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 Antiquum et Papyrologicam pertinentia, 36.) Pp. xxxiv + 416, 43 pls, ills. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1996. Cased, Nlg. 340. ISBN: 90-5063-127-4.

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 Ὅμηρον 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**), mythography (**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 *κουρεπιϲτουλάριοϲ (*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. Gascou, *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 whim has eliminated all the ⸌. 6 ὁ θάνα[τος certain. **778** 10–11 read ἔγγραπτα; 24 καυνάκην in text; 25–26 ἐπὶ τοῦ π..ντος: ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος?; 31 surely τῶν καλῶς ἐχόντων; 34 τοῦτο → μου τὸ; 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 εποu stands for ὅπου or ε<ἰ> που (ἵνα goes with ἀποκαταστῆσαι); 37 read γενομένου. **779** 4 διοκητῆι → διοικητῆι. **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'ίων'ος is a patronymic; after that, the uncertain [Ἀ]ρκα[ῖ]ος is an unlikely version of Ἀρκάς; 20 n. ἐπισκέπειν, not ἐπισκοπεῖν. **787** 40, 41a read ἔκτοτε. **788** 1–2 In the context, Ἀντινοέ]ων πόλεως (cf. 1 n.) is an unviable alternative; 9 οὗ → ἀφ'οὗ]; 17 ἀργυρί[ου δραχμῶν τρια]κοσίων → ἀργυρί[ου δ]ραχμ[ῶν, 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 Γαΐ[ου. **790** 1 Πετεῦρι[ς] → Πετεῦρι[; 9, 11–12 the restorations are at least too bold to admit into the text. **792** 8 νῦν → c[ο]υ ἐν; 9 π[όλιν] → C[ε]ρ[ύφιν]; 12 delete the restored καί: λαβεῖν (14) depends on δ[ηλουμέ]νων (13–14), and has no relation with ἐσχηκέναι (14); 13 <διὰ> → δ[ι]ὰ; 14 ε[ἰς τὸ] → ἐ[κ τῶν?]; 17 πενταкω[cίας → πεντακος[ίας; 26 supplement ταῦτα rather than τάδε, cf. P.Oxy. VI 908.37; 32 Ἀθύ[ρ] → Ἀ[θ]ὺρ; 34 (PH) π[ρό]χ[ειται → πρόχ[ειται. **794** 9 ἐκ [π]λήρους is impossible, but I have not arrived at a plausible reading; 16 kala(ndas) → *Kal(endas)*. Coptic indices: ⲤⲔⲈⲨⲞⲤ is Greek. ⲡⲁⲣⲣⲓⲥⲧⲁ is a *vox nullius*: ⲡⲀⲢϨⲒⲤⲦⲀ stems from παρίστημι.

Wolfson College, Oxford   N. GONIS