

XXX. Notes on Papyri and Ostraca

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1. *PFuad 75*

This papyrus bears a letter written in October, 64 A.D., by a woman named Thaubas to her father Pompey. She writes with genuine but restrained pathos to inform him that her sister Herennia has died after childbirth.

The photograph provided on Plate iv in the Fuad volume permits us to clear away a few minor errors of reading. In line 1, the editor has printed *Πομπείωι* and corrected this to *Πομπηΐωι* in his critical apparatus. The photograph leaves no doubt that the papyrus has *Πομπηΐωι*. In line 6 the edition has *τετηλευτηκέναι*, and in line 11 *τετηλεύτηκεν*, with the correct spellings again given in the apparatus; the photograph, however, has the correct spellings: *τετελευτηκέναι* and *τετελεύτηκεν*. Beginning at the end of line 6 and continued in line 7, *εὐτηχῆσθαι* is the reading of the photograph, not *εὐτηχυῆσθαι* as in the edition. The illusion of *upsilon* is created by a curved extension upward from the bottom of *chi* on the right side of the letter. In his note to line 6 the editor hesitates between *εὐτυχεῖσθαι* and *εὐτυχῆσθαι* as possible equivalences for the spelling of the papyrus. The following discussion will show, I believe, that the perfect form is to be preferred.

Since lines 3–11 are necessary for understanding the contribution that *εὐτυχῆσθαι* makes to the story told by Thaubas about the death of her sister Herennia, I repeat them here.

καλῶς ποιήσεις λαβὼν τὴν ἐπιστολήν
 μου ἑξαυτῆς εἰσελθὼν διὰ τὸ τὴν
 5 ταλαίπωρον θυγατέρα σου Ἑρεννίαν
 τετελευτηκέναι καὶ ἤδη εὐτη-
 χῆσθαι τῷ Φαῶφι τῇ ἐνάτῃ ἀπ' ὠ-

I have had most generous help of various kinds from Professors V. Bartoletti, G. D. Kilpatrick, B. R. Rees, J. Schwartz, and Mr. G. A. Michailidis. Their contributions are acknowledged in the course of the article at the appropriate places.

μοτοκητοῦ ἔτεκεν γὰρ ὀκτώι
 μηνῶν παιδίον νεκρὸν καὶ τέσσαρας
 10 ἡμέρας ἐπέζωσε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα
 τετελεύτηκεν.

6. 1. ἦδη. 6-7. 1. εὐτυχήσθαι. 7-8 1. ὠμοτοκετοῦ. 8. 1. ὀκτώ. The editor's doubt about the otiose *iota* is unfounded. 10. The editor's correction of ἐπέζωσε to ἐπέζησε is not necessary.

The writer of this text appears to have co-ordinated τετελευτηκέναι and εὐτυχήσθαι so that they seem to be in the same relation to διὰ τό. Accordingly, if the scribe is to be taken seriously, the infinitives jointly provide the reason given by Thaubas for urging her father to return. The first of these infinitives tells him that his daughter has died, but what additional information is conveyed by εὐτυχήσθαι is not obvious. The editor relates it to the use of εὐτύχει on funerary stelae and combines it with τετελευτηκέναι in such a way as to make Thaubas say: "Tu feras bien, au reçu de ma lettre, de venir aussitôt, parce que ta malheureuse fille Hérennia est morte, heureuse à jamais(?), le 9 de Phaôphi, pour avoir accouché avant terme."

The editor is aware that the passive infinitive does not fit the linguistic pattern of the stelae, on which the active verb is the norm, and he observes quite rightly that the passive of εὐτυχεῖν is not normally associated with a personal subject. Nevertheless, *LSJ*, s.v. εὐτυχέω, do cite the passive aorist participle of this verb applied to a personal subject in Iamblichus' *De vita Pythagorica* 2.9. Taking this piece of evidence as a guide, we may remove the difficulty in the Fuad papyrus by assuming εὐτυχήσθαι to be the scribe's error for εὐτύχεται, an error induced of course by the proximity of τετελευτηκέναι. This correction permits the verb to derive its specific meaning in this context not from τετελευτηκέναι but from ἀπ' ὠμοτοκετοῦ. Herennia is then represented by Thaubas as having survived the miscarriage which she suffered on Phaophi 9. She succumbed, however, four days later—not on the 9th, as the editor supposed, but on the 13th—to the sequelae of her miscarriage.

If viewed in the light of this correction, lines 3-11 can be rendered as follows, with no syntactic or semantic difficulty. A few elements of paraphrase are placed within parentheses.

“Please come home as soon as you receive my letter, because your poor daughter Herennia has died. And (to think that) she had already come safely through a miscarriage on the ninth of Phaophi. For she had a still-born child in her eighth month, and she lived on for four days, and (only) after that she died.”

2. *PStrasb.* 143 = *Sammelbuch* 5.8258

This text is a deed of loan of a familiar type. The loan was made before the harvest and was to be repaid after the harvest in June. It consisted of two parts: a loan of sixty-eight drachmas and a loan in kind. The money loan is described as ἀργυρίου, and this is of course usual, but the loan in kind is said to be ἐν γύρι (= γύρει) πυροῦ . . . καὶ κριθῆς, i.e. “in wheat meal . . . and barley meal.” The word γύρις has not previously occurred in the loans preserved on papyrus, and in fact it is very rare in papyrus texts altogether. Furthermore, in order to obtain ἐν γύρι from his reading of the papyrus, the editor has had to introduce a correction.

What is expected within the context of a loan in kind is indicated by *PLond.* 2.308 (p. 218), which also has a loan in two parts, the first described as on the Strasbourg papyrus by ἀργυρίου, the second however as ἐν γένει, which is commonplace for loans in kind.¹ The Strasbourg papyrus ought also to have this phrase, especially since a cursive writing of γενι might look enough like γυρι to be read in this way. Once that had happened, it would necessarily be corrected to γύρι = γύρει. The spelling γένι recurs in the same phrase in other loans, e.g. *PFay.* 90.11 and *PGen.* 43.10.

Professor Schwartz, who has been kind enough to examine the papyrus at my request, has verified this conjecture.² He would now read ἐν γένι, and his palaeographic comment is most pertinent: “L’epsilon est très ouvert et ressemble à un ypsilon dans cette écriture, mais le nu est absolument certain.”³

¹ Preisigke-Kiessling, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. γένος (6).

² Letter dated April 26, 1958.

³ Other minor improvements of the text may be suggested. Since line 21 has ἐμοῦ and line 22 μοι, line 1 should have [ὁμολογῶ in place of [ὁμολογεῖ, and line 16 ἀποδώσ[ω] in place of ἀποδώσ[ει]. The loan is couched in terms of a subjective homology.

3. *PMichael*. 15

This text is a private letter written in the first century A.D.⁴ It begins with a normal prescript, which is marred however by the omission of the final syllable from the expression *τῷ φιλάτῳ*.⁵ The body of the letter is then introduced with the following sentence, as given in the edition (3–5):

καὶ δι' ἐτέρας σε ἐπιστολῆς ἠρώτησα ἐπιστεῖλ(αί)
μοι τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου ἰδίου ἐνλείπον, καθὼ καὶ αὐτὸς
5 χρεῖαν ἔχω.⁶

The editor's translation of these lines is entirely adequate: "I have asked you in another letter to send me the balance due from our private account, since I also am in need of it."

What is, nevertheless, somewhat disconcerting in this text is the composition of the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου ἰδίου*. The use of *ἴδιος* in the predicate position is not unknown, but it is by no means common,⁷ and the question therefore arises whether the article is not followed rather by a diminutive form beginning with *λογ* and ending with *ιδίου*. If we accept this hypothesis as a means of testing the reading, it may be formulated for practical purposes as *λογ.ιδίου*. And there is a word which will fit this pattern, the rare diminutive *λογαρίδιον*, which is derived from *λόγος* through *λογάριον*. It has been known heretofore only from two papyri:

POxy. 3.599: *μηδὲν λέγε περὶ οὗ ὀφείλεις μου λογαρίδιον*.⁸

PMerton 24.15–16: *καλῶς π[οι]ήσεις ἀντιβαλὼν Σεμπρ[ωνί]ω τὸ λογαρίδιον*.

The photograph of the papyrus reproduced on Plate IV at the end of the volume confirms the suggestion that *λογαρίδιον* is the correct reading. If this is substituted for *λόγου ἰδίου*, the sentence may be rendered as follows: "I have asked you in another letter to send me what remains on the account (i.e. to my credit), since I also have need of it."

⁴ So Bell and Turner. See *PMichael*., p. 27, note 1.

⁵ See however B. R. Rees, *CR* 70 (N.S. 6, 1956) 235.

⁶ I have omitted here as elsewhere all dots which I judge to be unnecessary. Line 4: *ἐνλείπον* = *ἐλλείπον*. Line 5: *ἔχω* = *ἔχω*.

⁷ Cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri* 2, pt. 2 (Berlin-Leipzig 1933) 52, 73 f. (esp. 74.19–22).

⁸ Cited from this source as a new diminutive by L. R. Palmer, *Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* (London 1946) 90. The limited use made of *-αριδιον* in noun formation is stressed by D. C. Swanson, *Journ. Bib. Lit.* 77 (1958) 145.

4. *PMichael*. 33

In this text, which has been assigned on palaeographic grounds to the late fourth or the fifth century A.D., a certain Flavius Ptoleminus requests the assistant to the *exactor* of Oxyrhynchus to effect the transfer of two properties to his daughter Sarapias. Their separate areas, as well as the total area of both, are given very briefly by means of abbreviations, symbols, and numerals. As these statements are presented by the editor, with some modification by his revisers,⁹ they have the following form.

10-11 β(ασιλικῆς) (ἀρτάβης) ᾱ (ῥμισυ) ἰδικ(ῆς) κς (τέταρτον)
 13 ἰδικ(ῆς) λ (τέταρτον) (ὄγδοον)
 14 β(ασιλικῆς) (ἀρτάβης) ᾱ (ῥμισυ) ἰδικ(ῆς) νς (ῥμισυ) (ὄγδοον)

This arrangement of the text implies that both parcels consisted of former royal land which was now privately owned, 26½ aruras in one plot and 30⅔ aruras in the other, or a total of 56⅘ aruras, all of it rated for tax purposes at 1½ artabas on the arura. It is tempting to explain the papyrus in this way because by the late fourth century the royal domain had in fact passed either by direct imposition (*epibolē*) or through hereditary lease into private hands.¹⁰ Seemingly, then, although the old name (*basilikē*) was retained for the sake of administrative continuity, a new designation (*idikē*) marked the real status of the land.

As attractive as this explanation may be, the editor has noted also another way of reading the text which points in a different direction. It may be observed that the tax rate is given with the first area, omitted from the second, and repeated with the total; but the editor admits that what he has taken as a mark of abbreviation after *ιδικ* in each of the three statements may be identical with the symbol for artaba after β(ασιλικῆς). If this were true, however, the papyrus would lose all meaning since there would be no mention of the areas that Ptoleminus desires to have transferred to his daughter's name.

On the other hand, the numerals which follow *ιδικ(ῆς)* in each of the three statements might properly have been preceded by the symbol for arura, and in Index x the editor has indeed equated all the symbols, those after β(ασιλικῆς) as well as those after *ιδικ*, with ἄρουρα. If this identification were the true one,

⁹ See *PMichael*, p. 59, note 1.

¹⁰ Cf. H. I. Bell, *Recueil Champollion* (= *Bibl. Éc. Hautes Études* 234, 1922) 263.

it would be possible to think that the transfer involves $1\frac{1}{2}$ aruras of royal land and $56\frac{5}{8}$ aruras of private land. This approach to the problem would have every advantage because the papyrus is a notification to an official that a transfer of property is to be made, and the description of the property may be expected to follow official terminology. With the interpretation proposed by the editor, the rate is attached to a name which no longer applies, the area to the new and actual category. In the case of land that had passed from one classification to another we might rather have looked for something like βασιλική ἐν τάξει ιδικῆς.¹¹ Although royal land was in effect private land in the fourth century,¹² it retained its independence as a formal category for a long time. Royal and private land are the only categories mentioned in the returns of the land census which followed on the reforms promulgated by Diocletian in his edict of 297.¹³ They continued to be distinguished at least as late as 365 A.D.¹⁴

With the help of a photograph which Mr. Michaëlidis was kind enough to send me, the textual problem raised by the edition can be resolved. The supposed rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ artabas proves to be a false reading; in place of $\bar{\alpha}$ (ἡμισυ) the papyrus has ζ (ἡμισυ). It is equally clear that the symbols used after β(ασιλικῆς) and ιδικ are the same, as the editor suspected they might be. Such differences as a meticulous inspection reveals are minor and quite negligible; they are certainly well within the limits of divergence that may be expected in cursive writing. And since the text concerns a transfer of land, the form ̲ must be a rapid version of the usual symbol for arura.¹⁵ Consequently, the statements may now be modified to read as follows:

- 10–11 β(ασιλικῆς) (ἀρούρας) ζ (ἡμισυ), ιδικ(ῆς) (ἀρούρας) κς (τέταρτον)
 13 ιδικ(ῆς) (ἀρούρας) λ (τέταρτον) (ὄγδοον)
 14 β(ασιλικῆς) (ἀρουργαι) ζ (ἡμισυ), ιδικ(ῆς) (ἀρουργαι) νς (ἡμισυ) (ὄγδοον)

¹¹ Cf. Wilcken, *Chrest.* 341 (2nd century) 15: βασιλ(ικῆς) ἐν τάξει ιδιοκτητήτου.

¹² On ownership of royal land see Johnson and West, *Byzantine Egypt* (Princeton 1949) 13 ff.

¹³ For references see *PRyl.* 4.656, introd.

¹⁴ *Sammelbuch* 3.6612; cf. Bell (above, note 10) 264 f. The same is true of *dēmosia*, *hierā*, *ousiakē* (*PFlor.* 1.64), and *katoikikē* (*PLips.* 6; *CPR* 10).

¹⁵ For the typical form of this symbol see *RE*, 2^{te} Reihe, 2, s.v. *Siglae*, 2305 (Bilabel).

Flavius Ptoleminus is accordingly requesting that the ownership of one parcel consisting of $7\frac{1}{2}$ aruras of royal land and $26\frac{1}{4}$ aruras of private land, and another consisting of $30\frac{3}{8}$ aruras of private land, or a total of $7\frac{1}{2}$ aruras of royal land and $56\frac{3}{8}$ aruras of private land, be assigned to his daughter Sarapias.

There is also some difficulty in the text about the location of these plots. The first is said to be ἐν .ε..ελιοις Γεσσαίου (9) and the second ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Γεσσαίου (12–13). The shift from plural to singular suggests that the word used in line 9 is such that a change of number does not materially affect its meaning. The revisers have proposed, with all due reserve, ἐν θεμελίοις Γεσσαίου. Since θεμέλια refers to the foundations of a building, or at best for our purpose to building-sites,¹⁶ it is not appropriate for land measured by aruras, which are suitable only to agricultural land.¹⁷ The photograph strongly suggests ἐν μέν πεδίοις.¹⁸ The letters marked with a bar are all mutilated but may be taken as practically certain; only the badly damaged *nu* presents disturbing features. Taken as a whole, however, this reading of the papyrus carries conviction, on grounds both of palaeography and of sense.¹⁹

5. Wilcken, *Ostr.* 1306

This ostrakon has a text of only six lines, of which two are seriously impaired and a third contains a query. With so little

¹⁶ LSJ, s.v. θεμέλιος, II.

¹⁷ Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. lxxii.

¹⁸ Cf. BGU 4.1092.12: ἐν πε[δ]ίοις κώ[μη]ς (372 A.D.); POxy. 6.913.9: ἐν πεδίῳ τῆς ἡμετέρας κώμης (442 A.D.). For μέν correlative with καί (11) see Denniston, *Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1954) 374; Mayser, *Grammatik* 2, pt. 3, 130. For the position of μέν immediately after the preposition, in *koinê* as in classical Greek, see Mayser, *op. cit.* 2, pt. 2, 517.

¹⁹ The name Gessaeus, which the editor compares to Gessius, remains problematic. Almost completely preserved in 13, it is badly damaged in 9, which has suffered from a horizontal tear in the papyrus. *Gamma* is well preserved in both lines, and I should not have supposed that it could be in doubt; *ai* is at least extremely likely. The letter read as *epsilon* is mutilated in 9, where the remains might tempt one to this reading even though it would be unlike any other *epsilon* in this hand; in 13 it appears to be characteristically *omicron*. Nor is it clear that two letters were intended rather than one where the editor has double *sigma*.

The photograph makes possible a number of minor corrections. Line 7: Ἀμμωνίονος, ὑποστέματος. 8: Ἰνδικτίονος. 9: The editor suggests that “The small circle before δνόματος perhaps represents ἀπό, omitted by mistake.” The “small circle” is a small *omicron* which was replaced by a large one. 16: The double curve after *ia* is followed by two oblique lines instead of one. 17–19: The subscription was written by a second hand.

writing to support a judgment, Wilcken chose to use the broad limits of the Principate as a comprehensive date.²⁰ I reproduce his transcription.

θη(σαυρῶ) κώμης
 Ἱερᾶς Νεικολάου
 /ς ιη / .. / ς ὀνόμα-
 τος Κάσιος καὶ Ἰσίδω-
 5 ρος δι(ὰ) Ἀσηπ(?) ὀνηλάτο[υ]
 σακ.. / ε! Χοιὰκ κ[.]

2. l. Νικολάου. 4-5. l. Κασίου καὶ Ἰσιδώρου.

Translation: "In the granary of the village of Hieria Nicolau . . . in the name of Casius and Isidorus, acting through Asep(?) the donkey driver . . . 5. Choiak 2[.]"

Wilcken wrote no commentary on this text, and so we do not know what he thought about the series of symbols and numerals in line 3. Two years after Wilcken's publication, Paul Viereck made his own examination of the ostrakon and published a few corrections.²¹ For line 3 he suggested /ς ιη / κη / ς, but if this is what the ostrakon really has, it is as meaningless as Wilcken's partial reading. All we can be sure of is that Viereck, like Wilcken, conscientiously reported what he saw. For the beginning of line 6, he hesitantly proposed σακκοφ(όρου). With this reading, Asep takes on the dual rôle of donkey driver and porter. At the end of the line Viereck saw no indication that a second numeral was lacking after *kappa*.

Since the village of Hieria Nicolau is mentioned in line 2, the ostrakon comes from the Fayûm, as Wilcken had supposed.²² Hieria Nicolau was identified by Wessely, on the basis of Wilcken's ostrakon, with Hieria Nesus in the southern or Polemon division of the Fayûm,²³ and in this conclusion he was followed by Grenfell and Hunt.²⁴ More recently, however, Hieria Nicolau has been named together with Caranis in *Ostr. Mich.* 3.1069, and it is also linked to Caranis by other ostraca and papyri from that site.²⁵

²⁰ Wilcken: "Aus römischer Zeit."

²¹ *Arch. f. Papyrusf.* 1 (1901) 467; cf. *Berichtigungsliste* 2.i.102.

²² Wilcken: "angeblich aus dem Faijûm." Cf. his *Ostr.* 1.716. In *Ostr. Mich.* 1.408 the village is described as in the Arsinoite nome.

²³ *Denk. Akad. Wiss. Wien* 50 (1904) Abh. 1.78.

²⁴ *PTebt.* 2, p. 380.

²⁵ *Ostr. Mich.* 1.371, 407, 408; 2.891. Three papyri in the Caranis archive of Aurelius Isidorus, which will be published shortly, also mention Hieria Nicolau: *PCairIsidor.* 34, 37, 39.

The village was doubtless not far from Caranis in the eastern or Heraclides division of the nome.

Very few ostraca from the Fayûm were known in 1899, when Wilcken published his epochal edition, but some thirty years later a considerable number of similar texts from the Fayûm, and especially from the village of Caranis, were transcribed by Leiv Amundsen, who identified them as receipts covering the transportation of tax grain on donkeys from village granaries to Nile ports, whence it was carried on the river to the granaries at Alexandria.²⁶ With the help of the new texts, most of which fall into the late third and early fourth centuries, Amundsen recognized Wilcken's reading of line 3 of *Ostr.* 1306 and Viereck's revision of the same line as unsuccessful attempts to decipher a date expressed as a series of regnal years. Although he seems not to have examined the ostrakon, he ventured two suggestions, presumably by way of illustration:

γ(εν)ή(ματος) ηη (έτους) ιζ (έτους) ι (έτους), i.e. "of the crop of the 18th yr. (of Diocletian), the 17th yr. (of Maximian), and the 10th yr. (of Constantine and Galerius)" = 301/302.

γ(εν)ή(ματος) ηη (έτους) ις (έτους) ηη (έτους), i.e. "of the crop of the 18th yr. (of Constantine I), the 16th yr. (of Licinius I), and the 8th yr. (of Crispus, Constantine II, Licinius II)" = 323/324.²⁷

Amundsen had no reason to prefer one of these dates to the other, since neither squares sufficiently with the indications given by Wilcken and Viereck to justify its adoption, and other guesses might be made but without real profit. We can now show, however, that Amundsen was right when he advanced the date of the ostrakon to the fourth century, and specifically the first quarter of the fourth century. Among papyri of which an edition has been prepared but not yet published, are ten which mention Casius and Isidorus,²⁸ to whom the receipt written on Wilcken's ostrakon was issued. In six of these they occur together, precisely as on the ostrakon. They were brothers, sons of Heras and grandsons of Petubestis. The ten texts are spread over the years

²⁶ *Ostr. Oslo.* 17–21, comm. For further bibliography see *TAPA* 81 (1950) 101, to which add J. Schwartz, *Bull. de l'Institut. français d'arch. orient.* 47 (1948) 179–200.

²⁷ *Ostr. Oslo.*, p. 40, note 1; cf. *Berichtigungsliste* 2.ii.187.

²⁸ They belong to the Isidorus archive (see footnote 25): *PCairIsidor.* 9, 10, 12, 17, 101, 111, 113, 116, 119, 146. Six of these were previously published by Boak in *ÉtPap.* 2 (1934) 12–14, 17–20; 3 (1936) 41 f.; 7 (1948) 35–55.

from 298 to 314. The first of Amundsen's alternative dates for the Berlin ostrakon falls within this period; his second date is only a decade later. Unfortunately, the ostrakon has disappeared along with the rest of the Berlin collection, but if it ever comes to light again and its date is deciphered, we may expect that it will be within these limits, and probably closer to 314 than to 324.²⁹

We can now also say that Wilcken's ostrakon comes not only, as he supposed, from the Fayûm, but definitely from Caranis. Hieria Nicolau, which is mentioned in line 2 of the ostrakon, was near Caranis, as we have shown, and Casius and Isidorus, who are credited on the ostrakon with a delivery of grain from the granary of Hieria Nicolau to a Nile port, appear in the papyri to which we have referred as residents and taxpayers of Caranis.

Now that we know the type of receipt to which Wilcken's text belongs, its place of origin, and its approximate date, we can do something more for line 6 by comparing the similar receipts on Michigan and Oslo ostraca which have the same provenance and the same relative date. Deliveries are there stated either in terms of donkey loads or of sacks.³⁰ Clearly, then, Wilcken saw *σακ..! ε!* and Viereck *σακκοφ(όρου)* where *σάκκοι ε!* would be pertinent.³¹

Another minor but necessary improvement of Wilcken's text is effected by changing *θη(σαυρῶ)* in line 1 to *θη(σαυροῦ)*. The transportation receipts published by Amundsen and others attest the use of *θησαυροῦ*, *ἐν θησαυρῶ*, *ἀπὸ θησαυροῦ*, but not *θησαυρῶ*.³²

6. *Ostr. Mich.* 1.299

The editor of this ostrakon has tentatively assigned it on the strength of the handwriting to the first century B.C., and

²⁹ Apart from this ostrakon, no text earlier than the 4th century is cited for *Ἀσῆπ* or *Ἀσῆφ* by Preisigke, *Namenbuch* and *Sammelbuch* (Vol. 5). [Since these lines were written, the Berlin papyrus collection has been recovered and ought soon to be available for consultation.]

³⁰ *Ostr. Oslo.* pp. 49 f.; *Ostr. Mich.* 1.401-4.

³¹ The absence of a verb is usual in transportation receipts. See *Ostr. Oslo.*, pp. 53 f.

³² *Ostr. Oslo.*, p. 41; *Ostr. Mich.* 1.456, 541; 2.929; 3.1081. On the restricted use of the dative without preposition in a locative function, see Mayser, *Grammatik* 2, pt. 2, 147.34; 295.26; cf. A. Debrunner, *Geschichte d. griech. Sprache* 2 (= *Sammlung Gösschen* 114, 1954) §183a.

since it refers to Pauni 24 of the 21st year, he further ventures to narrow this period to the reign of Augustus and suggests that the text was written on June 18, 9 B.C. The editor states that "the reading of the ostracon is rather uncertain," and he has assigned it to a section labelled *Uncertain* which he has placed after lists and receipts concerned with *Work on the Embankments*. This group of ostraca consists of Nos. 295–328, and many of these have already been shown to be in fact receipts for labor performed on the embankments, while others have been identified as receipts for money payments.³³

The published text, however, of No. 299 does not reveal its purpose. The name of the tax is obscured by abbreviations, but since these nevertheless provide the only clue, the text is repeated here.

(ἐτους) κα' Ἀρνώ(της) Πετερό(ῖτος ?) λ ζ
Παῦ(νι) κδ /

The editor proposes λo(ιπά) as a possible resolution of the first abbreviation, but makes no comment on the second. The latter consists on the ostracon of *zeta* with a broad, shallow, concave arc directly above it. The arc has almost exactly the same position and form as the *upsilon* in line 2, which is placed directly above *alpha*. The same abbreviations occur in the same form and the same order in *Ostr. Mich.* 2.745.³⁴ Both texts accordingly have λo() ζv(), and the proper resolution of these abbreviations is suggested by *Ostr. Mich.* 3.987, which is a fragmentary receipt for λόγο (=λόγω) ζvτη(ρᾶς).³⁵ With this phrase as a model, we may adopt λό(γω) ζv(τηρᾶς) as an adequate expansion of the abbreviations in 299 and 745.³⁶

Comparison of Nos. 299 and 745 reveals that they have the same basic structure. Both receipts have the same elements in

³³ *TAPA* 71 (1940) 630–3, 642–5; 72 (1941) 441 f., 445–7; *CP* 37 (1942) 144 f.; 39 (1944) 28–30; *Berytus* 8.ii (1944) 87 f.

³⁴ The published text has λό(γω) ζ(vτ), but see the note *ad. loc.*

³⁵ The published text has λόγο(v) where the ostracon has λογο with no mark of abbreviation. Writers of ostracon texts are indeed very fond of unmarked abbreviations, but in the present instance λόγω is a neater interpretation of λογο than λόγω(v).

³⁶ On the incidence and rate of the beer tax see C. Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels 1939) 157 f.; S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938) 187 f.; *Ostr. Oslo.* 12, comm.; *POslo.* 29, comm.; *POxy.* 12.1433.52, note.

the same order, with one exception. No. 745 consists of the date by the regnal year of an unnamed emperor, the name of the contributor, the designation of the tax, the month and day, the amount. No. 299 as published has all these except the amount of the tax at the end; it concludes with month and day. This omission would of itself raise no question since the amount of a payment is often omitted when the tax is paid in full. Nevertheless, one small detail is unusual. The numeral $\kappa\delta$, which dates the receipt to the 24th of the month, has a horizontal line above it and an oblique line to the right of it. One or the other is customary, but not both at once.

This exceptional collocation of lines above and to the right of the numeral has come about because the characteristically angular *ductus literarum* lends itself to editorial confusion of *delta* and *sigma*. Almost precisely the same form of *sigma* may be seen in Schubart, *PGrBerol.* 15b.9 (39 A.D.). When allowance is made for this peculiarity, the writing on the ostrakon resolves itself into $\Pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}(\nu) \kappa \sigma\mu$, which corresponds perfectly in form to $\text{Ἐπεὶ} \phi \bar{\epsilon} \phi$ on No. 745. The amounts of these payments—240 and 500, may be at once compared with similarly large amounts in contemporary receipts on Michigan ostraca for *epistatikon*, *sitōnion*, *syntaxis*, and the bath tax, and contrasted with the relatively small amounts in other receipts for the same taxes.³⁷ They fit a pattern of large amounts expressed in copper drachmas and smaller ones in silver drachmas. This mixture of coinage points to the reign of Augustus as the approximate date of all the receipts in question,³⁸ and the only texts in these groups with complete dates were in fact written in his reign: 120 (3 B.C.), 998 (1 B.C.), 750 (1 A.D.), 986 (10 A.D.).³⁹ To this extent at least Amundsen's attribution of No. 299 to the year 9 B.C. is sustained.

³⁷ *Ostr. Mich.* 1.120–5, cf. 116, 295, 296, 298, 300–2, 309; 2.709–751, cf. 754–69; 3.979–86, cf. 994–1000. A number of the texts cited from *Ostr. Mich.* 1 have been revised and discussed in *TAPA* 71 (1940) 643–5 and *Berytus* 8.ii (1944) 87 f.

³⁸ See West and Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (Princeton 1944) 17; cf. *TAPA* 71 (1940) 642, note 69; *Berytus* 8.ii (1944) 88, note 29; *Ostr. Mich.* 2.763, note.

³⁹ Nos. 743, 979, and 981 were written by a single hand. For the possibility that 743 belongs to the last year of Cleopatra (30 B.C.) and 981 to the 1st year of Augustus (29 B.C.), see 981.1, note. The hand of 763, which is dated to a 28th yr., recalls *PRyl.* 2.73 (Pl.3=Schubart, *Palaeographie*, Abb. 22), which was written in 33–30 B.C., but the 28th yr. is not appropriate to the reign of Cleopatra although it fits easily into the longer reign of Augustus.

7. PSI 14.1404

This papyrus bears a letter written in the second year of Claudius, probably in the summer of 42 A.D. after the harvest, when the Nile boats were kept busy transporting tax grains from the *chora* to Alexandria.⁴⁰ The letter contains an urgent message from Apollonius to his son Macron.⁴¹ After acknowledging receipt of a quantity of olives (3–4),⁴² Apollonius complains that he is unable to send Macron his monthly rations because there is no reliable person to whom to entrust them (5–8). This statement is later supplemented with the information that Ammonius had not been willing to accept the rations for shipment because he was on his way to pick up a cargo (17–21). But Apollonius has also another reason for his delay, and this he adds in lines 9–10:

διὰ τὰ πράγμα[τα]
ἃ μ' ἐμλάμβαν[ε]ν

The editor has faithfully reported the doubtful quality of *mu* and final *nu*, and in his note to 10 he corrects the line to ἃ μ' ἐλάμβανεν. By thus eliminating a letter doubtfully read, he poses for us an engaging problem in method. Is it permissible to correct a reading by excising a letter about which doubt is entertained in the first place? Is it not possible that a quite different but acceptable text might result if the doubtful letter could be given another interpretation?

It is easy enough to see on a photograph of this papyrus why the editor was tempted by *mu*, but a line in which a few firmly articulated strokes of the pen have been hesitantly identified with *mu*, then cancelled in order to give sense to the line, ought perhaps to be re-examined on the chance that the scribe intended some other letter, or since the editor's reading is *mu*, even two

⁴⁰ Line 21 has a reference to *embolê*, presumably the lading of a Nile boat engaged in transporting tax grains. See Preisigke, *Fachwörter* s.v.

⁴¹ Editor: "νὸς potrebbe essere, come spesso, un semplice titolo affettivo." There can be little doubt that the relationship is real. Apollonius writes of sending *epiménia*, and this is characteristically a father's concern. See *PMich.* 8.473.21, note.

⁴² ἐλαίας (δραχμῶν) μ: ε.ias (δραχμὰς) μ ed. My own reading has been obtained from a photograph which Professor Bartoletti had the great kindness to send me. I take this occasion to report his observation (letter of March 31, 1958) that the second syllable of ἐλθεῖν is written not at the end of line 16, but at the beginning of line 17.

other letters.^{42a} For this purpose, a skeleton transcription of the line may be serviceable. Reduced to α $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nu$ [], the text excludes all doubtful and restored letters, retaining only the elements which are secure. Isolated in this way from dubious additions, the sequence of the letters of course immediately suggests α $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$. This verb may even be felt to be especially appropriate because Apollonius reveals in lines 11–12 that the affairs which engage his attention are “public,”⁴³ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ is standard usage for assuming the responsibilities of a liturgical post.⁴⁴

Now, if we attempt to apply this conjecture to the papyrus, we have no trouble in recognizing that $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ - is a perfect reading of what is written on the papyrus. The letter *tau* has suffered a slight distortion of a kind which has become familiar from other papyri.⁴⁵ In his desire to continue from *tau* into *alpha* without raising his pen, the scribe has converted what would normally have been a horizontal line into an oblique stroke with a downward inclination to the right.⁴⁶ And the same cursive tendency has led him to proceed from *tau* to *alpha* without forming the closed loop which is generally associated with *alpha* at this period. The result is in fact a skilful piece of rapid writing, but it does look superficially like *mu*.

The end of the word is almost totally obscured by an abraded surface and faded ink. We have a choice between the active and the middle forms of the verb, i.e. between $-\nu\omega$ and $-\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. The latter appears to me to be too long for the available space, but $-\nu\omega$ would cover very nicely the editor's $-\nu[\epsilon]p$, not only for space but in a palaeographic sense as well. I conclude therefore that lines 9–10 have the following text:

διὰ τὰ πρᾶγμα[τα]
 α $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$.

^{42a} Cf. Youtie, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri: Prolegomena* (Bulletin Supplement No. 6, Institute of Classical Studies [London 1958]) 52 f.

⁴³ π[λ]ήρης δὲ (sc. ὧν) ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις. Bartoletti has reread the entire text and confirmed ἐν τοῖς. The photograph has no clear writing between ϵ and ι s, and my efforts to discriminate between traces of ink and the darkened surface of the papyrus have not been successful.

⁴⁴ Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch* s.v. 3.b; cf. LSJ, s.v. II.1.

⁴⁵ Cf. Youtie and Bonner, *TAPA* 84 (1953) 61, note 8.

⁴⁶ The scribe has treated *tau* similarly in line 6, where he joins it to *omicron*.

8. PSI 14.1407

This text is a receipt issued in 181 A.D. by the sitologi of Talei for two payments of catoecic and other dues. Both payments were made by Protarche, but not on her own behalf. They are credited to other accounts.

5-6 εἰς Χαίρημων⁴⁷ Πετριθέωνος διὰ Πρωτάρχης

8-9 Θεογ^ο α^ο διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς

The first payment, accordingly, was applied to a tax obligation due from Chaeremon. For the second the editor proposes conjecturally Θεογ() ὁ ἀ(δελφός), hence a payment made in the name of Theog(), brother of Chaeremon. In this there is nothing intrinsically impossible, but other considerations make it unlikely.

If Theog() were truly a personal name, we should still owe a moment's thought to what might appear to be only a mild coincidence. There was a village named Theogonis not far from the village of Talei. Both were in the southern or Polemon division of the Arsinoite nome, in the neighborhood of Tebtunis.⁴⁸ They are sometimes found closely associated in papyri,⁴⁹ and they shared a *grapheion* or record office in the first century.⁵⁰ Theogonis was a very small place, so small that it lacked its own *komo-grammateus* or village secretary in the latter half of the second and the early third century. In 170/171 it shared the services of a secretary with Ibion Eicosipentaruron, in 201/202 with Cerceusiris.⁵¹ It would not be surprising therefore if the land taxes of Theogonis were collected by the sitologi of Talei in 181 A.D. In any case, there is nothing exceptional about a receipt which combines payments on lands situated in more than one village. *PMich.* 6.395 is such a receipt; it was issued by the sitologi of Caranis for catoecic dues on land in the neighboring villages of Cercesucha and Psenarpsenesis. The tax list in *PMich.* 6.374 represents a man as paying "public" dues on land in Ptolemais Nea (ii.7) and Cercesucha (ii.8).

If line 8 of the Florentine papyrus has Θεογ(οῖδος) rather

⁴⁷ Read Χαίρημωνα. The nominative is nevertheless frequent after εἰς in tax receipts.

⁴⁸ *PTebt.* 2, pp. 379, 402 f.; cf. *PTebt.* 1.17.5, note.

⁴⁹ *PTebt.* 1.74.39; 75.58; 151; *PMich.* 5.311.3,9; 312.4,6; 321.9,11.

⁵⁰ *PMich.* 5.287.2.

⁵¹ *BGU* 1.91.3-4; 2.484.1 (cf. *Berichtigungsliste* 1.48).

than a personal name, then $\delta \acute{\alpha}$ (δελφός) without a personal name loses its cogency. A different explanation is suggested by the phrase τοῦ α(ὕτοῦ) ἔτους in line 5, where the same abbreviation is employed. We need only read $\delta \alpha$ (ὕτός) in line 8 to have a perfectly comprehensible situation: Protarche has paid the taxes on parcels of land belonging to Chaeremon both in Talei and in Theogonis. The same use is made of $\delta \alphaὐτός$, sometimes written with the same abbreviation, in other receipts as well as in tax registers, e.g. *PMich.* 6.374.ii.8; 385.16; 398.14.

The foregoing discussion is sufficient, I believe, to establish Θεογ(ονίδος) $\delta \alpha$ (ὕτός)⁵² as the correct expansion of Θεογ⁻ο α⁻.

9. PSI 14.1419

This papyrus has a letter written sometime in the third century A.D. by Aurelius Suchammon to his father Thonis. The early part of the letter is badly damaged, and since its understanding depends in some measure on the later lines, I reproduce the text in full.⁵³

- [Αὐρήλ]ιος Σουχάμμων Αὐρηλίω Θώνει τῷ πα[τρὶ πλείσ]τα χαίρειν.
 [καλῶ]ς ποιήσεις ἀγοράσας μοι δύο κεράμια μ[.....]ν καὶ σφυ-
 [.....]στ[.]ω[ν]. ἔὰν ρ[ὕ]ν ἔλθῃ πρὸς σέ "Αλφειος .[.....]αι παρ' αὐτοῦ
 [....] τιμὴν αὐτοῦ[υ]. καὶ σὺ δὲ ὠνε[....].εἰα [κ]εχυμένα δέκα
 5 [καὶ σο]ι δ[ιὰ] σπουδ[ῆς] ἐπιπέμψω ἥτοι κανίσκια ἥτοι παιδικὰ σα..[
 ἥτο]ι· ἄλλα τινά. ἀσπάζομαι τὰ παιδιά σου καὶ τοῦ[ς] οὖς πάντας.
 [ἐὰν] οὖν μέλλῃς τὰ μοσχίδια⁵⁴ ἀγοράσαι, πρόσελθε Πετσειρ[ε]ι⁵⁵
 [τῷ] ἀδελφῷ Νεικά⁵⁶ ἐξ ὀνόματός μου καὶ καλὰ σοι δώσει
 [παρ'] ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐπιξενούμενος καὶ ἐντετελέμην αὐτ[ῷ]
 10 [πε]ρὶ τούτων. ἐρρώσθαι σε εὖχ(ομαι).

Lines 2–5 are perhaps not so hopeless as they look.⁵⁷ An

⁵² *Sc.* μεμέτρηκεν, from μεμετρή(μεθα) in line 4. But the somewhat vague structure of receipts is of more concern to us than it was to the ancients, who were more interested in assembling all the proper elements of a receipt than in giving them a technically correct syntactic relation. Cf. footnote 47.

⁵³ I exclude the broken line of writing inserted by a second hand into the lower margin. It would be easy to restore as an address: π(ατὴρ) Αὐρήλίου Σουχάμμ[ων]ος ἀπόδος Θώνει πατρί, but its position on the recto is embarrassing. While the papyrus may, by exception, have been folded so that this portion of the recto was exposed, the editor notes possible traces of an address on the verso, where of course it properly belongs.

⁵⁴ Read μοσχίδια.

⁵⁵ Read Πετσειρ. This name is more commonly *Petosiris* or *Petsiris*.

⁵⁶ Read Νικά.

⁵⁷ Editor: "Le precarie condizioni del papiro in questi righe non consentono neppure una ricostruzione ipotetica."

exchange of letters with Vittorio Bartoletti has done much to clarify the problems that they present. In the course of our consultation, he not only was kind enough to send me a photograph of the papyrus but also generously made a painstaking review of my suggestions.

It is line 7 which supplies the clue for the mutilated genitive in line 2. After a brief interruption in line 6 for salutations to "your children and all your family," Suchammon returns in line 7 to the primary concern of the letter. He has already asked Thonis to make certain purchases, including two jars of $\mu[\dots]\nu$. Now he turns to specific instructions about the purchase of $\mu\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$. If in consequence we venture to restore $\mu[\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\omega]\nu$ ⁵⁸ in line 2, we shall find ourselves enabled also to understand the beginning of line 3.

PCairZen. 2.59176.168 records the purchase of $\delta\sigma\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\upsilon$ $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. This association of fruit stones with young shoots justifies the reconstruction of lines 1-2 as $\delta\upsilon\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\alpha\ \mu[\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\omega]\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\phi\upsilon[\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\delta]\sigma\tau[\acute{\epsilon}]\omega[\nu]$, "two jars of shoots and a basket of stones." *PMich. Inv.* 3630 is another private letter which also mentions fruit stones as well as several kinds of fruit,⁶⁰ and *Ostr. Tait* 1, p. 172, No. 140 is a customs receipt for a donkey load of fruit stones and dates.⁶¹

In the light of the information gained thus far, the sentence which runs from line 3 into line 4 presents no real difficulty. Having asked his father to buy certain things for him, Suchammon now tells him how to lay hands on the money needed to pay for them; he is to get it from Alpheus, to whom doubtless Suchammon has entrusted it to take to his father. Hence, these lines may be restored as follows:

$\xi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \rho[\delta]\nu\ \xi\lambda\theta\eta\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\ \textit{Ἀλφειος}\ \kappa[\acute{o}\mu\iota\sigma]\alpha\iota^{62}\ \pi\alpha\rho'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\rho\eta$
 $[\tau\eta\nu]\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega[\nu].^{63}$

⁵⁸ Possibly $\mu[\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\iota}\omega]\nu$, which fits exactly the editor's measurement of the space. See footnote 54.

⁵⁹ Hellenistic dim. of $\sigma\phi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma = \sigma\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$; cf. Palmer, *Grammar*, 85, 91.

⁶⁰ *AJP* 65 (1944) 252 f.; see esp. 252, note 6.

⁶¹ Editor: " $\delta\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}$ is curious, but nothing else seems possible."

⁶² The papyrus may have had $\kappa\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, as it has $\mu\sigma\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$ in line 7. This would accord with the space indicated in the edition.

⁶³ The edition has $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\rho[\delta]$, and *omicron* is certainly a possible interpretation of the broken letter before the lacuna; but *omega* is also possible, and the plural pronoun is required by line 2.

The next sentence begins with *καὶ σὺ δέ*, and this is closely followed by the letter groups *ωνε*, *εια*, *εχ*, and *εναδε*. All of these elements can be explained from other examples of private correspondence. Three will suffice.

PMich. 8.483.5: *καὶ σὺ δ[ε] περ[ι] ὧν ἐὰν χρειάν ἔχῃς γράφε μοι.*

PMich. 3.206.18–20: *ἐρωτηθῆς δὲ ἴ τινός σοι χρία⁶⁴ ἐ[στὶ]ν ἐνθάδε, δήλωσόν μοι καὶ εὐθέως διαπέμψω.*

PCornell 49.8–9 (cf. *Berichtigungsliste* 2.ii.50): *περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐὰν χρήσῃς⁶⁵ τῶν ἐνθάδε, κτλ.*

The phrase *ὧν ἐὰν χρειάν ἔχῃς*, with appropriate variations of course, is standard usage in the private letters,⁶⁶ and the rôle of *ἐνθάδε* is obvious.⁶⁷ We may therefore use them to complete line 4 of the Florentine papyrus without transcending the limits of conventional expression:

καὶ σὺ δὲ ὧν ἐ[ὰν χ]ρεία[ν] ἔχῃς ἐν<θ>άδε.

I have retained dots under letters where they are used in the edition, but these letters are not doubtful, they are simply letters of which the damage suffered by the papyrus has left only small remnants. And although it may seem rash at first sight to entertain a correction within lines so largely restored, the validity of the correction is guaranteed by the parallel passages cited above.

This reconstruction leaves two letters at the end of the line unexplained. Since we are under the necessity of accounting for *κα*, we are compelled to reject the supplement introduced by the edition at the beginning of line 5. In its place I propose to allow *κα* to be completed in the following manner:

κά- | [γώ σο]ι⁶⁸ δ[ιὰ] σπουδ[ῆς] ἐ[πι]πέμψω.

⁶⁴ Read *ἐρωτηθῆς δὲ εἴ τινός σοι χρία*.

⁶⁵ Read *χρήσῃς*.

⁶⁶ Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids 1949), s.v. *χρεία*; H. Koskenniemi, *Stud. z. Idee u. Phraseologie d. griech. Briefes* (*Ann. Acad. Scient. Fenn.* B.102.2) 68; H. A. Steen, *Clichés épistolaires dans les lettres sur papyrus grecque* (*Class. et Med.* 1, 1938) 129 f.; S. G. Kapsomenos, *Ἐρευναι εἰς τὴν γλῶσσαν τῶν ἐλληνικῶν παπύρων* ('*Ἀριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς* 7, 1957) 365 f.

⁶⁷ For a closely similar use of *ἐντεῦθεν* see Koskenniemi (above, note 66) 72; of *ἐνταῦθα*, *ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ*, *παρ' ἐμοί* (*ἡμῖν*, *ἡμῶν*), Steen (above, note 66) 129 f.

⁶⁸ Or possibly *κά[τω σο]ι*. *Iota* can no longer be read on the papyrus, but it is guaranteed by Bartoletti (letter of Mar. 5, 1958): "Vedo che il papiro ha sofferto qualche piccolo danno in confronto à quando io ne feci la prima trascrizione: all'inizio del r. 5 si leggeva allora]ϛ[, ora si legge soltanto]δ[."

In the context so established, the pronoun in line 4—σύ—is proleptic and emphatic, and καὶ γὰρ includes intensive καί: “And on your side, whatever you need from here, I for my part will send on to you immediately.”⁶⁹ Suchammon offers an exchange of favors: his father will buy two jars of shoots and a basket of fruit stones and, by implication, send them on to Suchammon, possibly by Alpheus; in return Suchammon is prepared to send whatever his father may designate as meeting his own needs.

Only the word at the end of line 5 has resisted all our efforts to identify it. An obvious suggestion is σαυδ[άλια, but it has no value. Bartoletti could not see it on the papyrus and I cannot see it on the photograph. A possible but not entirely convincing interpretation of the faded writing is σαλω[, and this also leads no further.

It may serve the convenience of the reader to have the preceding discussion summarized in the form of a corrected text of lines 2–6.

[καλω]ς ποιήσεις ἀγοράσας μοι δύο κεράμια μ[οσχειδίω]ν καὶ σφύ-
[ρίον ὁ]στ[έ]ω[ν]. ἐὰν ρ[ὸ]ν ἔλθῃ πρὸς σέ "Αλφειος κ[όμισ]αι παρ' αὐτοῦ
[τὴν] τιμὴν αὐτῶ[ν]. καὶ σὺ δὲ ὦν ἐ[ὰν χ]ρεία[ν] ἔχῃς ἐν<θ>άδε⁶⁹ κα-
5 [γὰρ σο]ι δ[ιὰ] σπουδ[ῆς] ἐπιπέμψω ἥτοι κανίσκια ἥτοι παιδικὰ σα..[
[ῆτο]ι ἄλλα τινά.

Translation: “Be so good as to buy for me two jars of shoots and a basket of pits. Accordingly, if Alpheus comes to you, get the cost of them from him. And what you for your part have need of from here, I in turn will send on to you without delay, whether baskets or children’s . . . or anything else.”

10. *PMerton* 23

This text is a letter in which a certain Parais instructs his business partner Dionysius to give five hundred drachmas to a woman named Taphorsois, who will deliver the letter. The money is presumably a loan made on the security of two aruras of land with interest at the very high rate of 48 per cent for one year. Dionysius is told to draw up the instrument appropriate

⁶⁹ It is of course possible that the scribe’s inattention not only reduced ἐνθάδε to εἰς but also obliterated γράφε μοι, which would have made a smooth and easy sentence. It is precisely this combination that is suggested by the examples given in Steen (above, note 66) 129 f.

to the transaction either in his own name or in the name of Parais (7-9):

καὶ ἐὰν θέλῃς εἰς ὄνομ[ά μ]ον τὸν χρηματισμὸν ποιῆσαι ποιή<σ>ον,
ἢ εἰ ἐθέλεις εἰς ὄνομά σου ἀδιάφορον.

Editors' translation: "and if you wish to make out the instrument in my name do so, or if you wish to make it in your name it makes no difference."

The concurrent use of ἐὰν θέλῃς and εἰ ἐθέλεις in this text is noticeable but not basically disturbing. The traditional distinction of ἐὰν and εἰ was seriously weakened in the *koinê*, even to the extent that ἐὰν was sometimes followed by the indicative and εἰ by the subjunctive.⁷⁰ Although the Merton papyrus retains the conventional association of the subjunctive with ἐὰν and the indicative with εἰ, the clauses have the same structural rôle in the sentence, and there is no difference of meaning.⁷¹ More striking is the shift from a form of θέλω to a form of ἐθέλω. These verbs were not of equal weight in the *koinê*. The predominant present was θέλω, with ἐθέλω a relatively weak competitor. The latter is entirely absent from the Septuagint and the New Testament.⁷² For papyri of the Ptolemaic period, Mayser's count showed not a single example of ἐθέλω in documents and only one instance in literary texts.⁷³

This does not mean that ἐθέλω was totally lost to Hellenistic Greek or that late papyri have no trace of it.⁷⁴ But since the Merton text admits ἢ εἰ only as a doubtful reading, it may be worthwhile to see what can be done by assuming that the papyrus has ...ε θέλεις rather than ἢ εἰ ἐθέλεις. To divide the words in this way is of course tantamount to suggesting εἰ δὲ θέλεις, and this proposal can be tested on the very fine photograph reproduced on Plate 25, which faces the printed text. Immediately before *epsilon* there are four minute points of ink. It is these points that the editors not unreasonably extended into *epsilon*, but they are so placed as to facilitate also the reconstruction of a

⁷⁰ Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, s.vv. ἐὰν and εἰ; Mayser, *Grammatik* 2, pt. 1, 284 f., 288; L. Radermacher, *NTGrammatik*² (Tübingen 1925) 198 f.

⁷¹ Cf. F.-M. Abel, *Grammaire du grec biblique* (Paris 1927) 289, rem. iv.

⁷² Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, s.v. θέλω. For a brief summary of usage see *LSJ*, s.v. ἐθέλω.

⁷³ Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, pt. 2², 119.

⁷⁴ Cf. W. Crönert, *Memoria graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig 1903) 131 f. A good example in a papyrus letter is *PWarren* 20.4: ἐὰν ἐθέλῃς.

triangular *delta* such as may be seen in another δέ in line 11. More remnants stand farther to the left on the papyrus, only slightly removed from a long vertical tear which interrupts the physical continuity of lines 3–11. It is easy to see why the editors assimilated them to *eta*, but it is precisely the same characteristic placement of a horizontal line at right angles to a vertical line which makes the remnants equally available for *epsilon*, as this combination is written in lines 2 and 7.

Now, in a *koiné* text which bears the vulgar stamp so unmistakably as *PMerton* 23, we are bound to prefer *θέλεις* to *ἐθέλεις* when a choice must be made of two doubtful readings, both of which conform to the palaeographic indications.⁷⁵ The thoroughly popular quality of the language used in the Merton papyrus is easily demonstrated. The body of the letter begins in line 3 with a rather lengthy *nominativus pendens*, and this is resumed by a dative pronoun in line 5.⁷⁶ Within the same sentence the writer shows the characteristic *koiné* preference for a diminutive: *ἐπιστόλιον* (5).⁷⁷ In the next sentence he shifts from *ἐάν* c. subj. (7) to *εἰ* c. ind. (8–9) with no difference of meaning.⁷⁸ He prefers the colorless *ποιῆσαι* (8) to a verb of more specialized meaning like *συγγράφαι* or *συνθέσθαι*.⁷⁹ He uses *τέσσαρες* (11) for *τέσσαρας*.⁸⁰

We may, therefore, confidently substitute *εἰ δὲ θέλεις* for *ἦ εἰ ἐθέλεις* in *PMerton* 23.

11. *PRyl.* 4.653

This papyrus preserves in two columns the minutes of a hearing held at Arsinoë by Quintus Iper, *praeses* of Aegyptus

⁷⁵ For an exactly similar situation, where again the requirements of *koiné* idiom dictate the choice of a reading, see *Eos* 48.i (1956) 373–5.

⁷⁶ H. Ljungvik, *Studien z. Sprache d. apokryphen AG* (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* 1926. Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och historiska Vetenskaper, 8) 19; idem, *Beitr. z. Syntax d. spätgriech. Volkssprache* (*Skrifter Uppsala* 27.3 [1932]) 8; L. Rademacher, *NTGrammatik*² (Tübingen 1925) 219; Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik d. NTGriechisch*⁷ (Göttingen 1943) Anhang, 77.

⁷⁷ Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, pt. 3², 38–45; Palmer, *Grammar*, 84–91; cf. D. C. Swanson, *Journ. Bib. Lit.* 77 (1958) 134–51.

⁷⁸ Cf. footnote 71.

⁷⁹ D. Tabachovitz, *Études sur le grec de la basse époque* (*Skrifter Uppsala* 36.3 [1943]) 52 ff.

⁸⁰ Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, pt. 1, 59; 1, pt. 2², 74; Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik d. NTGriechisch* 23.

Herculia, early in June, 320 A.D.,⁸¹ on complaints submitted by Arion and two fellow villagers from Theadelphia. Their first complaint is directed against the people of Andromachis, who have deprived Theadelphia of its water supply. Since "a little more than a third of column i is missing," and the beginning of each line now lacks 32 to 40 letters, no serious attempt at restoration is possible. Nevertheless, the general drift can be discerned. After the protocol in line 1, the plaintiffs' advocate, probably Leontius,⁸² states their case. In lines 2-6 he shows what efforts they have made to guarantee an adequate flow of water to their fields; in 6-11, what steps the inhabitants of Andromachis have taken to block the mouth of a channel leading to Theadelphia so that they alone may benefit from the inundation. The decision of the *praeses* is given in 12-14 in the original Latin, and this is repeated in Greek in Col. ii. 22-24.

Col. i.14-ii.18 presents a second complaint, this time against persons described in the edition as οἱ περιμένον<τες> καὶ οἱ τούτου ἀδελφοὶ ὑπερκαθήμενοι ἡμῖν. In the editors' translation, they appear as "these survivors and their brothers who keep a watch on us." The participle περιμένον<τες> is thus taken in a sense which it has nowhere else, and the pronoun τούτου is tacitly changed to τούτων because it would otherwise have no antecedent.⁸³ But the plural pronoun is an accommodation to the correction in περιμένον<τες>; and if the correction is removed, the text which remains is οἱ περιμενον, or rather, if we follow more closely the indications of the photograph (Pl.5 = A. Bataille, *Traité d'études byzantines*, fasc. 2: *Les papyrus* [Paris 1955] Pl.2), οἱ περιμανον.

What the scribe has written falls easily into a well known pattern,⁸⁴ of which a few examples will suffice.

PAmh. 2.66.34: τοῖς [π]ερὶ Σαταβοῦν, "Satabus and his associates," i.e. the four persons named in lines 31-33.

⁸¹ The consular date in line 1 should read [*d(ominis) n(ostris) Constantino Aug(usto) VI et Constantino no(b)ilissimo*] *Caes(are) I co(n)s(ulibus)*. Quintus Iper succeeded Valerius Ziper as *praeses* at least by June, 320 A.D. (cf. N. Lewis, *Journ. of Juristic Papyrol.* 2 [1948] 60, note 1). He was still *praeses* in Dec., 321 (*PThead.* 13; cf. *Princeton Papyrus Roll*, pp. 32 ff.).

⁸² His name is attached to the speech recorded in 14-18. Cf. the editors' note to 14.

⁸³ Cf. the editors' note: "The reference in this line is obscure."

⁸⁴ Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch s.v. περί* (288.31); cf. Mayser, *Grammatik* 2, pt. 1, 18 f.

BGU 1.19.17: οἱ περὶ τὸν Πετεσ[ο]ῦχον, i.e. Petesuchus and Dionysius (cf. line 4).

PFamTebt. 15.44: πατήρ τῶν περὶ Ἡλιόδωρον, i.e. the father of Heliodorus and Heraclides (cf. line 42).

These passages show clearly enough that the Rylands papyrus uses the same idiom:

οἱ περὶ Μάνον⁸⁵ καὶ οἱ τούτου ἀδελφοὶ ὑπερκαθήμενοι ἡμῖν.

This can be rendered adequately as "Manus and his associates, as well as his brothers, who are situated above us (on the canal)."

It is of course possible that οἱ περὶ Μάνον is a periphrasis for Μάνος. This usage also has a parallel in *PCairoBoak* 14 (= *Sam-melbuch* 5.7675),⁸⁶ in which two persons apply for a lease of land at Caranis. They are described in lines 3–5 as "Aurelius Capito, son of Heliodorus, of the quarter of the Camp of Apollonius (at Arsinoë), and Aurelius Ptolemaeus, son of Ptollarion, from the village of Caranis." Apart from Capito and Ptolemaeus, no other applicants are mentioned, and they alone append their signatures to the document. Nevertheless, they are referred to in line 12 as τοῦς περὶ Καπίτωνα καὶ Πτολεμαῖον.⁸⁷ This expression may therefore be nothing more than an elaborate way of saying "Capito and Ptolemaeus."

However that may be, the pronoun τούτου now has its antecedent in Μάνον, and it is Manus and his brothers who are being charged in this second plea with obstructing the channel on which Theadelphia depends for its water. Quintus Iper's decision is given first in its Latin form (19–21), then in a Greek version (25–7).⁸⁸

⁸⁵ *Manos* is a rare name, but the reading is certain. The only historical personage of this name was the bishop of Hemeria in the late 5th century (Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* 14.1231 [Ensslin]). Pape, *Griech. Eigennamen*³ (Benseler) makes it a variant of the better known *Manēs*. [See now *P. Dura* 28.27 for *Mannos*.]

⁸⁶ This text will be presented shortly in a new edition (*PCairIsidor.* 103).

⁸⁷ . . . Καπίτωνα καὶ Πτολεμαῖον *ed. pr.*

⁸⁸ A careful examination of P1. 5 justifies a number of other corrections, which I list here under line numbers:

4. τά: τε *ed.* παλαιὰ Ἀλύπιος: παλαιὰν πρὸς *ed.* For Alypius as a colleague of Arion (cf. line 2) see *PThead.* 48.8.

6. ἀλλ' οἱ: the article is written on the line, not above it as the editors have supposed.

8. [ο]ὐκ ἔωσιν: κέωσιν *ed.* The same expression is used again in line 15. εἰσρέειν: for εἰσρέειν or εἰσερεῖν; εἰς ῥίθρον *ed.* ἔτι: τε: εὐλαβ- *ed.*

12. *PRyl.* 4.654

This text is an excerpt from the minutes of Maximianus, *iuridicus Aegypti*. It presents an episode, perhaps the final episode, in what must have been a protracted effort by the masons of Oxyrhynchus, sometime in the first half of the fourth century, to appropriate the services of a young man who was already apprenticed to a linen weaver. The Rylands papyrus suggests that the masons were prepared to resort to violence, even to kidnapping, if they could by this means obtain a new recruit. Their desperation underlines the increasing lack of manpower in Egypt and the empire. Plagues, domestic and foreign wars, inflation, neglect of irrigation works, high taxation, not to mention religious persecution, had combined to reduce by death or flight the number of agricultural workers and artisans available at a time when they were very badly needed to implement the program of imperial reform initiated by Diocletian.⁸⁹ The requisitions imposed by the State on guilds in this period of economic confusion were particularly heavy in proportion to their contracting membership rolls, and they were doubtless driven more than once to adopt questionable measures in the attempt to meet their quotas.

In the Rylands papyrus, the advocate Apolinarius presents a plea to Maximianus on behalf of Paulus, the young man who is the object of contention between the weavers and the masons. Although he is only an apprentice, he is said to be a competent weaver. Nevertheless, the masons are making every effort to detach him from his present occupation in order to place him as an apprentice in their own craft. Maximianus, in formulating his decision, implies no criticism of the action taken by the masons, and he grants the protection sought by Paulus only on condition that he be shown to be an experienced weaver. This judgment

10. *στόμιον*: *στομαίον* ed. This hand does not necessarily distinguish between *μι* (cf. 6) and *μαι* (cf. 9).

10–11. *τὴν ἀνα[κάθαρσιν αὐτοῦ ποιήσασθαι: τὴν ἀνα[* ed. Cf. 13 *repurgare*, 23 *ἀνακαθάραι*.

16. *ἐπεὶ τοίνυν* < > *προσῆκει κτλ.: ἐπεὶ τοίνυν προσῆκει κτλ.* ed. The sentence has a most awkward construction unless it is assumed that the scribe inadvertently dropped the subordinate clause.

⁸⁹ Compare the causes of the decline in the Occident discussed by A. E. R. Boak, *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West* (Ann Arbor 1955), Chap. 5.

implies that all economic arrangements based on private contract must yield before the needs of the State. It appears that if Paulus had been still a beginner and not yet a producer, the court could have disregarded his contractual relation to his master to the extent of weighing the value to the State of another weaver as against another mason. Every case of this kind has the State as a tacit party.

This text has profited from a discussion of its problems by Friedrich Zucker in *Studi Calderini-Paribeni* 2 (1957) 339-43. Zucker has for the first time put the interpretation of lines 3-4 on a sound footing, and he has urged convincingly that the real parties to the dispute aired before Maximianus were not weavers and masons acting as individuals, but rather the guilds of which they were members. The case reflects their basic concern with the relation of a guild to its apprentices, and the decision rendered by the *iuridicus* delimits the scope of their authority.

The Librarian of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, has been kind enough to send me a photograph of the papyrus, and Professor B. R. Rees has established for me the correct reading of line 12. His meticulous examination of the papyrus, which I have been able to control through the photograph, has resulted in a much improved text of lines 8-14. Since their intelligence depends on the context in which they are imbedded, I reproduce the entire text, apart from line 1 and most of line 2,⁹⁰ with notes and translation. I have of course made full use of previous work on this text by Roberts, Turner, and Zucker, and generally without specific acknowledgment.

[A]polinar[i]us d(ixit):

[λινόνφ]ος τὴν τέχνην ἐστίν, σύνδ[ικον] δὲ εἶναι δεῖ τοῦ τὴν ἐργασίαν
πληροῦν-

[τος. ἔσ]τιν γὰρ αὐτῷ σύνεργος Παῦλος[ς] οὗτος μαθητὴς μὲν τυγχάνον,
εἰς

5 [ἀσκησι]ν δὲ τῆς τέχνης ἀφεικόμενος. οὗτοι δὲ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὥς οὐκ
ὀλίγα

[ταῖς δημ]οφαίαις τυγχάνουσαι χρεῖαις χρήσιμοι, καὶ σὺ οὐμὸς δεσπότης
συν-

⁹⁰ The photograph is not adequate for a revision of these badly damaged lines. That a fresh examination of the papyrus might be profitable is indicated by the irregular division of syllables which the edition has between 1 and 2. The photograph suggests *Oxurunchō-/rum* as a possible reading.

[οἶδας, τ]ῷ γὰρ ἀναβολικῷ πλίστα συντελοῦσιν, καὶ ὅσαπερ ἀπὸ τούτων
ἀπερ-

[γασθῆνα]ι δεῖ. ἀλ<λ'> οἱ οἰκοδόμοι δικ<αι>οῦσαι τῆς τοσαύτης
ἐπαιγούσης χρείας

[ἀεὶ τὰ κα]τ' αὐτοὺς μόνον συνορᾶν. τὸν γὰρ δὴ βοηθούμενον οἰκ[ο]-
δόμον

- 10 [ποιῆσ]αι σπουδάζουσιν λινούφον τυγχάνοντα <ᾗ>πράγματα τολμῶντες
παρα[ν]ομότατον. τῆς μὲν γὰρ τέχνης ἦν μεμάθηκεν ἀποσπῶσιν,
έτέρα γὰρ τὴν τῶν οἰκοδόμων ἐκδιδάξαι βούλονται. ἐπὶ τύννη τῇ
οἰκείᾳ

φολαχθῆναι δεῖ αὐτόν, προσήκει εἶνα μηδεμίαν ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκο<δό>μων
πάσ-

χοι βίαν προνοεῖσθαι τούτου τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ τὸν λογιστήν. ἄξειοι.

- 15 Maximian[us] v(ir) p(erfectissimus) iuridicus Aeg(upti) d(ixit):
ὁ λογιστῆς καὶ ρ[α]τραηγὸς προνοήσονται εἰς τὰ ὑπ[ὸ] τοῦ τ[ου] κατη-
γορημένα ἐι τήν]
τέχνην ἐκμημάθηκεν καὶ ἤδη ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐργασίᾳ ἔστιν εἰς έτέρα μὴ
μεταφέρεσθαι τέχνην.

2. d(ixit): dix(it) ed. Here, as in line 15, the papyrus has the one-letter abbreviation, with an oblique line through the stem of *d*. Cf. W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915) 43-6.

3. [λινόφ]ος: [λινόφο]ς ed. σύνδ[ικον] δὲ εἶναι δεῖ κτλ.: for this obligation as binding the members of a guild, see A. E. R. Boak, *TAPA* 68 (1937) 217 f. Cf. *PMich.* 5.243.6, where a fine is imposed *ἐάν τις παρίδῃ τινα ἐν ἀγδίᾳ καὶ μὴ συνεπισχύσῃ ἐπὶ τῷ* (= τὸ) *συλλῦσαι αὐτὸν τῆς ἀγδίας*. The specific application of this rule in the Rylands papyrus should go a long way to resolve what slight doubt might remain (Zucker, p. 341) that the linen weavers were organized as a guild.

4-5. *l. τυγχάνων*, Pap. *τυγ'χανον*; ἀφικόμενος. The sentence *ἔστιν . . . ἀφικόμενος* appears at first sight to contain a contradiction. Paulus is said to be an apprentice, but he is already practicing his trade. The editors therefore suggest, in their note to line 3, that *οὕτω* be introduced before *ἀφικόμενος*. With this correction the text is obviously consistent: Paulus is still an apprentice and accordingly not yet a full-fledged practitioner of the craft. But if we follow line 11, which states that he has already mastered the weaver's discipline, we may prefer to insert *οὐ* before *τυγχάνων* and give a contrary sense to the words of the papyrus: Paulus is not an apprentice but is already active as a weaver. Zucker, however, has shown that we need not tamper with the text. He considers that Paulus is still an apprentice but has nevertheless learned the techniques of the craft sufficiently to render effective assistance to his master. This is substantially the view taken by the editors in their introduction to the text. That Zucker thus recreates a real situation is proved by the apprentice contracts. See A. Zambon, *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 59 f.; W. L. Westermann, *Journ. of Juristic Papyrol.* 2 (1948) 29 f.

6. *l. τυγχάνουσι*, Pap. *τυγ'χανουσαι*. καί: κ corrected from ο; [[ο]] καί ed. The scribe's first intention was to write *ὁ καί*, which would in fact make a smooth text. If he had retained *ὁ καί*, the relative *ὅσαπερ* would have had *πλείστα* (7) as its antecedent. As the Greek now stands, it is probably best to take the clause *τῷ γὰρ κτλ.* as an exegetical parenthesis and *καὶ ὅσαπερ κτλ.* as the object of *συνοῖδας*.

7. *l. πλείστα. συντελοῦσιν: συντελοῦσιν ed.*

7-8. ἀπερ[γασθῆναι]: ἀπερ[γάξασθαι] *i. ed.* The present tense of this verb is not commonly used as a passive; see *LSJ*, s.v. ἐργάζομαι (iii). Cf. 13: φυλαχθῆναι δεῖ.

8. οἰκοδόμοι: "masons," as noted by Zucker (p. 340, note 2). δικά<αι>οῦσαι = δικάουσαι. This correction was suggested by the editors (*app. crit.*) and approved by Zucker, who thinks that the omission of *αι* may reflect the current pronunciation of this word (p. 340, note 1).

9. [ἀεὶ τὰ κα]τ' αὐτούς: the quite different reconstruction presented in the edition rests on a reading not confirmed by the photograph:]τουτους where]ταυτους is unmistakable. The unemphatic pronoun αὐτούς here substitutes for a reflexive in a prepositional expression used as an object, and as such it does not clash with the use of ἐάντους in line 5, where the same prepositional phrase is employed attributively with οἱτοι. See Mayser, *Grammatik* 2, pt. 1, 68. (I have also been guided in my judgment by pertinent observations on NT usage which Professor G. D. Kilpatrick was kind enough to send me in a letter of July 14, 1958.)

10. [ποιῆσ]αι: suggested by the editors in their *Addenda and Corrigenda* (p. xvii) and approved by Zucker, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 16 (1958) 232, note 4. *l. σπουδάζουσιν. τυγχάνοντα <ἀ>πράγματα*: Pap. τυγ'χανονταπραγματα; τυγχάνοντ' ἀπράγματα *ed.*, but *alpha* has a long horizontal tail which suggests the end of a word. Furthermore, such elision as the editors have indicated is not frequent in papyri; cf. Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, pt. 1, 156 f. τολμῶντες = τολμῶντες; *ε* corrected from *α*. So read also by David and Van Groningen (letter of Mar. 7, 1958); τολμοῦσες *ed.*, who correct to τολμοῦντες, a late variant of τολμῶντες.

11. *l. παρανομώτατον, ἀποσπῶν.*

12. ἑτέραγ δὲ τήν: ἑτέραγ[ν] δὲ τήν *ed.* The dotted letters are almost completely faded. *l. ἐκδιδάξαι. ἐπὶ τύννη = ἐπὶ τοῖννη; ἐπὶ γυναιῶν ed.* The new reading has been obtained from the papyrus by B. R. Rees, whose judgment is completely confirmed by the photograph. The last two letters are damaged but easily reconstructed now that he has identified them. For examples of ἐπὶ τοῖννη in other 4th century papyri see *PRyl.* 4.653.16; 659.5,6; *PCol. Inv.* 181(19) + 182 (=Kraemer and Lewis, *TAPA* 68 [1937] 370 ff. = *Sammelbuch* 5.8246) 19.

τῇ οἰκείᾳ: supply τέχνη from the preceding sentence. φυλαχθῆναι: this verb is likewise used with the dative in *PGrenf.* 2.82.14: σπουδάσατε τοῦτον ἀπολῶσαι καὶ φυλάττειν τῇ τηλικαύτῃ ἀρχοντικῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ. Cf. *LSJ*, s.v. β.3.

13. προσήκει: cancelled by the editors. *l. ἴνα. οἰκο<δ>μων: μ* written over an incomplete δ; οἰκο[.]δῶμων *ed.*

14. For the joint appearance of the strategus (*exactor*) and the logistes (*curator*) here and in 16, Zucker refers to Rees, *Journ. of Juristic Papyrol.* 7-8 (1953-4) 90 f. *l. ἀξιοί.* The absolute use of this verb is familiar to us from the Alexandrian *synchōrēseis*. Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. refers to it "als alleinstehendes Stichwort, am Schlusse einer gerichtlichen oder notariellen Verhandlung;" cf. W. Schubart, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 5 (1913) 56 f. Examples are to be found in P. M. Meyer, *Jur. Papyri* (Berlin 1920) 19.30; 41.30.

15. d(ixit): see note to line 2.

16. τὰ: what the scribe wrote looks like πα; it is probably ττα. τοῦτ[ου: τοῦτ]ων *ed.* Paulus alone is the plaintiff, as shown by the singular noun βοηθούμενον (9) and the singular verb ἀξιοί(14).

17. *l. ἐκμεμάθηκεν. ἦδη:* 1st η written over an incomplete δ.

Translation

. . . Apolinarius said: "He is a linen weaver by trade, and he is bound to lend his assistance in court to a fellow artisan. For he has as fellow worker this Paulus who is present here, still an apprentice but already actively engaged in the craft. These men are in their own right of no small usefulness to the public services, and you, my lord, know—for they contribute abundantly to the *anabolicum*—how very much they have to produce. But the masons think it right, in spite of the very great and pressing need, always to consult only their own interests. For they are bent on making my client into a mason although he is a peaceful linen weaver, so daring a very great wrong. They are taking him away from the craft that he has learned, and they wish to teach him another, the masons' craft. Inasmuch, therefore, as he must be preserved for his own craft, it is fitting, in order that he suffer no violence from the masons, that the strategus and the logistes make provision for him. This is his request."

Maximianus, vir perfectissimus, iuridicus Aegypti, said: "The logistes and the strategus will make provision, in respect of his charges, that if he has learned the craft and is already in this trade he not be transferred to another."

13. *POxy.* 22.2340 and 2341

These texts are written on the same papyrus, 2340 across the fibres on one side, 2341 along the fibres on the other.⁹¹ Both are records of judicial proceedings held in the late second and early third centuries, 2340 in 192 A.D., 2341 in 208 A.D. No. 2340 is concerned with a claim for exemption from service as a sub-strategus in the fourth region, presumably of Alexandria. The plaintiff's advocate argues that as a weaver who is also foreman of a factory his client is not obligated to accept an appointment of this kind. The record of the hearing is contained in two columns, with a total of 24 lines preserved.

Below line 24 the editor has printed another line, which was written by a second hand along the fibres at right angles to the preceding text. Line 25, as it is numbered in the edition, has only the phrase *περὶ τᾶξεως ἐμβολ(ῆς)*, i.e. "on the order of

⁹¹ I have simplified the situation somewhat. For more details see the edition.

lading," or perhaps "on arrangements for lading."⁹² This obviously has no relation to 2340, and since the latter is a palimpsest "from which previous writing has been removed with a sponge," the editor suggests that line 25 may be "a survival from this earlier text."

But boats and times of lading are important factors in No. 2341, which is on the other side of the sheet. Here, a complaint is made to the prefect Subatianus Aquila that the traditional procedure for clearing the Oxyrhynchite nome of tax grains at the season when conditions are most favorable has been neglected with disastrous results. The complaint is presented to the prefect by a prytanis of Oxyrhynchus, who states that "this canal of ours which is adjacent to the city has an influx and superabundance of water at the time of the inundation." He requests, therefore, that "the boats be sent at that time and the villages along the canal be cleared first on this canal."⁹³ He then demands that when this stage has been passed, the customary "peg" system be instituted. While the language used by the prytanis is highly technical and his description of the system is not precise enough to clarify details, the outlines of the procedure can be discerned. When the village granaries along the canal have been emptied, there begins the movement of grains by donkey and camel over the most direct routes from the inland villages to the canal, and as produce again piles up in the villages on the canal, the boats first clear the southern villages and work northward only when the region to the south has been completely serviced. In this way the boats have some chance of keeping pace with the inundation as it progresses to the north.^{93a}

This is more or less the system described by the prytanis, in so far as we can glimpse it through the complexities of his language. It is in effect a schedule of lading, a timetable for boats operating on the Tomis canal. The phrase printed as line 25 under No. 2340—*περὶ τάξεως ἐμβολ(ῆς)*, "on the order of lading"—would therefore serve excellently as a brief description of the contents of

⁹² See footnote 40.

⁹³ I differ somewhat from the editor in my interpretation of this sentence. I understand *τῇ πόλει* with *παρακείμενος* and feel entirely satisfied with *τῇ ἀναβάσει* as a temporal dative. The editor's note to line 5 must be weighed against Mayser's remarks on *τῇ ἀναβάσει* (*Grammatik* 2, pt. 2, 297). See also F. Zucker, *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 16 (1958) 259.

^{93a} Cf. V. B. Schuman, *CP* 54 (1959) 204 f.

2341. Since it has no internal connection with 2340, I take it to be in fact a docket for 2341. Its value lies in the confirmation it brings to the editor's interpretation of a very difficult and only approximately intelligible piece of Greek, which is nevertheless comparable in importance to *POxy.* 18.2182.⁹⁴

14. *POxy.* 22.2351

This text is a lengthy and well preserved lease written at Oxyrhynchus in 112 A.D. The lessor is the priest Phatres, and the lessees are the brothers Pachnumis and Totoës also called Plutarch, who are sons of Pachnumis, and another Totoës, the son of Papirius. The lease was written by Totoës also called Plutarch, who effected a syntactical integration of his subscription with the lease in a rather curious way, according to the edition (63–6):

κυρία ἡ μίσθωσις οὐσά μου
τοῦ Τοτοέως τοῦ καὶ Πλουτάρχου χειροῖς
καὶ εὐδοκῶ καὶ συναποδώσω ἐξ ἀλληλεγγυῆς
ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς προκειμένοις.

The editor explains the barbarous *χειροῖς* as “probably a confusion of *χειρός* and *χειρί* rather than a heteroclite plural,” and he renders the Greek accordingly: “This lease is valid, being in the hand of me Totoës also known as Plutarchus; I give my assent and will jointly pay on all the aforesaid conditions on a basis of mutual security.”

The text of the lease is thus made to flow without interruption into the subscription of one of the lessees, who has written both the lease and his own subscription. To these he adds the date of the lease (66–9). Then another hand continues the document with a joint subscription in the name of the other lessees. This statement contains the usual résumé of their obligations and concludes with a promise to pay similar to the one made by the writer of the lease (78–82):

συναποδώσομεν . . . ἐπεὶ πᾶσι⁹⁵ τοῖς προκειμένοις οἷς καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν.

These words are unambiguous, and we may render them with the editor: “we will jointly pay . . . on all the aforesaid conditions, to which we give our assent.” And if we compare them with the

⁹⁴ Cf. Youtie and Pearl, *CW* 37 (1943) 7 ff.

⁹⁵ Read ἐπὶ πᾶσι.

words used by Totoës also called Plutarch, we see immediately that his *χειροῖς* is to be divided into *χείρ* and *οἷς*, and *οἷς καὶ εὐδοκῶ* then corresponds to *οἷς καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν* in line 82. What is still wrong, however, is the position he has given to the clause. As in line 82, it belongs at the end of the sentence, after *ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς προκειμένοις*.⁹⁶

We have now to consider what meaning the writer attached to *cheir*. The word is of course frequently applied to the hand that writes a document, and by metonymy it often designates the document itself,⁹⁷ as it does, for example, in *POxy.* 2.264.12: *κυρία ἡ χείρ*. Totoës sets down a comparable expression: *κυρία ἡ μίσθωσις*, and to this he adds *οὐδ' αὖ μου τοῦ Τοτοέως τοῦ καὶ Πλουτάρχου χείρ*. He appears therefore to establish an identity between *misthōsis* and *cheir*, as if the latter were indeed another name for the lease. At the same time, he has restricted the application of *cheir* by inserting his own name in the genitive, and yet although he wrote the document, it is in no proper sense *his* document.

The apparent contradiction is not hard to resolve. Totoës meant to say that the lease was written by his hand, as of course it was, and we can clarify his intention by correcting his text to *χειρ<ί>*. It is almost exactly so that Paul of Tarsus signed a number of his letters: *ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου*.⁹⁸

15. *PHamb.* 2.182

This papyrus consists of two fragments, which the editor has labelled A and B. Both pieces are damaged at the top, and A is also torn at the bottom, but B preserves the end of the text. The papyrus is reproduced on Plate 14.

Written in 249 B.C., the text is a letter sent to a colleague by an administrator, presumably an *oekonomus* since he is concerned with the distribution of oil to dealers.⁹⁹ These persons have been the cause of some serious trouble to which he applies the words

⁹⁶ For a much more shocking displacement in a documentary papyrus see O. Guéraud, *ChronÉg* 55 (1953) 147 f.

⁹⁷ Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch* s.v. 2 and 3 (728.15 ff.).

⁹⁸ 1 Cor. 16.21, Col. 4.18, 2 Th. 3.17. In the last he adds: *ὃ ἐστὶν σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ· οὕτως γράφω*.

⁹⁹ Cf. C. Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels 1939) 81.

hybris and *perispasmos*.¹⁰⁰ Perhaps they had conspired to sell oil at illicit prices or had created an artificial scarcity as a means of forcing higher prices.¹⁰¹ Whatever the trouble may have been, it has now been resolved and the dealers are again under control. With evident relief, the writer sums up his past and present relations with them in lines 2–6:

καὶ ἀπολελύμεθα¹⁰² τῆς λοιπῆς ὀχλη-
ρίας ἧς ἐκτὸς τῆς ἀποδείξεως
τῶν πραγμάτων παρηνωχλούμεθα
5 πρὸς ταῖς ἐκείνων ἐπιμελείαις ὄντες
καὶ πρὸς τῷ ἐξαρισκεύεσθαι αὐτοῖς.

The editor's German version of these lines has the very great virtue of showing precisely what he thinks them to mean: "wir sind auch befreit von der übrigen Plage, mit der wir ausser der Abwicklung(?) der Geschäfte¹⁰³ belästigt wurden, derweil wir mit der Aufsicht über sie (die Ölhändler) beschäftigt waren und mit der Verteilung (des Öles) an sie."

As the editor remarks, ἐξαρισκεύεσθαι is unparalleled. He derives it from ἀρίσκος, a word known to us only from Hesychius in the sense of "basket," but it is a word of many forms, among them ῥίσκος, "coffer, chest."¹⁰⁴ He therefore takes the verb to mean "distribute in containers." This explanation has the advantage, as the editor sees it, of accounting for the dative pronoun which follows the infinitive. And the distribution of oil was in fact a principal function of the writer's office, as we may infer from lines 11–12, but there he describes his activity with a most ordinary expression: ἔλαιον διατίθεσθαι.

There is indeed another way of explaining the verb which does not take us so far from our present lexical resources. What the papyrus has differs by only one letter from ἐξαρεσκευέσθαι; it substitutes a short *iota* for an *epsilon* in an unaccented syllable.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Lines 8–9. On the relation of these words to *ochlêria* (2–3), see the editor's note to 9 and Zucker's correction in *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 16 (1958) 220.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Préaux (above, note 99) 87 f.

¹⁰² καὶ γὰρ λελύμεθα ed.

¹⁰³ See the editor's note to line 3.

¹⁰⁴ See the editor's note to line 7. Cf. *LSJ*, s.vv. ἄρριχος, ῥίσκος, ὕριχος. For ἔρισκος see *PMich.* 2, p. 33, note 8.

¹⁰⁵ Mayser, *Grammatik* 1, pt. 1, 80, and A. Thumb, *Griech. Sprache im Zeitalter d. Hellenismus* (Strassburg 1901) 138, suggest that this substitution may find its phonological explanation in the Egyptian environment, but it may also of course be only a writing error.

And rare as this compound is, it already has a place in our lexicons, its derivation is obvious, and it also is appropriate with a dative pronoun.

Neither ἀρεσκεύεσθαι nor ἐξαρεσκεύεσθαι ever came into common use, doubtless because they were overshadowed by ἀρέσκω, which was firmly established in the language and remained a favorite in the literary as well as the colloquial vocabulary. Nevertheless, the simple verb is listed by Hesychius, who defines it with φιλοφρονεῖσθαι. Athenaeus (6.256D) has it with a dative in a passage attributed to the historian Clearchus, and LSJ give one reference each for Plutarch (*Mor.* 4D) and Marcus Aurelius (5.5), who use it in an absolute sense: "be obsequious." The compound verb is attested only twice. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* 5.19, mss. AL have ἐξαρεσκομένους τοῖς θεοῖς, but all others have ἐξαρεσκευομένους τοῖς θεοῖς, "placating the gods (with sacrifice)." Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 3.1.2 = Stählin 1.236.10) speaks of the passionate aspect of the soul as εἰς μοιχείας καὶ λαγνείας καὶ εἰς φθορὰς ἐξαρεσκευόμενον, "delighting in adultery, lust, and rape."¹⁰⁶

If we accept the minor correction which converts the infinitive as written on the papyrus into ἐξαρεσκεύεσθαι, we not only avoid the creation of a new verb, but we also find that the writer is saying something more interesting than we had supposed. Furthermore, we now know what to think of "the remaining annoyance" (2-3) to which he had still been subjected, quite apart, as he says, from the normal irritations inherent in the routine of his office (3-4). His instructions had imposed on him a double rôle in his relations with dealers. He was of course expected to supervise their activities (5) but at the same time ἐξαρεσκεύεσθαι αὐτοῖς, "to be agreeable to them, to conciliate them, to keep them happy" (6). His words thus echo the plaint of administrators through the ages.

But now that the dealers have somehow put themselves in the wrong, discipline is again the order of the day, and he feels that at last he can get on with his work. He asks his colleague not to forget what the dealers have done (7-9) and doubtless not to handle them too gently. Presumably, he also lays stress

¹⁰⁶ The verb has been challenged by editors, and Stählin marks his reference to it in the index volume with an asterisk, which he attaches to ms. readings "wenn ihre Richtigkeit fraglich ist."

on the official requirement that the dealers make prompt delivery of the *elaikê* (10–11).¹⁰⁷ Then, as his letter moves to its close, he manages a more cheerful tone. The approach of important festivals¹⁰⁸ has created a large demand for oil among the dealers (11–15), and proportionately large returns from the *elaikê* may be anticipated *ἐὰν αὐτοὺς ἐπιστρέψωμεν*, “if we hold them (i.e. the dealers) in check” (15–17).

¹⁰⁷ With *ἐλακὴν συστρέφειν* compare *NTMatt.* 27.3: *ἔστρεψεν τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια τοῖς ἀρχιερεῶσιν.*

¹⁰⁸ Lines 13–14: *αἱ ἑορταὶ αἱ μέγισται αἱ ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ.* The third *αἱ* used in place of *τῶν* is harsh but perhaps reflects the writer’s feeling for *αἱ ἑορταὶ αἱ μέγισται* as a unified concept.