



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Numbered Koitai in the Oxyrhynchite Nome

Worp, K.A.; Sijpesteijn, P.J.

Citation

Worp, K. A., & Sijpesteijn, P. J. (1978). Numbered Koitai in the Oxyrhynchite Nome. *Aegyptus : Rivista Italiana Di Egittologia E Di Papirologia*, 58, 157-159. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8184>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8184>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Numbered Koitai in the Oxyrhynchite Nome

« The term *κοίτη*, corresponding to *σφραγίς* (1), designates the topographical sections in which the land was divided, especially for purposes of *ἐπίσχεψις*. 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 Φερνουφίτου 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: $\kappa\omicron\iota\tau\eta\ \tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\theta\ \nu\omega\nu$

(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 Karanis numbered up till 94 (cf. O. M. PEARL, *The 94 Klerouchies of Karanis*, Akten des XIII. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, München, 1974, pp. 325 ff.). In a papyrus recently acquired by the Library of the University of Amsterdam (P.Amstel. 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 κοῖτ(αι) τπε ὑπολόγ(ου) (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 κληροῖ. As an example we may take lines 7-8 of Col. I: ἐκ τοῦ Νεικίου κληροῦ συνε κ(ατ)οι(κικῆς) ιδιω(τικῆς) ἐσπαρμένῃς (ἄρουραι) α <ι'ς'λ'β' > κ(ατ) ἄγνοι(αν) παρεθ(εῖσαι) ἐπὶ κ(ατ)οι(κίαν) σλε. No translation accompanies the text, but we must suppose, that the editors took the category of catoecic land from συνε κ(ατ)οι(κικῆς). The internal abbreviation in κ(ατ)οι(κικῆς) / κ(ατ)οι(κίαν) is no reason for disturbance (vide infra) but the absence of the symbol for ἄρουραι 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 συνε κοι() at face value we are inclined to resolve συνε κοι(της) and to translate the above lines as follows: « from the kleros of Nicias, 255th *koite* ». Also in lines 1, 2, 4 and 5 we resolve κοι(τη) instead of κ(ατ)οι(κικῆς) and take the numeral as the number of the *koite*.

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

Σείριος Ἀρπαήσιος γεωργ(ός) Ἰσιδώρας
Μοχλιτιδος ἐκ τοῦ Ἀματόκου γ(ηδίου ?)
κοίτ(ης) ἀπὸ (ἄρ.) δ (ἄρ.) α κτέ.

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

(1) It is also possible to read κοίτ(η) τπε ὑπόλογ(ος) meaning that the 385th *koite* consists of unproductive land.

(2) In line 15 an addition of only the ιδιωτικαὶ ἐσπαρμέναι ἄρουραι 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 ς'' but that Sir Harold Idris Bell thought γ a more likely letter.

in this text follows after ἐκ τοῦ + proper name it is κλῆ(ρου) (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 κοί(της) (4). As the papyrus is damaged by a hole just in front of κοι() in line 26 we are unable to decide whether there was a numeral in the lacuna. There certainly is no numeral in front of κοι() in lines 26 and 37. We ask ourselves if it is necessary to resolve to κοί(της). We propose to resolve κοι() in lines 26 and 37 to κ(ατ)οι(κικῆς) (cfr. e.g. P.Oxy. XLIV 3168) (5).

P. J. SIJPESTEIJN - K. A. WORP

University of Amsterdam

(1) In line 18 the editors read [κλῆ](ρου) τοῦ Ἀθραδάτου and remark in their note on this line that the trace before τοῦ does not suit the reading ἐ]κ. As also Ms. Paola Pruneti (*I KAHPOI del nomo Ossirinchiite, Aegyptus* LV, 1975, p. 166, 3 n.) remarks the position of τοῦ between κλῆρος 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. YOUTIE, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri. Prolegomena*², 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 κοι() 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: (ἀρ.) αθ'

line 5: (γίνονται) (πυροῦ ἀρτ.) ιζ<; line 15: (γίνονται) (πυρ. ἀρτ.) ε

line 7: (ἀρ.) δ θη

line 8: παρεχ(ώρησεν) (πυρ. ἀρτ.) γ; (πυρ. ἀρτ.) θ d^η

line 43: We certainly are dealing with a form of σκωληκόβρωτος (cfr. D. BONNEAU, *Le fisc et le Nil*, Paris, 1971, p. 71).