

FESTSCHRIFT FOR KOENEN

CORNELIA E. RÖMER, TRAIANOS GAGOS (edd.): *P. Michigan Koenen* (= *P. Mich. XVIII*): *Michigan Texts Published in Honor of Ludwig Koenen*. (Studia Amstelodamensia ad Epigraphicam, Ius

and similar papers at core.ac.uk

127-4.

This volume celebrates the 65th birthday of Ludwig Koenen. It contains texts from the papyrus collection of the University of Michigan, where K. teaches, edited by former pupils and other colleagues. Of varied content, and of more than average interest, these texts make up a major papyrological publication: a fitting tribute to a scholar who has contributed so much to papyrology and the study of antiquity in general.

Among the most interesting pieces in the literary section (759–68) are those pertaining to Early Christianity. 763 is an early (second–third century) example of a homiletic work or *Gemeindebrief* with citations from the New Testament. There is a remote possibility that this is a fragment of a lost work of Origen, during whose lifetime 763 must have been copied, but what little survives cannot confirm this. 764, of similar nature and date, is of special interest for its close affinities with 2*Clem.*, a text possibly written in Egypt in the second century. 767 is ‘an original document from the Arian controversy?’. The identification is tentative, and indeed difficult; but if correct, this would be the first text of this kind to appear. The reference to a Didymos, ὁ τὸν Ὀμηρον μελετῶν, apparently Didymos the Blind, is noteworthy. As for the other literary pieces, 760 comes from a work on geography (south Italy and Sicily), possibly Homeric. 765 was taken to contain medical prognostics, but it clearly comes from a handbook of divination, a genre already represented in papyri (Pack² 2104–13). There are also fragments of Homer (759), of the *Alexander Romance* (761), mythology (762; cf. W. Luppe, *APF* 43 [1997], 233ff.), *materia Aesopica* (765), and a fever amulet (768).

Documentary papyri occupy the largest part of the volume. The Ptolemaic texts (769–81) were all recovered from the same cartonnage (NB: partial (?) publication of another text on p. 95 n. 10), and mostly relate to the village of Mouchis in the Fayum. 771–4 shed new light on the taxes known as *χρυσοχοϊκή* and *κόλλυβος*, 777–80, which merit further study, on the workings of the beer monopoly. The whipping by the policeman in 773 and the ‘report of violence’ in 776 should be of interest to the social historian. 781, a list of cleruchs, attests some interesting ethnic designations. The list of officials under Ptolemy V Epiphanes (pp. 94–6) is of special note also.

Of the texts of the Roman period, I single out the following. 782 is probably the earliest declaration of small animals from the Fayum. 784 combines a new fragment with PSI IV 320. 787 augments P.Mich. IX 616, and advances its understanding (in 55–56 *ἀνικνέομαι is an *addendum lexicis*). 791 is an addition to the archive of Marcus Lucretius Diogenes. 793 furnishes the first instance of a postconsular date by the consuls of 380.

The last two documents should be of interest to Late Roman historians. 794 (late fifth century) is an order issued by the office of the **κουρπεπιστολάριος* (*cura epistularum*) of the *praeses provinciae Arcadiae*; see D. Hagedorn, F. Mitthof, *ZPE* 117 (1997), 187ff., who also sketch the contribution of 794 to our knowledge of Late

Roman bureaucracy. The addressees, the Oxyrhynchite *defensor civitatis* and *riparii*, are ordered to compel the acting *curator civitatis* and a *protodemotes* (here one misses any reference to J. Gascoy, *BIFAO* 76 [1976], 200ff., and P.Oxy. LIX 3987) to dispatch wreaths to Heracleopolis (the *prases's* residence). The date, 23 December, made the editor think of New Year celebrations. **795** (fifth–sixth century) is a memorandum drafted in a *scrinium canonum* (the first attestation in papyri), apparently that of the *sacrae largitiones* (see *ZPE* 121 [1998], 144), concerning the oil supply of Pelousion. There are several uncertainties, but it is at least possible that the activities illustrated by this document relate to an *alimonium*. *Alimonia* of oil are known to have existed in Rome and Constantinople, and P.Mich. XI 613 (415) attests this institution at Alexandria. Pelousion was the chief city of the small province of Augustamnica I at the time; could we extrapolate such *alimonia* for all provincial capitals in the Late Empire?

796–8 are Coptic (literary). This is the first time that Coptica are included in a volume with Greek texts from Michigan: a reminder that post-Pharaonic Egypt should not be viewed through Greek eyes only.

Some details (I thank Dr P. Heilporn for checking my readings on the originals). **760** i.8 *-τύπως*; 8–9 *εἰ]κάζει*; ii.20 *Ἐχέτ[λη]* in text. **766** It is a pity that a computer which has eliminated all the *ι*. 6 *ὁ θάνα[τος]* certain. **778** 10–11 read *ἐγγραπτα*; 24 *καυνάκη* in text; 25–26 *ἐπὶ του π...ντος*: *ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος?*; 31 surely *τῶν καλῶς ἐχόντων*; 34 *τοῦτο* → *μου τοῦ*; *εἰ δὲ μή γε* is a self-contained elliptical expression, and *γε* should not be bracketed (likewise in **779** 16 *εἰ δὲ μή, γε* → *εἰ δὲ μή γε*); 36 *επου* stands for *ὄπου* or *ε<ζ> που* (*ἵνα* goes with *ἀποκαταστήσαι*); 37 read *γενομένον*. **779** 4 *διοκητήη* → *διοικητήη*. **780A** The editors' dating, 205–204?, relies on a docket of uncertain import, and is at best a *terminus post quem*. 11–12 The editorial interventions are unnecessary. **781** 37 *Ἀρκαδ' ἰών'ος* is a patronymic; after that, the uncertain *[Ἀ]ρκα[ί]ος* is an unlikely version of *Ἀρκάς*; 20 n. *ἐπισκέπειν*, not *ἐπισκοπεῖν*. **787** 40, 41a read *ἔκτοσε*. **788** 1–2 In the context, *Ἀντινοέων πόλεως* (cf. 1 n.) is an unviable alternative; 9 *οῦ]* → *ἀφ' οὔ]*; 17 *ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν τριακocίων* → *ἀργυρίου δ]ραχμῶν*, with the amount of the rent lost in the break; 18 the sublinear dot should follow *τοκάδων*. **789** 2 The man mentioned here seems to have had *tria nomina*; if so, his *praenomen* should be restored as *Γαῖ]ου*. **790** 1 *Πετεύρι[ε]* → *Πετεύρι[ε]*; 9, 11–12 the restorations are at least too bold to admit into the text. **792** 8 *νῶν* → *ε[ο]ν*; 9 *π[όλων]* → *ε[ρ]φ[όλων]*; 12 delete the restored *καί*: *λαβεῖν* (14) depends on *δηλονμέλωνων* (13–14), and has no relation with *ἐσχηκέναι* (14); 13 *<διὰ>* → *δ[ι]ὰ*; 14 *ε[ί]ς τὸ* → *εἰ[ς] τῶν?*; 17 *πεντακω[είας]* → *πεντακο[είας]*; 26 supplement *ταῦτα* rather than *τάδε*, cf. P.Oxy. VI 908.37; 32 *Ἀθύ[ρ]* → *Ἀ[θ]ύρ*; 34 (PH) *π[ρό]χ[ε]ιται* → *πρόχ[ε]ιται*. **794** 9 *ἐκ [π]λήρου* is impossible, but I have not arrived at a plausible reading; 16 *καλ(νδας)* → *Kal(endas)*. Coptic indices: **ΚΚΕΥΟΣ** is Greek. *παριστα* is a *vox nullius*: **ΠΑΡΖΙΣΤΑ** stems from *παρίστημι*.

Wolfson College, Oxford

N. GONIS