

## XV.—The Greek Signatures of P. Mich. Inv. 4703

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In the original publication of P. Mich. 4703<sup>1</sup> by Prof. Henry A. Sanders of the University of Michigan the seven Greek signatures<sup>2</sup> on the verso were not deciphered to the complete satisfaction of the editor, and Fink, in his reinterpretation of the document,<sup>3</sup> did not find it necessary to take them into consideration. This study<sup>4</sup> endeavors to straighten out some of the difficulties found in reading the signatures and to set forth the evidence they contain concerning the place of origin of the document.

Professor Sanders suggested that anyone interested in making a further study of these signatures start with the last, and I have followed his advice. His reading here is *Ανιλληιος κυρ Αντωνινος*.<sup>5</sup> The cognomen *Ἀντωνίνος*<sup>6</sup> is certain, also *κυρ*, which, without doubt, should be resolved *Κυρ(ινα)*,<sup>7</sup> designating the tribe Quirina. Preceding *κυρ* is *ιος*, likewise certain, but the letter before iota, I feel, is

<sup>1</sup> Henry A. Sanders, "A Soldier's Marriage Certificate in Diploma Form," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 81 (1939) 581-590 and Plates I-II.

<sup>2</sup> That the signatures are in Greek, while the document itself is written in Latin, would seem to me to indicate nothing more than that Greek, not Latin, was the language normally, if not exclusively, used by these individuals. The first four who signed have a sure, fluid style, indicative of familiarity with Greek script and long practice in its use, qualities shared to a lesser degree by the last three.

Greek was the language of many Roman citizens, and this fact is emphasized by the large number of Greek inscriptions concerning them found throughout the Roman world. See also H. A. Sanders, "Two Fragmentary Birth-Certificates from the Michigan Collection," *Mem. Am. Acad. Rome* 9 (1931) 80.

<sup>3</sup> Robert O. Fink, "The *Sponsalia* of a *Classarius*: a Reinterpretation of P. Mich. Inv. 4703," *TAPhA* 72 (1941) 109-124.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Sanders was kind enough to have a photograph of the signatures sent to me for study. It is reproduced here for the benefit of the reader.

<sup>5</sup> The other signatures read by Sanders are: 1. *Ἰλτηητιος πυλ|Ἰηιουνος*; 2. *Ἰμηνλῖος βε|Τιφφηνος*; 3. *]. . . μιοῖ γα|Ζαδνος*; 4. *Ἰαλψονιος φᾶλ|σττῖνος*; 5. *Ἰξίφξιος αρν|Γηρος*; 6. *Ἰρχαυιος κρι|Μαγγος*.

<sup>6</sup> The nominative case is odd. We should presume from other attested documents, e.g., *P. Eleph.* 2; 3; 4; *P. Mich.* 167, that the seals of these individuals accompanied their signatures. In such instances the names are regularly in the genitive case. The irregularity here and in the seventh signature may be attributed to carelessness, or, less probably, to the lack of a seal.

<sup>7</sup> The abbreviation is found frequently in inscriptions, e.g., *IGRP* 1.446; 512.

not  $\eta$  but  $\nu$ , giving the word  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$ . The name of the father is therefore required. Here is the chief difficulty, for the name may be written in one of several ways<sup>8</sup>; also some of the name is missing. If the  $\lambda$  before  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$  is taken as designating a praenomen it should be resolved  $\Lambda(\acute{\omicron}\kappa\iota\omicron\varsigma)$ . Before  $\Lambda$  is a possible  $\alpha\nu\lambda$ , the  $\nu$  being made in much the same way as the second one in  $\text{'}\Lambda\nu\tau\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ . We might then read  $\text{M}\text{[}\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda(\iota\omicron\varsigma)\text{]} \Lambda(\omicron\kappa\iota\omicron\upsilon) \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \text{Κυρ(}\iota\nu\alpha\text{)} \text{'}\Lambda\nu\tau\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ .

Having a pattern<sup>9</sup> in which occur  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$  and the name of the tribe, we may go to the first signature and take the names of the witnesses in order. Here it is possible to read  $\text{Κ[}\overline{\sigma\rho\rho\eta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu} \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\text{]} \text{Κυρ(}\iota\nu\alpha\text{)} \text{'}\text{Ιουλί}\omicron\upsilon$ . Though Julius is unusual as a cognomen it is attested as such in *CIL* 10.2715 and Stéphane Gsell, *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1922) 1544.

The remains of the second signature may be read as  $\text{[}\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\text{]} \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon\text{Κυρ(}\iota\nu\alpha\text{)} \text{[}\text{Τιβιρ}\acute{\eta}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ . The simplest, though not necessarily the correct, resolution of the first part is  $\text{Ο}\acute{\upsilon}\alpha\lambda\text{[}\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ .

The first line of the third signature is almost obliterated. At the end, above, is a horizontal line denoting an abbreviation, and below that a perpendicular line which might well be the remains of a  $\rho$ . As a pure guess  $\text{Κυρ(}\iota\nu\alpha\text{)}$  might be read. The cognomen appears to be  $\text{'}\Lambda\lambda\text{[}\xi\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\upsilon$ . If this is so, the signer seems to have written  $\text{Αλε}\xi\alpha\alpha$  first and then changed the  $\alpha$  to  $\nu$ .

The letters of the first line of the fourth name are fairly clear. They may be read as  $\text{Ο}\acute{\upsilon}\text{[}\alpha\lambda\eta(\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon) \text{or } \text{Ο}\acute{\upsilon}\text{[}\alpha\lambda\eta(\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon) \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$ . The dot following  $\eta$  may be taken as a mark denoting an abbreviation.<sup>10</sup> The last three letters of the cognomen,  $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , are fairly distinct. Before them are traces of ink which suit the shape of  $\rho\eta$ , giving a possible  $\text{Σε[}\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ . I do not understand the meaning of the oblique line just before  $\nu$  nor a similar line in the second signature.

Little can be made of the fifth signature. The first line begins with  $\phi$  which seems to be followed by  $\text{ιδ}\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\upsilon$  though this is very doubtful. The cognomen ends in  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ .

The first line of the sixth signature is likewise very difficult. A doubtful  $\text{[}\iota\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\upsυ \text{Κυρ(}\iota\nu\alpha\text{)}$  may be read. The final  $\nu$  or  $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\upsυ$  is a

<sup>8</sup> E.g., *IGRP* 1.445,  $\text{Τ. Φλά}\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma \text{'}\text{Αρτεμ}\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \text{Κυρ}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\alpha \text{'}\text{Αρτεμ}\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ; 979,  $\text{Τ. Φ(}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\text{)} \text{Λεοντ}\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\text{ν Κυρ}\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\alpha \text{'}\text{Ακ}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\text{}$ ; 3.633,  $\text{Γά}\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \text{Λικ}\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\iota\omicron\varsigma \Lambda\text{[}\iota\kappa\iota\nu\text{]}\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\text{ν Κρατ}\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omicron\upsilon \nu\text{[}\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma\text{]} \text{Σεργ}\acute{\iota}\alpha \text{Φλαβ}\acute{\iota}\alpha\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma \text{'}\text{Ιά[}\sigma\omega\text{]}\nu$ .

<sup>9</sup> That signatures and names of witnesses tend to follow a pattern is shown by *P. Mich.* 166; 167; 169. See also Sanders, "A Latin Marriage Contract," *TAPhA* 69 (1938) 110.

<sup>10</sup> See Mitteis-Wilcken, *Papyruskunde*, vol. 1, *Grundzuge*, xlii.

very shallow curved line written above and crossing the top of the initial stroke of  $\kappa$ . The cognomen is  $\text{Μάρκον}$ .<sup>11</sup>

From the paleographical study of the signatures an interesting deduction may be made concerning the locality in which the document, found at Karanis, was drawn up. Demetria, one of the principals involved in the main body of the document, and her *tutor* were residents of the colony of Caesarea.<sup>12</sup> Gaius Valerius Gemellus, the other principal, was a soldier of the Imperial Alexandrian Fleet. The fact that ships from the Alexandrian Fleet made up in part the squadron stationed at Caesarea in Mauretania<sup>13</sup> points to that place rather than Caesarea in Palestine as the colony mentioned. Of the seven witnesses, four (1, 2, 4, 7) definitely belonged to the tribe Quirina and there is some evidence that two others (3, 6) did. Therefore we may conclude that the document was drawn up in the locality in which the witnesses lived, in this case, Caesarea in Mauretania, which belonged to the tribe Quirina<sup>14</sup>; otherwise we should expect individuals from more than one tribe to be signatories.

<sup>11</sup> Marcus is found as a cognomen in *CIL* 9.1897, C·PONTIO·C·L MARCO; Gsell, *op. cit.* 694, C·OCTAVIVS MARCVS.

<sup>12</sup> See Fink, *op. cit.* 109–110.

<sup>13</sup> R. Cagnat, *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique* (Paris, 1892) 339–344; M. Jean Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Cairo, 1918) 100.

<sup>14</sup> H. Dessau, *RE s.v.* "Caesarea" 1295.



P. Mich. Inv. 4703