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In this contribution I wish to publish 10 new readings in already published documents written on papyrus, pottery or stone.

1) P.Berl.Zill.4 = ChLA X 463: the plate of P.Berl.Zill. 4 (ca. 350) published in ChLA X 463 (p.85) allows me to contribute two small corrections in col. I, lines 2 and 3, of this interesting text: in line 2, for [κάντια κατ᾿] read τρισκαε[δ]εκάτην καὶ and for [λημέας] read [Δημέας] (does this reference to a former president of the town council of Hermopolis refer to the same person as the Hermopolitan praepositus pagi Demeas occurring in P.Stras. 129 and 149 [A.D. 331; 15th pagus] or in P.Herm. 21 and 54 [A.D. 346; 8th pagus]?). In line 3, read ... ταλάντων for ...... αν...

2) P.Harris 76: The editor of this text (A.D. 88; no provenance stated) points out in his introduction that one is dealing with a rudely written receipt for compulsory labour performed on the Nile dikes, in a locality which was not the Fayum, as naubia and not days appear as the unit. This opinion cannot be maintained, since P.J. Sijpesteijn established (Penthemeros-certificates, 18) that in contrast with the πενθημερω [penyÆmerow] the liturgical system according to quantum is found both in Upper and in Lower Egypt and in the Fayum (cf. his list of such receipts, loc.cit. 38ff., to be supplemented by P.Mich. XV, pp.154-55, P.Heid. 320 and p.164; ZPE 76 [1989] 93-94).

This leaves open the question whether the provenance of P.Harris 76 can be determined more precisely. Sijpesteijn (loc.cit., 38-39) attributed the text to Thebes, though he does not indicate his motives for this; in fact, I do not see sufficient grounds to follow his authority in this particular instance. A majority of the Rendell Harris papyri comes from the Oxyrhynchite Nome (cf. P.Harris I, preface), and there is thus a presumption that this text shares this provenance. The ed.princ. mentions a village name Ἐκτίου ἐποίκιον; this village (note that one letter is dotted), however, is not attested in this nome (cf. P.Pruneti, I centri abitati nell’Ossirinchite).

As this text shows some peculiarities not found in other naubia receipts with a well-established provenance (cf. the remarks by Sijpesteijn, loc.cit., 69-70), it is worthwhile to quote the first 5 lines of the text in full:

格尔ασταῖ δι(ά) Σαρα[π(ῖονος)] καὶ μετ(όχων) χω(ματικῶν ?)
τά ἐκ τῶν μοσκαλο περιχώμα(τος ?)
δημοσίων χωμάτων Ἐκτίου

* As usual, I should like to thank my colleagues R.S. Bagnall and P.J. Sijpesteijn with whom I had the pleasure of discussing some of the problems dealt with above. Moreover, Bagnall kindly corrected my English in an earlier version of this article.
After this follows a date to year 8 of Domitian, Pharmuthi (=iii-iv.89; ed.: 'A.D. 88'). It is remarkable that there is no indication of a day numeral.

In order to check whether especially the doubtful readings in lines 2 and 3 were securely established I applied for a photo of the text, which Dr. R.A. Coles kindly made available to me. The photo (see plate IXa) makes me suggest a different reading in lines 1-5, viz.

"Has performed through Sarapion and colleagues ... of the polder of Mikkalos (?) for the public dikes of the village of Istros, Totoes, son of Aquila, son of Pasion, 5 naubia, makes 5 naubia."

At present, there is no day numeral clearly visible on the photo after the month of Pharmuthi, but there are some traces of ink after this name which may in fact belong to the expected numeral (or is this just dirt?).

The new reading calls for some comments:

1-2) I assume that χω + ταπιστών belong to one single word which contains an indication of the function of Sarapion and his colleagues. There is, however, no such function as a *χωταπιστής; such certificates were usually handed over by χωματεπιμεληται who took charge of the dikes in a topos. There is no easy solution for the problem, but there may be some attraction in the idea that the scribe was not very competent (note the editor's characterisation of the handwriting as 'rudely written') and that he should have written a word which bears some resemblance to χωταπιστών, i.e. χωματεπιστατών ('written' in the form of χωματεπιστατών). This error may have been influenced by the fact that the scribe had to distribute parts of this word over 2 lines. If this approach is correct, one is dealing with another instance of the function of χωματεπιστάτης discussed by M.Peachin in BASP 19 (1982) 162-163. He has found 2 instances of this official taking charge of the dikes at village level, viz. in P.Princ. II 72.14 (IIIrd cent. A.D.; prov. unknown) and in P.Col. inv. 459 (331P; Oxyrhynchite Nome) published by himself. Not only would our interpretation produce a third attestation of this official, it would also bring back the earliest dated instance by almost 250 years. To be sure, this solution would be in conflict with Peachin's assumption, that during the first two centuries A.D. an official called the χωματεκβολέως was in charge of the dikes at village level. It should, however, be remarked that the earliest attestation for a χωματεκβολέως dates from A.D. 165-69 (P.Mich. XI 618), whereas our texts dates from some 80 years earlier. Furthermore, it seems remarkable that the χωματεκβολέως does not seem to occur outside of the Fayum, whereas, if my readings and interpretation are correct (cf. below, ad line 3), 2 of the 3 attestations of the χωματεπιστατής come from the Oxyrhynchite Nome (and the third instance, P.Princ. II 72, may come from this same province, as so many
Princeton papyri have an Oxyrhynchite provenance: a striking instance, perhaps, of regionalistic differentiation as regards terminology for the same type of official.

2) The reading Μικκάλω is not secure, but an alternative reading of, e.g., μεκάλω is still more difficult. Is one dealing with the (not elsewhere attested) ‘polder of Mikkalos’? So much seems certain that the ending -λω must be an error for -λο. Of course, one is dealing here with the indication of the area of activity of the officials presumably called the χωματεπιστάται.

3) The village name read in the ed.princ. Εκτίου is not correct; the reading ‘Ιστρου imposes itself and this village is known indeed from the Οξύρχυνθη nome, where it was situated in the ‘middle toparchy’; it is now attested from 57/58 onwards, cf. P.Pruneti, op.cit., 73.

The mention of this Oxyrhynchite village name enables us to establish that P.Harris 76 now appears to contain the first naubion-receipt ever published from the Oxyrhynchite nome.

3) P.Monac. III 106: The editor labels this text a ‘Benachrichtigung über die Übersendung von Steuergeldern’, no doubt because of his readings in lines 1-2: ἐπέ(μφήθη) (ὑπὲρ) μερισμοῦ ἐννόητης ἱνδ(κτίωνος) Ἀπώ Ιουλί/ υἱὸς Ποσθίου, κτλ. The amount of money indicated in the rest of line 2 is 22 karats, i.e. the amount of 1 ὀρίθμιον νομισμάτων. Line 3 contains the subscription by a deacon George. Except for the start of line 1, the whole document looks like a normal tax-receipt from Byzantine Egypt and a check of the plate (Abb. 49) shows that one should read at the start of line 1 Ἐπε(ἱφ) λ· μερισμοῦ, κτλ. rather than the editor’s reading quoted above. Furthermore, at the start of line 2 one should read Ἰωά(ννοὺ). An Apa Iouli, son of John, is listed in Pros.Ars.I 481 from SPP VIII 882; one can only speculate whether one is dealing with the same person. As to what follows after John’s name, Ποσθίου, it is difficult to be certain; one seems to be dealing either with a patronymic belonging to John (is this a shortened form of the well-known name Παψ(νου)θίου ?) or with some indication of a trade or profession hitherto unknown.

4) P.Nepheros 48: the editors of this text print the dating formula in line 1 as:

[ὅπωτείας τῶν λαμπρ(οτάτων) θωθ ις,]

but in their note it is observed that it is also conceivable that «der Konsulat in dem betreffenden Jahr von zwei Kaisern bekleidet wurde; dann könnte die Schlaufe, die im Text als Abkürzungszeichen aufgelöst worden ist, auch als Kennzeichen für eine davorstehende Zahl gedeutet werden; die davon übrige Tintenspur könnte am ehesten zu einem γ passen, also φή = „zum dritten Mal” ».

A check of the plate convinces me that this is indeed the better reading, but it remains to be seen, what fourth century consulates, held for the 3rd time either by both emperors or by only the second imperial consul, can be matched with the size of the lacuna. In fact, as this is probably not much longer than ca. 40 letters (cf. the length of line 5 until ἡφάλειων), 23 (21) of which are taken by the words ὁπωτείας τῶν (τοῦ) δεσποτῶν (ποτῶν) (κυρίων) ἡμῶν, there is practically no consular formula mentioning one or two imperial consuls which can be fitted into the lacuna: years 300, 313, 324, 346, 354, 360, 370, 396 offer each much too long formulas. The only formula which can be fitted into the lacuna is the following from A.D. 323: [τοῖς ἁπάδειξθαισμένοις ὑπάτοις το] γ, i.e. 30 letters restored. While assuming some indentation I think that the papyrus dates from this year.
5) P.Prag. I 72: the ed.princ. of this order for delivery shows a butcher (χοιρομάγειρος) ordering to his steward to hand over 5 artabs of barley to a notary. While a butcher might well have barley at his private disposal, the commodity beginning in κρ that a butcher normally dealt with was meat, not barley. A check of the plate (tav. 72) convinces me that the editor's reading is not compelling; rather than reading κρηθης (ἄρταβας) I read in line 3 κρέως λίτρος.

6) P.Prag. I 117: This papyrus (Arsinoites, 289/290) contains a receipt for (a lost amount of) rent paid by a certain Aurelius Didaros who had leased 3 arouras near the village of Tebetny. In itself this is fairly unobtrusive information, but the piece acquires, in my opinion, some special interest, if one compares SB XIV 12191 (provenance not known; A.D. 297), an acknowledgement by four inhabitants of the village of Tebetny to an Aurelius Didaros, that they have borrowed from him a certain amount of money. Given the resemblances of time (A.D. 289/290 vs. A.D.297) and place (Tebetny) there seems no obstacle against a supposed identification of the Didaros (a name not too frequently encountered) occurring in both texts. But there is more: the original of the Rainer papyrus has never been found back in Vienna after Wessely cited parts out of it in various articles (the text of SB XIV 12191 rests only upon a modern reconstruction; cf. ZPE 30 [1978] 235-38). It seems conceivable that the Rainer text (which now may show, through Didaros, a connection with the famous Heroninus archive) was transferred to Prague, together with Wessely's own Heroninus documents (for the fate of Wessely's private papyrus collection cf.Th. Hopfner, Die Papyrussammlung Carl Wessely, jetzt 'Papyrus Wessely Pragensis', Archiv 12 (1937) 68f.; Th.P. Volides, ὃς μέγας παπυρολόγος τῆς Βιεννής Κάρολος Βέσσελό (Carl Wessely), 1860-1931, καὶ ὁ ἀδίκως ἀπολεσθεὶς δἰα τὴν Ἑλλάδα θησαυρὸς τῶν παπυρῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἐπιστημονικῆς μνημοσύνης Γ.Γαρδίκκου, Ἀθῆναι 1939, 106-122), but so far the document has not turned up in Prague. D. Hagedorn draws my attention to the fact that in line 11 [τ]ύν φόρ[αν] has to be read instead of τὸ φόρ[αν].

7) O.Meyer 43: The ed.princ. stated as the provenance of this ostrakon 'Elephantine-Syene' but it was subsequently suggested (cf. BL II.1 15) that this could not be correct because of the αἱ κραναϊ-formula. In fact, this formula suggests that the ostrakon has a provenance from the West bank of the Nile opposite of Thebes (cf. ZPE 76 [1989] 45ff.). A photo kindly provided by Dr. S. Pickering (Macquarie University; Dr. Pickering informs me that most of the O.Meyer are kept now in the Nicholson Museum, Sydney University) enables me to observe that the reading at the start of line 1 as given in BL II.1.15 and that of the name of the son of Apollonios, Ἔπια( ), is not correct. I read the text as:

δι᾽(ἐγραφεὶ) Ἀρμήνιο( Ψειμύ(νθης) δι(κ) Ἐπω(νύχου) Ἀπολ(λωνίου)
ὑπ(ερ) ἔλαιο(υργῶν) ἰε (Ετους) (δραχμῶς) δ αἱ κ(αθαραῖ) (δρ.) γ (τετράβολον)
(ἡμιοβέλλον). (Ἔτους) ἰε Ἄδριανοῦ
τού κυρίου Φαό(φι) ἰε .

For the use of the name of Ἐπόνυχος especially in the Theban region cf. W. Crönert in SPP II, p.41. For the resolution of Ἐλαίο( ) in line 2 cf. ZPE 76 (1989), 68.
8) O. Petrie 84: while studying calculations made by tax collectors in ostraka from the West bank of the Nile opposite Thebes I found it necessary to check the original or at least a photo of this ostrakon in order to see whether the *ed.princ.* had mistakenly left out a sign for 2 chalci in line 2 (cf. ZPE 76 [1989] 68). A splendid photo of this ostrakon kindly made available to me by Dr. W. Cockle (University of London) enabled me to convince myself that on this point the editor had correctly represented the text. At the same time, however, this photo allows me to contribute one small correction to an otherwise exemplary edition of this text: in line 4 read Χου(ἀκ) ἅζζ rather than Ἡχου(ἀκ) ἅζζ.

9) I. Akoris 40: this text contains an inscription which deals with the rise of the Nile. The original inscription is now lost and the editor repeats the text of the *ed.princ.* in BSAA 18 (1921) 55 # 12 (=SB III 6608). Lines 2-4 read:

```
Επὶ τῆς τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων βασ[ιλε]ῶν ἡ[α]ο[ικ]α[ζ]
Φλαυνίων [.....]η[α]ο[ικ][εν[.....]ο[.....]ο]
καὶ Θεοδ[οσίου (?)]
```

The text appears to present a regnal formula including 2 or more emperors, one of whom is a Theodosius. In *RFBE* 44 it was noted that the authors had been unsuccessful in discovering any reign to which the reported traces could refer. Upon reflection this formula seems to allow of the following attempt to bring some light into the darkness, as far as lines 3 and 4 are concerned. I propose the following reading:

```
καὶ Θεοδοσίου τῶν αἰωνίων Αὐγούστων]
```

i.e. a date during the reign of the emperors Gratian, Valentinian II and Theodosius, between 19.i. 379 (*dies imperii* of Theodosius) and 25.viii.383 (death of Gratian). It is small beer to assume a lacuna of 6 rather than of 7 letters, an eta misread for a ny, and a lacuna of 3 rather than of 2 letters. What happened, however, with the second emperor's name, is less simple. I have assumed a slightly larger lacuna than indicated in the *ed.princ.* and I have assumed that the omikron is in fact part of an alpha. One may also speculate that the author of the inscription confused the names of 2 different emperors, i.e. mixed up the name of Οὐάλεντως and Οὐάλεντινιανοῦ; it is, as R.S. Bagnall reminds me, even conceivable that the scribe bungled things and wrote Οὐ[σαλ]εντιανο[v]ον or something like that. This new reading (33 letters in line 3, 31 letters in line 4) does not solve the problem of the twisted word order in line 2, where one expects Βασιλείας to precede τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων rather than to follow it. Indeed, one might read, perhaps, Βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς, but than the question remains, which substantive should be supplied with ἡ[α]ο[ικ]α[ζ] and where it should be placed. Βασιλείας might seem the expected substantive (with all of τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων -- αἰωνίων ἄγούστων in attributive position), but so much is certain that in the present restoration of line 4 there is probably no room for it at the end of this line (cf. the number of letters in ll. 3,4) and the start of line 5 has been preserved. I cannot find a convincing solution for this problem.
10) SB I 5246: In lines 22-23 the ed. princ. of this text reads:


On the basis of these parallels I propose to restore in SB I 5246 lines 22-23 as follows:
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