Numbered Koitai in the Oxyrhynchite Nome

The term κοίτη, corresponding to σφυκή (1), designates the topographical sections in which the land was divided, especially for purposes of ἐπισκεψίς. It has so far been used in this sense in the Oxyrhynchite, Hermopolite, and Mendesian nomes; so G. M. Browne rightly remarked when he edited P.Oxy. XXXVIII 2847 (note to Col. II, 18). Recently a papyrus of the Mendesian nome (P.Oxy. XLIV 3205; originally published by Ms. A. Swiderek (The Land-Register of the Θεοροφίτου Toparchy in the Mendesian Nome, JJP XVI-XVII, 1971, pp. 31-44 = SB XII 10891) gave us many more examples of numbered koitai in the Mendesian nome. In the Oxyrhynchite nome, however, the word κοίτη does not seem to have been frequently used. In all the volumes of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri we found this word only in XII 1470, 11; XIV 1743, 3/10; XIX 2240, 14; 2241, 15/23/32/34/35/44/51/53/54; 2242, 2/15/18/26/37; XXXVIII 2847, II 18 and XLII 3049, introduction. In only two instances (XII 1470 and XLII 3049) was the κοίτη numbered. In P.Oxy. XII 1470, 11 there is a question of a parcel of land situated in the 109th koite. In P.Oxy. XLII 3049 we find below the main text A a note in a different hand and upside-down in relation to another note which is written across the fibres while the main text A is written along the fibres. The note reads: κοίτη ττηπειγυπολαγονον

(1) Used in the Arsinoite nome. The term klerouchia is used only in a small area (the division of Heracleides of the Arsinoite nome) and is chronologically restricted (early in the reign of Antoninus Pius until the fourth century A.D.). These klerouchiai were in Karania numbered up till 94 (cf. O. M. PEARL, The 94 Klerouchies of Karanis, Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologen-kongresses, München, 1974, pp. 325 ff.). In a papyrus recently acquired by the Library of the University of Amsterdam (P.Amsel. inv. no. 12, published by us in TAAANTA VIII-IX, 1977, 108-111), we found klerouchies at Theadelphia numbered up till 115.
which the editor tentatively explains as νοίτ(α) τπε ὑπολογ(α) (the rest of this note does not make any obvious sense). This note proves that in 247 A.D. there were at least 385 koitai in the Oxyrhynchite nome (1). We think that we are able to enlarge the number of numbered koitai in the Oxyrhynchite nome with two more instances.

P.Oxy. XII 1534 is according to the editors part of a list of holders of catoecic, private and (rarely) crown land, arranged according to κληροι. As an example we may take lines 7-8 of Col. I: ἐκ τοῦ Νεικιου κλῆρου καὶ καὶ(τροπο) καὶ καὶ(τροπο) ιδίω τινι (ντινι) ἔσπερ(α)μένης (ἀρουραί) α <′γελεπορια <ντινι (καινιν) σκλ. No translation accompanies the text, but we must suppose, that the editors took the category of catoecic land from καινιν(ατ)οι(καινιν). The internal abbreviation in καινιν(ατ)οι(καινιν) is no reason for disturbance (vide infra) but the absence of the symbol for αρουραί and the large amounts of aruras of catoecic land in comparison with the mostly small amounts of private land (2) strike one as anomalous. If, however, we take καινιν(ατ)οι(καινιν) at face value we are inclined to resolve σκλ. καινιν(της) and to translate the above lines as follows: «from the kleros of Nicias, 255th koité». Also in lines 1, 2, 4 and 5 we resolve καινιν(της) instead of καινιν(ατ)οι(καινιν) and take the numeral as the number of the koité.

In P.Oxy. XIX 2242 we find an account of rents from the 3rd century A.D. Lines 13-15 read as follows:

Σεῖριος Αρπαχσιος γεωργ(ας) 'Ισιδωρας Μογλιτίδας ἐκ τοῦ 'Αματόκου γ(γδίου ?) καινιν(της) ἀπό (ἀρ.) δ (ἀρ.) α κτέ.

As the question mark after γ(γδίου) in line 14 indicates, the editors were not certain when they resolved γ” (3). Otherwise, if anything

---

(1) It is also possible to read καινιν(της) τπε ὑπολογ(α) meaning that the 385th koité consists of unproductive land.
(2) In line 15 an addition of only the ἓδιωτικαί ἐσπαρμέναι ἀρουραί is given!
(3) That there are two obliques after γ becomes clear from their note on this line, in which it is also stated that Ms. E. P. Wegener preferred to read ζ” but that Sir Harold Idris Bell thought γ a more likely letter.
in this text follows after ἐξ τοῦ + proper name it is χλῇ(φοῦ) (1). If we take γ" as a numeral there is no problem whatsoever: the parcel of land in question lies in the 3rd koite. The same might be the case with the parcel mentioned in lines 1 ff. (2). In our opinion the parcel lies in the 3rd koite (3). In lines 18, 26 and 37 there is, according to the editors, also a question of χοῖ(της) (4). As the papyrus is damaged by a hole just in front of χοῖ( ) in line 26 we are unable to decide whether there was a numeral in the lacuna. There certainly is no numeral in front of χοῖ( ) in lines 26 and 37. We ask ourselves if it is necessary to resolve to χοῖ(της). We propose to resolve χοῖ( ) in lines 26 and 37 to χ(ξη)οί(της) (e.g. P.Oxy. XLIV 3168) (5).
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(1) In line 18 the editors read [χλダイエς] τοῦ Αλβάδαπάκετου and remark in their note on this line that the trace before τοῦ does not suit the reading δαικε. As also Ms. Paola Pruneti (I KAHPOI del nome Ossirinchite, Aegyptus LV, 1975, p. 166, 3 n.) remarks the position of τοῦ between χλダイエς and the proper name is curious. The reading as it stands now is presumably not right. On the photograph of this papyrus (kindly provided by Dr. R. A. Coles) it cannot be decided what the trace at the edge of the papyrus stands for.

(2) Cfr. for the sign after γ the adnotatio critica. S could be the symbol for 'year' but the two obliques after it are hard to account for. On the other hand S" is used to mark a numeral (cfr. H. C. Youie, The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri, Prolegomena, BICS Suppl. 33, London, 1974, p. 20, 20 n.

(3) The editors take it that the payments are due for the third year of an unnamed Emperor. It strikes us as unusual that the emperor is not named and that only in line 2 the regnal year is mentioned.

(4) In all cases the papyrus has χοῖ( ) with a horizontal stroke marking abbreviation through the upper part of the iota.

(5) We append some minor corrections which Dr. R. A. Coles checked for us against the original:

line 3: (ἀφ.) ζβ' 
line 5: (γίνονται) (πυρὸδ ἄρτ.) ιζ<; line 15: (γίνονται) (πυρ. ἄρτ.) ζ 
line 7: (ἀφ.) δ' ζη 
line 8: παρεχ(ωφησιν) (πυρ. ἄρτ.) γ; (πυρ. ἄρτ.) ζ δη 
line 43: We certainly are dealing with a form of σκωληχώρωτος (cfr. D. Bonneau, Le flec et le Nil, Paris, 1971, p. 71).