



# TYCHE

## Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Band 9, 1994

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer  
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

1994

BOLEKAPUEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

# TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 9

1994

  
H O L Z H A U S E N

**Herausgegeben von:**

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

**In Zusammenarbeit mit:**

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

**Redaktion:**

Johannes Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme  
Georg Rehrenböck, Hans Tacuber

**Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:**

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1,  
A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer  
Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.  
Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

**Auslieferung:**

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II<sup>2</sup> 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in  
Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1994 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.  
Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,  
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien  
Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.  
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.



## I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Raffaella C r i b i o r e (New York), A Homeric Writing Exercise and Reading Homer in School (Tafel 1) . . . . .	1
Johannes D i e t h a r t (Wien), Denis F e i s s e l (Paris), Jean G a s c o u (Strasbourg), Les prôtokolla des papyrus byzantins du V <sup>e</sup> au VII <sup>e</sup> siècle. Édition, prosopographie, diplomatique (Tafel 2–7) . . . . .	9
Michael G r ü n b a r t (Wien), Stempel in Mondsichelform. Ein Beitrag zur frühbyzantinischen Stempelkunde (Tafel 8–9) . . . . .	41
Heikki K o s k e n n i e m i (Turku), Einige Papyri administrativen Inhalts aus Turku (Tafel 10–15) . . . . .	51
Nico K r u i t (Leiden), Three Byzantine Sales for Future Delivery (SB XVI 12401 + 12402, SB VI 9051, P.Lond. III 997) (Tafel 16–17) . . . . .	67
Metodi M a n o v (Sofia), Eine neue Inschrift auf zwei silbernen Schöpfkellen aus Thrakien (Tafel 18) . . . . .	89
Arietta P a p a c o n s t a n t i n o u (Strasbourg), Conversions monétaires byzantines (P.Vindob. G 1265) (Tafel 19) . . . . .	93
Marjeta Š a š e l K o s (Ljubljana), The Embassy of Romulus to Attila. One of the last citations of Poetovio in classical literature . . . . .	99
Mustafa H. S a y a r, Peter S i e w e r t, Hans T a e u b e r (Wien), Asylie-Erklärungen des Sulla und des Lucullus für das Isis- und Sarapisheiligtum von Mopsuestia (Ostkilikien) (Tafel 20–24) . . . . .	113
Ralf S c h a r f (Heidelberg), Der Iuthungenfeldzug des Aëtius. Eine Neuinterpretation einer christlichen Grabinschrift aus Augsburg . . . . .	131
Oliver S c h m i t t (Jena), Die <i>Buccellarii</i> . Eine Studie zum militärischen Gefolgschaftswesen in der Spätantike . . . . .	147
Pieter J. S i j p e s t e i j n (Amsterdam), Four Papyri from the Michigan Collection (Tafel 24–26) . . . . .	175
J. David T h o m a s (Durham), 1) Epistrategoi in P.Rainer Cent. 68 — 2) A Note on CPR XVIIIA 16 . . . . .	181
Ruprecht Z i e g l e r (Düsseldorf), Aigeai, der Asklepioskult, das Kaiserhaus der Decier und das Christentum (Tafel 27) . . . . .	187
Sophia Z o u m b a k i (Athen), Ῥωμαῖοι ἐγγαλιούντες. Römische Grundbesitzer in Elis . . . . .	213
Bemerkungen zu Papyri VII (<Korr. Tyche> 130–147) . . . . .	219
Buchbesprechungen . . . . .	227

James C. A n d e r s o n jr., *The Thomas Ashby Collection of Roman Brick Stamps in the American Academy in Rome*, London 1991 (B. Lörincz: 227) — W. R. C o n n o r, M. H. H a n s e n, K. A. R a a f l a u b, B. S. S t r a u b, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, Copenhagen 1990 (W. Hameter: 227) — Nicola C r i n i t i, *La Tabula Alimentaria di Veleia*, Parma 1991 (W. Scheidel: 229) — D i o d o r o s, *Griechische Weltgeschichte*, Buch I–X. Übers. v. G. Wirth & O. Veh, Stuttgart 1992–1993 (G. Dobesch: 230) — Peter G r e e n, *Alexander to Action. The Hellenistic Age*, London 1990 (I. Kertész: 232) — Dieter H ä g e r m a n n, Helmuth S c h n e i d e r, *Landbau und Handwerk 750 v. Chr. bis 1000 n. Chr.* Frankfurt a. M. 1991 (W. Scheidel: 234) — Gerhard H o r s m a n n, *Untersuchungen zur militärischen Ausbildung im republikanischen und kaiserzeitlichen Rom*, Boppard a. Rhein 1991 (B. Palme: 234) — Anne K o l b, *Die kaiserliche Bauverwaltung in der Stadt Rom. Geschichte und Aufbau der cura operum publicorum unter dem Prinzipat*, Stuttgart 1993 (E. Weber: 236) — Jens-Uwe

K r a u s e, *Die Familie und weitere anthropologische Grundlagen*, Stuttgart 1992 (W. Scheidel: 237) — Venceslas K r u t a, *Die Anfänge Europas von 6000 bis 500 v. Chr.*, München 1993 (G. Dobesch: 238) — L. P. M a r i n o v i c, E. S. G o l u b c o v a, I. S. S i f m a n, A. I. P a v l o v s k a j a, *Die Sklaverei in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches im 1.–3. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1992 (W. Scheidel: 239) — Paul S c h u b e r t, *Les archives de Marcus Lucretius Diogenes et textes apparentés*, Bonn 1990 (B. Palme: 240) — M. W. H a s l a m, H. E l - M a g h r a b i, J. D. T h o m a s, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LVII*, London 1990 (B. Palme: 244) — John R. R e a, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LVIII*, London 1991 (B. Palme: 245) — Aules P e r s i u s F l a c c u s, *Satiren*. Hrsg., übers. u. erkl. v. W. K i ß e l, Heidelberg 1990 (G. Dobesch: 247) — Marc R o z e l a a r, *Lukrez — Versuch einer Deutung*. Nachdruck, Hildesheim 1989 (G. Dobesch: 248) — Ulrich S c h m i t z e r, *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen. Mythologische Dichtung unter politischem Anspruch*, Stuttgart 1990 (G. Dobesch: 250) — Reinhard S c h n e i d e r, *Das Frankenreich*, München <sup>2</sup>1990 (G. Dobesch: 252) — Reinhold S c h o l l, *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*, Stuttgart 1990 (B. Palme: 253) — Charlotte S c h u b e r t, *Die Macht des Volkes und die Ohnmacht des Denkens. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mentalität und Wissenschaft im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1993 (H. Heftner: 256) — Julia S ü n s - k e s T h o m p s o n, *Demonstrative Legitimation der Kaiserherrschaft im Epochenvergleich. Zur politischen Macht des stadtrömischen Volkes*, Stuttgart 1993 (E. Weber: 256) — Paul V e y n e, *Brot und Spiele. Gesellschaftliche Macht und politische Herrschaft in der Antike*, Frankfurt 1988 (G. Dobesch: 257) — Hans V o l k m a n n, *Die Massenversklavung der Einwohner erobert Städte in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, 2. ... u. erw. Aufl. v. G. Horsmann, Stuttgart 1990 (G. Dobesch: 259) — Ingolf W e r n i c k e, *Die Kelten in Italien. Die Einwanderung und die frühen Handelsbeziehungen zu den Etruskern*, Stuttgart 1991 (L. Aigner-Foresti: 259) — Wolfgang W i l l, *Julius Caesar. Eine Bilanz*, Stuttgart 1992 (G. Doblhofer: 261)

Indices (J. Diethart) . . . . . 263  
Tafeln 1–27

NICO KRUIT

Three Byzantine Sales for Future Delivery  
SB XVI 12401 + 12402, SB VI 9051, P.Lond. III 997\*

(Tafel 16–17)

During the preparation of my article *Local Customs in the Formulas of Sales of Wine for Future Delivery* (ZPE 94 [1992] 167–184), I also studied SB XVI 12401. Thanks to the re-allocation of some fragments, several readings could be emended. The new readings justified a reissue of this text, which I submit here<sup>1</sup>.

---

\* I would like to thank H. Harrauer (Vienna) for his invitation to prepare a new edition of SB XVI 12401 and his kind assistance during the preparation of this article. Also, I would like to thank T. S. Pattie for his permission to publish P.Lond. III 997 and for checking my readings on the original. He also provided me with the physical description of the papyrus. I am grateful to J. G. Keenan for sending me a print-out of his lecture held at the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists at Copenhagen (now published in the Proceedings, Copenhagen 1994, 444–451) and to J. van der Vliet (Leiden), who has read an earlier draft of the first part of this article, concerning the various Apa Apollos monasteries of Egypt.

List of abbreviated literature:

- S. Timm, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten in arabischer Zeit*, TAVO Beihefte 41/1–41/6, Wiesbaden 1984–1992.
- A. Calderini, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano*. *Coptic studies*. Acts of the Third International Congress of Coptic Studies Warsaw, 20–25 August 1984, Varsovie 1990.
- J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten* (*Byz. Not.*), MPER NS XVI, Wien 1986.
- M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite: toponymes et sites*, *American Studies in Papyrology* 21, Missoula 1979.
- M. R. M. Hasitzka, *Koptisches Sammelbuch (KSB I)*, MPER NS XXIII, Wien 1993.
- P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah, Coptic Texts from Deir el Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*, London 1954.
- P. Ermitage Copt. = P. W. Jernstedt, *Koptskie teksty Gosudarstvennogo Ermitaža*, Moskwa, Leningrad 1959.
- P.Lond. Copt. = W. E. Crum, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London 1905.
- P.Mich. Copt. = W. H. Worrell, *Coptic Texts in the University of Michigan Collection*, Ann Arbor 1942.
- P.Ryl. Copt. = W. E. Crum, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester 1909.
- P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Customs Duties in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, *Studia Amstelodamensia* 17, 1987.

<sup>1</sup> Further additions to the list of sales for future delivery in P.Heid. V and my article are given by A. Jördens, ZPE 98 (1993) 263, n. 1. P.Sta. Xyla Inv. O/154 has just been published as P.Sta. Xyla 6. In the meantime two more sales for future delivery, P.Mich.inv. 4291 (VI, Oxy., wine) and P.Mich.inv. 407 (347 AD, Ars., wheat and vegetable seed), have been published by P. J. Sijpesteijn, ZPE 100 (1994) 271–272 and 275–277. In SB XVIII 13124 the remark on l. 9 „ὄσόμενος ἰ. ὄξόμενος“ is a slip for „ἰ. ὄξόμενος“. For P.Lond. III 1303 see also J. Gascoy, ZPE 96 (1993) 135–140. Cf. also the Coptic sale of wine for future delivery on the back of P.Princ. II 84, edited by L. S. B. McCoull, ZPE 96 (1993) 227–229.

The text is addressed to someone of the monastery of Apa Apollos near the village of Titkois<sup>2</sup>. Other Greek documents addressed to someone belonging to this monastery are<sup>3</sup>:

P.Sta.Xyla 18	Loan of money (?)	487/488 AD
P.Sta.Xyla 8	Loan of money (?)	535 AD
P.Amst. I 47	Sale of wine for future delivery	537 AD
P.Sta.Xyla 5	Loan of money	539 AD
SB XVI 12267	Loan of wine	540 AD
P.Sta.Xyla 10	Loan of money	543 AD
P.Lond. V 1899 <sup>4</sup>		600 AD
SB VI 9051	Sale of wheat for future delivery	VI
P.Amst. I 48	Sale of wine for future delivery	VI
P.Sta.Xyla 6	Sale of wine for future delivery	VI
P.Sta.Xyla 19 <sup>5</sup>	?	VI/VII
SB XVI 12266	Tax receipt	VII

A Coptic text from the same monastery is P.Med.Copto inv. 76.21 (VI–VII), edited by S. Pernigotti, *Aegyptus* 65 (1985) 101–105. In his article in *Anagennesis* 1 (1981) 219, J. Gascou stated that the same monastery is also mentioned in several Coptic papyri in the possession of an antique dealer in Cairo in 1977. He informed me by letter that he does not know what has become of these texts. He was not able to make transcriptions of them at that time, so that these texts, apparently not yet published, cannot be taken into account.

<sup>2</sup> For this monastery see S. Timm, pp. 2077–2080, s. v. Ptoou n-Titkooh (P.Amst. I 47–48 are cited there as P.Amh. I 47–48) and p. 2700 s. v. Titkōis. Cf. also J. R. Rea, *JEA* 71 (1985), Suppl., p. 70 s. v. Τῖτκῶις.

<sup>3</sup> Not listed here is P.Sorb. inv. 2227 fol. 24↓, a codex concerning taxes from the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the VI<sup>th</sup> century, containing a reference to a monastery of Apa Apollos, identified with the one in Titkois by J. Gascou, *Anagennesis* 1 (1981) 219–220. Gascou informed me by letter that the text has δ(ιὰ) μου(αστηρίου) Ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλ[λωτος in fol. 29↓, E 3. However, he is not sure whether the monastery meant here is the one of Titkois or the one of Bawit. More details concerning this codex in L. S. B. McCoull, *Tyche* 2 (1987) 99–105, especially n. 3 and J. Gascou, *Les codices documentaires égyptiens*, *Bibliologia* 9 (1989) 71–101.

<sup>4</sup> It was suggested already in the commentary of the editio princeps of SB VI 9051 that in P.Lond. V 1899 reference is made to the same monastery. However, the supplement of l. 10 was never adapted. This suggestion was repeated by the editors of SB XVI 12401 in their commentary on l. 3, supplementing [ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος ἐν ὄρει κῶ]μης Τῖτκῶεως. The identification of Aurelios Kuriakos son of Kollouthos of P.Lond. V 1899 with his namesake, son of Kollouthos and Ioudith, as suggested in P.Mich. XIII 664 (cf. BL VII 92) has to be rejected. Both texts originate from different nomes. Besides, according to P.Mich. XIII 664, 12, Kollouthos has died in or before 584/599 i. e. in the 3<sup>rd</sup> indiction year, the 4<sup>th</sup> indiction is yet to come (see l. 27). P.Lond. V 1899 however, dates from 600, the 4<sup>th</sup> indiction year. If both persons would be the same, one would expect in P.Lond. V 1899, 6 an expression describing Kollouthos as deceased. This is not the case. With the editors of SB VI 9051 I doubt whether the solution προ(εστῶτι) in P.Lond. V 1899, 8 is correct (see their comm. on l. 2). With προ(εστῶτι) nothing is expected in the gap in l. 9 ending ]ου. ]ου could be the end of the fathersname of Isakios. In that case read perhaps Ἰσακίῳ προ(εσβυτέρῳ) | [υῖῳ NN]ου „to Isakios the priest, son of NN“.

<sup>5</sup> The reading of this fragmentary text has to be corrected. The honorific title εὐλαβέστατος (l. 1) is either added to a personal name or to a religious function, cf. F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch III*, Abschn. 9 s. v. and D. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden*, Diss. Gießen 1930, s. v. P.Sta. Xyla 19, l. 1 has therefore to be read and supplemented as [NN] τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου μο[νάχου] του μο[νάχου] of the monastery of Ἁπα Ἀπολλῶτος or [-] τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου Μο[ναχ]ῶ[ς] religious function of the monastery of Ἁπα Ἀπολλῶτος. The genitive is perhaps to be read as a dative (cf. e. g. P.Sta. Xyla 5, l. 7), ll. 1–2 thus building the address of the contract.

Apart from a koinobion of Apa Apollos in the Oxyrhynchite nome<sup>6</sup>, other monasteries of Apa Apollos are known in Bala'izah<sup>7</sup> (in the nome Apollonopolis Parva), Bawit<sup>8</sup> (in the Hermopolite nome) and in Aphrodito<sup>9</sup> (Antaiopolite nome). Yet another monastery of Apa Apollos (in Djeme) is mentioned in two Coptic texts in the Coptic Museum in Cairo<sup>10</sup>. From several Coptic and Greek texts mentioning a monastery of Apa Apollos it is uncertain which monastery they refer to. As a result, one text can be attributed to different monasteries by different scholars. P.Ermitage Copt. 3, for example, is assigned to the monastery in Bawit by its editor, Titkois by J. Gascou<sup>11</sup>, Aphrodito by L. S. B. McCoull<sup>12</sup>, and Bawit again by M. Krause<sup>13</sup>. Following M. Krause, I will look for some criteria which might help in deciding to which monastery a text may refer.

Krause distinguished three criteria<sup>14</sup>:

- 1) the name of the monastery
- 2) the titles of the monastics
- 3) the names of the persons mentioned, and, especially the provenance of the witnesses.

I will not use the second criterion. The monastic titles used in the texts discussed below are too common to have any value. For the last criterion to be useful in the case of Titkois, we have to establish where this village should be located. Titkois is not identified with any modern settlement<sup>15</sup>. Other villages mentioned in texts addressed to someone of the monastery in Titkois are: Δημητρίου (P.Sta.Xyla 6 and 10), Ἐρμιταρίου (SB XVI 12266), Μαγδάλων Μεγάλου (P.Sta.Xyla 8), Μοιρῶν (P.Sta.Xyla 5), Πώεως (P.Sta.Xyla 18), Σεντρύφεως (SB XVI 12267), Τανεμῶεως (P.Lond. V 1899, SB VI 9051, SB XVI 12401 + 12402) and ΤΑΞΡΟΥΣ (P.Med.Copto inv. 76.21)<sup>16</sup>. All these places are to be found in the southern part of

<sup>6</sup> P. Barison, *Aegyptus* 18 (1938) 77. A koinobion of Apa Apollos occurs in Johannes Moschus, *Pratum spirituale* 184 (= *Patrologia Graeca* 87, Col. 3057, listed in A. Calderini, *Dizionario* I. 2, 149). Since that koinobion is situated in the Thebais, it cannot be the Oxyrhynchite one. Whether it has to be identified with the monastery of Apa Apollos in Bawit (so Jean Moschus, *Le pré spirituel*, Introduction et traduction de M.-J. Rouët de Journel, Paris 1946, 242, n. 1) is not certain. All southern-Egyptian monasteries of Apa Apollos are attested in AD 580, the date of Moschus' tour in Egypt (see M. Rouët de Journel, *op. cit.*, p. 9).

<sup>7</sup> See S. Timm, pp. 686–691 s. v. Der al-Bala'iza.

<sup>8</sup> See S. Timm, pp. 643–653 s. v. Der Anba Abullu'. Some Coptic texts mentioning Bawit from the XIth century, now in the Leiden Museum of Antiquities, are edited by M. Green, *OMRO* 64 (1983) 61–122. On these texts see also L. S. B. McCoull, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 55 (1989) 201–206.

<sup>9</sup> See S. Timm, pp. 1331–1333 s. v. Kloster des Apa Apollos.

<sup>10</sup> Nr. 3091 and 3431, both private letters, see G. Robinson, *ZPE* 70 (1987) 68 and 72. This monastery is not listed among the churches and monasteries of Djeme in S. Timm, pp. 1019–1027 s. v. Gabal Sama, nor in the article of T. G. Wilfong, *BASP* 26 (1989) 89–145.

<sup>11</sup> J. Gascou, *Anagenesis* 1 (1981) 220, n. 1.

<sup>12</sup> L. S. B. McCoull, *ZPE* 88 (1991) 210, n. 3 and *Le Muséon* 106 (1993) 43, n. 58.

<sup>13</sup> M. Krause, *ZÄS* 112 (1985) 146 with n. 18 and *Coptic Studies*, p. 207.

<sup>14</sup> M. Krause, *Coptic Studies*, p. 206.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 300. The arab name for Titkois as it can be found in the arab life of Apa Phib, viz. Adkühi (cf. R.-G. Coquin, *Bibl. Orient.* 34 [1977] 323) is not of any help for identifying Titkois either. On this toponym cf. also S. Timm, pp. 969–970 s. v. Gabal Ablüg.

<sup>16</sup> ΤΑΞΡΟΥΣ is also mentioned in the life of Phib, edited by T. Orlandi, A. Campagnano, *Vite dei monaci Phif e Longino*, Milano 1975, p. 26. 17 as the place from which Apa Apollos went south to the monastery of Apa Pamin. On his way there, he passed the village Titkois. This location of ΤΑΞΡΟΥΣ, north of Titkois, coincides well with the location of Ταρούθις which is probably the Greek name of this place. Ταρούθις is situated in the Leukopyrgites Kato, cf. M. Drew-Bear, *Le*

the Hermopolite nome, Δημητρίου, Ἐρμιταρίου and Τανεμώεως belonging to the Leukopyrgites Ano<sup>17</sup>. The village Titkois is situated in the Koussites Kato by M. Drew-Bear on the basis of BGU II 556, a toparchy which „parait avoir occupé une étroite bande de terre d'environ cinq kilomètres de large, entre Sanabou et Meir“<sup>18</sup>. It must be close to the Leukopyrgites Ano, since another village Κε.ν ἐπὶ Τιτ'κώεως“ belongs to the latter toparchy. Titkois also appears in P.Cairo Preis. 30, a list of place names, several of which are securely attested in the Leukopyrgites Ano. According to P. J. Sijpesteijn and K. A. Worp who recently offered a new edition of this text<sup>19</sup>, all toponyms in that text, including Titkois, may have belonged to the Leukopyrgites Ano<sup>20</sup>. The exact limits of this toparchy are unfortunately not known. As far as we know up to date, it can be limited to the region between Singirg (= Σενκύρκις) and Sanabu (= Σενοᾶβις). From all this we have to conclude that Titkois has to be searched for in the same region Bawit is situated in, probably somewhat more southerly, so that geographical information about the witnesses in itself cannot be decisive for attributing a Hermopolite text to the monastery of Bawit or Titkois.

As for the first criterion, the names of the Apa Apollon monasteries indeed are different. In the Greek texts of Titkois, the persons belonging to the monastery are described as being μοναστηρίου Ἄπα Ἀπολλῶτος (P.Sta.Xyla 5 and 8), τοῦ ἁγίου μοναστηρίου ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος (P.Amst. I 47–48, P.Lond. V 1899, P.Sta.Xyla 10) or τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου ἀββᾶ Ἀπολλῶτος (SB XVI 12401 + 12402) ἐν ὄρει (or similar) τῆς κώμης Τιτκώεως<sup>21</sup>. In P.Sta.Xyla 18, SB VI 9051 and XVI 12266 the word for „monastery“ is lost. Only in P.Sta.Xyla 18 Ἄπα Ἀπολλῶς is said to be holy (ἅγιος). Unfortunately, the Coptic text is incomplete. The monk Ienoch is described there as ΠΙΜΟΝΟΧΟΣ I [ — ΔΠ]Δ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ [± 6] ΜΠΤΟΥΥ ΝΤΙΤΚΟΟΥ. It is

---

*nome Hermopolite*, 267 and 270. The other toponym mentioned in the life of Phib, viz. ΤΑΠΑΡΟΥΕ (p. 32. 5), lying south of Titkois, is now known from some greek texts too. It occurs in Greek as Ταπαρώων in P.Amst. I 45, P.Rainer Cent. 103 and possibly in PSI IV 304 (see BL VIII 397). However, none of these texts provides any useful information concerning the whereabouts of this place and therefore they are useless for narrowing down the area where Titkois must be looked for. ΤΑΠΑΡΟΥ also occurs in unpublished Coptic documents to be edited by S. J. Clackson, cf. BASP 30 (1993) 67–68. The placename is discussed by Clackson in a paper to be published in the forthcoming Acts of the Fifth International Congress of Coptic Studies, see BASP, l. c., 67, n. 2 and 68, n. 6.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, s. v. For Μαγδάλων Μεγάλου see s. v. Μαγδάλων Μεν[, corrected to Μαγδάλια Με[γά(λου)] in P.Sta. Xyla 8, n. on l. 8.

<sup>18</sup> M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 300. See also l. c. Carte 2.

<sup>19</sup> ZPE 80 (1990) 262–265. See also J. Hengstl, ZPE 86 (1991) 239, correcting l. 32.

<sup>20</sup> Issou, frequently mentioned in P.Cairo Preis. 30, can be added to the places that belong with certainty to the Leukopyrgites Ano, see below on P.Mich.Copt. III 20 and note 43. Dioskorou too can now securely be ascribed to the Leukopyrgites Ano, cf. P.Duk.inv.Miss. 88, edited by P. van Minnen, ZPE 101 (1994) 83–86. The interpretation of Sijpesteijn and Worp is corroborated by a text recently published by G. Husson, BACPS 8 (1991) 37–46, dated in the late VII<sup>th</sup>–early VIII<sup>th</sup> century, where some toponyms also occurring in P.Cairo Preis. 30 are mentioned. All these, with the exception of Koussai, seem to belong to the Leukopyrgites Ano. Cf. also the commentary on SB XVI 12377 (= P.Heid. Inv. G 95), a text having several toponyms in common with P.Cairo Preis. 30 and corroborating the adscription to the Leukopyrgites Ano of these places.

<sup>21</sup> Since ἐν ὄρει is written in full in P.Amst. I 48 (see BL VIII 8, there is no abbreviation mark justifying ἐνορεί(ας)) and in SB VI 9051 (see below), there is no reason to doubt with A. K. Bowman, Gnomon 55 (1983) 465 the correctness of the interpretation of M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 300. Cf. also the words used in P.Med.Copto inv. 76.21, cited above: the geographical location of the monastery is expressed there as ΜΠΤΟΥΥ ΝΤΙΤΚΟΟΥ (misprinted in the transcription, the correct reading in the commentary on l. 2) The word ΤΟΥΥ just as ὄρος originally means „mountain“, but is also used in the sense „monastery“, see P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 27–28 and M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 300 and note 581.



unclear what has to be supplemented in the gap of about 6 letters. The editor supposes that something like  $\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}^{\text{T}}(\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}})$  has to be restored.

The name of the monastery in Bawit is known from BM Or. 6201–6204 and 6206, studied by M. Krause in his thesis *Das Apa-Apollon Kloster zu Bawit, Untersuchungen unveröffentlichter Urkunden als Beitrag zur Geschichte des ägyptischen Mönchtums*, Leipzig 1958<sup>22</sup>. His thesis was not available to me, but luckily some information about the name of the monastery in Bawit can be gathered from other publications. L. S. B. McCoull has published the dating formulas of the texts in which the monastery is mentioned by name<sup>23</sup>. The monastery is described as  $\text{M}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{G}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}$ <sup>24</sup>. The full geographical description may be found in BM Or. 6203, ll. 17–18  $\text{M}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{G}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{C}}$ , „the monastery of the holy Apa Apollon, south of the city of Shmun (= Hermopolis)”<sup>25</sup>. However, the monastery is not always described in so many words. In one of the graffiti of Bawit<sup>26</sup> someone describes himself as a monk (?) τουτου μονστηρου αβα Πολλωτ αρχματριου „of this monastery of Apa Apollon, the archimandrit”.

The designation of the monastery of Bala'izah is well known from the texts published by P. E. Kahle<sup>27</sup>. The monastery is referred to as  $\text{P}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}} (\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{B}}) \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}} (\overline{\text{Q}}\overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{C}})$  „the (holy) monastery of Apa Apollon (in the nome of the town Sbeht (= Apollinopolis Parva))”<sup>28</sup>. Twice we find  $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}}$  instead of  $\text{M}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}$  and in two unpublished papyri  $\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}}$  occurs<sup>29</sup>.

The monastery of Apa Apollon in Aphrodito is mentioned in several Coptic texts of the Vatican Museum which are in course of publication (P.Vatic.Copti Doresse). Some information about these texts was published beforehand by L. S. B. McCoull, *CdE* 56 (1981) 190–193. A transcription of another text from Aphrodito mentioning the monastery of Apa Apollon was already given by P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, p. 21. A person called Phoibammon is described as  $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{F}}[\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{A}}]\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}} [\overline{\text{N}}]\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}}[\dots\dots] \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{Z}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{K}}[\overline{\text{E}}]$  „Papa Phoibammon the father of the mount of Apa Apollon [.....] and the whole people of God and the poor brethren”<sup>30</sup>. The monastery still existed in the

<sup>22</sup> BM Or. 6205, despite the remarks of Krause (e. g. *ZÄS* 112 (1985) 146, n. 18 and *Atti del XVII Congr. Int. di Pap.*, Napoli 1984, 746, n. 79) does not belong to the correspondence of the monastery in Bawit. It is published as P.Lond. IV 1494. A plate can be found in P.Lond.Copt. Plate 4. The date „before AD 709” (cf. *BL* V 58) concerns only the Arab protocol, not the Coptic text, see *CPR* III 1. 2. Nr. 84.

<sup>23</sup> *BASP* 24 (1987) 63–66. All texts are dated in the IX<sup>th</sup> century. Further details about the content of these texts can be obtained from S. Timm, pp. 647–650.

<sup>24</sup> BM Or. 6202–6204, 6206. There are only some minor variations in the writing of  $\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}}$  ( $\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}(\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}})$ ) in BM Or. 6204 and 6206) and in the way of writing and abbreviating  $\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}$ .

<sup>25</sup> Cf. M. Krause, *Coptic Studies*, 205.

<sup>26</sup> J. Maspero, E. Drioton, *Fouilles exécutées à Baouît* (Mém. Inst. Fr. du Caire, t. 59, Le Caire 1932), Nr. 448.

<sup>27</sup> P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah, Coptic Texts from Deir el Bala'izah in Upper Egypt*, London 1954. This publication seems not widely known among papyrologists. The Greek texts were never incorporated in SB. Among them are three fragments of letters of Qurrah ibn Sharik (Nr. 180–182), not listed in the article of H. Cadell, *Recherches de Pap.* 4 (1967) 107–160. Other new documents of Qurrah were recently published by R. Pintaudi, P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 296–300 (Greek) and Y. Ragib, *JNES* 40 (1981) 173–188 (Arab).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 15. An example of the description cited above can be found in *Bala'izah* Nr. 103. Apa Apollon may also be called holy, see e. g. *Bala'izah* Nr. 102 and 204. The latter is a Greek letter, mentioning a  $\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{G}}\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{B}}\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{O}}$ , dated on palaeographical grounds to the VII<sup>th</sup>–VIII<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>29</sup> See P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 27.

<sup>30</sup> The transcription is based on a photograph of the papyrus in the Crum Material, see P. Kahle, *Bala'izah* 21 and n. 2. The provenance Aphrodito is now assured by comparison of this

eighth century as is proved by P.Vatic. Copti Doresse 20, a letter from Rashid son of Chaled to Petros and the brothers of the monastery of Apa Apollo<sup>31</sup>.

With this information it might attempt to attribute texts mentioning an Apa Apollos monastery without stating their locality, more securely to one of the monasteries described above. First of all the Greek texts. An Apa Apollos monastery occurs in SB VI 9144, in a letter of a pagarch Flavios Johannes to ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπό μου(αστηρίου) Ἀββ(ᾶ) Ἀπολλῶ(τος). Originally the text was attributed to Aphrodito and dated in 589 AD because of the identification of this pagarch with his namesake of P.Cairo Masp. III 67325. The date, and therefore the identification, was rejected by J. Gascou since the formula ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπό is attested in the Arab period and not earlier<sup>32</sup>. Flavios Johannes might be identical with the pagarch of the Hermopolite nome known from P.Lond. V 1753 (VI–VII) and BKU III 420 as corrected by P. J. Sijpesteijn, Cde 56 (1981) 361<sup>33</sup>. However, the text does not offer any distinctive characteristics on the basis of which it can securely be attributed to one of the Apa Apollos monasteries, apart from the fact that the name of Apollos never seems to be abbreviated in the Greek documents from Titkois. The same applies to P.Vatic.Aphr. 13, recently attributed to the monastery of Titkois instead of the one in Aphrodito by L. S. B. McCoull<sup>34</sup>. Her reason for doing so is mainly a chronological one: P.Vatic. Aphr. 13 has to be dated after the Arab conquest on palaeographical grounds and because of the content, the text being a list of requisitioned contributions from the monastery (cf. BL VIII 503). As McCoull informs us, in fiscal records of the post-conquest period, the Aphrodito Apa Apollos monastery is usually

text with other evidence from Aphrodito, cf. L. S. B. McCoull, Cde 56 (1981) 189. The text has recently been edited by McCoull in *Le Muséon* 106 (1993) 37–39. The other text cited in Cde 56 (1981) 189–190 mentioning the same (?) Phoibammon turns out to be in the Ismailia Museum, see L. S. B. McCoull, *Actes du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès Copte 1988*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1992, II 106–108.

<sup>31</sup> Described by L. S. B. McCoull, Cde 56 (1981) 192. The writer of that text, Rashid son of Chaled, could not be identified with any known person by McCoull and the text was not dated by her. For Rashid see now J. Gascou, K. A. Worp, ZPE 49 (1982) 91, and K. A. Worp, BSAC 26 (1984) 100–101 and ZPE 58 (1985) 83–85 (= SB XVIII 13870). He is attested in the beginning of the eighth century. To be added to the documents listed by Worp, BSAC 26 (1984) 100 are P.Ryl. Copt. 156 and BM Or. 6201 A and C cited in P.Ryl. Copt., p. 63, n. 3, all mentioning Rashid as the amir of Hermopolis. It is unclear to me whether by BM Or. 6201 A the same text is meant as BM Or. 6201 (A) 2, cited by L. S. B. McCoull, BSAC 27 (1985) 63 and n. 8, also mentioning Rashid son of Chaled as amir of Hermopolis and dated in the 14<sup>th</sup> indiction ? = 732/733 AD. A photograph of BKU 339 (cf. Worp, BSAC 26, l. c.) has been published in W. Kaiser, *Ägyptisches Museum Berlin*, Berlin 1967, Nr. 1160.

<sup>32</sup> See BL VIII 340. A check of the Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri confirmed the occurrence of ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπό in the Arab period only. It is found in CPR VIII 73 (694), 74–75 (698), P.Apoll. I (658/659 or 688/689, BL VIII 10), *Bala'iza* Nr. 180–181 (709–714), P.Lond. IV 1407–1408, 1410 (709), P.Merton II 100 (669, BL VIII 209), SB I 5638, 5643–5644, 5646–5649, 5651 (all 710), VI 9144 (589 ed. pr.) and VIII 9758 (2<sup>nd</sup> half VII). Ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπό also occurs in SPP VIII 1198 (664 or 679, BL VIII 451), Wilcken, *Chrest.* 256 (709), SB XVIII 13218 (713, see SB XVIII, p. 490) and 13771 (677 or 707). The Hegira year supplemented in the translation of the Arabic part of the latter papyrus, fifty seven, is only correct for 677. According to the editors, 707 is equally possible, in which case Hegira year eighty eight is to be supplemented. Since the sender of SB XVIII 13771 is to be identified with the one of SPP VIII 1198 (see BL VIII 451), a date 694 or 709 for that text cannot be excluded. ὑμῖ[ν τοῖς] | ἀπό has probably to be restored in SPP VIII 992, 2–3 (VII), thus making the beginning of this text, the corrections of BL I 417 and BL VIII 449 included, comparable to P.Apoll. I. Lastly, ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπό is found in two Arab-Greek letters of Qurrah, edited by A. Grohmann, *APEL* III 160–161 (709), which were never included in SB.

<sup>33</sup> This identification is more likely than an identification with Flavios Johannes pagarch of the Arsinoites, for whom see CPR X, p. 154 and 156, nn. 16–19. Apparently this pagarch promoted to duke of Arcadia in 655 (?), cf. CPR XIV 1, n. on ll. 6–7.

<sup>34</sup> L. S. B. McCoull, ZPE 88 (1991) 209–210.



referred to by its place name Pharoou<sup>35</sup>, and therefore the text should be attributed to the Titkois monastery. I do not think that McCoull's arguments can be conclusive: as she states herself, after the Arab conquest, the Aphrodito monastery is referred to *usually* by its place name, i. e. not in all cases<sup>36</sup>. Secondly, in the Greek texts the name of the monastery near Titkois is always written out in full and never abbreviated. Since all Apa Apollos monasteries are attested in the seventh century, all places, including Aphrodito, are possible as place of origin of P.Vatic. Aphr. 13<sup>37</sup>.

Of the Coptic texts, I already mentioned P.Ermitage Copt. 3 (VIII<sup>th</sup> century) above. The provenance of this text is probably the Hermopolite nome, since the village  $\text{CENEC}\lambda\lambda$  is mentioned on the verso. The text written on the back of P.Ermitage Copt. 3, published as P.Ermitage Copt. 14, forms another indication for a Hermopolite provenance. In that text the village Micholis occurs. Both villages are situated in the Leukopyrgites Ano<sup>38</sup>. Therefore, the choice is limited to the monastery of Titkois and the one of Bawit. The fact that Apa Apollos is called holy ( $\text{N}\Phi\Delta\Gamma\text{I}\text{O}\text{C}$   $\Delta\text{P}\alpha$   $\Delta\text{P}\text{O}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , l. 2) could point to Bawit. P.Ermitage Copt. 7 is undoubtedly written in the Hermopolite nome. The places  $\text{P}\lambda\text{H}\text{T}\epsilon\text{M}$ ,  $\text{K}\omega\text{C}$  and  $\text{P}\text{o}\upsilon\text{r}\alpha\eta\upsilon$  are mentioned<sup>39</sup>. The document therefore may belong to those of the monastery in Bawit, or, as Gascou proposed, to the documents of Titkois<sup>40</sup>. The latter is perhaps the most likely since both  $\text{P}\lambda\text{H}\text{T}\epsilon\text{M}$  (=  $\text{P}\lambda\eta\theta\mu\iota\varsigma$ ) and  $\text{K}\omega\text{C}$  (=  $\text{K}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ , modern El Qūsīya) are situated in the south of the nome. Furthermore, the adjective  $\Delta\Gamma\text{I}\text{O}\text{C}$  modifying Apa Apollos, which seems usual in Bawit, is lacking.

Another Coptic document mentioning a monk of Apa Apollos is P.Mich. Copt. III 20:  $\Delta\text{P}\alpha$   $\text{E}\text{N}\text{O}\chi$   $\text{P}\text{I}\text{M}\text{O}\text{N}\text{O}\chi\text{O}\text{C}$   $\text{N}\text{P}\alpha$   $\bar{\text{N}}\Delta\text{P}\alpha$   $\Delta\text{P}\text{O}\lambda\lambda\omega$  „Apa Enoch, the monk of the (monastery ?) of Apa Apollo“, ll. 1–2. It is dated in the IX<sup>th</sup>–X<sup>th</sup> century on palaeographical grounds. The provenance is the Hermopolite nome, explicitly mentioned in the text. It is uncertain whether Enoch belongs to the Titkois monastery or the one in Bawit<sup>41</sup>. The designation of the

<sup>35</sup> For the monastery of Pharoou and its relation with Dioscorus' family see L. S. B. McCoull, *CdE* 56 (1981) 190 and *Le Muséon* 106 (1993) 21–63.

<sup>36</sup> E. g. not in P.Vatic.Copti Doresse 20, cited above. Cf. also the information about some unpublished Coptic papyri in the Duke University Collection, briefly described by L. S. B. McCoull, *Coptic Studies*, 225–226: „Perhaps relevant to the procedure of conscription of sailors in the Aphrodito area in the 8th century is number I C 24, a receipt from Psate the  $\text{C}\lambda\theta$  and *kalaphates* (caulker), from the *topos* of Apa Apollo: its third indiction date may correspond to A. D. 719. Also from monks from Apa Apollo named Ersenouphi and Theodore comes number I 20, an account for *demotion* (undated)“.

<sup>37</sup> Perhaps Aphrodito is the most likely after all. Although Aphrodito and the Antaiopolite nome are only named in P.Vatic.Aphr. 1, 3, 8, 10, 18 and 25, other texts can also securely be attributed to Aphrodito because of the formulas used (nos. 2 and 11), identification of persons known from other texts from Aphrodito (nos. 14 and 20), subscriptions of notaries (nos. 4, 5, 7, 9 and 19), or because of being part of another Aphrodito text (no. 17 and perhaps 26). Only the more fragmentary texts cannot be attributed to Aphrodito with certainty, but there seems to be no reason to doubt the provenance stated by the dealers who sold these papyri.

<sup>38</sup> See M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 170 s. v.  $\text{M}\iota\chi\omega\lambda\iota\varsigma$  and 235–236 s. v.  $\text{S}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\lambda\acute{\omega}\iota\varsigma$ . P. van Minnen, *ZPE* 101 (1994) 86, n. on l. 6, proposes to identify  $\text{M}\iota\chi\omega\lambda\iota\varsigma$  with modern Amshoul, whereas Timm (not available to Van Minnen), pp. 106–107, still identifies Amshoul with Selilais, disregarding the clues collected by Drew-Bear, *Hermopolite*, 236–237, that Selilais was situated in the North-Eastern part of the nome.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, s. v.  $\text{P}\lambda\eta\theta\mu\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\text{K}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$  and  $\text{P}\text{o}\upsilon\text{r}\alpha\eta\upsilon$ .

<sup>40</sup> J. Gascou, *Anagenesis* 1 (1981) 220, n. 1.

<sup>41</sup> The Michigan text is treated in different ways by S. Timm. On p. 646 he suggests that Enoch might be identical with the one of P.Ermitage Copt. 3 (which is excluded if both texts are dated correctly). On pp. 2078–2079 he says that it is not certain whether the Michigan text concerns the

monastery used here matches neither. The only geographical information is the fact that the writer of the document originates from Esou. Esou was identified with the Greek *epoikion Issou* and the modern place *Sāw* by Worrell, see P.Mich. Copt. III 20, note on line 1, and S. Timm, p. 2321 s. v. *Sāw*. The identification of Esou/*Sāw* with the Greek toponym would have to be rejected if Issou indeed was situated north of Hermopolis in the Patemites Kato as is supposed by P. van Minnen, ZPE 67 (1987) 121. This location of Issou is not followed by P. J. Sijpesteijn, K. A. Worp in their reedition of P.Cairo Preis. 30, cited above. According to them, Issou too has to be situated in the Leukopyrgites Ano, whence the identification is possible again<sup>42</sup>. The correctness of their interpretation is proved by the revised reading of BGU XI 2074 V<sup>o</sup> I 10, a list of localities of the Leukopyrgites Ano, also mentioning Ἰσσοῦ<sup>43</sup>. With Esou = Issou = *Sāw* being only four miles away, the monastery of Bawit is perhaps the one meant here, but Titkois, also mentioned in P.Cairo Preis. 30, cannot be excluded.

Recently some new Coptic texts have been published, also referring to *topoi* of Apa Apollon. The first one is P.Würzburg Inv. Nr. 43, sent by Isac ΠΜΟΝΟΧΟC ΜΠΤΟΠΟC ΝΑΠΑ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ to the Dikaion ΜΠΜΟΝΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΜΠΤΟΠΟC ΝΑΠΑ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ<sup>44</sup>. Originally, the provenance of this text was stated to be Bala'izah, but this was rejected by M. Krause<sup>45</sup>, because of the occurrence of the toponym CΕΝΕCΛΑ, a well attested village of the Hermopolite nome. He ascribed the text to Bawit, only mentioning the other Hermopolite monastery in Titkois in his additional note in ZÄS 112 (1985) 153. Of course Titkois is equally possible, especially since CΕΝΕCΛΑ is also situated in the Leukopyrgites Ano<sup>46</sup>, and because the adjective ΔΓΙΟC, modifying Apa Apollon, is missing again. The second text is Duk.Inv. C 4, edited by L. S. B. McCoull<sup>47</sup>. On the back of a letter the place of the holy Apa Apollon is mentioned (ΜΠΤΟΠΟC ΜΠΑΚΙΟC ΔΠΑ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ). No other geographical information is provided. Therefore, the text cannot be assigned to one monastery in particular. The third one is a text from the collection of Princeton University, dated in the VIII<sup>th</sup> century, and originating from the Hermopolite nome, since the place ΤΒΔΚΕ is mentioned<sup>48</sup>. However, it cannot be decided whether the text has to be ascribed to the correspondence of Bawit or Titkois.

Other references are only available in descriptions. In BM Or. 6201 B, cited in P.Ryl. Copt. p. 168, n. 3, a ΤΟΠΟC ΝΦΔΓΙΟC ΔΠΑ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ is mentioned in connection with the

---

monastery in Bawit or in Titkois. Nothing is said about the Ermitage text on that page. On p. 2321 s. v. *Sāw* the Michigan text is attributed to Bawit.

<sup>42</sup> Esou and Issou are listed separately in M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 103 and 135. Esou is not a κόμη (so Drew-Bear). This qualification is based on the reading ΚΩΜ ΙCΟΥ in P.Mich. Copt. III 20, V<sup>o</sup> which, however, was corrected by P. E. Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 663–665 (Nr. 239) to ΡΩΜ ΙCΟΥ „since ΚΩΜ does not occur elsewhere in such a context“.

<sup>43</sup> Ἰσίου ed. pr. The reading was already doubted by A. K. Bowman in his review of M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, Gnomon 55 (1983) 464. The reading Ἰσσοῦ was checked for me on the original by W. Brashear. The fact that Issou can now be ascribed to the Leukopyrgites Ano corroborates the ascription of Ekous to that toparchy, and not to the Patemites Ano (so P. van Minnen, ZPE 67 (1987) 121). Cf. M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 96 and CdE 54 (1979) 289. Now that Ἰσίου no longer exists, the supplement E[ἰσί]ου in P.Duk.inv.Miss. 88, II 4 (cf. above n. 20) must be rejected. Perhaps Ἰσσοῦ is meant here too (Ἐ[ἰσσοῦ]), but the reading is not certain.

<sup>44</sup> Edited by W. Brunsch, ZÄS 108 (1981) 93–105 (= KSB I 49). The text is dated in the first half of the VIII<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>45</sup> *Coptic Studies*, pp. 205–207 and ZÄS 112 (1985) 143–153. See also the reply of W. Brunsch, ZÄS 114 (1987) 113–117.

<sup>46</sup> See M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 235–236 s. v. Σελεσλάις. The other toponym mentioned in this text ΤΑΠΟCΙ is not of any help, since it is not attested elsewhere.

<sup>47</sup> BASP 20 (1983) 137–138. Cf. also the remarks of A. Alcock, BASP 23 (1986) 71.

<sup>48</sup> Edited by H. Satzinger, P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Enchoria* 16 (1988) 49–51 (= KSB I 52).

Hermopolite village ΤΗΛΚΕ, identified with modern Dalqah<sup>49</sup>. The comment of Crum that „the τόπος referred to would therefore be that at Bawit, some 7 miles further south“ might be correct, especially since the name of the monastery matches the name of the one in Bawit exactly. In three other texts a „place“ or „monastery“ of Apa Apollos occurs (ΠΜΔ ΝΔΠΔ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ). The first one is P.Lond. Copt. 1078 descr., a text written in „a neat Greek hand“, where one finds a μοναστήρ(ιον) ἀβ(βᾶ) Ἀπολλῶς (read Ἀπολλῶτος?). The provenance of this text is the Hermopolite nome, since the place Πάλλαντος, situated in the Leukopyrgites Ano, is also mentioned in that papyrus<sup>50</sup>. In the same text another monastery appears, viz. that of Apa Anoup. The same pair of monasteries also occurs in an unpublished papyrus from the XI<sup>th</sup> century, in the possession of Mr. Michaelides and cited by J. Drescher, JEA 46 (1960) 111–112<sup>51</sup>. Perhaps this text has to be assigned to the Hermopolite nome too. Noteworthy in this respect is the fact that a place of Apa Anoup occurs also in P.Ermitage Copt. 14, the back of P.Ermitage Copt. 3, mentioning a monastery of Apa Apollos and discussed above. The combination of the names Apollos and Anoup might be an indication for the monastery in Bawit, since the names of Apa Apollos, Apa Anoup and Apa Phib are frequently mentioned together in that place. The third text is P.Ryl. Copt. 284 where one reads in l. 3 ΠΜΔ ΝΔΠ ΔΠΟΛΛΩ. Any clue where this „place“ has to be situated is missing (cf. S. Timm, p. 1969).

Other unpublished texts mentioning a monastery of Apa Apollos are listed by M. Krause, ZÄS 112 (1985) 146, n. 18<sup>52</sup>. He ascribes all these texts to the monastery of Bawit. Whether this is true cannot be established until the texts are published. Not listed by him is a text of the collection of H. P. Kraus, described in his *Catalogue 105*, Nr. 94, a letter dated in the VI–VII<sup>th</sup> century, written „by the monk Esaias of the monastery of ... to his brother Paul of the *topos* of Apa Apollo“<sup>53</sup>. Other papyri of the collection of Kraus also refer to a person called

<sup>49</sup> For Telke see M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 274. BM Or. 6201 B has no relation whatsoever with BM Or. 6201 from Bawit or BM Or. 6201 A and C (cited in n. 31). BM Or. 6201 A, B and C are separate inventory numbers of larger collections of papyri, cf. E. Balogh, P. E. Kahle, *Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 31.

<sup>50</sup> See M. Drew-Bear, *Le nome Hermopolite*, 68 s. v. Ἀπολλῶτος.

<sup>51</sup> For the Michaelides manuscript collection see S. J. Clackson, ZPE 100 (1994) 223–226. Documents relating to the monasteries of Apa Apollos will be the subject of Clackson's doctoral thesis, l. c. 225, n. 18 and BASP 30 (1993) 67, n. 2.

<sup>52</sup> BM Or. 6201 B 29; 216; 219; 230 and 268; papyri seen by Krause in the Museum of Ismailia and P.Yale Inv. 2102 and 2103, mentioned by L. S. B. McCoull, Proc. XIV Int.Congr. of Pap., London 1975, 219. In the meantime, P.Yale Inv. 2102 has been published by L. S. B. McCoull, *Archiv* 35 (1989) 29. In that text someone named Peter, humble monk of Apa Apollos occurs. There is no clue whatsoever regarding the provenance of this text. It might be possible that the Ismailia papyrus seen by Krause are those edited by L. S. B. McCoull, *Actes du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès Copte 1988*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1992, II 104–112, in which case they are to be assigned to Aphrodito.

<sup>53</sup> The collection of Kraus is now in the Beinecke Library, see S. Emmel, BASP 17 (1980) 53 and n. 1. Neither this text, nor the Yale papyri cited in the previous note, were included in L. S. B. McCoull, *Coptic Documentary Papyri from the Beinecke Library (Yale University)*, Cairo 1986 (P.Beinecke Copt.). Unfortunately, no concordance is given of the text published and the numbers in Kraus catalogue. As far as I know the following Greek and Coptic texts are published (those in bold type are provided with a plate in *Catalogue 105*):

Kraus	Edited as	Yale Inv.	Kraus	Edited as	Yale Inv.
4	P.Yale II 101	1742	68	P.Beinecke Copt. IV 29	1806
5	SB XIV 11331	1743	69	P.Beinecke Copt. II 4	1807
6	Sijpesteijn, <i>Customs Duties</i> Nr. 437	1744	71	P.Beinecke Copt. II 5	1809
7	Cf. BASP I (1963–64) 31		72	P.Beinecke Copt. IV 30	1810
18	SB XIV 11332	1756	73	P.Beinecke Copt. IV 31	1811
35	SB X 10269 + BL VII 219	1773	76	P.Beinecke Copt. V 37	1814

(Apa) Apollos (Kraus Nr. 93, 111, 117 (= P.Beinecke Copt. III 19), and 131) or to a monastery of Apa Apollos (Kraus Nr. 31). Because of the occurrence of this name, these texts were tentatively assigned to the monastery of Bawit by Th.C. Petersen in the Introduction to *Catalogue 105*. H. C. Youtie, in his reedition of SB X 10269 (= Kraus Nr. 35), ZPE 16 (1975), remarked on p. 263 that the correspondence of the date of the feast (ἀγάπη) of Apa Apollos in that text (Mecheir) with the date of the commemoration of Apa Apollos according to the Coptic Church Calendar (Mecheir 5) might be an indication to a provenance from Bawit. That at a certain time a feast of Apa Apollos indeed was celebrated on Mecheir 5 was confirmed recently by J. Gascou, recognizing P.Jand. inv. 318 as a calendar of Egyptian saints<sup>54</sup>, mentioning Apa Phib and Apa Apollo (i. e. the founder of the monastery of Bawit) on Mecheir 5. However, since the founders of the monastery of Titkois and the one in Bawit are probably identical<sup>55</sup>, the ἀγάπη referred to could be held in both places<sup>56</sup>.

41	Le Muséon 87 (1974) 534–541	1779	77	P.Beinecke Copt. IV 32	1815
42	Archiv 35 (1989) 32	1780	84	P.Beinecke Copt. III 11	1822
		(not 1781!)	87	P.Beinecke Copt. IV 33	1825
43	Journ. of Copt. Stud. 1 (1990) 17–22	1781	90	P.Beinecke Copt. III 12	1828
44	Archiv 35 (1989) 33 and Journ. of Copt. Stud. 1 (1990) 22–24	1782	91	P.Beinecke Copt. III 13	1829
46	BASP 17 (1980) 56–57	1784	92	P.Beinecke Copt. III 14	1830
50	Archiv 35 (1989) 30–32	1788	95	P.Beinecke Copt. III 15	1833
54	P.Yale I 45	1792	100	P.Beinecke Copt. III 16	1838
59	Stud. Pap. 13 (1974) 59–60	1797	115	P.Beinecke Copt. III 17	1853
60	Stud. Pap. 13 (1974) 59–60	1798	116	P.Beinecke Copt. III 18	1854
64	Stud. Pap. 13 (1974) 59–60	1802	117	P.Beinecke Copt. III 19	1855
66	P.Beinecke Copt. I	1804	118	P.Beinecke Copt. III 20	1856
67	P.Beinecke Copt. III 10	1805	123	P.Beinecke Copt. III 21	1861
			125	P.Beinecke Copt. III 22	1863

Kraus Nr. 59, 60, and 64 are falsifications, see U. Horak, Tyche 6 (1991) 92–98. On the analogy of the papyri described by Kraus and published by McCoull, the inventory number of Kraus Nr. 94 is now probably P.Yale Inv. 1832. The other Coptic texts from the Beinecke Library edited by L. S. B. McCoull in P.Beinecke Copt. and Archiv 35 (1989), bearing an inventory number in 2000, are not from the collection described in *Catalogue 105*, despite the remarks of McCoull, Archiv 35 (1989) 25, n. 1. The inventory number of the text edited in BASP 2 (1964–1965) 105–108, belonging to another lot of papyri bought by Beinecke, (P.Yale (Beinecke) inv. 1789) must be wrong. According to P. J. Sijpesteijn, P.Mich. XV p. 147, the inventory number would be 1887.

<sup>54</sup> P.Jand. inv. 318 was previously edited as a list of names by P. J. Sijpesteijn, K. A. Worp, Aegyptus 67 (1987) 69–70, Nr. 61 (= SB XVIII 13140). The reedition of the text is published in *Analecta Bollandiana* 107 (1989) 384–392.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. R.-G. Coquin, *Orientalia* 46 (1977) 435–446. See also the lemma „Bawit“ by the same in the *Coptic Encyclopedia* II, 362–363. According to Coquin, the commemoration celebrated on Mecheir 5 was in fact the date of the death of Apollon of Scète and not of Apa Apollos of Bawit. The compiler of the Coptic Church Calendar would have mixed up the two saints. This view could be rejected by Gascou, thanks to the information provided by P.Jand. inv. 318. According to Gascou, the feast of Apa Apollos shifted from Mecheir 5 to Phaophi 25, the feast of Apa Phib, because the latter was more important and the two saints were closely connected. Another support for this theory may be found in the Ethiopian Synaxar, where one reads on the 25<sup>th</sup> of Teqemt (= Phaophi 25) in the translation of G. Colin, *Patrologia Orientalis* 44 (1987) 145–146: „Quand le Christ voulut le faire se reposer de la fatigue de ce monde, il (= Apa Apollos) mourut en paix le cinq du mois de Yakkātit (= Mecheir 5). Pour nous, nous avons écrit son histoire avec (celle de) son ami abbā ‘Abib (= Apa Phib)“. The date Mecheir 5 for a feast of Apa Apollos, the founder of the monastery of Bawit occurs also in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, *Hymnaire Copte* 8, see M. Wisá, *Actes du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès Copte 1988*, Louvain-La-Neuve 1992, II 170–171. Therefore, the attribution of SB X 10269 to Aphrodito and the assumption that Apollos of Aphrodito died in Mecheir (so L. S. B. McCoull, *Le Muséon* 106 (1993) 23–24) has probably to be rejected.

<sup>56</sup> On ἀγάπη see A. Papaconstantinou, ZPE 92 (1992) 241–242.

Lastly, reference is made to „the God of the holy Apa Apollo“ in a papyrus in the collection of the Society for Coptic Archaeology in Cairo, published by L. S. B. McCoull in *Atti del XVII Congr. Int. di Pap.*, Napoli 1984, 784, number 7. As McCoull remarks, „the recipients may have been one of the Apa Apollo monasteries of Middle Egypt ... „

P.Vindob.Barbara 266 + 267  
Hermopolite nome

17,5 × 32 cm

VI-VII AD  
Tafel 16

- 1 χ]μγ<sup>ϑ</sup>θ[  
2 † τῷ ε[ὐλ]αβησιτάτῳ ἀββᾶ Ἐπολλῶτος μ[ον]άξ(οντι) τοῦ ἀ[γίου] τό]που ἀββᾶ  
Ἐπολλῶτος ἐν ὄρει τῆς  
3 κώμης Τιτκώεως [τοῦ Ἐρμο]υπ(ολίτου) νομοῦ πα(ρὰ) Αὐρήλιος Ἄνο[ῦφις] Ἰωάννου  
μη(τ)ρὸς Θεχαρίης ἀπὸ κώμης  
4 Τανεμώεως τοῦ Ἐρμο[υπολίτου] νομοῦ. ἐδε[ξ]άμην καὶ πε[πλήρω]μαι παρ(ὰ σ)ου  
τῆς τε[λ]ε[ί]ας καὶ ἀξίας τιμῆς  
5 οἴνου μ]ούστου [μ]έτρων [έκατὸν τε]σσεράκ[οντα] ἀπὸ ξηστῶ[ν τριῶ]ν τῶ(ν)  
ξηστῶν ἐν [τ]ρουλάτοις τοῦ τόπου  
6 γί(νεται) οἴ[ν(ου)] μέτρων(ν) ρμ ἀπὸ ξ[(εστῶν) γ ἄ]περ ὁμολο[γῶ] διδόνει σοι ἐν τῷ  
Μεσορ(ῆ) μην[ί] καιρῷ τῆς (τρύγης) καρπ(ῶν)  
7 τῆς σὺν [θ(εῶ)] εἰσιούσης θεκ[άτης] ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ἐν οἴ[ν]ῳ νέου καλλίστῳ καὶ  
εὐασέ[στῳ] μέτρῳ τοῦ πίτου  
8 κ[αὶ] εἰ [εὐρεθεί]η ὄξος ἢ ἀ[ποίητος] ἢ ὀζόμεν[ος] ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἕως Φαμε[νῶθ] μην[ὸς] τῆς  
αὐτῆς ἰνδ(ικτίονος)  
9 ἐπ[ὶ] τῷ μ]ε ἀλλάξη σο[ι] ἐν οἴνῳ κ]αλῷ εὐα[ρ(έστῳ)] χ[ω]ρὶς προχ(ρείας) χωρὶς  
ἀ[πάσης] ἀμ]φιβολείας. εἰ δὲ  
10 μὲ δ[άσω] σοι τῶν αὐ[τῶν] οἴ[νων] ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ προθ(εσμία) ὁμολο[γῶ] διδόν[ει] σο[ι]  
ὑπὲρ τῆς τιμ(ῆς)  
11 χρυ[σοῦ] νομ]ισμάτεια [ ]. τὸ γρ[α]μμ(ά)τ(ιον) κοί[ρ]ιον καὶ β(έβ)αιον [καὶ  
ἐπερωτ]ηθεὶς ὁμολόγ(ησα) †  
12 † Αὐρ[ήλιος] Ἄνο[ῦφις] Ἰωάνν]ου (ἐ)θέ[μην] † Αὐρήλιοι Ἐνώχ[ NN καὶ Βίκ]τωρ  
Νουμηνα  
13 [μ]αρ[τῶ]ν τῷ γραμμ(ατίῳ) ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου] δ[ ]ρ.

2. 1. Ἐπολλῶτι, εὐλαβεστάτῳ 3. 1. Αὐρηλίου Ἄνούφως 5. 1. ξεστῶν 6. 1. μέτρα, δίδοναι 7. 1. δεκάτης, νέφ,  
εὐαρέστῳ, πίθου 9. 1. ἀλλάξα 10. 1. μή, τὸν αὐτὸν οἴνον, δίδοναι 11. 1. νομισμάτια, κύριον, ὁμολόγησα

„To the most revered abba Apollon, monk of the holy monastery of abba Apollon on the hill of the village Titkois of the Hermopolite nome, from Aurelios Anouphis, son of Johannes, his mother being Thechariè, from the village Tanemois of the Hermopolite nome. I have received and have been paid in full from you the complete and worthy price for 140 metra of must, (each metron consisting) of 3 xestai, the xestai being packed in the trullae of the monastery, total 140 metra of 3 xestai of wine, which I agree to give to you in the month Mesorè at the time of the vintage of the crops of the with God coming tenth indiction in new,

very fine wine of the best quality by the measure of the vat, and, if from that it is found to be vinegar or unfit for use or having a moldy taste up to the month Phamenoth of the same indiction, I agree to exchange it for you in fine wine of the best quality without payment in advance, without any ambiguity. And if I shall not give to you the same wine within the same appointed time, I agree to give to you for its price x golden solidi. The contract is valid and guaranteed and, being asked, I have given my consent. I Aurelios Anouphis, son of Johannes, have drawn up (the contract). I Aurelios Henocho, son of NN, and I Biktor, son of Noumenas, I bear witness to the contract having heard declarations from the person executing it.“

1–2. The reading of lines 1–2 could be improved as a result of the turning around of two fragments in these lines. Originally, the fragment in what now is line 1 was mounted in line 2 and vice versa. In the ed. princ. a date was recognised in the upper fragment (τὸ ζ// Παχλῶν) and the editors supplemented a Christian invocation and a post-consular date of Mauricius before and after the fragment, also assuming that yet another line of writing was lost. The reconstruction of these lines was doubted by K. A. Worp, see BL VIII 382. Worp also doubted the readings of the fragment and proposed to supplement a date and to read the fragment as ἐν Ἑρμοῦ π[όλ(ε)] τῆς [Θηβαίδος] although τῆς was very doubtful and rather seemed τῶ. He dated the text in the late VI<sup>th</sup> or early VII<sup>th</sup> century<sup>57</sup>. All this, apart from the date, now has to be rejected. The reading of the fragment now mounted in line 2 is clear: ]αζ// τοῦ α[. The first letter could also be o-mikron. I do not share Worp's doubts about the ζ (read by him as the λ of π[όλ(ε)] since the forms of various letters are different within this text. Therefore, the ζ read here may be slightly different from the one in ὀζόμεν[ο]ς in line 8. The correct position of the fragment in this line is assured by a small strip of papyrus crossing it and also visible in line 3 (cf. the Introduction of the editio princeps). Therefore the only possible reading and solution of the abbreviation marked by the double oblique stroke is μ[ον]άζ(οντι) τοῦ ἀ[γίου τῶ]που<sup>58</sup>. Another Apollos, monk of the monastery of Apa Apollos near Titkois, occurs in SB XVI 12267 of 540 AD, l. 4 Ἀὐρ[η]λίω Ἀπολλῶτι Ὄρου μονάζοντι. The identity of these persons cannot be excluded, especially since the Apollos of SB XVI 12267 is the addressee in a loan of wine.

In line 1 there are traces of three letters. No traces of writing are visible elsewhere in the upper margins of the papyrus. I therefore presume that the papyrus has no dating formula, nor a christian invocation, and starts directly with the address. The same practice can be found in SB VI 9051, also addressed to someone of the monastery of Apa Apollos near Titkois and sent by an inhabitant of Tanemois. In that text χμγ precedes line 2 with the address. In my opinion the traces visible here are to be interpreted as χ[μγ]θ. These and other Christian signs are also found at the start of SB XVI 12267 ([χμγ]θ–), P.Lond. V 1899 (†) and P.Med.Copto inv. 76.21 (†, not rendered in the transcription, but clearly visible on the plate). As a result of the shifting of the two fragments, H. Harrauer was able to incorporate the loose fragment found together with this text and published as SB XVI 12467 into l. 2.

3. The name Θεαρή is not attested elsewhere.

4. ἐδε[ξ]άμην καὶ πεπληρωμαί: the usual formula in Hermopolite sales for future delivery is ὁμολογῶ ἐσχηκέναι καὶ πεπληρωσθαι (cf. P.Heid. V, p. 308). A construction without ὁμολογῶ occurs also in P.Strasb. I 1, 5–6 (Πεπλήρω[μαί | παρ]ἄ σοῦ [καὶ ἔσ]χ[ο]ν) and in SB VI 9051, 5–6 (Ἐχω σοὶ καὶ χρε[ωστῶ καὶ πεπληρωμαί | ἀπ[ο]κρότως). The genitive τιμῆς is typical for the Hermopolite nome. It has to be supplemented in P.Sta. Xyla 6, 1 instead of τιμῆν. The reconstruction of the preceding lines (l. c., comm. on l. 1) has to be changed accordingly.

<sup>57</sup> The corrections of K. A. Worp were incorporated in SB XVI Nachträge und Berichtigungen, pp. 540–541 with το[ ] instead of τῆς [Θηβαίδος].

<sup>58</sup> μονάζοντι in P.Cairo inv. no. 10078 (AD 556), edited by P. J. Sijpesteijn, ZPE 70 (1987) 55–56 with plate 1b (= SB XVIII 14062) is abbreviated in a similar way. The zeta with oblique stroke there is nearly identical with the one in our text.



5. ἀπὸ ξηστῶ[ν τριῶν] τῶ(ν) ξηστῶν ἐν [τ]ρουλάτοις τοῦ τόπου: the meaning of this passage was explained by K. A. Worp, *CdE* 59 (1984) 148: „The writer means that each *metron* consists of 3 *sextarii* which are packed in the *trullae* of the monastery“. A specification of the content of the metra or knidia is rare in the Hermopolite sales of wine for future delivery, see P.Heid. V, p. 320 and N. Kruit, *ZPE* 94 (1992) 184 with n. 50). Such a specification occurs in SB XVI 12488, l. 11 ἕκαστο]ν μέτρον ἀπὸ ξηστῶν πέντε, P.Amst. I 48, l. 14 ἐκ ξηστῶν τριῶν ἕκαστου κνιδίου, and SB XVIII 13124, l. 6–7 ἐκ ξηστῶν | τριῶν ἕκαστον (read ἕκαστου) μέτρον. Usually a private measure or the μέτρον τοῦ πίθου will be used. The measure is normally mentioned in the clause considering the return of the wine: ἄπερ ἀποδώσω σοι date ἐν οἴνω νέφ καλλίστω καὶ εὐαρέστῳ μέτρῳ and name of the measure, or similar (cf. P.Heid. V, p. 315). In P.Amst. I 48, SB XVI 12488 and SB XVIII 13124 the specified measure stands at the same spot. Here the situation is different: the amount of xestai for which is paid, is specified, while the measure to be used at the time of the return is the μέτρον τοῦ πίθου. (see l. 7). Yet another phrasing occurs in P.Lond. III 997, for which see below. For τροῦλλα and derivatives, see J. M. Diethart, *ZPE* 64 (1986) 78.

7 and 9. The corrections of K. A. Worp, l. c. (cf. above on ll. 1–2) on these lines have to be rejected. They were based on a photograph, showing more loose fragments, among others -σε- of εὐασέστω. This fragment, as H. Harrauer reported me, is now securely placed. The oblique stroke read by Worp as the lower part of a rho is in fact the upper part of the ε in Φαμενῶθ in l. 8.

9. The solution προχ[ρείας], tentatively suggested in the editio princeps, is now corroborated by SB XVIII 13124, l. 13.

9–10. A small loose fragment with traces of two lines, reading ]σ.[ and ]δι[, was integrated in ll. 9–10 by the previous editors to form the phrases χωρὶς π[άση]ς ἄ[μ]φιβολείας and ὁμολο[γῶ] ]δ[ιδόν]ει σο[ι] (the letters of the fragment as read by the previous editors are underlined). Although this is the only suitable spot in the main body of the text for the scrap to be integrated, I do not follow their proposal for two reasons: firstly, the distance between the two lines on the fragment is somewhat larger than between lines nine and ten; secondly, the way διδόνει would be written here, would be different from the way it was written in line 6. In line 6 there is no ligature of δ and ι, which is the case here. Another possible location of the scrap could be in lines 13 and 14, see below.

11. A possible amount of νομισμάτια to be paid in case of non-delivery is ἐν ἡμισυ, resulting in a price of 420 sextarii/Solidus if an extra charge of 50% was included in the fine. For the price of wine cf. the introduction to P.Heid. V 359 and my article in *ZPE* 94 (1992) 182–184. [ἐν ἡμισυ] would fill the gap adequately.

12–13. The subscription of the contractor and the witnesses is in an unusual form. Normally, we find ἐθέμην τοῦτο τὸ γραμματίον ὡς πρόκειται. Also the joint subscription of the witnesses is rare. Usually, each witness signs for himself with μαρτυρῶ τῷ γραμματίῳ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ θεμένου. Similar joint subscriptions can be found in CPR VII 45, P.Heid. V 357, SB VI 9051 (though using a different expression), P.Strasb. VI 597, and P.Sta. Xyla 13 and 17. Note that the verbs in the formula used in these joint subscriptions are not in the plural, but in the singular, as if each witness testifies separately<sup>59</sup>. In all these texts someone else subscribes for the witnesses (and often for the contracting party as well) because they are illiterate<sup>60</sup>. Probably that is the case here too, since there

<sup>59</sup> In P.Strasb. VI 597, 18–19 one finds μαρτυροῦμεν τὴν μίσθ[ω]σι[v] | ἀκούσας πα[ρ]ὰ τοῦ θεμ[έ]νον. Perhaps we have to read μαρτυρῶ instead of μαρτυροῦμεν, rather than ἀκούσαντες instead of ἀκούσας as suggested by the editor.

<sup>60</sup> CPR VII 45 and P.Heid. V 357 are both signed by the notary Pinoution (see P.Heid. V 357, commentary on l. 5). There is no change of hands in P.Heid. V 357. Apparently, Pinoution also wrote the body of the text (cf. P.Heid. V 357, note on l. 35). Therefore, his name should be supplemented in l. 32: Αὐρηλιος | [Πινουτίων Λιλ]οῦ etc. In l. 12 we have to read γίν(ονται) κριθ(ῶν) ἀρ(τάβαι) η// and in CPR VII 45, 4 γίν(ονταί) κριθ(ῶν) ἀρ(τάβαι) γ//, cf. BL 8 p. 112. Since Pinoution uses the formula ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γράμματα μὴ εἰδῶτων in P.Heid. V 357, the same formula has probably to be read in CPR VII 45 and not ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀγραμμάτων ὄντων as suggested in J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, *Byz. Not.*, Herm. 16.7.1, cf. my review of *Byz. Not.* in *Rivista di Bizantinistica* 1 (1991) 265 and 266. P.Strasb. VI 597, ll. 20–21 may be read and

seems to be no change of hands. If so, we can expect yet another name in l. 13 followed by ἀξιωθεῖς ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, „because they are illiterate“. The large delta in l. 13 could be part of that name. With the papyrus are kept some loose fragments which could be part of this text. One of them has been placed in ll. 12–13 in the gap following Ἐνώχ by H. Harrauer. Three lines are preserved, the first one containing only some traces, the others reading ]ἰοσελλε[ ]..<sup>θ</sup>( ) εγρα[. It is hard to say whether it is correctly placed: ]ἰοσελλε[ could be read as [υ]ἰός Ελλε[, but this would leave not sufficient space for καὶ Βίκ]τωρ. Apart from that, it would be the only instance in this text where filiation would be expressed with υἰός. Perhaps the fragment has to be put one line below: with the delta of l. 13 we could read Δ[ενιήλ]ἰος Ελλε[ ἔγ]ρ(αψα). The other line of the fragment with ]..<sup>θ</sup>( ) εγρα[ could be read as part of the notary's subscription, δι' ἑμοῦ NN σὺν θ(εῶ) ἔγρα[φη]. The combination of these words in such a subscription is only known from P.Ryl. Copt. 159 (= J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, *Byz. Not.*, Herm. 10.3.1), written in a very different hand<sup>61</sup>. If the notary's subscription has to be put in l. 14, the fragment I have removed from ll. 9–10 could be inserted here, forming the beginning of the subscription (δι') and σα in ἀκούσας.

Verso (Tafel 16). I have not been able to control the reading of the verso. However, I do not share the doubts of the previous editors about resolving the staurogram at the beginning of the verso into χ(ει)ρι(ό)γραφον). We never find a Christian sign in the verso's of the other Hermopolite sales of wine for future delivery. Six of the seven texts from which the beginning of the verso is preserved however, start with an abbreviation of χειρόγραφον<sup>62</sup>.

## SB VI 9051

Thanks to a photograph kindly send to me by the Museum of Fine Art in Bruxelles, I was able to verify the readings of SB VI 9051. As was already stated in the editio princeps, about half of the text is preserved, the right hand side being lost. The handwriting is very regular with ± 33 letters written on the preserved half and, judging from ll. 2 and 4, ± 17 letters missing from the lost right half. Here I present some new readings and a new reconstruction of the text, presuming that all lines have to be supplemented with about 17 letters and were not written irregularly as was supposed in the commentary on l. 6 in the editio princeps.

- 1 ↓ χμγ  
 2 † Τῶ εὐλαβεστάτῳ ἀββᾶ Φοιβάμμωνι [ ± 17 ]  
 3 ἀββᾶ Απολλῶτος ἐν ὄρι κόμης Τιτκώεως τοῦ [Ἐρμουπολίτου νομοῦ]  
 4 π(αρ)ὰ Αὐρηλίου Μαθείας υἱὸς Θεοδώρου ἐκ μη[τρὸς NN ἀπὸ κόμης]  
 5 Τανεμώεως τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ. Ἔχω σοι καὶ χρε[ωστῶ καὶ πεπλήρωμαι]  
 6 ἀπ[ο]κρότως τελείας καὶ ἀξίας τιμῆς σίτο[υ ἀρταβῶν τριῶν ἡμισυ]  
 7 [γίν(ονται) σί(του) (ἀρτάβαι) γS ἐκάστην ἀρτάβην] τῶ σῶ μέτρ[ω ± 5 ἄσπερ  
 εἰρημέ-]

supplemented to ἀξιωθεῖς[ς] ἔγρα[ψα ὑπὲρ αὐ]τοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶ[ν μ]αρτύ[ρων γράμ]ματα | μη εἰδόντων (l. εἰδόντων), cf. P.Sta. Xyla 17, ll. 14–15.

<sup>61</sup> The reading σὺν θ(εῶ) is to be preferred. It seems impossible to combine the traces below the theta to either βοηθ(οῦ) which might be read in a notary's subscription in the formula δι' ἑμοῦ NN δι' ἑμοῦ NN βοηθ(οῦ) ἔγραφη or similar which is well attested in the Hermopolite nome, or to ἀξιωθ(εῖς) followed by ἔγρα[ψα] which one might expect if the fragment should be placed in ll. 12–13.

<sup>62</sup> BGU XII 2207 and 2209, SB XVI 12486, 12488, 13037 and P.Lond. III 1001 (see ZPE 94 [1992] 175). Only in SB XVI 12492 we find ὁμολογ(ία). Most verso's further consist of the name of the contractant, sometimes his profession, his provenance, and the amount of wine. Read in the V<sup>o</sup> of SB XVI 12489 and P.Heid. V 356 κν(ιδίων), in SB XVI 13037 κερ(αλαίου) and κνιδ(ίον).



- 8 [νας ἀρτάβας τρίας ἡμισυ] ἀποδώσω σοι ἐν [καιρῷ συγκομιδῆς καρ-]  
 9 [πῶν ἐν τῷ Π]αῦνι μ[ηνι] τῆ(ς) σὺν Θεῷ τρίτης ἰν[δ(ικτίονος) ἐν σίτῳ νέφ  
 καθαρῷ]  
 10 [ἀδό]λῳ καὶ εὐαρέστῳ κεκ[οσ]κινευμέν(ν)φ) καλῷ χ[ωρίς τινος ὑπερθέσεως]  
 11 πασει καὶ οἰασδήποτε ἀφορμῆς· παρελθού[σης δὲ τῆς προειρημένης]  
 12 προθεσμίας(ς), εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω σοι τῶν αὐτῶν σ[ίτου ἀρταβῶν τριῶν ἡμισυ,]  
 13 ἐτοίμως ἔχω διδόναι σοι ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων τιμ[ῆς χρυσοῦ κεράτια]  
 14 δεκατέσσαρες εὐθύς μετὰ τὴν προθεσμίαν[ν καὶ πρὸς σὴν ἀσφάλειαν]  
 15 πεποιήμαι σοι ταύτην τὴν παροῦσαν ἀσφάλειαν ὡ[ς πρόκ(εῖται)] Αὐρ(ἡλίου)  
 Μαθείας υἱὸς]  
 16 Θεοδώρου ὁ προκ(είμενος) στοιχί πάντα ὡς πρόκ(εῖται) ἐπιμαρτυρ[ούντων Αὐ-  
 ρ(ηλίων) NN, name of father]  
 17 καὶ Μούϊτος Ἀβρα( ) καὶ Ἠλίας Σερήνου μαρτύρ(ων) τῆ ἀ[σφαλεία καὶ  
 ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖς) ὠμολ(ογήσα).]  
 18 † Αὐρ(ἡλίου) Ἰωάνν(ης) . Βίκ(τορος) [ἀξ]ιωθ(εῖς) ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γρά(μ-  
 ματα) μὴ [εἰδόντων

Verso: →

- 19 [χ(ει)ρ(όγραφον) οἱ ἀσφ(άλεια) Αὐρ(ηλίου) Μαθεία Θεοδώρου] υἱοῦ ἀπ[ὸ]  
 κ(ώμης) Τανεμ[ώεως] σί(του) (ἀρταβῶν) γS traces.

3. l. ὄρει 4. l. Μαθεία, υἱοῦ 11. l. πασῆς 12. l. τὰς αὐτὰς σίτου ἀρτάβας τρίας 16. l. στοιχεῖ 17. l. Ἠλία

„To the most revered abba Phoibammon – – of the monastery of abba Apollon on the hill of the village Titkois of the Hermopolite nome, from Aurelios Matheias, son of Theodoros, his mother being NN, from the village Tanemois of the same nome. I have received from you and I owe you and have been paid in full without fail the complete and worthy price of 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabai of wheat, total 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabai of wheat, each artabe in your measure – –, which said 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabai I shall give to you at the time of the harvest of the crops in the month Payni of the with God third indiction in wheat which is new, pure, unadulterated and of the best quality, sifted and good, without any delay and instigation whatsoever; when the aforesaid period has past, if I have not given you the same 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabai of wheat, (then) I am prepared to give to you for the price of those 14 golden keratia immediately after the appointed time and for your security I have made for you this present bond as stated above. Aurelios Matheias son of Theodoros the aforementioned, everything as stated above is satisfactory to me, while the Arelioi NN, son of NN, and Mouïs, son of Abra( ), and Elias, son of Serenos, testified as witnesses to the bond, and, being asked, I have given my consent. I Aurelios Johannes, son of Biktor, being asked, I have written for them since they do not know letters.“

Verso: „Contract (or bond) of Aurelios Matheias, son of Theodoros, of the village of Tanemois, for 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> artabai of wheat.“

2. Considering the ways the monastery of Apa Apollon is referred to (see above) we have the following options to supplement the gap: [monastic title τοῦ ἁγίου τόπου], [monastic title μοναστηρίου]. In the first case, about 4 letters are left for the monastic title, in the second case about 6. The supplements προεστῶτι of the editio princeps (based on the doubtful reading of P.Lond. V 1899, cf. above, note 4) and ἀρχιμανδρίτη, suggested in BL VII 201, are obviously too long.

They would have to be abbreviated, but other monastic titles, such as μονάζ(οντι) would fill the space adequately too.

3. Read ἐν ὄρει. There is no abbreviation mark so that a reading ἐνορί(ας) seems excluded (cf. above, note 21).

6–8. A quality designation (σίτο[υ εὐαρέστου] in the editio princeps) is not expected here, see P.Heid. V 357, commentary on line 11. Usually, the measure to be used stands behind the quality designations of the product to be delivered. Whenever it is transferred to the front, the measure is specified, see above, commentary on SB XVI 12401 + 12402 line 5. A possible supplement after τῷ σῶ μέτρῳ is δικαίῳ or Ἀθηναίῳ, cf. P.Heid. V, p. 321.

8–10. The readings of l. 10, doubted in P.Heid. V, p. 322, n. 15 are certain. For the restoration cf. my article, ZPE 94 (1992) 176, n. 28. For the meaning of ἄδολος cf. P.L.Bat. XXII, p. 88, not. p.

10–11. χ[ωρίς ὑπερθέσεως] | πασει (read πάσης) could be possible too, but with τινος added the lacuna is better filled. For τις in combination with πᾶς cf. P.Flor. I 94, ll. 13–14.

11–12. τῆς προειρημένης προθεσμίας, also in SB XVIII 13124, l. 13; in my opinion των αὐτων σ[- -] stands for τὰς αὐτὰς σ[ίτου ἀρτάβας τρίας ἡμισυ], rather than τὸν αὐτὸν σ[ίτον] as suggested in the editio princeps, cf. below, commentary on P.Lond. III 997, l. 15.

13. The supplement τιμ[ῆς χρυσοῦ κεράτια] is rather short, but seems the only one possible.

14–15. For the expression πρὸς τὴν σὴν ἀσφάλειαν πεποίημαί σοι ταύτην τὴν παροῦσαν ἀσφάλειαν cf. P.Lond. V 1776, ll. 2–3.

16–17. In Byzantine times, the verb ἐπιμαρτυρέω is, as far as I know, only found in P.Lond. V 1692, P.Michael. 41 and P.Mich. XIII 671 (all from Aphrodito). It occurs in the formula ἐφ' ὑπογραφῆς ἐμῆς or similar καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς συνηθῶν ἐπιμαρτυροῦνταν μαρτύρων, followed by the subscriptions of the contractant, witnesses and notary<sup>63</sup>. This formula (without μαρτύρων) was supplemented in the editio princeps, resulting in a restoration of no less than 41 characters. This cannot be correct. ἐπιμαρτυρ[ ] must be the beginning of a genitive absolute because l. 17 starts with καὶ Μούϊτος and because of the word order. It is unlikely that we have to type a period after ὡς πρόκ(εῖται) and start a new sentence with Ἐπιμαρτυρ[οῦμεν]. In addition, the reconstruction as proposed here, provides space for the *stipulatio* which otherwise would be lacking. A similar construction with προσμαρτυ(ρησάντων) and also three witnesses occurs in P.Prag. I 43, ll. 24–26 (Boubastos, 635 AD).

18. Ἰωάνν(ης) is abbreviated with an oblique stroke through the last ν. Between Ἰωάνν(ης) and Βίκ(τορος) there is a sign visible, looking like X, resembling the abbreviation (ὑπέρ). Naturally, ὑπέρ does not make any sense. The only possibility would be to understand (υἱός), but I was not able to find that word abbreviated in this way.

Verso. The beginning of the verso, standing on the back of the broken-off right hand side of the recto, is missing. There is only one line of writing, not two as in SB<sup>64</sup>. Some traces are visible of Μαθεῖα Θεοδώρου, but they cannot be assigned to any letters in particular. There are some traces after γS. They are inexplicable, because nothing else is expected. The only explanation that I can think of is to read γS ἡμ(ισυ). In that case, S would not be the sign for (ἡμισυ), but a number marker. The reading ἡμ(ισυ) is compatible with the first traces, especially the η, but since there seem to be more traces following it, I don't know whether this is the correct solution.

### P.Lond. III 997

This text is yet another sale of wine for future delivery. It is addressed to Flavius Georgios, son of Silvanos, who is already known from several other texts<sup>65</sup>. The wording of the text is

<sup>63</sup> Supplement in the gap of P.Lond. V 1692 A, l. 20 and B, l. 18 μαρτύρων.

<sup>64</sup> In P.Sta. Xyla 6 there are only two lines of writing, not three. Line 17 is the reconstruction of the lost left hand part of the verso and should be put between square brackets. Probably γενόμενον has to be added before παρά, cf. BGU XII 2208–2210.

<sup>65</sup> He and his family are discussed by P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Hellenika* 40 (1989) 381–383 and by J. G. Keenan in his lecture *Soldier and Civilian in Byzantine Hermopolis* held at Copenhagen during

very much like SB XVI 12488, a sale of wine for future delivery addressed to Georgios' father Silvanos of 538 AD<sup>66</sup>. In both texts there are peculiarities which are not, or rarely found in other Hermopolite texts. The content of the *metra* is given (5 *xestai*). Also, the amount of *metra* is repeated again in words after the γίνεται formula. Furthermore, the vats are to be supplied by the seller of the wine, a unique clause. One might conclude that P.Lond. III 997 has been used as a model for SB XVI 12488.

P.Lond. III 997  
Hermopolite nome

15 × 14,2 cm

12-10-537 AD  
Tafel 17

Darkish brown papyrus of average quality. Broken off at the left and bottom. There is a wear suggesting a vertical fold, about 61–62 mm from the right edge and what appears to be a kollema about 54 mm from the right edge. The handwriting is along the fibres. The Verso is presumably blank because it is laid down on card.

1 † Μετὰ τὴν ὑπατεῖαν Φλ. Βελισ]αρίου τοῦ ἐνδοξοτάτου τὸ β̄ Φαῶφι ἰε̄ πρώτης  
ἰνδ(ικτίονος)  
2 Αὐρήλιος Ἀπολλῶς name of father μ]ητρὸς Ἀδωρῶς ἀμπελουργὸς ἀπὸ κώμης  
3 - - - Φλαουί]φ Γεωργί]φ Σιλβανοῦ τῷ θαυμασιωτάτῳ ἀπὸ  
4 - - - χ]αίρειν. Ὁμολογῶ ἐγὼ ὁ προγεγραμμένος Ἀπολλῶς  
5 ἐσχέκεναι καὶ πεπ]ληρωῦσθαι παρὰ τῆς σῆς θαυμασιοτήτος τῆς  
6 πρὸς ἀλλήλους συμπεφω]νημένης τελείας καὶ ἀξίας τιμῆς οἴνου νέου  
7 μούστου μέτρων τριακοσίων, γί(νεται)] οἴν(ου) μέτρ(α) τ// ἄπερ εἰρημένα σοῦ οἴνου  
8 μέτρα τριακόσια ἕκασιον] μέτρων ἀπὸ ξέστων πέντε μέτρῳ τοῦ  
9 - ἀποδόσω σοι ἐν] τῷ Μεσορῆ μηνὶ καιρῷ τρύγης καρπῶν  
10 τῆς σὺν θεῷ εἰσιούσης δευτ]έρας ἐπινεμήσεως ἐν οἴνῳ νέφ καλλίστῳ  
11 καὶ εὐαρέστῳ τῶν κούφων] παρεχομένων παρ' ἐμοῦ νέως πεπεισσω-  
12 μένων. Καὶ εἰ εὐρεθῆῃ ὄξος] ἢ [ἀ]ποίητος ἢ ὀζόμενος ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ οἴνου  
13 ἕως Φαμενώθ μηνὸς καὶ αὐτοῦ] τῆς αὐτῆς ἰνδικτίονος ἐπὶ τῷ με

the 20<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Papyrologists (cf. above note „\*“). Texts related to Silvanos are P.Lond. III 992 (507), SB XVI 12488 (538), P.Lond. III 1316b, edited by G. M. Parássoglou, *Hellenika* 38 (1987), 35 (probably 541/542, cf. Sijpesteijn, l. c., 382), and P.Lond. III 1051 (probably 549, cf. Sijpesteijn, l. c., 382). P.Lond. III 1052a (edited by P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Hellenika* 38 [1987] 144) mentions a Σιλβανὸς στρ(ατιώτης). Since the handwriting of this papyrus looks identical to that of P.Lond. III 1316b on the microfilm, I believe we have here another attestation of our Silvanos. If so, P.Lond. III 1052a should be dated between 507 and 533/534 AD as Silvanos apparently was still on duty in that text (see also below n. 69). Related to his son Flavios Georgios are P.Lond. III 1000 (538), P.Lond. III 1001 (539), P.Lond. V 1872 (548), P.Lond. V 1766 (559) and P.Lond. III 1020. According to BL I, 298 the date of the latter text would be 541/542, according to Sijpesteijn, l. c., 382 556/557 and perhaps even 571/572 are equally possible. Georgios' uncle Isakos (cf. the family-tree of Sijpesteijn, l. c., 383 and his note 8) is not to be identified with the contractant of P.Strasb. V 493, l. 10 as was suggested by the editor. The second hand of the Strasbourg text is not the same as in the subscription of Isakos in P.Lond. III 1001. Besides, the reading in P.Strasb. V 493 is far from being sure as was kindly reported to me by J. Gascou. On the original he was able to read Φλ/ Ἰσακ without difficulty, but after that the reading Φο[ι]βαμμ is virtually impossible. Only α is sure but φ seems impossible. There is no writing behind the first μ, nor an abbreviation sign.

<sup>66</sup> See also my remarks on this text in ZPE 94 (1992) 175.

14 ἀλλάχαι σοι ἀντ' αὐτῶν ἐν καλῷ οἴνω χ]ωρ[ίς] τινος ὑπερθ[έσεω]ς  
 15 ]οιν[ ]].[  
 16 ].[

„In the second post-consulate of the most honourable Flavios Belisarios, Phaophi the 15<sup>th</sup> in the first indiction, Aurelios Apollos, son of NN, his mother being Adora, vine dresser, from the village – – to Flavios Georgios, son of Silbanos, the most excellent, greetings. I, the aforementioned Apollos, agree to have received and been paid in full from your excellency the complete and worthy price we mutually agreed upon for 300 metra of new wine must, total 300 metra of wine, which said 300 metra of wine, each metron consisting of 5 xestai in the measure of – –, I shall give to you in the month Mesorè at the time of the vintage of the crops of the with God coming second epinemèsis in new, very fine wine, of the best quality, while the vats are supplied by me, newly pitched. And if, from the same wine, it is found to be vinegar or unfit for use or having a moldy taste up to the month Phamenoth, itself included, of the same indiction, I agree to exchange it for you, instead of those in good wine, without any delay.“

1. For the first time we encounter a numbered post-consulate of Flavios Belisarios. In all other texts of his second post-consulate the number is omitted, cf. P.Strasb. V 473 and the texts cited in R. S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, K. A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta 1987, 609. See also R. S. Bagnall, K. A. Worp, *The Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, Zutphen 1978, 50–52.

2. Ἀδωρᾶς: the genitive of this female name is either Ἀδωρᾶ (e. g. P.Cairo Isid. 95, l. 1) or Ἀδωρᾶς (e. g. SB XIV 12133, l. 7). To be added to the references given in P.Oxy. LV 3815, comm. on l. 8 is P.Cornell 34 V°. See also G. Wagner, *Les oasis d'Égypte*, 71 Nr. 14 AMOYINADΔΩPE. The editor of P.Mich. VI 376 is wrong in regarding Ἀδωρᾶ as a male name, cf. the Index.

3-4. The restoration of these lines poses some problems. One could also supplement Ἀυρηλί]φ in line 3, since Georgios is an Aurelios in P.Lond. V 1872. However, since in all other texts related to him (cf. note 65) he is called Flavios, the odds favour this restoration<sup>67</sup>. The main problem is the restoration of line 4. In all texts but one Georgios describes himself, or is addressed to as Γεώργιος Σιλβανοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως or ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμοπολιτῶν. Here, the former is excluded as the borrower Apollos originates from a village and not from the city, but ἀπὸ [τῆς Ἑρμοπολιτῶν χ]αίρειν would be a suitable restoration. However, in P.Lond. III 1001 of 539 AD, Georgios is addressed to as Φλαουίφ Γεωργίφ Σιλ[β]ανοῦ) | ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρμο(υ)πολιτῶν, „to Fl. Georgios son of Silvanos, former soldier from Hermopolis“ (ll. 6–7). Like his father, Georgios could have been a veteran of the ἀριθμὸς τῶν Μαύρων stationed in Hermopolis. Since J. Gascou has demonstrated that the *Mauri* were replaced by the *Numides* in 533/534 already<sup>68</sup>, a restoration

<sup>67</sup> Another instance of a man called Aurelios in one text and Flavios in another is described by J. G. Keenan, *BASP* 27 (1990) 142–144. In the same periodical, 110, n. 2, J. J. Farber rejects the possible identification of Aur. Paternouthis and Fl. Paternouthis among others because of their different status designations. This view is rejected by Keenan, l. c., 143, n. 16.

<sup>68</sup> See J. Gascou in *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin I, IVe–VIIe Siècle*, Paris 1989, 283–284. According to Gascou, the latest text mentioning the *Mauri* still in function in Hermopolis is P.Cairo Masp. I 67091 of 528 AD. No texts have been published recently to challenge this view, cf. the list of IV<sup>th</sup>–VI<sup>th</sup> century texts mentioning Moors in Proc. 20<sup>th</sup> Int. Congr. Pap., Copenhagen 1994, 260–262. The date 533/534 is a *terminus ante quem* for those texts mentioning the Moors which could only be dated in the VI<sup>th</sup> century on palaeographical grounds, such as P.Herm. Rees 66 and P.Prag. I 42. Now that SB XVI 12489 can be dated in the middle of the V<sup>th</sup> century (see BL VIII, p. 383) and thus falls well within the limits of the presence of the Moors in Hermopolis, the restoration of ll. 4–5 can be corrected to Φλ(αουίφ) Φοιβάμμ[ωνι NN rank τῶν ἐν τῇ λαμπρο-

mentioning the Moors in 537 AD could only be possible if Georgios had become a veteran of this unit before its replacement<sup>69</sup>. But Georgios could have been part of both units and therefore been addressed in a more general way as „former soldier from Hermopolis“, in which case ll. 3–4 are to be supplemented in the same fashion as P.Lond. III 1001 with one or more abbreviations.

On the other hand, one may well doubt whether Georgios has ever been a soldier. As stated above, in all texts but P.Lond. III 1001 Georgios' military status is left out. Furthermore, the honorific title *θαυμασιώτατος* used here and in P.Lond. V 1766 for Georgios is normally „befitting a secular village post“ (J. G. Keenan, *Atti del XVII Congr.*, III 958–959), or used for a „middle level administrator“ (CPR X 6, n. on l. 6), not for someone of military status (cf. F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch III*, Abschnitt 9, s. v.). Indeed, generally speaking one would not expect *θαυμασιώτατος* for a soldier as soldiers and other members of the army are usually addressed to as *καθοσιώμενος*<sup>70</sup>. On the other hand, in an abstract form, militaries are referred to as *ἡ σὴ θαυμασιότης* (e. g. P.Amst. I 45, SB XVI 12488) and at least one former military is addressed with the title *θαυμασιώτατος*: *Τῷ θαυμασιωτάτῳ [Ι]ω[ά]ννη ἀπὸ πριμικ(ηρίων)* (BGU XII 2163, ll. 1–2)<sup>71</sup>. If Georgios was not a soldier we are left to explain ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν in P.Lond. III 1001. A translation „former soldier“ would then be excluded. In that case a translation „belonging to the class of soldiers“ would be more appropriate. It would mean that Georgios, despite not being a soldier, belonged to the same social class<sup>72</sup>.

τάτῃ Ἐρμοῦ] ἡ πόλει διακειμένων γενν[αιοτάτων Μαύρων χ(αίρειν) etc. (cf. the address of BGU XII 2141 (446 AD). It cannot be excluded that the *Foibammon* of this text is the grandfather of Georgios and the father of Silvanos. The only text I know of which would be in contradiction with the date of leave of the Moors as established by Gascou is P.Lond. III 1004 descr. In the description, the text is dated „in Epeiph of an uncertain year, after the consulship of Flavius Basilius (?) [= AD 542–565]“. However, ll. 5–7 can be read on microfilm as *Φλαουίῳ Ἀπολλῶτι .[NN rank ἀριθμοῦ τῶν] ἡ γενναιοτάτων Μαύρων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρμουπολιτῶν καθιδρυμένων] ἡ χ(αίρειν*. The reading of the name of the consul cannot be verified on microfilm, only some traces are visible. If the reading is sound, the text could be dated in the postconsulate of Fl. Basilius I, consul in 480 AD (cf. CPR. X 117–118). However, the description of the text is wrong in reading *ἰνδ]ικτίονος* Ἐπεί[φ at the end of l. 2. The correct reading is *ἰνδ]ικτίονος ἐν Ἐρμ[οῦ πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος*. The name of the month is expected at its usual place, before the indiction number. Since the element ἐν Ἐρμ[οῦ πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος is not attested before 507 AD (cf. A. Calderini, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici*, s. v.), a date 480 AD seems excluded. Probably the reading *Βασιλίου*, already provided with a question mark in the description, has to be rejected. The first and only text from Hermopolis mentioning the *Numidae Iustiniani* is BGU XII 2197. Unfortunately, the date is lost, only a 2nd indiction which is yet to come is mentioned in l. 12. The first possible date for this papyrus is therefore the first indiction of 537/538 AD

<sup>69</sup> Cf. SB XVI 12488 of 538 AD, where Georgios' father Silvanos is described as ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν τοῦ πρότερον ἐν Ἐρμ[οῦ πόλει ἀριθμοῦ τῶν Μαύρων. A lack of space forbids a similar restoration in P.Lond. III 997. Sijpesteijn (l. c., n.1) is using the date of SB XVI 12488 as a *terminus post quem* for the other text in which Silvanos is called a veteran, P.Lond. III 1316b (cf. above n. 1). Since the unit of the Moors has left Hermopolis in 533/534 and Silvanos is explicitly addressed to as a veteran of *this* unit, it might be safer to date his retirement from the army in the period between 507 (= the date of P.Lond. III 992, Silvanos still in active duty) and 533/534.

<sup>70</sup> See O. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden*, Diss. Gießen 1930, 18. *Καθοσιώμενος* is the title used in e. g. PSI IV 296 and P.Strasb. VII 579, addressed to a soldier and an ex-drakonarios of the unit of the Moors.

<sup>71</sup> For his career see BGU XII, Einleitung XXV. The same man is entitled *αἰδέσιμος* in P.Coll. Youtie II 89 (= P.Berol. 13912). The titles *θαυμασιώτατος* and *αἰδέσιμος* may be due to the fact that Iohannes is a former *primicerius*, i. e. an administrative function, not a specific military rank, cf. P.Coll.Youtie II pp. 578–579.

<sup>72</sup> J. G. Keenan suggested by letter as a translation of ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν „of military status“ or „of military family“ by analogy of ἀπὸ ὑπατῶν. Cf. also the editors of P.Landlisten, discussing the chronological sequence of P.Landlisten F and G, suggesting that *ex-beneficarius* could mean „gehörend zu der Klasse/Kategorie der *beneficarii*“. I do not agree with P. J. Sijpesteijns view (op. cit. [n. 1], p. 381) that ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν in P.Lond. III 1001 is said of Georgios' father Silvanos. It

To sum up the arguments discussed above, I do not think that any conclusion can be reached: Georgios' name Flavios and the address of P.Lond. III 1001 could favour a military status. The address in all other texts and his honorific title, however could point in the opposite direction.

8. Here as well as in SB XVI 12488 each *metron* has to contain 5 *xestai*. Usually, the content of the *metra* or *knidia* is not specified in the Hermopolite sales of wines for future delivery. For other exceptions see above on SB XVI 12401 + 12402, commentary on l. 5. The fact that both here and in SB XVI 12488 the content of a *metron* is specified as 5 *xestai*, casts doubt on the assumption that a *metron* has a standard capacity of 10 *xestai* (so P.Sta.Xyla 6, n. on l. 1, citing L. Casson, TAPA 70 [1939] 8). If so, it would have been much easier to acknowledge the receipt of the price for 150 *metra* of wine, without further specification.

8–9. μέτρον τοῦ Ι [-: for the different kinds of measures used in the Hermopolite nome see P.Heid. V p. 320. [πίθου could be a suitable supplement, cf. SB XVI 12401 + 12402, where the content of the *metra* is also specified, and the measure to be used at the time of the delivery is the μέτρον τοῦ πίθου.

11–12. Just as in SB XVI 12488 the vats are to be delivered by the seller of the wine, the opposite being the usual practice. Only one element is added, the vats are to be newly pitched. The pitching of jars is also required in sales of vats in advance<sup>73</sup> and among the work to be executed by those who lease potteries<sup>74</sup>. In those text the vats to be delivered are either καινόκουφα or νέα κοῦφα<sup>75</sup>. Νέα κοῦφα are to be supplied by the buyer of the wine in P.Sta. Xyla 6. I also considered the possibility of reading νέων before πεπεισσωμένων, but the traces of the last letter clearly do not allow such a reading.

12–14. Mr. Pattie has made the following observation regarding these lines: „there is an overlap affecting ll. 13, 14 and to a small extent 12. It looks as if the papyrus has been damaged and distorted, and when repaired the left part has been laid over the right“. As a result, the ζ of ὀζόμενος in l. 12 and the η of αὐτῆς in l. 13 are partly invisible. The overlap is most clear in l. 14: ωρ, damaged on both sides, is somewhat higher than the rest of the line. ις is hidden behind the overlap.

13. The restoration of this line is based on SB XVI 12488.

15. The little scrap of papyrus reading ]οιν[ and a trace of a letter in the following line is attached to the upper part by a single fibre. Line 15 may have continued after ὑπερθέσεως of l. 14 with καὶ ἀντιλογίας καὶ κρίσεως καὶ δίκης, cf. SB XVI 12488. However, in that case the scrap could not be integrated. It seems more likely that οιν is part of the guarantee clause in which the

---

would be unnatural to read the address of P.Lond. III 1001 in this way. Instead of ἀπ'ὸ διακ(όνων) one could also read ὑπ'οδίακ(ονος) in P.Sta. Xyla 12, l. 9. For sub-deacons testifying or subscribing to contracts, cf. E. Wipszycka, JJP 23 (1993) 194. All texts but one listed by her are from the Hermopolite nome. The wavy line below the signature of the notary in P.Sta. Xyla suggests a Hermopolite provenance for that text too, cf. J. M. Diethart, K. A. Worp, *Byz. Not.*, p. 13.

<sup>73</sup> E. g. BGU XII 2205, P.Prag. I 46, P.Flor. III 314, P.Lond. III 1303 (= P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Tyche* 6 [1991] 197–199), P.Oxy. LVIII 3942 and MPER NS XV 112. Cf. also my remarks in *ZPE* 94 (1992) 168, n. 5. For P.Prag. I 46 see also the corrections by J. Bingen, *CdE.* 63 (1988) 388, P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Aegyptus* 68 (1988) 77 and J. M. S. Cowey, R. Duttonhöfer, M. Richter, P. Schubert, *ZPE* 77 (1989) 220. The suggestion of Bingen and Cowey *e. a.* that κοῦφα and κούφων in ll. 16 and 17 are to be replaced by ἀγγεῖα and ἀγγείων has to be disregarded: not the adjective κοῦφος is meant here, but the substantive κοῦφον. This is clearly shown by the wording of MPER NS XV 112 where the receipt of the price for vats, [τιμῆς τῶν] κοῦφων (l. 19), is acknowledged, which will be returned in the month etc., ἄπερ τὰ αὐτὰ κοῦφα ὁμολογῶ παρασχεῖν κ.τ.λ. (l. 26). As in P.Prag. I 46 and BGU XII 2205 ἀγγείων μεγάλων is added after κούφων in the acknowledgement of the receipt of the price as a specification of the kind of vats for which has been paid: „I/We have received in full the price of vats, viz. ἀγγεῖα μέγαρα so many“. In BGU XII 2205 and MPER NS XV 112 the price is for vats being ἀγγεῖα μέγαρα and other kinds of vats too. Cf. P.Oxy. L 3595–3597 and LXVIII 3942 where κοῦφα and καινόκουφα is used in a general sense, „(new) vats“, to refer to specified kinds of vats mentioned earlier in those texts.

<sup>74</sup> E. g. P.Oxy. L 3595–3597, CPR XIV 2. Cf. also the literature cited there.

<sup>75</sup> The word νεόκουφον originally read in SPP VIII 968 turns out to be a ghost-word, see *Korr.* *Tyche* 75 in *Tyche* 7 (1992).



seller, in case he does not deliver at the end of the term agreed upon, undertakes the obligation to pay a certain amount of money as the price of the product instead. This clause, especially known from Hermopolite and Antinoopolite contracts, can take two forms: either they start with εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποδώσω (the product) ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ προθεσίμῃ or with παρελθούσης δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσμίας, εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω (the product)<sup>76</sup>. Whatever the sequence of the clause is, δέ stands at its beginning. The product can be described as either τὸν αὐτὸν οἶνον / σίτον / χόρτον<sup>77</sup> or reference is made to the amount of the product τὰ αὐτὰ οἶνου<sup>78</sup>. In the first case the price for which will be paid is expressed as ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοῦ τιμῆς<sup>79</sup>, in the second case we find ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων τιμῆς<sup>80</sup>.

Bearing this in mind, we first have to take a new look at SB XVI 12488 before returning to our text. Ll. 15–19 of that text run:

χωρίς τινος ὑπερθέσεως καὶ ἀντιλογίας καὶ κρίσεως καὶ  
[δίκης καὶ ἀφορμῆς μέ]χρι δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσμίας. Εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω  
[σοι τὰ προγεγρ(αμμένα) μέτ]ρα ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω παρασχεῖν σοι  
[ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτῶν τιμῆς κ. τ. λ.

Some observations have to be made: 1. the element μέχρι δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσμίας in the formula χωρίς τινος ὑπερθέσεως is unparalleled. The word δέ after μέχρι is odd and inexplicable; 2. the guarantee clause would start with εἰ not followed by the usual δέ and without a reference to the term agreed upon; 3. the product is not mentioned, only the amount. These anomalies could be solved if μέ]χρι is not to be read. Originally, in P.Lond. III 999, ὑπ]έρ was read. This reading was corrected in BL I 298 to παρελθούσης Bell, briefl., laut Original), but the correction was rejected by Harrauer in his reedition of the text: „Auf dem Photo erkenne ich jedoch sicher ],ρι“. The letter in front of ρ consisted of an oblique stroke, according to Harrauer compatible with ε, whence his reading π]ερί. In SB the correction of D. Hagedorn, interpreting the oblique stroke as the upper part of a χ and thus reading μέ]χρι, was incorporated. Checking the Plate (85, not 86 as in SB) and the microfilm, it appeared that the reading ],ρι is far from certain. At first sight, the traces visible could be read in this way, but comparing them with ρ and ι in the rest of the text, one soon finds out that they would be much more upright than expected. The text is written in a sloping hand and here ι would be in a vertical position. The trace of the letter read as ε by Harrauer and as χ by Hagedorn is the upper part of a letter. It is written in the same angle the vertical letters such as δ, η, ι, κ are written in. This excludes the reading ε and *a fortiori* the reading χ<sup>81</sup>. In fact, the traces are very well compatible with a reading ης as proposed by Bell in BL I. The supposed ι is not a letter, but probably some physical

<sup>76</sup> Cf. P.Heid. V, p. 327 and the texts cited there n. 261. Of course there are some minor variations such as the verb used for „to return“ and καιρός instead of προθεσίμῃ, but the pattern is always one of the two described above.

<sup>77</sup> See e. g. SB XVI 14490–12491, P.Lond. III 1001 with BL I 298, BGU XII 2198.

<sup>78</sup> SB XVIII 13124 (sc. μέτρα). Cf. also P.Strasb. VII 696 εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω σοι τὸν αὐτὸν [v] οἶνον καὶ τῆ [v] | εἰρημένην ποσότητα.

<sup>79</sup> BGU XII 2198 is even more explicit: ὑπὲρ τῆς χόρτου τιμῆς. When the product is in the plural, we get ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτῶν τιμῆς, so BGU XII 2208 and 2210. The only exception would be P.Lond. III 1001 which, according to BL I 298, has ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων [v] | τιμῆς. Comparing the traces in l. 23 with τούτων in l. 21 and αὐτὸν in l. 22, I would rather read αὐτῶ [v] on the microfilm. α and τ are following each other, υ is written as a horizontal stroke above the α.

<sup>80</sup> The fact that SB VI 9051 has τῆς τούτων τιμῆς is one of the reasons for not reading τὸν αὐτῶν (= τὸν αὐτὸν) σ[ίτον, but rather τῶν αὐτῶν σ[ίτου ἀρταβῶν (= τὰς αὐτὰς σίτου ἀρτάβας), see above. In P.Strasb. VII 696 τούτων must refer to the εἰρημένην ποσότητα. In the Antinoopolite contract P.Ant. I 42, ll. 25–26 the clause runs εἰ μὴ ἀποδοίην [v] τῶν αὐτῶν οἶνον ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω | παρασχεῖν σοι ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων διμῆς (l. τιμῆς). In the *apparatus criticus* the editor proposes to read τὸν αὐτὸν οἶνον. Considering the pattern described above, we rather have to read τὰ αὐτὰ οἶνου (sc. μικρὰ ἀγγεῖα).

<sup>81</sup> The fact that ε would have been written less upright was also remarked by Harrauer: „Nicht eindeutig ist eine schräg verlaufende Oberlänge vor dem ρ. Sie kann gut zu einem etwas steiler geschriebenen ε gehören“.

damage to the papyrus<sup>82</sup>. Therefore we should read with BL I Παρελθούσ]ης δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσμίας, εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω ἰ [σοι etc., thus providing the solution to the problems of observations 1 and 2. Since the product should be mentioned, we should intergrate οἴνου in l. 18, and since reference is made to the amount of the product, τούτων should be supplemented instead of αὐτῶν, so that ll. 15–19 run like this:

χωρίς τινος ὑ]περθέσεως καὶ ἀντιλογίας καὶ κρίσεως καὶ  
[δίκης. Παρελθούσ]ης δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσμίας, εἰ μὴ ἀποδώσω  
[σοι τὰ αὐτὰ οἴνου μέτ]ρα ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτοιμῶς ἔχω παρασχεῖν σοι  
[ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων τιμ]ῆς κ. τ. λ.

Now returning to our l. 15, we may supplement on the basis of the pattern described above and the corrected reading of SB XVI 12488 [Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀποδώσω σοι τὰ αὐτὰ] οἴν[ου μέτρ]α [τριακόσια, followed by a reference to the προθεσμία and the promise to pay a certain amount of money instead ὑπὲρ τῆς τούτων τιμῆς. Unfortunately, the letter in l. 16 can not be read with any certainty (it looks like an η, but other readings cannot be excluded), so that the exact phrasing here must remain obscure.

Papyrologisch Instituut  
Witte Singel 27  
NL-2311 BG Leiden

Nico Kruit

<sup>82</sup> Note that the ι was not read on the original in the editio princeps, nor by Bell when correcting the passage.



Handwritten text on a fragment, possibly including the word "Kritik".

Large fragment of handwritten text, appearing to be a continuation of the document.



Main body of handwritten text, consisting of several lines of cursive script, some of which are crossed out with a large 'X'.

zu Kruit, S. 77ff.

