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few years ago, in an article about the Greek and Latin literary papyri from the village of Soknopaiou Nesos (modern Dîmeh) in the Egyptian Fayum Oasis, H. Harrauer and I tried to determine which papyri really come from this place and which papyri are — on more or less uncertain grounds — only attributed to it.1 The documentation discussed in that article2 was collected by scrutinising, first of all, the more than 3000 entries in the well-known Catalogue of Greek and Latin literary texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt compiled by R. A. Pack (Ann Arbor 1965).3 In fact, a search was made through this catalogue for all Greek and Latin literary papyri connected with this village. As a result of the investigation4 it could be demonstrated that in the case of quite a few (ap-
proximately 20) papyri their purported “Soknopaiou Nesos” provenance is uncertain. Even so, it cannot be doubted that excavation activity at Soknopaiou Nesos has indeed yielded a number of literary papyri. Likewise, nobody can have any reasonable doubt that a large number of Greek and Latin literary papyri have been brought to light in particular during American, Australian, Egyptian, English, French, German and Italian excavations at more or less well-known places in the Nile valley: first of all (esp. in terms of productivity) comes Oxyrhynchos in mid Egypt, but also productive — though in varying degrees — are other places in the Nile valley such as (in alphabetical order) Abusir, Abusir el-Malaq, Antinoopolis, Aphrodites Kome, Apollinopolis Magna (Edfu), Hermopolis, Hibeh, Kellis, Lycopolis, Memphis, Panopolis, Qarara (Harara), Syene/Elephantine, the Theban region and, of course, various Fayum villages like Bacchias, Euhemeria, Hawara, Karianis, Narmouthis, Philadelphia, Tebtynis and Theadelphia, not to mention the “Fayum” in general.

5 Cf. in latest instance P. VAN MINNEN, “Boorish or Bookish? Literature in Egyptian Villages in the Fayum in the Graeco-Roman period” in the present volume of *JJP*, pp. 99-184. I am most grateful to him, not only for allowing me a preview into his article, but also for reading an earlier version of this article of mine and for contributing a number of significant improvements.

6 For Oxyrhynchos as a site of literary papyri cf. the dissertation by J. KRÜGER, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturezession*, Frankfurt/Main 1990, esp. pp. 144-260 and 309-354. Of course, since the publication of Krüger’s work various new publications of papyri, esp. volumes of *P. Oxy.* (starting with *P. Oxy. LVI*), have brought more new pagan and Christian literary papyri to our attention; cf., e.g., *P. Oxy. LVI* 3822-3851; *LVII* 3876-3901 (among which 25 Thucydides papyri); *LIX* 3963-3972; *LX* 4009-4055 (among which 6 Euripides, 9 Menander and 29 Aeschines papyri); *LXI* 4093-4112 (among which 13 other Thucydides papyri); *LXII* 4301-4333 (among which 24 Demosthenes papyri); *LVIII* 4401-4432 (New Testament, Comedy and Hellenistic poetry); *LXV* 4442-4476 (various pagan and Christian [sub]-literary texts).

The following note\(^9\) presents in the first place a discussion of a few "aberrant" toponyms not yet mentioned above which were referred to in Pack's catalogue as the provenance of only one or at least only very few Greek and/or Latin literary papyri. I intend to demonstrate that in these cases the exact provenance of some literary papyri attributed to these toponyms is all but certain and that the indications given by various editors and incorporated into Pack's catalogue should be taken *cum grano salis*. Sometimes, e.g., fictive provenances were attributed to papyri by dealers (or their suppliers) who invented these in order to conceal their sources (*cf.* *infra*, *sub* "Aboutig"); in other cases provenances were attributed to papyri based on information given in a text written on one side of a papyrus, while later on the other side of a papyrus turned out to contain relevant (but at first disregarded) information (*cf.*, e.g., below on the Xenophon text written on the verso of a register now published as *P. Pher.*). In general it remains essential, of course, to make a distinction between (1°) a papyrus *excavated* at any given place "X" and (2°) a papyrus *bought* at any given place "X". In case a papyrus was bought at a place "X", it is definitely possible that such a papyrus was actually written and found/excavated at some distance and came to the point of sale via the antiquities trade. Furthermore, one needs to distinguish between the so-called "Schriftheimat" and the "Textheimat", i.e. a text may have been written in Antiquity at place "X" ("Schriftheimat = Schreibort"), but was transferred to another place "Y" before in modern times it actually came to light ("Textheimat = Fundort").\(^10\) All toponyms discussed below (mostly in alphabetical order) are "aberrant" in that no information seems to be available on excavations actually undertaken at the spot, or because there are some other problems involved.

(1°) CONTRAPOLLINOPOLIS (in Southern Egypt): Pack 2439 gives the provenance "Contrapollinopolis?" to a literary text containing musical annotations which is written on the verso of a military record in Latin (= *Rom. Mil. Rec.* no. 64) illustrating the affairs of the Cohors I Augusta Praetoria Lusitanorum Equitata stationed in Contrapollinopolis in 156 AD. Does this mean that the literary text also comes from Contrapollinopolis? As the first editor of the text, Th. Mommsen, already noticed, the military record may have travelled already in antiquity via a veteran or an ex-official (perhaps even through the "scrap papyrus" trade) to a completely different place in Egypt (e.g., the Fayum) before it came to light in modern times. One may compare the situation re Pack 1748 [from Apollinopolis Heptakomias/Hermopolis; *cf.* *infra*, the Ap-

---

\(^9\) I am most grateful to my colleague R. S. Bagnall who read an earlier version and corrected my English.

\(^10\) *Cf.* E. G. Turner, *op. cit.* [n. 8], Chapter IV: "Place of Origin and Place of Writing: the Geographical Distribution of finds". *Cf.* the Appendix below, sub Hermopolis.
pendix under "Hermopolis") and the recently published P. Pher(etnouis), a roll containing on the recto an official administrative document related to the Kynopolite Nome, on the verso a Xenophon-text from Soknopaiu Nesos or Karanis in the Fayum [cf. Pack 1552 and Harrauer & Worp, art. cit. [n. 1], 37-38]. So much is certain that this papyrus should not be taken as proof of the existence of a rich musical life in the Roman military camp at Contrapollinopolis.

(2°) GIZEH (near Cairo): it is not "common knowledge" that Greek papyri were ever discovered during excavations at or near Gizeh. The more suspicious, therefore, looks the label "from Gizeh" given to two texts in Pack's catalogue (Pack 1848, 1849). A check, however, of their ed. princ. shows that both papyrus codices (now in Strasbourg) were purchased in the antiquities trade at Gizeh (for this subject, cf. K. Preisendanz, op. cit. [n. 8], 223 and 225). Therefore, their precise provenance remains uncertain; Pack 1849 may come from Hermopolis (cf. van Minnen & Worp, art. cit. [n. 4] 176, n. 61).

(3°) KAINEPOLIS (= Qenah in Southern Egypt): apparently there is no pagan Greek or Latin literary papyrus preserved from this place, but J. van Haelst reports (Catalogue 373) a Greek/Coptic Biblical parchment (= P. Lond. Copt. 500 descr.) from "Kainepolis" (for the toponym cf. A. Calderini & S. Daris, Dizionario geografico III 47-48). This indication remains questionable in that in "Kainepolis" = "Qenah" the Sahidic-Coptic dialect should have been used. According, however, to van Haelst and the editor of the Greek part of the text (published by A. Passoni dell'Acqua in Aegyptus 60 [1980] 110-119) the text is written partly in Greek, partly in the Fayumic dialect.11 The fragment with its curious round form has the appearance of a covering lid of some kind of earthenware vessel or jar. Now, Crum's description of the London text states that according to B. P. Grenfell the object in question came from Keneh (apparently graecized as "Kainepolis" only by later bibliographers, with retrograde application). On balance I see no compelling arguments for attributing the "Schriftheimat" of the text indeed to the Southern Egyptian town of Qenah. As my colleague N. Kruit (Leiden) suggests, one might as well assume that the papyrus was written indeed in the Fayum, but travelled at some moment (already in antiquity, or through the modern antiquities trade?) to Southern Egypt where it was acquired in modern times.12

11 In this context it may be in order to recall that in Lower Egypt there was apparently another town of the name "Kainepolis" and that in the Fayum and the Heracleopolite nome there were various villages named "Kaine" (cf. A. Calderini & S. Daris, Dizionario, III 48, nos. 2-6). It will be shown, however, that there is no immediate relationship between any of these places and the provenance of our text.

12 I am grateful to my colleague N. Kruit (Leiden) for discussing this text with me.
(4°) KOPTOS: apparently there is one single Greek non-Christian literary text from this place, viz. Pack 1345 (= van Haelst 695) referring to a codex containing a text of Philo Judaeus; according to its ed. princ. this codex stems apparently from Koptos, but subsequent scholarship (referred to by van Haelst) argued that the text may derive, after all, from an archetype in Origen’s library at Caesarea in Palestina.13 So much seems certain that there were never any large-scale “papyrological” excavations in Koptos.14 If the text was really acquired there, it must be regarded as an accidental discovery made there, unless one is dealing, after all, with a purchase made via the antiquities trade; in that case the dealer may have tried to cover up his sources. NB: The other, Christian text “from Koptos” mentioned by J. van Haelst (Catalogue, no. 403; cf. p. 420) contains a fragment of Luke hidden in a cover wrapped around the Philo-codex. There is good reason now to connect this text with van Haelst 336, cf. T. C. Skeat in JTS 43 (1997) 1-34.

(5°) KROKODILOPOLIS: Pack 2283 refers to a “Legal fragment” (or “Prose maxims”, or “Private letter”? Date not stated in Pack’s entry) from “Krokodilopolis”, but there were at least 3 such toponyms in Graeco-Roman Egypt (cf. A. Calderini & S. Daris, Diz. Suppl. I 180). Hence, there is the question: “Which Krokodilopolis”? Consultation of the ed. princ. of the papyrus (by A. Vogliano in Acme 1 [1948] 260) shows that the fragment was “rintracciato (= “discovered”) a Medinet-el-Fayum”. While it remains unclear why Pack’s catalogue graecized this modern toponym (the introduction to the catalogue contains no policy statement on this subject) the use of the word “rintracciato” makes it conceivable that the text was bought rather than excavated at Medinet el-Fayum; therefore, the exact provenance of the text remains uncertain.

Finally, there is (6°) a place name not referred to yet in Pack which nevertheless deserves to be discussed here, i.e. ABOUTIG, a village situated south of Lyco-polis which apparently produced a handful of Greek literary texts, viz. two Homer papyri (P. Yale I 9 and P. Yale I 11), a fragment of Thucydides (P. Yale II 99), a school exercise with literary quotations from Homer, Demosthenes, Xenophon, and the Anthologia Palatina (P. Yale II 135) and a Demosthenes papyrus (published in ZPE 100 [1994] 45-46); see also the phylacterion published as P. Yale II 130. The only information about the provenance of these fragments (all belonging to one single collection!) stems from the seller of these papyri, Maurice Nahman from Cairo/Paris. The link, however, between P. Yale II 99 and a papyrus excavated at Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. LVII 3901) exposes the unreliability of this information. Therefore, one should reckon with the distinct

14 The excavations conducted there by W. Flinders Petrie are another matter. It is not known to me whether Petrie found papyrus over there.
possibility that all Yale texts reportedly stemming from Aboutig came in fact from Oxyrhynchos. It does not seem likely that the texts other than *P. Yale* II 99 came in fact from an accidental find really made at Aboutig.

**APPENDIX:**

**A SURVEY OF GREEK AND LATIN LITERARY PAPYRI FROM NON-FAYUMIC PLACES IN EGYPT**

### ABUSIR

*Pack* mentions 4 literary texts from Abusir, viz. nos. 1537, 1884, 1885, 1886. *Pack* 1537 is the famous Timotheos papyrus (IV BC) found near a wooden sarcophagus during excavations by the German Egyptologist L. Borchardt; *Pack* 1884-1886 are much later (III-IV AD) school texts on wooden boards kept in New York (cf. now *Cribiore* 142, 391 and 392 [pp. 173ff.]). The counterpart of *Pack*’s catalogue of pagan literary papyri, compiled by J. van Haelst (*Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, [Paris 1976], p. 420) does not list any Christian texts from Abusir.

### ABUSIR EL-MALAQ

This place in the Heracleopolite nome has yielded to date apparently almost 20 (sub-)literary texts, viz. (questionable references are preceded by a “?”): *Pack* 903 (I BC; prov. not stated, but cf. *Atti XVII* [Napoli 1983] *Congresso di Papirologia*, II, 345 n. 3); 1774/2068/2099 (II/I BC); ?1781 (II BC); 1785 (I BC/I AD; prov. not stated, but cf. *Akten XXI*. *Papyrologenkongress*, Archiv Beih. 3 [1997], II, 1084 n. 4); 1921 (III/II BC; prov. not stated, but cf. *Akten XXI*. *Papyrologenkongress*, II, 1084 n. 4); 2102/2570 (reign of Augustus); 2594 (I BC; prov. not stated, but cf. *Akten XXI*. *Papyrologenkongress*, II, 1084 n. 4). Next to these texts the following literary texts from cartonnage found at Abusir-el-Malaq are not yet listed in *Pack*: *Archiv* 39 (1993) 17-20 (III/II BC) and 41 (1995) 12-13 (Hom. II., I BC/I AD); *Forsch. & Berichte* 10 (1968) 122 no. 8 (Pindar, *Nem.* 6. 25-35, Aug.); *Proceedings XIXth* (1992) *Congr. Papyrology Copenhagen*, 285-286 no. 4 (II BC); *BKT* IX 120 (Homer, I BC); IX 140 (late I BC); IX 147 (I BC/I AD); IX 150 (late I BC); IX 190 (late I BC; Demosthenes); IX 191 (reign of August); IX 192 (I BC).

These papyri, all from cartonnage kept at Berlin (cf. E. Salmenkivi, “Der Wert des archäologischen Kontextes für die Deutung der Urkunden — die Berliner Kartonage”, [in:] *Akten 21. Internat. Papyrologenkongress*, Berlin 1995, II, 1083-1087, esp. 1084, n. 4), are mainly (sub-)literary “adespota”, but cf. *Archiv* 41 (1995) 12-13 (Homer), *BKT* IX 120 (Homer), 190 (Demosthenes) and *Forsch. & Berichte* 10 (1968) 122 no. 8 (Pindar, *Nem.*). Now, there are a substantial number of documentary texts from Abusir-el-Malaq cartonnage dating from the reign of Augustus’ reign or thereabout, published mainly in *BGU* IV, VIII and XIV; a large portion, however, of the documentary texts, though found at Abusir-el-Malaq, originate from Alexandria (cf. also W. Schubart in *Pap. Graec. Berol.*, pp. x-xi on pl. 7b). It may be supposed, therefore, that some (many?) of our literary papyri from Abusir-el-Malaq cartonnage with a date to “I BC/I AD” or “Aug.” ul-
timately derive from Alexandria as well. Such an “Alexandrian” provenance (via Abusir-el-Malaq) seems much less likely for the much earlier Pack 1921 (= P. Schubart 17, III/II BC), for P. Berol. 21304, published in Proc. XXth Congr. of Papyrology (Copenhagen 1992), 285-286 no. 4 (II BC) and for Pack 1781 (= P. Berol. 16352, II BC). In the case of especially Pack 1781 it should be noticed that many Berlin papyri with an inv. number in the “16,200-16,400” range come from cartonnage from the 2nd cent. BC, from Heracleopolis/the Heracleopolitan nome; it would seem more likely, then, that Pack 1781, too, comes from that nome. To be sure, there are no Christian papyri from Abusir el-Malaq (cf. van Haelst, Catalogue, p. 420).

**ANTINOOPOLIS**


It will be seen immediately that among the underlined entries there are a few more texts related to the English excavations at Antinoopolis in 1914, while some texts published in PSI are the result of the later Italian excavations over there. The Giessener text (Pack 1515) was acquired in 1907 at Sheik Ibada near Antinoopolis (cf. Turner, Greek Papyri, 50), but it is unknown how the acquisition took place: was the text excavated there, or was it purchased there, after French excavations under A. Gayet at Antinoopolis in 1902 had brought various antiquities, among which papyri, to light? If the text was only purchased at Sheik Ibada, the provenance of the text should better be labelled as “unknown”. Given the publication year (1908) of the papyrus from Leipzig (Pack 1303) and the composition of the German “Papyrus-kartell” (into which the Universities at both Leipzig and Giessen participated; cf. O. Primavesi in ZPE 114 [1996] 173-87) it would not be surprising, if the Leipzig papyrus was acquired along with the Giessen papyrus. Two texts in Pack, viz. 354 and 1171, have the label “Antinoopolis”, but in fact they are related to the Dioscorus archive from Aphrodites kome (cf. infra); they were excavated there at the beginning of this century. Oddly enough, the presentation given in Pack 1659 creates the impression that one is dealing with one text, partly excavated by J. de Johnson in 1914 (= P. Ant. I 15), partly kept in Berlin and published in P. Lit. Schubart 23 (Schubart does not state the provenance and year of acquisition of the papyrus
he published). C. Austin, however, points out (Com. Gr. Fr., p. 244, sub no. 241 [= P. Schubart 23]) that, while the Berlin fragment might possibly come from the same play as P. Ant. I 15 [= Com. Gr. Fr. no. 240], it is not from the same codex.

J. van Haelst (Catalogue, p. 420) mentions 23 Christian texts from Antinoopolis, published for the most part in P. Ant. and in PSI-volumes.

APHRODITES KOME

For the rather many (semi-)literary payri from Aphrodites kome (modern Kom Ishqaw) cf. Pack 348-356 (356 = 2165), 375/1301, 658/864/885/888, 1171, 2080, 2406; ZPE 97 (1993) 110-115. Almost all of these texts are, with the exception of 375/1301 (works of Eupolis and Menander), 658/864/885/888 (Homer, Iliad, passages from books II, X and XI; cf. J.-L. Fournet in Akten 21. Papyrologenkongress, 1 297 ff.), 2080 (Life of Isocrates), and possibly that of 2406 (medical prescription), (semi-)literary and grammatical texts written by the well-known notary Dioscorus of Aphrodite and belonging to his archive; two texts (Pack 354 [metrological tables] and 1171 [Scholia on Homer Il.]) are attributed in Pack to “Antinoe”/”Antinopoli” (q.v.), though they should better be labelled “Aphrodites kome”, because they also belong to the Dioscorus archive. Dioscorus is judged by some modern scholars to have been “the worst poet in Antiquity”; for him and a higher appreciation of his literary achievements cf. L. S. B. MacCoull, Dioscorus of Aphrodito. *His work and his world* (Berkeley 1988) and the forthcoming monograph by J.-L. Fournet. The famous Eupolis/Menander codex (Pack 375/1301; IV/V AD) once owned by Dioscorus gave an impetus to the study of Menander in modern times. J. van Haelst (Catalogue, 420) mentions 1 Christian papyrus from Aphrodite, but according to his index (p. 401) he knows of two Maspero papyri, viz. P. Cairo Masp. I 67024 verso (= 711) and II 67188 (= 898); the first text (= 711) is labelled “Aphrodite?” the other text (= 898) is labelled “Antinopoli?” Again, both texts derive from the same excavations in the same village, i.e. Kom Ishqaw, while they may have been written in Antinoopolis during Dioscorus’ stay there.

APOLLINOPOLIS MAGNA

From this place (= modern Edfu) there are no literary texts on papyrus (cf. supra, [1°] “Contrapollinopolis”), only 7 ostraka with a (semi-)literary content, viz. Pack 1934, 2647 (= Cribiore 260), 2680, 2681 (= Cribiore 176), 2682 (= Cribiore 101), 2683, 2684. It was assumed that all of these are connected with a local school, but Cribiore sub “D. 388” (p. 286) excludes no. 2684 (= O. Edfu III 327) expressis verbis; it is less clear what her view is on Pack 1934 (= O. Edfu III 326), 2680 (= O. Edfu I 1229) and 2683 (= O. Edfu II 308). To the literary texts from Edfu one may add now the indications on, e.g., a papyrus fragment of Euripides’ Bacchae given by F. Uebel in the Proceedings of the 12th Papyrological Congress, p. 492, and a List of books (published by W. Luppe in Archiv 27 [1980] 240).

J. van Haelst (Catalogue, p. 420) mentions 3 Christian/Biblical texts from Edfu, but there are in fact 5 such items in his catalogue, cf. nos. 672, 704, 764, 905, 1123.
For literary papyri from Hermopolis, cf. P. van Minnen & K. A. Worp, *art. cit.* [n. 4].15 Various texts can now be added, viz.


(2°) the various supplementary data provided by W. Müller in *Archiv* 42 (1996) 4ff., nos. 1-45;

and (3°) various texts published in *BKT IX*. Many Hermopolitan texts published in this volume are republications of texts published already previously; therefore, a concordance between *BKT IX* and the lists provided by van Minnen & Worp (*cf. supra*, n. 4) may be helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. 1 (Fayum)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no. 54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>no. 107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no. 63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>no. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>no. 141</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>no. 60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>no. 30</td>
<td>35?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>no. 40 +</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>no. 65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>no. 75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>no. 59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>no. 68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>no. 37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>no. 151</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>no. 33, 35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>no. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>no. 102</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>no. 56</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>no. 80 (= Pack 1086)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>no. 23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>no. 67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>no. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>no. 70</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>no. 71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>no. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>no. 49</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>no. 89</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 To be sure, R. Pintaudi, *Anal. Pap.* 7 (1995) 31-33 argues for the removal of Pack 1362 = PSI II 147 from our listing (no. 94). P. van Minnen points out that the information given by *Pack* 2753 (cf. our footnote 59), is incomplete and misleading. C. Wessely published 10 texts written on 4 wax tablets and 3 papyri; the wax tablets and his first papyrus come from Hermopolis, the third papyrus comes from the Fayum, while the provenance of the second papyrus is not certain.
On the problems involved with some papyri reported to be from a few villages situated in the Hermopolite nome [Tuna el-Gebel, Meir, Ma‘abdeh, Deirut and Mellawi] cf. van Minnen & Worp, art. cit. [n. 4], 157-158. About Ma‘abdeh it was noted there that apparently this place (situated to the North of Lycopolis = Assiut) produced a papyrus containing parts of Homer’s Iliad (Bk XVIII, cf. Pack 953; provenance not indicated) and another papyrus containing parts of the Iliad (Bks II-IV) and the grammarian Tryphon (cf. Pack 634 and 1539). It remains, however, uncertain whether these texts were found really at Ma‘abdeh. Of the first text it is stated that it was bought in 1849/1850 by A. C. Harris in Alexandria after it had been recovered by an Arab from a burial pit of crocodile mummies near Ma‘abdeh near Manfalut in Upper-Egypt (cf. К. Preisendanz, op. cit. [n.8], 100); Preisendanz reports that five years later, in 1854, the second text was found by Harris himself at the same place in Ma‘abdeh near a human mummy which was deposited among the crocodile mummies. Perhaps, however, the second text was found in fact at some unknown place and came via the antiquities trade to a dealer Castellani (operating mainly in Luxor) who sold it to Harris; it seems possible that the dealer (or later the owner?) devised a slightly exotic findplace for his papyri. On this subject cf. A. Wouters, The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt (Brüssel 1979) 61. As to Apollinopolis Heptakomias van Minnen & Worp noted already that Pack 1748 = New Primer 29. II refers to a text from Giessen (Germany) commemorating the ascension to the throne by the emperor Hadrian. The papyrus refers in 1. 12 to belongs to the archive of Apollonios, the provincial governor of the Apollonopolite nome, and apparently it is the only “literary” text in his archive. In the preface to P. Giss. it is stated expressis verbis that the papyri of the Apollonios-archive were purchased in Hermopolis and it is well-known that Apollonios originated from Hermopolis; after his term as governor of the Apollonopolite nome Apollonios returned to his mother-city. Therefore, it seems likely that the provenance indication “Apollinopolis” in Pack’s catalogue is incorrect and that the text’s provenance should be indicated as “Hermopolis”. In this context, however, it should be noted that the text itself refers to Phoebus Apollo who co-announces Hadrian’s ascension to the throne and in the province carrying his name Apollo was awarded, of course, a place of honor. The referral to the name of Apollo in this papyrus in this context and the fact that in 1. 12 reference is made to “the reverence of our
strategus" may be taken therefore as an indication that the papyrus was written indeed in Apollinopolis Heptakomias during Apollonios’ term of office (Note the distinction to be made between “Schriftheimat/Schreibort” and “Textheimat/Fundort”, for which cf. supra).

HIBEH


J. van Haelst, Catalogue no. 1137 (= Pack 2845) mentions 1 possibly “Christian” text from Hibeh, P. Hib. II 232 (III AD); P. van Minnen, however, rightly observes in his article “Boorish or Bookish” (in this volume, pp. 105-106 n. 18) that the text may be pagan.

KELLIS


16 P. van Minnen rightly reminds me that not all papyri from Hibeh derive from cartonnage, cf. P. Hib. II 195 and 232.
LYCOPOLIS

Ancient Lycopolis (modern Assiut) was the birthplace of the famous Neoplatonic philosopher Plotinus (III AD). From here we have only a few publications of pagan literary texts, viz. (1°) Pack 1126, a codex-fragment of Homer’s *Odyssey* (IV AD) owned by the Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres in Paris and published in 1905 by S. de Ricci as “from Lycopolis”. At present J. Gascou and J.-L. Fournet (Strasbourg) prepare an edition of more unpublished Byzantine papyri from the Lycopolite nome; apparently these belong to the same find as de Ricci’s papyrus; (2°) a medical papyrus from the said Académie, published by J.-L. Fournet in *Trav. & Mem. Byz.* 12 (1994) 309-322; (3°) a London papyrus published in *CdE* 60 [1985] 30-47, from Ptolemaic cartonnage found by Hogarth during excavations in Deir Rifa (near Lycopolis); it contains a fragment of a history of Alexander the Great.

J. van Haelst (*Catalogue*, p. 420) mentions, next to 4 Christian texts from the monastery of Deir Bala’izah near Lycopolis (cf. his nos. 31, 351, 737 and 738), only some 3 Christian texts from Lycopolis (cf. his nos. 923, 932 and also no. 660 [from Lycopolis or from the Fayumic village Theadelphia?]); cf. also his no. 1072 (= the famous Cologne Mani codex which was bought at Luxor, but probably derives from the Assiut region).

MEMPHIS
AND SURROUNDINGS

From the Memphis area (including Sakkarah and the monastery of Apa Jeremias) come approximately 15 literary texts:

Pack 31/401/1320: *P. Didot*, pp. 16-18, 18-22 and 25-28 (II BC; “school” text from a “private” archive; = *Cribiore* 244; cf. also no. 1319)
Pack 78: *P. Par.* 71 (I-II AD)
Pack 246: *P. Par.* 2 (II BC)
Pack 369: *P. Par.* 1 (II BC)
Pack 447: *P. Med.* I 15 (II BC; school text; = *Cribiore* 246)
Pack 1319: *P. Didot*, pp. 2-15 (II BC)
Pack 1435: *P. Didot*, pp. 28-34 (I-II BC)
Pack 1619: T. Louvre (IV AD; school text; = *Cribiore* 396 = van Haelst 239
Pack 2332: *P. Par.* 1 4 (II BC; school text; = *Cribiore* 98)
Pack 2476: *UPZ* I 81 [Leiden] (II BC; school text = *Cribiore* 245)
Pack 2579: P. Louvre inv. 7733° (III/II BC)
Pack 2730: T. Lenormant [Paris] (IV AD; school texts; = *Cribiore* 399)
Pack 2742: *UPZ* 147 [Leiden] (II BC; = *Cribiore* 78)
Pack 2911: P. Louvre inv. 7733° (III/II BC)

To these one may add the mathematical texts (probably intended for use in school) published by P. Cauderlier in *RA* 1983, pp. 259ff. (= *SB* XX 14647-14653).

Most of the literary texts from the Memphis area are kept now in Paris, some in Leiden, Milano or St. Petersburg. Next to the Ptolemaic literary texts there is a relatively
large number of wax tablets said to be from Memphis and dating from the 3rd/4th century AD. Many Ptolemaic literary papyri from Memphis belong to the same group of Ptolemaic papyri as the documentary texts from the Serapeum (re-)published in the UPZ. On the other hand, Pack 1254 (Isocrates; prov. unknown, III/IV AD) comes perhaps also from this region of Egypt, cf. the date of the text's arrival in Europe\(^{17}\) with the date of the discovery of some Memphite Serapeum papyri.\(^{10}\) Among the authors represented in Memphis are Aeschylus, Alcman, Chrysippus, Eudoxus, Euripides, Menander, Posidippus' epigrams and perhaps some Epicurean-philosophical (possibly: mythological/theological?) prose. Apparently many of the texts listed above were used in a local school.

According to J. van Haelst (Catalogue p. 420) there are no Christian literary texts from Memphis itself (cf., however, his nos. 54 and 331 + 597 [Memphis or Panopolis?] and 205 [Memphis or Antinoopolis [so Cribiore 397]?]; he mentions, however, 4 texts from the nearby Apa Jeremias monastery at Sakkarah (Catalogue, nos. 184-187) all belonging to the Old Testament.

**PANOPOLIS**

For the pagan literary production of the Panopolitan region cf. now A. Martin & O. Primavesi, L'Empédocle de Strasbourg (Strasbourg – Berlin 1998), pp. 43-51. J. van Haelst (Catalogue p. 420) mentions 39 Christian texts from Panopolis (add now: P. Köln V 214 [II AD], belonging to P. Bodmer II = van Haelst 426, and P. Bodmer XXIX); one should also take into account the many texts from the famous White Monastery near Sohag. NB: On the reverse side of the papyrus listed as van Haelst 672, stands an unpublished (?) pagan literary (mythological) text from Jena which may come from Panopolis or Apollinopolis Magna; it dates from the IIIrd/IVth century.

**QARARA (HARARA)**

Qarara = the ancient “Castra Hipponon” in the Heracleopolite Nome. All papyri from this place are kept in the Heidelberg (Baden) collection. For a Manetho text originating from German excavations at this place (P. Bad. IV 59) cf. Pack 1295; furthermore, there is a writing exercise from the same excavations, P. Bad. II 64 (apparently it is not necessarily a school text and it is not listed in Cribiore). According to J. van Haelst, Catalogue, p. 420, there are 7 Christian texts from Qarara; cf. his nos. 33, 169, 228/860, 346, 492 and 859.

\(^{17}\) According to the first editor it was seen in Paris already in 1860, or even earlier.

\(^{18}\) Around 1850, cf. Turner, op. cit. [n. 8] 21. Against this hypothesis, however, it may be argued that the palaeographical date of the papyrus itself does not match with that of the Ptolemaic papyri from the Serapeum.
SYENE/ELEPHANTINE

Pack refers to approximately 8 texts from Elephantine/Syene (doubtful provenances are marked by a "?"), written partly on papyrus (cf. below underlined numbers in Pack), partly on ostraka; cf. nos. 900(?), 1013(?), 1020, 1737(?), 1924, 2323 (mathematical school exercises?), 2656 (= Cribiore 190), and 2909. Also from Elephantine apparently are some texts not yet recorded in Pack, viz. O. Leid. 1 (II BC) and 2 (Roman), both medical prescriptions on ostraka; ZPE 22 (1976) 19-20 (II/III AD) 22, Isocrates (school?) text on an ostrakon; BKT IX 62 (Homer II, II/III AD), ?BKT IX 63 (II AD, Hymns); BKT IX 72 (III/II BC, Prose or Verse); P. Mon. II 28 (magical text). J. van Haelst (Catalogue, no. 877) mentions 1 Christian ostrakon (V AD) from Elephantine, while his no. 353 contains a Bible fragment from Syene. In CIE 73 (1998) 119ff. G. Nachtergaele identifies the recently published O. Eleph. DAIK 165 (V/VI AD) as another Biblical text (Psalm 91. 13-16).

THEBES AND THE THEBAID

Pack lists approximately 45 entries with this provenance (below, questionable cases are preceded by a "?"), many of which were written on ostraka or are mere graffiti, viz.

Pack 244: "Codex Thebanus deperditus" (VI-VII AD; pcm)
Pack 257: P. Rossall School (I-II AD)
Pack 258: P. Berol. inv. 8519 (III AD)
Pack 396: BKT V. 2 96-97 (II BC, ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 242)
Pack 487: P. Gen. inv. 94 (V AD, cod.)
Pack 555, 557, 563, 586: Mon. Epiph. II 611, 612, 614, 613 (VI-VII AD, limestone; school texts = Cribiore 168, 225, 227, 226)
Pack 772: P. Par. 3 ter (I-II AD?, pap.)
Pack 777: P. Par. 3 bis (II AD?, pap.)
Pack 1210: O. BIFAO s. inv. no. (II AD, ostr.; school text?)
Pack 1236: P. Lit. Lond. 133 (II AD, pap.; school text; = Cribiore 283)
Pack 1582: Mon. Epiph. II 615 (VI-VII AD, limestone; school text; = Cribiore 319)
Pack 1586: O. Bodl. inv. 2944-45 (II AD, ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 272)
Pack 1596: WO II 1488 (II BC; ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 243)
Pack 1597: Mon. Epiph. II 616 (VI-VII AD?, wooden tablet; school text; = Cribiore 66)
Pack 1743: P. Grenf. I 11 (II BC, papyrus; Pathyris?)
Pack 1746: P. Rein. I, p. 5-12 (II-I BC, ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 252)
Pack 1758: BKT V. 1 78-79 (II BC, ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 177)
Pack 1844: P. "Collect. Graves", in Hermathena 5 (1885) 237-257 (IV AD; cod.)

19 This and the following item are both ostraka; as it is hard to believe that these were more than schooltexts, but they are not listed as such by Cribiore; cf. also below, n. 23.
20 The Elephantine provenance was not recorded in Pack's catalogue.
21 Cf. below, n. 23.
PROVENANCE OF SOME GREEK LITERARY PAPYRI

Pack 1852: BKT V. 1 108-114 (V AD, cod.)
Pack 71876: O. Cair. s. inv. no. (II AD, ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 266)
Pack 71947: O. Skeat 13 (I-II AD; ostr.; school text?)
Pack 1997: P. Leid. inv. 10 (III-IV AD)
Pack 71998: P. Holmiensis (III-IV AD)
Pack 1988: SB 1 5730 (III-IV; ostr.; school text; = Cribiore 215)
Pack 72132: O. Firenze s. inv. no. (III-IV AD, ostr.)

Pack 2134: Mon. Epiph. II 621 (VI-VII AD); school text; = Cribiore 123)
Pack 2269: J. Baillet, Tombeaux des Rois ou Syringues, passim
Pack 2270: Miscellaneous graffiti and epigrams on the colossus of Memnon, passim
Pack 72280: P. Ryl. III 475 (V AD; papyrus)
Pack 2333: Mon. Epiph. II 617 (VI-VII AD; wooden tablet)
Pack 2334: Mon. Epiph. II 618 (VI-VII AD; school text; = Cribiore 122)
Pack 2336: Mon. Epiph. II 619 (VI-VII AD; limestone; school text?)
Pack 2423: Mon. Epiph. II 622 (VI-VII AD; ostr.)
Pack 2489: O. Cair. inv. 67930 (III BC; ostr.)
Pack 2495: P. Yale II 105 (I AD; papyrus)
Pack 2700: Hall pl. 34 no. 33187 (VII-VIII AD; ostr.; = Cribiore 173)
Pack 2721: O. Bodl. inv. 2941-42 (II AD; ostr.; = Cribiore 267, 268)
Pack 2732: ZPE 6 (1970) 133-49 (III AD; wooden tablets; = Cribiore 388)
Pack 2740: O. Meyer 83 (Roman; ostr.; = Cribiore 51)
Pack 2743: Mon. Epiph. II 620 (VI-VII; ostr.; = Cribiore 67)
Pack 72967: P. Ryl. III 479 (VI)
Pack 72974: P. Ryl. III 474 (IV)

Thebes has hardly preserved any belles lettres on papyrus for us (cf. Pack 244, 257, 258, 487, 772, 959, 1256, 1743; on the literary productivity of Southern Egypt in general, cf. M. Parca, Ptocheia or Odysseus in Disguise at Troy [Atlanta, GA 1991] 99-112, for Thebes esp. p. 102f.); one finds mainly technical manuals dealing with, e.g., chemistry. Furthermore, there are the large magical books from Thebes (excluded by Pack from his Catalogue!) and many of the "literary" texts from Thebes turn out to be school texts written on ostraka and chips of limestone.22 The village of Deir el-Medina (on the Theban West bank) produced 1 text (Pack 1210), an ostrakon (found during excavations at Deir el-Medina) containing notes on Homer Od. IX 1-3 en 39-40.23 Furthermore, there are two ostraka from Deir al-Bahari on the Theban West bank (Pack 2489, 2700); the first text contains an aretalogy of the deified Amenothes/Amenhotep, the second text has only the name Agamemnon inscribed.24 Furthermore, Pack lists 1 text from Gourna on the

22 It should be noted that a substantial number of ostraka listed by Pack without an indication of a known provenance possibly, even probably, comes from Thebes, the adjacent region (e.g., Hermomships) or at least from Upper Egypt (the "Thebaid"; for whatever reason the editors have given no reference to their provenance for, e.g., O. Bodl. II 2169-2170, 2172-2194, 2564, 2565).
23 Though apparently the text is not listed by Cribiore, I guess that probably the ostrakon contains a "school" text; the same remark may apply to the ostraka containing the texts of Pack 1947 and 2336, and cf. also Pack 2132 and above, notes 19 and 21.
24 This is a school exercise, cf. Cribiore 173.
Theban Westbank, containing the first ever discovered Hyperides-text (*Pack* 1233; cf. K. Preisendanz, *op. cit.* [n. 8], 98); more Hyperides-rolls from elsewhere would follow later.
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