, both of them well-known Arsinoite villages. Ἀπολυτάς has not been recorded elsewhere. Dionysia (TM Geo 565), formerly of the division of Themistos, is last attested in 362 (SB XXII 15286), three centuries earlier than our text. This is unsettling; it would also be unusual to find a village of North-West Fayum in this late period. The relative location of Dionysias and Herakleonas (TM Geo 796) is also problematic; the latter was part of the old division of Herakleides, located near Kerkesoucha Orous, anywhere but close to Dionysias. It is not likely that this short list of village officials referred to places so far apart.

We may revisit the first place name. The scribe wrote τὸ Ἡρακλείον. The omicron of το sits on the notional baseline, unlike those at the start of ll. 1–3, written over the taus, indicative of abbreviations. The toponym is not abbreviated. Τὸ Ἡρακλείον is a known Oxyrhynchite locality (TM Geo 4345); the same applies to Διονυσιάδος, recorded also in this period (TM Geo 9964; cf. also P.Oxy. LXXXIII 5368.14 n.). Herakleion is found with the article in texts of the third century; in its two other late attestations, POxy. XVI 2020.21 and XIX 2243(a).11, it occurs in constructions that would not have used the article. One may question the grammar, the use of the nominative instead of the genitive, but as we see from l. 2 a toponym could be used indeclinably. Τὸ Ἡρακλείον belonged to the old Middle Toparchy; the location of Dionysias is unknown, but it must have lain nearby.

3 As mentioned above, this is rare in census returns from rural Fayum. The public farmers from Talei in P.Tebt. II 481 = SB XX 14164 i–ii (161) and the priest from Bakchias in SB XXVI 16538 (217) stated their occupation, though not in the body of the text but in the prescript. We may question the supplement in SB XX 14164.i.9 Ἡραν ὁ προφητεύω(μιμένος) γεω(γός) (ἐτῶν) μη. The corresponding part in 14164.i.11 has ὁ προφητεύω(μιμένος) (ἐτῶν) λη.
We may also read the abbreviations at the beginning of ll. 1–3 differently. το( ) would stand for το(υ) or το(ν); the former is preferable, since entries in the genitive are common in lists: το(υ) γρ(αμματεύος) (1), το(υ) μειζόνον(υ) (2, 3). The list may derive from a government authority or an estate with interests in these villages. A σώματος could be employed by anyone in authority, private or public.

92. P.Lond. II 387
A certain Σαμβάς στομεύλης occurs in l. 18 of this sixth/seventh-century Arsinoite account. στομεύλης was thought to be a version of στομούλης, and it is in this form that the word appears in Preisigke’s Wörterbuch, translated as ‘Müller’. The Revised Supplement to LSJ presents it as σιτομ(εύ)λης, ‘miller’, but the iota that has replaced upsilon is an error. The reading of άρκλῆς, translated as ‘Müller’, is an unusual interchange. Inspection of the image shows that στομεύλης is a ‘ghost word’: the papyrus has στομεύρης. A στομέτρης called Sambas is known from CPR X 30.4, but this text is earlier than P.Lond. 387.

93. P.Lond. III 972
This fourth century rent receipt closes with a signature, ce(στομεύρης) ... ροκ( ) (l. 2). To judge from the online image, the papyrus has εσεθ(μεύρης) ὡς πρόκειται very quickly written, so that the second loop of ω, ε and the first leg of π are fused together. Contemporary documents ending εσεθ(μεύρης) ὡς πρόκειται are P.Stras. III 136.15 (281) and SB XXIV 16270.9 (341).

94. P.Lond. V 1740
This tax receipt begins δέδωκεν ὀνόμ(ατο) Νῦνα Ὀλημπιοδόρ(ου) δι(ου) Βασιλείδο(ου) ἄπασι(τητοῦ) τῆς Ἐλευθέρας. The reading of ἄπασι(τητοῦ) was questioned, since the reference to a tax-collector is hard to explain at this point (BL IX 247); the combination of this function with a ἐφευθέρας, a noun, not a name) would also be odd. An image shows that the papyrus has ἐπέρ: it is a payment made by Basileides for his wife. Numerous payments on behalf of wives are recorded in P.Sorb. II 69 (see p. 52 for discussion) and other tax registers from Hermopolis of the early seventh century.

95. P.Lond. V 1760
After the corrections of P. J. Sijpesteijn, Aegeyptus 71 (1991) 47 (= BL X 108), line 3 begins Ψαφο ( ?) εὐ ν’ Θ(ε) βοηθ(ῶ) λαγις(πητοῦ) (Ψαφο... θε... βοηθῶς ε... ἐπ. pr.). A dotted psi where we expect a cross is suspicious; an image shows that we should read † Αφοῦς εὐν Θ(ε) βοηθ(ῶς) λαγις(πητοῦ). Aphous recurs in P.Lond. V 1756.14–15, which also refers to indication 4.

96. P.Prag. II 141
This is a land register assigned to the fifth century and said to be of unknown provenance. The entries consist of names or more often the phrase ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ followed by fractions of the arura: e.g. pg.ii.6–9 run [ ... Μιακαλ (ἀρ.) π’ λ’ ἕξ’ (π’ ι’ λ’ ed. pr.) | (καί) ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ (ἀρ.) δ’ ι’ λ’ | (καί) ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ (ἀρ.) Ιην’ ι’ λ’ (the restorations are secure). The editor thought that οὐτῷ ‘würde man auf einen vorausgehenden Namen beziehen und darin einen Landbesitzer sehen’, but the references are to κλήρος; κλήρος is the noun implied by ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ. One of the names, τῷ Ψαφτί (ρ. iv.4), is known to be that of of a Heracleopolite κλήρος; the editor referred to SPP X 206.13 κλῆρος Ψαφτί, but maintained that ‘[t]rotz der vielen geographische Angaben läßt sich diese Liste keinem bestimmten Gau zuweisen’. Yet there is no reason to assume that the same κλήρος is not mentioned in both texts. One other κλήρος is Αἰολικόνος (iv.8), but this is not an attested name. We should probably restore Μιακαλόνος, attested as the name of apparently a κλήρος in the Heracleopolite P.Eirene III 33.16 (5th c.). For ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ, we may compare a fifth-century Heracleopolite land lease, CPR I 42.9ff., περί κάμην Καβέτιν Μύκραν κύκλῳ τοῦ χωρίου (ἄρονος) η | Σακαπρ (ἀρ.) β’ ἄλλας ἐν τῷ οὐτῷ (ἀρ.) γ; here τῷ οὐτῷ can only refer to Σακαπρ, which will have been a κλήρος, not a village (contrast M. R. Falivene, The Heracleopolite Name (1998) 190).
97. PSI XIV 1413
This is the lower part of a letter assigned to the second/third century, but the hand suggests a date not much later than the middle of the first century. There is a partly unread passage in ll. 8–9: \( \pi \theta \theta \theta \omega \alpha i \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\alpha} \varepsilon \varepsilon i \) \( \Theta \beta \ldots \) \( \alpha \rho \iota \varepsilon \lambda e \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau o i \).

At the end of l. 8, the papyrus has \( \ddot{\alpha} \lll \alpha \ \theta \beta \beta \alpha (\tilde{i} \tilde{\kappa} \tilde{\alpha}) \ \pi \lambda o \tilde{\iota} \alpha \), followed by a letter with a curved back, if it is a letter. Every word ends with a raised \( \alpha \) (a rounded Hakenalpha), although only the second is abbreviated. The beginning of l. 9 is more difficult. There is no (\( \pi \alpha \rho \)), but what seems to be a large \( \pi \), though there is no other such pi in the text; \( \mu \) is less likely. I am not sure whether \( \epsilon l e \varepsilon \varepsilon t o i \) is correct; if it is, and we incorporate the writing at the end of l. 8, we have \( \ddot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \lambda e \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau o i \): possible but uncertain.

98. SB XII 10903
The name of the payer in this receipt caused difficulty: ‘Après la voyelle initiale \( \alpha \), le scribe a tracé un signe bouclé en bas, qui ne ressemble à rien. J’ai pensé au chi: \( \tilde{\alpha} \chi \), mais ce nom n’est pas attesté ailleurs; en outre les chi dans ce texte sont très différents du signe en question.’ (IJJP 16–17 (1971) 107) The image shows that instead of \( \nu \delta \theta (\kappa i \tau \iota \nu o \nu o) \ A \ \mu \! \varepsilon \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \) (l. 1) one may read \( \nu \delta \theta (\kappa i \tau \iota \nu o \nu o) \ M \! \varepsilon \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \). But I admit that \( M \! \varepsilon \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \! \lambda \) is not a name known otherwise.

In l. 3, for \( \pi (\alpha \rho \alpha) \) \( k (\varepsilon r \alpha \tau i \alpha) \) \( \gamma \ \delta \) read \( \pi (\alpha \rho \alpha) \) \( \gamma \ \delta \) \( \mu \! \omicron \! \alpha \).
after τῆς, not reported in the edition, stands for (αὐτῆς). In sum, I propose to read † Β † δι(ακτολεύς) δι’ ἐμοῦ Πέτρου λογογράφου | σμφ(ονεί) † τῆς (αὐτῆς) πρώτης ἰνδ(ικτίωνος).

101. SB XIV 12130
This fifth/sixth-century account of money contains a reference to (δηναρίων) μυριάδες ρ Άφ (l. 22). The purpose of the two consecutive numbers, 100 and 1500, is not obvious, but on closer inspection the second number turns out to be illusory. The papyrus has ἀφ; if the dash represented the thousands, it would appear before α. This is to be read as ἄφ’ (ἀν), a phrase that normally introduces expenses.

102. SB XX 14451
This short fourth-century text conveys an urgent message: τὴν ἡμίσειαν τῆς προτέρας ἀννών | ἕδη συλλέξατε · καὶ γὰρ [ἐνθοθεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔρχομαι, τῆς χρείας ἐπειγούϲ]. The Greek is unobjectionable, but [ἐνθοθεν] makes one pause, as it adds an unnecessary detail. An image has recently been posted on line, and indicates that [ὑ] would fit in the lacuna only with difficulty (there would be no room in it for the αν of ἡμίσειαν). I propose to restore [ἐνθοθεν], which suits the space and adds to the urgent tone of the note: ‘Collect half of the previous (instalment of the) annona now; in fact, I’m coming to you early in the morning, since the need is pressing.’ All other examples of ἕωθεν in the papyri (six in DDbDP) are found with verbs that indicate or imply motion.

103. SB XX 14702
There are some curiosities in this seventh-century account from Hermopolis, including the entry (ὑπὲρ) ναύλου καμηλίου του (ἀρτάβη) κρ [ἡϲ] Ἀντινόου (l. 13). (ἀρτάβη) creates an anomalous sequence, even if we opted for different case. The image shows the classic artaba-symbol, a circlet with a short horizontal above, but this is not the one used for the artaba at that time. A more natural reading would be ου, that is, καμηλίου. For the construction, cf. SPP XX 211.3 (6th/7th c.; ‘V/VI’ ed.pr.) (ὑπὲρ) ναύλου καμηλίου ξα.

104. W.Chr. 325
This is a revised version of a petition of 140, first printed as P.Lond. III 846. Wilcken had recorded the corrections in APF 4 (1908) 547f., where he noted: ‘Wenn also ἐπηρεάζοντες μου zu schreiben ist, so muß notwendig das folgende ρω[δ]ο[ς] και, dessen Lesung G[renfell &] H[unt] bestätigen, verschrieben sein für ἀναδεδώκας.’ Wilcken printed: ἐπηρεάζοντες μου ἀναδεδώκας μου τὸ ὄνομα εἰɕ βυτερείαν. This would be an extraordinary misspelling in an otherwise correct text, but the image reveals that what Wilcken thought as the intended form is the true reading. The letter after the lacuna is delta, with the right-hand part raised high. Then, και is followed by a sinusoid that descends below the line. This should be read as και, as in εὐεργεϲίας in l. 16. I juxtapose clippings of the two passages:

The text should now run ἀναδ[ε][δ]ώκας μου τὸ ὄνομα κτλ.

Nikolaos Gonis, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, London WC1E 6BT
n.gonis@ucl.ac.uk

---

5 The text begins π(αρὰ) Ὀλυμπίου, followed by a dot at mid height (α μέϲη στιγμή); the editor printed a dash, noting that it was on the original, but this must be an illusion created by the photograph.