

Editions of a selection of literary, paraliterary, and documentary papyri from Oxyrhynchus.

S. Slattery, New College, DPhil, Trinity Term 2013

Acknowledgements

I have incurred a number of debts in the last three years, which it is a pleasure to acknowledge here. Drs R.–L. Chang, D. Colomo, and W.B. Henry allowed me extensive access to the papyri and all have given me advice and help on a variety of matters. Prof P. Finglass, Drs T. Rood, and S. Scullion have examined my work at various stages and offered important advice, especially Prof Finglass whose comments on *01* improved the piece immensely. Mr H. Spelman has taken a keen interest in my work; he proofread the literary section and offered many pertinent comments on it.

Prof J.–L. Fournet and Dr N. Gonis examined the thesis very quickly. The discussion of my work was extremely profitable: I am very grateful to them both for their many instructive comments and insights. I am further specially indebted to Dr Gonis for introducing me to Greek papyri and his encouragement many years ago to continue with Classics: it meant a great deal to me.

By far my greatest debt is to Dr A. Benaissa, my Supervisor. He took over my supervision at a difficult stage but worked tirelessly to ensure that my thesis progressed to a successful conclusion. My gratitude to him for his unfailing kindness and special thoroughness in discussing my work at all stages is boundless. I count it an immense privilege to have been his pupil.

I could not have undertaken study in Oxford without the significant financial support of Mrs M. Arthur, to whom I am much obliged.

Finally, I must offer special thanks to my mother who has gone to many efforts and made many sacrifices to support me over the last years.

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents twenty-one unpublished Greek literary and documentary texts from Oxyrhynchus kept in the Sackler Library, Oxford. Each papyrus is identified, transcribed, and edited with a detailed introduction and notes largely in accordance with the conventions and format of presentation of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London 1898–). The literary texts are diverse in content. The item of especial interest is a new fragment from Sophocles' *Tereus*, which joins a quotation from Stobaeus' *Anthologium*. It provides new information on the play's *dramatis personae* and the long vexed question of where the quotation is to be located in the play. Another new text is the remains of an unknown hexameter poem on a mythical subject which refers to the Lapiths and Centaurs. From the known texts, a minute fragment of Polybius' *Historiae*, a fragment Plutarch's *Alexander* and two fragments of Plato's *Philebus* stand out due to the rarity of these texts. The documentary texts illustrate a variety of matters tending on social, economic, fiscal, and legal aspects of life in Roman and late antique Oxyrhynchus. Of the texts from the Roman period, a text dealing with the execution of a testamentary bequest and another text concerning a summons to the prefect's *conventus* are notable for the information which they provide on the functioning of testamentary bequests and the practice of litigation respectively. Of the four texts from the Byzantine period, an Oxyrhynchite lease of land is of special importance due to the comparative rarity of documents of this kind from Oxyrhynchus and because it exhibits a number of points of interest, not least that the lessee is a *colonus adscripticius*. A 'sale on delivery of wine' also involves a *colonus adscripticius*. The other document of special interest is a large private letter which concerns various matters of business from a man who claims to be in a precarious situation.

ABBREVIATIONS

Papyri and the proceedings of the International Congresses of Papyrologists are cited in accordance with the standard abbreviations enumerated in J. F. Oates et al., *Checklist of editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic papyri, ostraca and tablets*⁵ (BASP Suppl. 9 2001). The most up-to-date version of the *Checklist* (June 2011) may be consulted at <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>. Bold arabic numerals refer to papyri published in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. The papyri edited in this thesis are numbered in boldface type and italicised, e.g. **21**.

Periodicals are abbreviated according to *L'Année philologique* (Paris 1927–). The full list of abbreviations is available at http://www.annee-philologique.com/files/sigles_fr.pdf. Greek authors and their works are generally abbreviated according to LSJ⁹ (Oxford 1996).

The following abbreviations are used in this thesis for frequently cited works:

BL = *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*
(1922–)

*CSBE*² = R.S. Bagnall–K.A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*²
(Leiden 2004)

DDBDP = The Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri: www.papyri.info/

GBEBP = G. Cavallo–H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300–800* (BICS Suppl. 47; London 1987)

GLH = C.H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands 350 B.C. – A.D. 400* (Oxford 1955)

*GMAW*² = E.G. Turner, P.J. Parsons (ed.), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*² (BICS Suppl. 46; London 1987)

Denniston, *GP*² = J.D. Denniston, K.J. Dover (ed.), *The Greek Particles*²
(Oxford 1954)

Gignac, *Grammar* = F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Milano 1976–81)

Kühner–Gerth, *Grammatik* = R. Kühner–B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der*

griechischen Sprache (Hannover–Leipzig 1898)

Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* = W.A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto 2004)

Taubenschlag, *Law*² = R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Graeco–Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 332 B.C. – A. D. 640* (Warsaw 1955)

Lampe, *Lexicon* = G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961)

LSJ⁹ = H.G. Liddell–R. Scott–H.S. Jones, *A Greek–English Lexicon*⁹ (Oxford 1996)

M–P³ = P. Mertens–R.A. Pack, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires grecs et latins*: <http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm>

PLRE = A.H.M. Jones et al., *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1971–92)

RSO^{2.0} = A. Benaissa, *Rural Settlements of the Oxyrhynchite Nome: A Papyrological Survey* (Trismegistos Online Publications IV, Version 2.0 2012): <http://www.trismegistos.org/top.php>

TrGF = B. Snell et al., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Gottingae 1971–2004)

Other works are cited by their full title and reference on the first occurrence in each edition and also in the bibliography.

NOTE ON EDITORIAL FORMAT

Each papyrus has been identified, transcribed, and edited with a detailed introduction and commentary largely in accordance with the conventions and format of presentation of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. However, the format of presentation of the papyri in this thesis chiefly differs from that series in the following ways:

(a) the texts of known authors are first presented in diplomatic transcript and equipped with a full description of doubtful letters;

(b) the introductions and notes are often considerably fuller, because they state the commonplace, which is taken for granted in that series;

(c) bibliographical information is presented more fully.

Both the new and known literary texts are presented first in a diplomatic transcript and then in an articulated transcript. The new texts are further equipped with accentuation, punctuation, and lectional signs. The lost portions of the known texts are restored from modern editions for the sake of readability and because it is a useful method of judging whether the lost portions of text of the papyrus are likely to have exhibited any deviations from the medieval tradition.

The introduction of each papyrus gives a physical description of the papyrus, discusses its palaeography, and notices any marked scribal tendencies. The introduction also proposes a date, identifies the text, outlines its content, and summarises its salient points.

The notes on the two new literary texts deal with points of difficulty in the interpretation of the texts, seek to illustrate the discussion with the parallels from similar texts, and comment on pertinent linguistic or literary features. The texts of known authors are collated with reports of the medieval MSS from authoritative editions. Any variants from the medieval tradition are noticed and the papyrus' contribution to the constitution of the text is discussed.

The documentary texts are presented only as articulated texts, and they are equipped with accentuation and punctuation. An apparatus records any lectional

signs or abbreviations and normalises the orthography according to the conventions of Attic Greek.

Egyptian personal and geographical names, which do not have Greek endings, and the names of Egyptian months are unaccented in accordance with the principles laid down by W. Clarysse, ‘Greek Accents on Egyptian Names’ *ZPE* 119 (1997) 183–4.

All dates are AD unless otherwise specified.

In the transcription of the papyri the conventions of the Leiden System have been adopted, see *CE* 7 (1932) 262–9. They are summarised as follows in recent volumes of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*:

αβγ	The letters are doubtful, either because of damage or because they are otherwise difficult to read.
. . .	Approximately three letters remain unread by the editor.
[αβγ]	The letters are lost, but restored from a parallel or by conjecture.
[. . .]	Approximately three letters are lost.
()	Round brackets indicate the resolution of an abbreviation or a symbol.
[αβγ]	The letters are deleted in the papyrus.
`αβγ´	The letters are added above the line.
<αβγ>	The letters are added by the editor.
{αβγ}	The letters are regarded as mistaken and rejected by the editor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: NEW LITERARY TEXTS

<i>01. Sophocles, Tereus</i>	Early second century	1
<i>02. Hexameters</i>	Third century	24

SECTION II: KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

<i>03. Homer, Il. 13. 244–52</i>	First century	48
<i>04. Homer, Il. 17. 446–89</i>	Early third century	50
<i>05. Apollonius Rhodius, 4.1020–50</i>	Second century	60
<i>06. Plato, Phil., 36d8–e1 + 48a1–b5</i>	Second/third century	78
<i>07–08. Demosthenes, In Tim.</i>		89
<i>07. Demosthenes, In Tim. §§ 7, 9–10</i>	Fifth century	91
<i>08. Demosthenes, In Tim. §13</i>	Third century	105
<i>09. Plutarch, Alex. § 42.9, 8–10</i>	Third century	108
<i>10. Polybius, Hist. 5. 67, 9–10</i>	First century	115

SECTION III: PARALITERARY TEXT

<i>11. Scholia Minora to Il. 13.703–829</i>	First century	119
---	---------------	-----

SECTION IV: DOCUMENTS OF THE ROMAN PERIOD

<i>12. Declaration of livestock</i>	21	133
<i>13. Acknowledgement of monies</i>	123	138
<i>14. Antirrhesis to a ὑπόμνημα διαστολικόν</i>	133–7	152
<i>15. Order to supply seed</i>	Second/third century	168
<i>16. Receipt for dyke, poll and pig taxes</i>	231	173
<i>17. Acknowledgement of repayment</i>	263	178

SECTION V: DOCUMENTS OF THE BYZANTINE PERIOD

<i>18.</i> Lease of an irrigation machine	538	191
<i>19.</i> Sale on delivery of wine	543	211
<i>20.</i> Application for transference of taxation	571	222
<i>21.</i> Private letter from Byzantium	Late sixth century	234
Index of works cited in Sections I, II, and III		259
Index of works cited in Sections IV and V		264

Less texts edited, translations and bibliography, this thesis contains 70,352 words.

SECTION I: NEW LITERARY TEXTS

01. SOPHOCLES, *TEREUS*¹

100/97(b)

7.4 x 12.5 cm

Earlier second century

A narrowish strip from a roll of papyrus with the upper parts of two columns and an intercolumnium. The upper margin is at least 2.6 cm. The intercolumnium is 2.6 cm at its narrowest and more than 4.3 cm at its widest. The writing runs with the fibres. The back is blank, save for an annotation made by A.S. Hunt in pen. It reads 'F 28.51.', which may be expanded to 'February 28th, fifty-first papyrus'. Unfortunately, the inventory number does not record in which season the papyrus was found.

The height of the column will have been more than the 10.9 cm which survives in col. ii. A coincidence with a quotation from a speech preserved in Stobaeus' *Anthologium* shows that col. i will have contained a minimum of 28 lines. But it is to be noted that the lines in col. i seem to be slightly less densely spaced than those in col. ii.

The line with its lead² is a shade under 0.5 cm. If one assumes that col. i contained only trimeters, the column height must then have been a minimum of c.12.5 cm. But there is no compelling reason to think that the column will have been any smaller if one were to assume that col. i is a mixture of lyrics and trimeters. The columns may, of course, have been significantly larger. The range of column height of dramatic texts may be illustrated from XLVII 3322 (E. *Ph.*, assigned to the later first/earlier second cent.), of which the column will have been at least 27.2 cm in height and contains 43 lines. This is the upper end of the range. At the other end, the

¹ I submitted an earlier draft edition of this papyrus to the Faculty of Classics for the 'Confirmation of DPhil Status' in July 2012. Prof P. Finglass and Dr S. Scullion were my examiners for this process. They made many helpful suggestions in the interview in September 2012, and Prof Finglass gave me extensive and detailed notes. I have made use of the notes in the subsequent revision of the edition, and when I refer to 'Finglass' without further attribution, I mean Prof Finglass' suggestions contained in these notes.

² On this term, see Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* xi.

column of XVIII **2180** (S. *OT*, assigned to 101–200) is 11 cm in height (with upper and lower margins of 4.1 cm and 4.2 cm respectively) and has 20 lines. Column heights in other genres of texts do exceed these parameters: see Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* 119–30. If 12.5 cm was the full height of the columns of 100/97(b), it would be relatively small, but it would still fall within the ‘normative range’ established by Johnson, *op. cit.* 119, which ‘encompasses a fairly continuous set of examples from about 12 to 27 cm, with a particular denseness over what remains a broad range, roughly 14 to 24 cm’.

The scribe wrote medium-sized, well-rounded capitals. They are upright, neat yet somewhat densely written, generally very regular, often decorated, and strictly bilinear with the exception of ϕ (ψ is not attested). Letters vary little in width. No ligatures are made. The hand is formal and calligraphic. It is to be classed as a specimen of the style conventionally called ‘Roman Uncial’. It is well executed and comparable with the more accomplished specimens of this style, but it cannot rival for finesse e.g. the ‘Hawara Homer’, depicted at *GMAW*² 13, or the ‘Ilias Ambrosiana’ (Cod. F. 205 P in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana), of which some pages are reproduced in G. Cavallo, *Il calamo e il papiro: la scrittura greca dall’età ellenistica ai primi secoli di bisanzio* (Pap. Flor. XXXVI; Firenze 2005, Tav. XLIII) or even XXXII **2624** (choral lyric).

The hand of **01** is identical with that of XXXII **2634** ‘Lyrical Verses’, and further close affinities to **01** may be observed in e.g. XXIII **2354** ‘Hesiod, Catalogue’, LIX **3972** ‘Comedy’, LXII **4301** ‘Old Comedy’, or LXVIII **4639** ‘Tragedy (Euripides?)’.

α and λ are basically an isosceles triangle in shape, but the right-hand oblique of α extends further than that of λ and is often hooked back and downwards, and they both have finials on the feet of their left-hand obliques. δ is much squatter and, at times, has a more ostentatious hook at the end of its right-hand oblique. ϵ , θ , o , and c are all well rounded, with the cross-bars of ϵ and θ nearly always dead centred within

the body of the letter; the cross-bar of ε never meets the top curve. υ has arms which extend almost at a right angle atop a short upright stem. γ , π , and τ have finials on the feet of their uprights; the bar of π extends conspicuously over the upright on both sides; the bar of τ is fairly broad. ι and ρ both have small finials on their feet, and the loop of ρ is fairly small. μ bows deeply and is made of two curving strokes meeting at the base-line with a low oblique dash adjoining the left-hand stroke. κ is in three independent strokes which do not always meet. ν is in three straight strokes. ξ is a high stroke with a lip on it and a single flowing stroke beneath it, closely resembling the Arabic numeral two. ω is made of two well rounded strokes. ‘Shading’ is not conspicuous, but the letters do have a certain pretentiousness of adornment.

Lectional apparatus includes a single inorganic diaeresis (col. ii. 6), several paragraphi, which signal a change of speaker (col. ii. 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18), and two intercolumnar annotations (col. ii 8 and col. ii 10). The diaeresis will almost certainly have been the work of the original scribe as well: this was the usual practice in this matter, cf. *GMAW*² 10–11. The paragraphi will also most probably have been added by the scribe. They have the same kind of small barbs at their extremities as some of the horizontals of letters, e.g. τ in col. ii 7 $\tau\omicron\gamma\alpha\rho\pi\theta$ [. The marginal annotations also seem to have been made by the scribe. The thickness of the stroke is not greatly different from that of the text nor does the ink differ, although the letters are approximately half the size of those which he used to copy the main text. The text may, of course, also have been worked over by a *diorthotes*.

Elision is tacitly effected wherever it is needed (col. ii. 1, 2, 5, 8, 19), but neither accents nor breathings are anywhere set, nor are any other signs of punctuation obvious. *Iota adscriptum* is not applied on the one occasion when it might have been (col. ii. 4).

The hand of *OI* is highly formal and stylised. Calligraphic hands of this kind tend not to have strongly distinguishing characteristics which altered markedly over the Roman period in such a way as to allow the development of the style to be traced

with confidence. The dating of papyri copied in hands of this style has, therefore, long proved difficult unless the papyri have been re-cycled in some way so as to carry datable items. However, G. Cavallo maintains that the ‘Roman Uncial’ underwent a process of ‘canonisation’, which does indeed allow its chronological development to be followed and, therefore, the papyri written in this style to be dated with some accuracy. He seeks to document its development in ‘Osservazioni paleografiche sul canone e la cronologia della cosiddetta “Onciale Romana”’ *ANSP* II 36 (1967) 209–20 = *Il calamo e il papiro* 151–61. He contends, 214–5 = 155–6, that the style had already become ‘canonised’ ‘tra la fine del I secolo d. C. e l’inizio del II. A quest’epoca mi sembrano da assegnare anche, in probabile successione cronologica, il PSI 1213, il PSI 8, e il POxy 2634, nei quali il canone appare perfezionato: si osservi la regolare e armoniosa rotondità delle curve, la forma non occhiellata e semicircolare dell’*epsilon*, il tratto mediano dell’*omega* disposto secondo la normale al rigo di base.’

The concept of ‘canonisation’, which Cavallo develops more extensively in *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Firenze 1967), lies open to challenge on a number of points which have been enumerated by critics of Cavallo’s publications. See in particular E.G. Turner (*GMAW*² p.20 and further on the ‘Roman Uncial’ in reference to the ‘Hawara Homer’ in particular, *GMAW*² no. 13, n. 1) and P.J. Parsons (review of *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*, *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 375–80). Chief among the difficulties of the concept of ‘canonisation’ is the notion that an ideal of the style should have consciously been envisaged and perfection of it sought. As Parsons points out, loc. cit. 379, no evidence exists that a model of any kind for this style was ever consciously constructed so that the idea of refinement of it or development of it is, ultimately, not tenable.

01 has not been re-used. Parallels dated on objective criteria which might secure the assignment of *01* to a particular period are difficult to find. The closest comparable examples with some certainty in the dating of their production include I

20 (Homer *Iliad* 2) = *GLH* 12b and Bodl. MS. Gr. Class. a. I (P) (Homer *Iliad* 1–2) = *GMAW*² no. 13, the ‘Hawara Homer’. **I 20** is assigned to the first half of the second century on the basis of accounts on the back in cursive hands of the second century: the hand of the Homer of **I 20** is, as Roberts observes, ‘unlikely to be later than the middle of the century’. Close similarities between these hands may be observed in the formation of ω, μ, υ, ε, θ, ο, and c. Further, the ‘Hawara Homer’ is assigned to a similar period, although the basis on which this dating rests is far less secure than that of **I 20**. The hand of the ‘Hawara Homer’ is compared by Turner, in the commentary on *GMAW*² no. 13, with an inscription from Athens dated to approximately c.217/8 AD. The inscription shows similarities in some of the forms of the letters and their adornment. The ‘Hawara Homer’ was written probably around 150, cf. *GMAW*² 13, p.38 and n. 1. Furthermore, **XXXII 2634** shows very close resemblances in the formation of ω, α, ρ, ε, θ, ο, c, and, above all, the singular ξ with the same letters of the ‘Hawara Homer’. **XXXII 2634** and **01** will, therefore, in all likelihood have been produced in close chronological proximity to it.

A further example of this kind of hand is P.Jena inv. 266 (E. *Ba.* 64–9)³, assigned to the second century. This papyrus shows how these calligraphic styles were not necessarily tied to particular places. The hand of this papyrus is extremely similar to that of **01** (indeed, on first sight, it seemed to be identical). The Jena papyrus is said to have been bought in Edfu,⁴ although this may be inaccurate: see R. Ast’s remarks in P.Jena II, introd. p.xxi.

Even though one will be extremely reluctant to assert with Cavallo’s confidence the chronological order of production of the papyri which he discusses in the article cited above, his view that **XXXII 2634** ought to be assigned to sometime around the earlier second century is most probably correct. This will apply to **01** if I have correctly identified the same hand in both papyri. **XXXII 2634** = *TrGF* ii 660

³ The image is available online at http://papyri.uni-leipzig.de/receive/IAwJPapyri_schrift_00000190.

⁴ F. Uebel, ‘Die Jenaer Papyrussammlung’ *Proceedings of XIIth International Congress of Papyrology* (1970) 491–5, at 492.

(Adespota) is a meagre scrap with lyrical verses. It which mentions a ‘dweller of black-cloaked Hades’, μελαμπαρέος ... Πλούτωνος οἰκήτωρ.⁵ Lobel, in the *editio princeps*, considered Sophocles a candidate for authorship of that piece on the basis of ‘the occurrence of a “Doric” α in prevailing Attic surroundings and a turn of phrase resembling one favoured by Sophocles’. The identification of **01** with Sophocles’ *Tereus* (see below) would corroborate the view that the scribe was also copying Sophocles in XXXII **2634**. But it must be noted that **01** and XXXII **2634** are not contiguous and the two papyri were found in different seasons. Nor are there any grounds to believe that these fragments come from the same play, since the scribe copied several plays of Sophocles.

Besides **01** and XXXII **2634**, the scribe also copied P.Köln VI 251 (S. *Ai.* 1–11)⁶. One point of inconsistency does appear between P.Köln VI 251, XXXII **2634** and **01**. P.Köln VI 251 is reported to be equipped with an apostrophe to signal elision, which is difficult to discern on the online image, and a hypodiatole, which is clearly visible. XXXII **2634** is also equipped with an apostrophe to signal elision. **01** has no lectional aids, save for one inorganic diaeresis. Inconsistency in this need not, however, debar identification of the same hand in all three papyri: e.g. the scribe of the set of papyri of Aeschylus in PSI XI 1208–10 and XVII **1259–64** and **1278–9** is similarly inconsistent in applying lectional aids, but the identification of the hand in all these papyri is not open to serious doubt: see Johnson, *op. cit.* 19.

If the identification of this hand in XXXII **2634**, P.Köln VI 251, and **01** holds, a single scribe copied at least two and perhaps three of Sophocles’ dramas, of which only one survived beyond late antiquity. This might lead one to suggest that a larger set of Sophocles’ dramas was produced at Oxyrhynchus in the early second century, similar to the set of Aeschylus’ dramas mentioned above. Of course, these

⁵ This papyrus also has an annotation on the reverse, but it is in a different hand from that which made the annotation on **01**. It reads ‘31’ (encircled) and directly beneath it ‘4B16C’. This corresponds to ‘31 4B.16/C’, i.e. it is the inventory number.

⁶ A digital image may be viewed online at: <http://www.uni-koeln.de/philfak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PKoeln/PK4949r.jpg>.

sets may both have been produced elsewhere, e.g. at Alexandria, and subsequently may have been brought to Oxyrhynchus.

The roll from which *01* comes will have been a fine production, carefully written, and well laid out with ample margins and generous intercolumnar space. It appears to be a luxurious copy of a dramatist who did not enjoy particular popularity in any period in Egypt. Hitherto, only 30 papyri, attributed with varying degrees of probability to Sophocles, have been published and only 16 of them come from known plays.

For the text, lines 1–3 of col. ii overlap with *TrGF* iv 583.10–12, which Stobaeus (4.22.45 Hense-Wachsmuth) cites as Sophocles' *Tereus* from the category ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τὸ γαμεῖν. The attribution of *TrGF* iv 583 to Sophocles has now and again been challenged. For instance, F.W. Schmidt, *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern* (Berlin 1886–7) i 263, observes that ‘Sophokleisch klingt mir das Ganze ... nicht. Der Gedankenkreis, in dem sich die Darstellung bewegt, namentlich die Klage im Eingange ist vielmehr entschieden Euripideisch’. A.C. Pearson, *Fragments of Sophocles* (Cambridge 1917) ii 228, takes a similar view: ‘I agree with Schmidt that the tone of these verses recalls Euripides rather than Sophocles, but they should not be rejected in the face of the evidence on mere suspicion.’ While the papyrus may offer no direct corroboration of Stobaeus' attribution of the quotation either to Sophocles or to his *Tereus*, the ‘Ionic’ ημῖν (col. ii 20) points very strongly to his authorship (see col. ii 20 n.). Moreover, the identity of the hand of *01* with that of other papyri certainly of Sophocles (P.Köln VI 251) and perhaps of him (XXXII 2634) offer some further indirect corroboration of his authorship. Since there is no solid evidence to challenge Stobaeus' ascription of *TrGF* iv 583 to Sophocles and since the papyrus now advances strong grounds which corroborate Stobaeus' statement, the ascription must stand until compelling new evidence emerges to refute it.

As might be expected with so exiguous an overlap, the papyrus contributes little to the text offered by Stobaeus. However, it provides important ancient testimony for one probably good reading transmitted in a single MS (ἀήθη), which has been almost universally doubted and variously emended since Scaliger (see col. ii. 1 n.). The papyrus does not help to place any of the other fragments attributed to the *Tereus*, *TrGF* iv 581–95, which have all been preserved in the indirect tradition.

The story of the *Tereus* may conveniently be illustrated by a papyrus hypothesis of the play, XLII 3013 (second/third cent.). Τηρεός · [ἡ ὑ]πόθεσις | [Π]ανδίων ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δυνάστης, | [ἔ]χων θυγατέρας Πρόκωνην καὶ Φιλο[μ]ήλαν, τὴν πρῶτην | [Πρ]όκωνην Τηρεὶ γάμωι ἔζευξεν [τῶι | τῶν Θρακῶν βασιλεῖ, ὅς ἔχεν ἐξ | [αὐ]τῆς υἱὸν προσαγορεύσας | Ἴτυν. χρόνου δὲ διεθόντος καὶ | βουλομένης τῆς Πρόκνης θεάσασθαι τὴν ἀδελφὴν, ἠξίωσε τὸν | Τηρέα πορεύσασθαι εἰς Ἀθήνας | ἄξιον. ὁ δὲ παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ ἐπ[. . . .] θεὸς ὑπὸ | τοῦ Πανδίου (τὴν παρ)θένον καὶ | μεσοπορήσας [ἠράσθη] τῆς παιδός· ὁ δὲ τὰ πικρὰ οὐ φιλιάσας | διεπαρθένευ[σεν· εὐλ]αβούμενος δὲ μὴ τῆ ἀδελφῆ μηνύσει | ἐγλωσσοτόμη[σε τὴν παῖδα·] | παραγενόμενος [δὲ εἰς τὴν] | Θράκην καὶ τῆς Φιλομήλας οὐ | δυναμένης [ἐκλαλεῖν τὴν] | συμφορὰν δι' ὕφους ἐμήνυσε· | ἐπιγνοῦσα δὲ ἡ Πρόκνη τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζηλοτυπ[ίᾳ τῆ ἐσχάτῃ] | οἰκτρηθεῖσα καὶ [c.7] | νηυερεῖνοι λαβούσα τὸν | Ἴτυν ἐσφαγίασε [καὶ καθεψήσα]σεν παρέθηκε [τῶ Τηρεῖ · ὁ δὲ τὴν] | βορὰν ἀγνοῶν [ἔφαγεν· αἱ δὲ φυγα]δευθεῖσαι ἐγένοντο ἡ μὲν | ἀηδὼν ἡ δὲ χελιδὼν, ἔπος] | δὲ ὁ Τηρεός.

Only a few line ends of col. i survive. The beginnings of almost all the lines of col. ii survive till the papyrus breaks off, but scarcely more than a few syllables remain. The surviving endings of the verses in col. i are compatible with iambic trimeters. But other metres also end in $\sim \times$, and the fact that only a few of the ends of the verses in col. i have survived might lead one to consider the possibility that the verses in col. i are not iambic trimeters: col. i might contain the end of a choral ode. The chorus appears in col. ii in dialogue with the speaker of the ῥῆσις and an ode

preceding the speech is, therefore, a possible scenario for the fragment. Other metres compatible with the verse end $\sim \times$ include e.g. those based on choriambi, cretics, glyconics, enoplians, the dodrans, the telesellian or even dochmiacs. But the dochmiac may be ruled out, because the speech would not be suitable as a response elicited from an ode or utterance in that metre, because most often it signifies intense emotional outburst.

The speech cannot have begun where Stobaeus begins to quote, because $\nu\upsilon\upsilon\delta'$ (*TrGF* iv 583.1) must pick up something which had previously been stated. Besides the 9 trimeters from the quotation not in col. ii, col. i must have accommodated the beginning of the speech so that, unless the papyrus was unusually large, at least some of the surviving verse ends of col. i will have been part of the speech and, therefore, trimeters.

As in all of Sophocles' dramas, three characters appear on stage, and all of them speak, although there is no 'three cornered dialogue'. On this, and its possible implications for the dating of the play, see P.J. Finglass, *Sophocles Ajax* (Cambridge 2011) 8–9.

Unfortunately, *01* offers little new information on the identities of the characters who appear in the play.

Down to col. ii. 7 is the $\rho\eta\kappa\iota\varsigma$ of a woman who is subsequently addressed as $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\omicron\iota\nu\alpha$ (10). The woman must be either a woman of high status in the $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ or a goddess, and the natural inference from Stobaeus' attribution of the quotation to Sophocles' *Tereus* is that the woman will have been Procne, wife of Tereus, king of Thrace. The part of the speech preserved in *TrGF* iv 583 has been assigned to Procne since F.G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* (Bonn 1839) i 377, and this has become the *communis opinio*. While the papyrus offers no grounds to challenge Welcker's view, it does not confirm it.

The chorus makes a brief remark to the woman (8–9). The identity of the chorus of the *Tereus* is unknown, but it has been widely speculated that it consisted

of Thracian women: e.g. F. Angiò, ‘Sofocle, Tereo, Fr. 583 R.’ *Sileno* 17 (1991) 207–13. While some have dissented from this view (e.g. G. Dobrov, ‘The Tragic and the Comic Tereus’ *AJP* 114 (1993) 200, n. 27), the papyrus puts it beyond doubt that the chorus was made up of women, because a woman could simply not have spoken as she does in front of a group of men, as D. Fitzpatrick, ‘Sophocles’ “Tereus”’ *CQ* 51 (2001) 95, emphasises: ‘the sentiment of this passage, a bitter comment on the social position of women who are married to foreigners, does not seem an appropriate one to be uttered by an Athenian princess in the presence of a chorus of Thracian men’. Unfortunately, the papyrus does not provide any further information on the chorus’ identity: they may have been Thracian, or possibly even Athenian.

A third character appears (10), whom a marginal annotation identifies as a herdsman (see col. ii 10 n.). He addresses the woman as δέσποινα, and the form of address clearly signifies that he will have been inferior in status to her. No herdsman or similar character appears in any extant treatment of the myth, but a herdsman may very well have been an innovation of Sophocles’ which was never imitated in later treatments of the myth. Herdsmen are, in any case, common characters in tragedy: they appear in e.g. Aeschylus’ *Glaucus Potnieus* (*TrGF* iii 25e); Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Pastores* (*TrGF* iv 502); and Euripides’ *Bacchae*, *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, *Rhesus*, *Andromeda* (*TrGF* v 146), *Antiope* (*TrGF* v 188), and *Alexandrus*. In all but the last three of the enumerated dramas, herdsmen fulfil either the role of the messenger, or the function of relating information to the main characters on which the drama turns. The strong likelihood is that the herdsman here fulfils the same function; see 11 n.

Since Welcker, *op. cit.* 377, *TrGF* iv 583 has been located with few exceptions in the prologue. But the presence of the chorus now debars this from being a possibility: the woman could not simply begin conversing with the chorus, nor would the chorus have opened the play. Wherever the ῥῆσις began, it did not continue beyond col. ii 7. Finglass observes that ‘[t]his looks like an episode early on

in the play. Procne's laments are very general, and concern her position as a wife in a foreign country. We know that the laments are the whole, or the climax of her speech, and so were not accompanied by laments for Philomela's death (of which Ovid falsely informs her) or mutilation. The mutilation might already have happened, but Procne doesn't know it yet.' Finglass compares the structure of the papyrus' dialogue with *S. Tr.* 141–204 where, he observes, 'Deianeira gives a long speech, then the chorus do not really reply to it, but merely announce that they see someone coming, then Lichas and Deianeira have their conversation, with no further remark from the chorus. Cf. *E. IT* 203–339.'

Finglass' reconstruction of the context was, in many respects, anticipated by N.C. Hourmouziades, 'Sophocles *Tereus*' in J.H. Betts et al. (eds.), *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* (Bristol 1986) i 134–42. At 136, he describes *TrGF* iv 583 as '[t]his bitter comment on women's social disadvantages, apparently spoken by a woman separated from her familiar ambience as a result of marriage to a man of totally foreign origin and background, has been understandably assigned to Procne. The text implies a situation before any news, good or bad, has reached her, therefore before Tereus' return from Athens, but neither its tone nor tenor fits the context of an opening speech: even a Euripidean prologue, long and expository as it might be, would leave no space for this kind of passionate generalisation, which seems to elaborate on a previously touched theme. The passage has been rightly paralleled with parts of Medea's first *rhexis* (*Med.* 230ff): just as in Euripides' play, here, too, the heroine seems to be addressing a sympathetic, most probably female, audience. If the example of the *Medea* is not altogether misleading, I would further argue that Procne also is speaking to the Chorus and, accordingly, place the fragment after the *parados*, preferably at the beginning of the first episode.'

As commentators have remarked, the speech quoted by Stobaeus is a denunciation of marriage. The woman holds forth to the chorus on the stages of a woman's life. She compares adolescence, the most joyous period of life, with

adulthood, which is a traumatic experience, because a woman is ‘thrust out of the home and sold’. It is bad enough, she avers, to marry a kinsman, but it is the ultimate misfortune to marry a barbarian.

She continues in the papyrus text. She mentions either custom or law (νόμῳ col. ii 4, already at col. i 19,] νόμος), seeing something (ἴδοιμι καί[6), and desiring something or missing something (e.g. τὸ γὰρ ποθ[εῖν or τὸ γὰρ ποθ[εινόν 7). The chorus makes a heartening remark (e.g. ἀλλ’ εὖ τελε[εῖται 8) before the herdsman appears and apprises the woman of something. The woman questions the herdsman (οὐκ οὖν 12) who mentions an oath (ὄρκον γάρ 14) and the revelation of something (φράσειν 15). She replies. The herdsman speaks of either himself or other people going somewhere (εἶρπον 18), of hunting (ἐξ ἄγρα[ς 19), of a man (ὄς 20) who is going somewhere (στεύχων 21) and of libations or a stream (ἔνθεν χοαί[22).

A scenario which might account for these details might be as follows: the hypothesis informs us that, in the middle of the journey to Thrace, Tereus was struck by desire for Philomela, μεσοπορήσας [ἡράσθη] τῆς παιδός (14–15). It does not reveal where he rapes and mutilates her. In Ovid (*Met.* 6.424–74) Tereus locks Philomela in a hut in the woods, but this may be an innovation of Ovid’s. Since Philomela’s rape and mutilation occurred somewhere on the way to Thrace, either on the road or in the countryside, the shepherd might have been going about his business near the palace and chanced to witness the attack, or, as Finglass suggests, he might have discovered the body of Philomela. He then comes to report what he has witnessed to Procne. He is acutely agitated, and begins recounting what he has seen. There is no prevarication with politesse; and he may swear something, presumably that what he is about to relate is the truth, because he could not otherwise have said it.

col. i

] ,ov

col. ii

αιδεισαν .[

] ,οπει		καιταυτε .[
]ε		χρεωνεπ .[
] .		νομωμεν[
5] ,αε	5	ειδεκτοιο .[
]ρος		ϊδοιμικαι[
]αι		τογαρποθ .[
] ,ατων	χ ^ο	̄αλλευτελ[
]ερων		χρηστηνφ[
10]α	πο . ^Η	̄δεποινα[
]		θελωντι[
]		̄ουκουνδ .[
]		λογωνμε[
] .		̄ορκονγαρ .[
15]ν	15	φρασεινα[
]ε		̄λεξαα . .[
]		κοινων . .[
]ρουε		̄ειρπονμ[
] ,νομος		αλλεξαγρα[
20]φης	20	οσημινερ .[
]
			ετειχωνδ[
]
			ενθενχοαι[
]
			εστηνυπο[
]μνυπ[
		25] . . π[

Unplaced scrap:

]νε .[

col. i.

1] ., ends of two obliques, κ or χ 2] ., ends of two obliques, κ or χ 4] ., tip of rounded stroke and foot curved stroke 5] ., tip of upright with serif, perhaps ν 8] ., bottom of oblique rapidly flattening, μ or λ 10]α, foot of sharply sloping oblique with mid-line crossbar
 14] ., upright with slight forward stroke at very base, compatible with η 19] ., upright with lip at foot, ν, ι, or η 20]φ, high vertical stroke with vestiges of curve beneath

col. ii

1 .[, rounded letter with traces of medial bar, θ or ε 2 .[, upright with beginning of bar atop, π or γ
 3 .[, foot of sharply sloping oblique with serif, α or λ 5 .[, high speck, tip of υ or τ 6 ο, speck on left-hand side of hole and part of arc on right-hand side of hole 7 .[, nearly complete circular stroke with traces of medial bar, ε or θ high curving speck, compatible with ε, ο, or c
 12 .[, back of curved letter, ε, θ, ο, c all possible 14 ορ, foot of seriffed upright with base of loop above and to right .[, trace of high downwards curving stroke, compatible with ε, θ, ο, or c
 16 . .[, left-hand upright and half of top bar, π or γ top of sharply descending oblique, α or λ 17 . .[, blot at base-line, perhaps vestige of serif part of upper portion of rounded letter 20 .[, single tiny high and low specks, perhaps γ or χ 22 ι[, tail of α meeting foot or serif of letter with vertical stroke 24], first, high bar with small barb at right-hand end and upright meeting almost at left-hand end, γ rather than π second, top of curved stroke, ε, θ, ο, or c third, trace of high oblique fourth, high slightly oblique descender, α, δ, λ, or perhaps ι 25] . ., high horizontal perhaps with upright on left-hand side top of upright with perhaps something extending leftwards and tip of upright π[, first, high horizontal with upright on right-hand side second, tip of high slightly oblique stroke, α, λ, or perhaps ι third, high small round trace, perhaps ρ fourth, top portion of curved stroke, ε, θ, ο, or c

100/97(b) + *TrGF* iv 583

col. i

]κον

]κοπει

]ε

] .
5] .
] . ac
] ροc
] αι
] . ατων
10] ερων
] α
]
]
] .
15] ν
] c
]
] ρουc
] . νόμοc
20] φηc

Incertum quot desint versus.

<A> νῦν δ' οὐδέν εἰμι χωρίς. ἀλλὰ πολλάκις
 ἔβλεψα ταύτη τὴν γυναικείαν φύσιν,
 ὥc οὐδέν ἐcμεν. αἱ νέαι μὲν ἐν πατρὸc
 ἡδικοτον, οἶμαι, ζῶμεν ἀνθρώπων βίον·
 τερπνῶc γὰρ αἰ παῖδαc ἀνοία τρέφει.
 ὅταν δ' ἐc ἡβην ἐξικώμεθ' ἔμφρονεc,
 ὠθούμεθ' ἔξω καὶ διεμπολώμεθα

col. ii

θεῶν πατρῶων τῶν τε φουσάντων ἄπο,
 αἱ μὲν ξένους πρὸς ἄνδρας, αἱ δὲ βαρβάρους,
 αἱ δ' εἰς ἀήθη[η δώμαθ', αἱ δ' ἐπίρροθα.
 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπ[ειδὰν εὐφρόνη ζεύξη μία
 χρεῶν ἐπα[ινεῖν καὶ δοκεῖν καλῶς ἔχειν.
 νόμφ μὲν [
 5 εἰ δ' ἐκ τοιου[
 ἴδοιμι και[
 τὸ γὰρ ποθ[.[
 χο. ἄλλ' εὖ τεγλ[
 χρηστὴν φ[
 10 ποιμ. δέσποινα [
 θέλων τι[
 <A> οὔκουν δ[.[
 λόγων με[
 <ποι> ὄρκον γὰρ [
 15 φράσειν α[
 <A> λέξαα . .[
 κοινον .[
 <ποι> εἶρπον μ[
 ἀλλ' ἐξ ἄγρα[c
 20 ὅς ἡμιν ἐρ[.[
 στείων δ[
 ἔνθεν χοὰ[
 ἔστην ὑπο[
] μνυ .[
 25] . . παρ[.[

col. i

2]κοπει: c]κόπει, c]κοπεῖ, ἐc]κόπει.

col. ii

1 ἀήθ[η with B: ἀληθῆ SMA. ἀληθῆ resembles an attempt to make sense of the perhaps unfamiliar ἀήθη. The adjective occurs once in tragedy (*A. Supp.* 576, ὄψιν ἀήθη), but it is common in later prose authors, e.g. Thucydides and Plato. αἰ δὲ εἰς δώματα ἀληθῆ is senseless and may be discounted summarily.

This and the preceding verse compare the misfortunes of women who are married to strangers, a less than ideal situation, with those who are married to barbarians, which is far worse. While many scholars have noted the comparison, they have been unable to accept the ἀήθη of Stobaeus' MS and resorted to emendation to construct the comparison. Brunck, in his edition of 1789, remarks 'quibuscumque moribus sit et qualiacumque fortuna utatur vir hospes vel barbarus, cui puella nuptum datur, haud secus insueta est, quo ducitur, domus.' Views of this kind have come to dominate the debate, and few words have come under such an attack as ἀήθη. E.g. Scaliger⁷ suggested ἀγήθη (corrected to ἀγηθῆ by van Herwerden, although it is never attested), Jacobs καλευτά, Bothe ἀηδῆ, Schneidewin ἀλιτρά, van Herwerden ἄκληρα, Meineke ἀμειδῆ, Kock ἀπηνῆ, Schmidt ἀμεμφῆ, Stadtmüller ἀναλοθῆ (= ἀνίατα) or ἀναλοδῆ, Holzner ἄδηλα or ἄσημα, Prinz ἀκηδῆ, van Blumenthal γαληνῆ.

The obvious senses of ἀήθη, 'strange' or 'unfamiliar', have long been rejected because, of necessity, the house of a husband into which a newly wedded bride moves will be strange and unfamiliar to her. But this is not a peculiar complaint: the speech of Medea at *E. Med.* 238–40 has much in common with that of A here. Medea there speaks of marriage which she describes as ἐc καινὰ δ' ἥθη καὶ

⁷ For the locations of these conjectures, see the bibliography in *TrGF* iv (ed.) S. Radt (Gottingae 1999).

νόμους ἀφιγμένην | δεῖ μάντιν εἶναι μὴ μαθοῦσαν οἴκοθεν | οἴω μάλιστα χρήεται
 ξυνευνέτη. The terms in which A expresses herself are resonant here, because καινὰ
 ἦθη hardly differs in sense from ἀήθη. Furthermore, the cognate noun ἀηθία
 describes a disagreeable and disturbing state in which to fall at E. *Hel.* 417–9: ὅταν
 δ’ ἀνήρ | πράξει κακῶς ὑψηλός, εἰς ἀηθίαν | πίπτει κακίῳ τοῦ πάλαι δυσδαίμονος. As
 R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena* (Heidelberg 1969) ii 128, paraphrases, ‘Stürzt
 (nämlich) ein Mann von hohem Rang ins Unglück, so kommt er in eine ihm
 ungewohnte Lage, und er ist viel übler daran als ein seit eh und je Unglücklicher’.

Further support for ἀήθη will be found in the comparison itself. The
 comparison meant is one between a marriage that is bad with one which is truly
 awful. If one marries a stranger, it will be bad because all that it entails will be
 strange. But if one marries a barbarian it will be terrible because all that marriage
 entails will be hostile to one. Naturally this second possibility will be so much worse,
 and this is well brought out by the contrast αἱ δ’ εἰς ἀήθη δώμαθ’, αἱ δ’ ἐπίρροθα,
 ‘some go to strange homes, some to hostile’.

However, if one were to maintain that ἀήθη both in the papyrus, the sole
 direct witness to the text at this point, and the MS of Stobaeus had arisen from
 corruption, one would have to explain how it had become the settled text in the early
 Roman period. It would mean that ἀήθη had ousted the true reading very early in the
 tradition and predominated so greatly as to obliterate any other plausible reading.
 This scenario is not remotely convincing, for ἀήθη is an improbable corruption. The
 direct testimony of papyrus and the only branch of the indirect tradition which offers
 an intelligible expression are surely sound.

4 νόμῳ. From the context, νόμῳ rather than νομῶ is almost certainly right.
 This perhaps picks up the mention of νόμος in col. i. 19.

νόμῳ μὲν [. This must be followed by a connector which begins with a
 vowel: e.g. νόμῳ μὲν [οὖν (Finglass).

5–6 Finglass notes that ‘εἰ might go with ἴδοιμι, or the latter could be the verb in the apodosis to the protasis introduced by the former. Cf. *S. Ph.* 1043–4 ὡς ζῶ μὲν οἰκτρῶς, εἰ δ’ ἴδοιμι’ ὀλωλότας | τούτους, δοκοῖμι’ ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγένοι.

7 τὸ γὰρ ποθ[.]: e.g. τὸ γὰρ ποθε[ῖν, τὸ γὰρ ποθο[ῖν (perhaps *S. Tr.* 196), τὸ γὰρ ποθε[ῖνόν. τὸ γὰρ ποθ’ ἔ[and τὸ γὰρ ποθ’ ὀ[seem less likely. Finglass suggests that this could be a concluding *gnome* and compares this usage of γὰρ in *E. El.* 1170 where it does this duty, τοὺς γὰρ θανόντας οὐχ ὀρώ λυπουμένους.

8 in mg. χ^ο. The monogram is very common: instances of its occurrence include VIII 1083 (Sophocles various plays, second cent.); XI 1369 (*S. OT*, fifth cent.); XI 1370 (*E. Med.* and *E. Or.*, fifth cent.), XX 2245 fr. 12 (*A.* various plays, second cent.), LIII 3688 (*S. Tr.*, fifth/sixth cent.), and P.Ant. III 211 (b) (*Ar. Lys.*, more of P.Ant. II 75, fifth/sixth cent.).

ἀλλ’ εὖ τελ[. E.g. ἀλλ’ εὖ τελ[εῖται (*E. Or.* 1670), τελ[εῖ (*A. Th.* 35), τελ[εῖσθω (*A. Ch.* 310), τελ[ευτήκει (*A. Supp.* 208). The last three were suggested by Finglass, who further compares *S. Tr.* 229 ἀλλ’ εὖ μὲν ἴγμεθ’, εὖ δὲ προσφωνούμεθα, which is spoken by an entrant; and he further observes that, in our passage, there seems to be a reference to the entering character.

9 χρητην φ[. The application of χρητός in Sophocles is wide. It encompasses e.g. people, *OR* 609–10 οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον οὔτε τοὺς κακοὺς μάτην | χρητοὺς νομίζειν οὔτε τοὺς χρητοὺς κακοὺς; the mind, *Ant.* 298–9 τόδ’ ἐκδιδάσκει καὶ παραλλάσσει φρένας | χρητὰς πρὸς αἰετὰ πράγμαθ’ ἵστασθαι βροτῶν; views, *Ant.* 635–6 καὶ εὖ με γνώμας ἔχων | χρητὰς ἀπορθοῖς αἰετῶν ἔγωγ’ ἐφέψομαι; words, *Tr.* 230–1 ἄνδρα γὰρ καλῶς | πράσσοντ’ ἀνάγκη χρητὰ κερδαίνειν ἔπη; and behaviour in general, *Ph.* 456–7 ὅπου δ’ ὁ χείρων τὰγαθοῦ μείζον χθένει | κάποφθίνει τὰ χρητὰ χῶ δειλὸς κρατεῖ.

Finglass observes that χρητην φ[- may be part of a brief prayer for good news from the shepherd who has just entered e.g. χρητην φ[άτιν or φ[έρων. It is not clear why the chorus should pray for good news. Procne is holding forth to the

chorus in general terms on marriage; the chorus see someone enter, and presumably this is unexpected. A prayer for good news would imply that the chorus and Procne are worried about something. Perhaps Tereus and Philomela, who might have been long expected, are delayed, and this causes Procne and the chorus to fear the worst.

10 in mg. πο̅. There is a fissure in the papyrus so that only the first two letters of the annotation can be read certainly; the third letter seems to be ι with μ suspended above it as an abbreviation: πο̅. ποιμ(ήν) is the likeliest interpretation.

10 δέσποινα [. On this term of address and what it denotes about the person using it see E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford 1996) 98–100.

11 θέλων τι. One might supplement e.g. θέλων τι [λέξει, θέλων τι[ν' λόγον, cf. S. *OR* 932–3 ἀλλὰ φράζ' ... χῶτι δημῆναι θέλων (all Finglass). As Finglass remarks, the herdsman does not prevaricate with an elaborate address to the queen, as does e.g. the herdsman at E. *IT* 238, who addresses Iphigeneia as Ἀγαμέμνονός τε καὶ Κλυταιμῆτρας τέκνον. The herdsman knows exactly who she is, and he is clearly agitated. The very directness of his approach suggests that he has something particularly pressing of which to inform her.

12 οὔκουν δ. [. It is impossible to exclude the possibility that ουκουν marks an inference, and is therefore to be accented οὔκοῦν, but it will be the simpler explanation that A is here asking a question of the new entrant. E.g. οὔκουν δο[κεῖς, δο[κεῖ σοι, δο[κῶ, δέ[δοκας, δέ[δωκε, δε[δώκασι, δέ[δορκας, δέ[δορκε, δε[δόρκασι, δε[δορκός. For οὔκουν δο[κεῖς opening a question, cf. e.g. E. *Alc.* 60 and *IA* 528 (both Finglass).

14 ὄρκον γὰρ [. Oaths were uniquely powerful in the ancient world, because, as R. Janko observes, *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge 1992) 194, 'to take an oath is in effect to invoke powers greater than oneself to uphold the truth of a declaration, by putting a curse upon oneself if it is false'. Finglass suggests that this may be a performative utterance. He refers to S. *El.* 47 where Orestes tells the

Paedagogus to add an oath to his speech to give it credibility. The addition of the oath guarantees that what the herdsman apprises Procne of will be the truth. To add such a powerful deterrence from telling falsehoods implies that what the herdsman is about to say would not otherwise be believed by Procne. Finglass wonders whether it might be that the herdsman has discovered the mutilated Philomela. One may, however, wonder whether a discovery of this kind, gruesome though it would be, would really be so incredible to Procne that the herdsman would need to swear an oath to establish that what he was about to say was the truth. Rather one might have thought that his trustworthiness would be under heavier scrutiny if he, a low character, were to contest the word or conduct of an aristocrat. Possibly the herdsman might have witnessed the rape or mutilation of Philomela, or indeed both, which he now reveals to Procne.

15 φράσειν α[. An infinitive will probably have depended on ὄρκον so that one might construe it e.g. φράσειν ἄ[, ἄ[ν or ἄ[παντα rather than begin a new clause. φράσει να[is an improbable articulation.

16 λεξασα .[. E.g. λέξασ ἄπα[ντα would be suitable here.

18 εἶρπον μ[: e.g. εἶρπον μ[έν. The herdsman begins his narrative here, hence the imperfect. Finglass notes that the speaker begins his story immediately; i.e. there is no ‘declaration of intent to narrate’: there is no γάρ or ἔπει. On this, see P.J. Finglass, *Sophocles Electra* (Cambridge 2007) on S. *El.* 680 and 681.

19 ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἄγρα[c. Finglass notes that this is a striking use of ἀλλά which is ‘almost like an inverted *cum* clause’. Possibly the shepherd was taken by surprise by whoever it was who appears from hunting. Perhaps he was making for somewhere and may not have been expecting to see anyone. Perhaps it is Tereus?

20 ὃς ἦμιν ἐρ .[. The traces seem to fit an upright with finials. E.g. ὃς ἦμιν ἔργ[α, ἔργ[ον, ἔργ[άζεσθαι, ἔργ[άσαι, ἔργ[άσεται, ἔργ[άσθηται, ἔργ[άσθηται would be possible. Alternatively one might consider e.g. ὃς ἦμιν ἔρχ[εται with perhaps e.g. ἐκ λόγους (cf. S. *OC* 1164 κοὶ φαὶν αὐτὸν ἐκ λόγους μολεῖν μόνον | αἰτεῖν ... (codd.

ἐλθεῖν) or *TrGF* iv 524.5 βροτοῖς δ' ἄν ἐλθὼν ἐκ λόγον δίκην ὄφλοι). The construction ἔρχεσθαι + dative also occurs in the sense 'fall to one' e.g. *Pi. O.* 1.100 τὸ δ' αἰεὶ πανάμερον ἐκλὸν | ὕπατον ἔρχεται παντὶ βροτῶν or 'come to one' e.g. *E. Med.* 419 ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει. It can also bear the sense 'come to aid' or 'relieve one' (LSJ⁹ s.v. III.4) as at *Od.* 16. 452–3 ἐκπέριος δ' Ὀδυσῆϊ καὶ υἱεῖ δῖος ὕφορβος | ἦλυθεν. Less likely would be ὅς ἡμῖν ἔρπει: it would be otiose, and in any case ἔρπειν + dative is not a very common construction, although e.g. *S. Ant.* 618–9 εἰδοῖτι δ' οὐδὲν ἔρπει, | πρὶν πυρὶ θερμῶι πόδα τις προσάουη might offer a parallel for the sense.

20 ἡμῖν. The correct accentuation of the first and second person dative plural of the personal pronoun is controversial: see recently e.g. P. Probert, *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol 2003) 150–1, S. Kaczko, 'ἡμῖν, ἡμῖν, ἡμῖν da Omero a Sofocle: problemi linguistici' *RFIC* 130 (2002) 257–98. See also W.S. Barrett, *Euripides Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) Appendix II 425–7. The second syllable must be short: this licence is confined in drama to Sophocles. Probert, following Apollonius Dyscolus, *Pron.*, 96.23–97.3, 97.28–98.2 and 100.1–3, is to be followed in the matter of accentuation.

21 κτείχων δ[: cf. e.g. κτείχων δ' ἀγρόκτην ὄχλον -x--- (*TrGF* iv 94 *Alexandrus*); κτείχων δ' ἰκνοῦμαι τούδε τοὺς χώρους (*S. OT* 798).

22 ἔνθεν χοαί [. The χοαί could be a drink offering for libations, the libations themselves, e.g. *S. OC* 1599 κάπειτ' ἀύεα παῖδας ἠνώγει ρυτῶν | ὑδάτων ἐνεγκεῖν λουτρὰ καὶ χοάς ποθεν, or a stream, e.g. *TrGF* iv 523 Ἀχέροντος ἄρκενας χοάς. Perhaps, as Finglass suggests, the herdsman and whomever he encounters arrive at a stream or fountain from which they draw water for libations. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985) 70, notes that χοαί are intended for the dead and the chthonic gods. But it is quite unclear for whom these χοαί are intended, or indeed why the shepherd and the other character need to make libations.

23 ἔστην ὑπο[-. I have articulated thus, although ἐς τὴν ὑπο[- would be possible. On the spelling of εἰς/ἐς in Sophocles, see P.J. Finglass, ‘Orthographica Sophoclea’ *Philologus* 153/2 (2009) 212–15. Both forms are possible and both are metrically guaranteed at various places in Sophocles. But Finglass shows that the MSS of Sophocles are often divided when there is no guarantee on quantity and notes that the MSS have a definite tendency to prefer εἰς to ἐς.

At col. ii 1 the papyrus has αἰ δ’ εἰς ἀθήνη, where εἰς is necessary on metrical grounds. Here the first syllable will be long on account of the consonant following ἐς and this affords no help to reach a decision. However, this is in the context of an extensive first person narrative, and an aorist (ἔστην) would fit in well with narrative scheme begun with an imperfect at 18 (εἶπρον).

24] μνο [. The letter before μ is most likely α; the first letter in the line looks more like γ than τ and unlike π. γ will not be accommodated in a word with αμν two letters later, but if τ were to be read (the papyrus breaks off where the bar might have continued) one could consider τέρραμν’, ‘chambers’ or ‘dwelling’, which would be compatible with the traces. Sophocles does not use the word but that is no real objection to reading it here. It is fairly common in Euripides: see W.S. Barrett, *op. cit.* at E. *Hipp.* 418 on its sense.

02. HEXAMETERS

87/305

fr.1 6.2 x 6.2 cm

Third century

Nineteen fragments from a roll of papyrus which preserve hexameters on an uncertain mythical topic: a reference is made to the Lapiths and Centaurs in fr. 8. The fibres and the sheet-joins show that the papyrus was originally used for a document, possibly relating to property as ἀπηλιω(τ-) (fr. 1), δτωρ[- (fr. 12), ἐπανα[- (fr. 2) , and the symbol Ϟ (= 200) (fr. 5) might suggest. It was only subsequently re-used for the hexameters. It is unclear whether the hexameters are all from the same poem or parts of several poems, e.g. the fragments may have come from more than one epyllion. It is difficult to make out any strands of continuous narrative from the various fragments.

The upper margin, which is preserved in part in fr. 2, is at least 1.8 cm; the lower margin, preserved in full in fr. 6, is 2.2 cm. Sheet joins can be seen in fr. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, but the width of the sheets cannot be established. It is uncertain how many lines each column will have had.

The main hand is medium sized and slopes gently forward. It has a certain similarity in style to XXX 2524 (hexameters, assigned to the third cent.). 02 is, however, much inferior to it in execution because it is irregular and inconsistent. It has strong affinities to the ‘Severe Style’ in that several letters have a certain angularity, e.g. α, δ, ζ, κ, λ, ν, and ω, but the scribe is not always consistent in this. α, for instance, is done in two strokes. Usually it has a sharply acute angle on its left hand-side, but this can also be a rounded loop. There is a certain contrast between wide and narrow letters: e.g. ε, θ, ο, and Ϟ are, by and large, narrower than η, κ, μ, ν, and π, but ε, θ, ο, and Ϟ do themselves vary markedly in size and positioning. At times they are raised, at times they lie on the base-line. ν has a shallow bowl atop an oblique and an often extravagant descender. ω is usually flat bottomed or has only a slight kink; μ bows deeply and smoothly. Bilinearity is regularly breached by the

descenders of υ, τ, ρ, φ, and ψ. The letters are without adornment. I am inclined to assign the hand to the third century on comparison with XVII 2098 = *GLH* 19b, (Herodotus 7) with a land survey, probably from the reign of Gallienus, on the back.

Lectional apparatus includes: rough breathing (Turner's form 1, *GMAW*² p.11) at fr. 5.6; apostrophe at fr. 1.7, 1.8, 5.8, 9.6, 11.3; and inorganic diaeresis at fr. 4.4, 8.5, 15.2. Elision seems to be consistently effected; it is marked by an apostrophe. There is no instance of *iota adscriptum*, but it is not certainly needed anywhere.

Numerous corrections are made, at times in a more cursive hand than that of the main text, e.g. `τε' at fr.3.5. These are usually set above the incorrect letter. This scribe is not consistent in deleting the incorrect letters graphically, but he does so at fr. 1.9, 6.3, 7.12, 9.2, 9.5, 9.6. It is not always clear whether the supralinear insertions are intended to be additions to the line, e.g. at fr. 3.5 where `τε' appears to be a metrically necessary addition, or intended to correct a false letter, e.g. at fr. 1.4 where δ is added above θ to correct give [θ]`δ'αμέντ[-. The inconsistency gives rise to ambiguity about what his interference signifies, and the problem is made all the more difficult by the exiguous remains of the pieces.

Iotacistic spellings are to be observed here and there: e.g. fr. 5.5 νιόθι[(1. νείοθι), 5.7 ιδειν[(1. εἶδει ν[?).

The order in which the fragments are presented is based mainly on the size: it does not imply anything about their sequence.

As to the poem itself, the subject is obscure. In fr. 1, justice (1 δίκη) is mentioned, the rays of the sun occur (2 ἠελίου ζωθαλπέος ἀκτείνεσσ[ι]), references are made to depths or deep things (5 νείατα), altars (7 ἐπὶ βωμοῖς), those who are misguided in their thinking (8 ἀμαρτίν[ε]`ο'οι), and the blessed gods (10 μάκαρες θεοί). Fr. 2 may refer again to the blessed immortals (5 ἀθα]νάτων μα[κάρων). Fr. 3 mentions dark things (3 σκοτίησι); force (5 βίη); wits (7]πραπί[δ). Fr. 6 concerns the earth (4 χθονί); wits for a second time (5 πραπίδ[); something gleaming (10

αἰγληεντ[] and perhaps ashes (12 τερ[ρ]η[]). Fr. 7 speaks of men (3 ἄν]δρεσσ[ι]) and manliness (4 ἀν]δρότητ[]). Fr. 8 refers to the Lapiths (3]ις Λαπίθησιν []) and the Centaurs (4] Κενταύροισ[]). Fr. 15 mentions woe (2 ὀ]ϊζύον []).

Fr. 1 seems to deal with an act of divine justice, although both its dispenser and agent remain obscure. A punisher (3 ποινητορ[]) is mentioned. The fragment then seems to press the dichotomy between gods (10 μάκαρες θε[οί]), and men, and in particular the minds of men (7 φρεσίν, 8 ἀμαρτίνοοι μάλ' ἔόντε[], 9 νόος ἐμπεδὲς ἦε []). ἀμαρτίνοοι, in particular, suggests that the reference is contemptuous.

The reference to the Lapiths and Centaurs must be of some significance, but their connection with the rest of the poem is wholly obscure. They might have been used as an extended *exemplum* to illustrate some point, or they might possibly be the subject of the narrative, but it is difficult to see how that would be compatible with the main fragment at least. The battle of the Centaurs and Lapiths is alluded to infrequently in epic: Hom. *Od.* 21.297, [Hes.] *Scut.* 178–90, A.R. 1.41–2, 1.59–64, and [Orph.] *Arg.* 170–74. It appears much more frequently in prose writers and in Latin literature.

Interestingly, in spite of its apparent lack of popularity as a subject for epic poetry, the battle of the Centaurs and Lapiths forms a significant part of the narration of another hexameter poem from Oxyrhynchus, LXIX 4714 (assigned to the third cent.), which is probably contemporary with *02*. The hand of LXIX 4714 is not, however, the same as that of *02*. So scanty is the fragment concerned with the Centaurs and Lapiths in *02* that it cannot be said whether or not there were any similarities in composition.

The metrical practices of the poet may be observed in part from fr. 1. Where it is possible to determine the caesura, five of the seven are masculine, and two feminine. The Bucolic caesura occurs in 2, 7, 9 and 10. Contraction of the biceps in the fourth foot is observable in 3 and 5. The fifth foot in 2 is contracted, ἀκτεῖνῆσσι, which makes it a σπονδειάζων. On this see M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982)

154. While the *σπονδειαζών* may be an affectation which is moderately common in Hellenistic poetry, the prevalence of the masculine caesurae might suggest that this is not the work of a poet of refined manner who followed the poetical conventions of the Hellenistic or Imperial age: cf. West, *op. cit.* 152–7.

Several items of the poet's vocabulary are of some interest. He uses two words which are elsewhere only to be found in Nonnus, *ζωθαλπής* (2) and *ποινήτωρ* (3). He also has some other slightly recondite items of vocabulary e.g. *ἀμαρτίνοος* (8), attested in Hesiod, Solon, Aeschylus, Rhianus, and Nonnus, and *περιδάμνασθαι* (4), which only occurs in Quintus Smyrnaeus.

fr. 1

.

] . . εδ . . ηκατε . [.] υσε . . [

] ουζωθαλπεοσακτεινεcc[

] . λιναυτισεπηνποιητο . [

δ

] κηπεριπανταθαμεντ[

v

5] ονναιεικαινειαταβ . . [

δ

] νικηρε . . . νεθρε . η . [.] . . [

] ενιφρεσινουτ' επιβωμοι . [

ο

] . σαμαρτινεοιμαλ' εοντε[

δ c ε .

] . ισιννοοσεμπεσεδημ-[

c

10] . . ακαρεσθ[

] λειομεν[

] ccινε .[

] .ω[

1] . . , foot of thickened upright meeting low oblique or horizontal from left, perhaps v straight descender breaching base-line with faintest traces of horizontal above, τ or less likely υ δ . . , foot of single upright reaching base-line low flattening oblique meeting subsequent letter, κ or ζ .[, obliques crossing diagonally at mid-line, ν, λ, or χ . .[, convergence on base-line of two strokes at acute angle, δ or α foot of upright ? 3] . , end of low oblique, α or λ .[, small high speck tending rightwards and traces of ink below base-line, perhaps ρ, or other descender 5 .[, small high speck high speck, possibly end of arc, e.g. ε or c 6 ε . . . , oval shaped forward slanting letter, o or c low arc, c or θ single upright .η, small and low rounded letter, o, ε, or bottom loop of β .[, long stroke breaching base-line with high bar crossing below tip, ψ, φ, or possibly ρ] .[, base of forward slanting oblique low bowing stroke 7 .[, low rounded letter, o or c 8] . , tiny speck at mid-line, ε or θ 9] . , end of high arc, c or ε `ε´, bar of ε continuing to meet upright 10] . . , high shallow bowl, perhaps υ tips of two uprights, μ, ν, or η κ, upright with high oblique extending flatly upwards θ[, small rounded letter set atop another rounded letter, θ 11] `´ . . , curved stroke, o or θ beneath correction oblique meeting oblique, λ or possibly χ 12 .[, high rounded stroke, open on left-hand side, β or less likely ρ 13] . , end of high oblique, κ, χ, τ, or υ

] γ τε δίκη κατέγ[ε]υσε .[

] ου ζωθαλπέος άκτείνεcc[iv

π]άλιν αύτις έπήν ποινητορ[~ -x

] κης περι πάντα δαμέντ[*

5] ον ναίειν και νείατα β .[.] .[

] νικηδε . . ινεθρε .η .[.] .[

] ενι φρεcιν ούτ' έπι βωμοίς

] c άμαρτίνοοι μάλ' έόντε[

10] . ιιν νόος ἐμπεδῆς ἦε .[
] ` . ' υ μάκαρες θε[εοὶ - - - *
] ` . ' . . εομεν[
] ccινε .[
] . ω[

.

fr. 2

	ο .		
] ocδιεμετ[] ocο . διεμετ[
] . πνοιο .[] . πνοιομ[
] νμεγαλ[] ν μεγαλ[
] . ηcδεινη[] . ηc δεινη[
5] νατωνμα[5] νατων μα[
	ν		
] πυματοε[] πύματον[
] . μαλιcτατ[] . μάλιcτα τ[
] . ρηο . επι[] αρηοι επι[
] . ονεcα .[] . ονεcα .[
10] . ε .[10] . ε .[
] . ε[] . ε[

.

1 `ο ` , oblique adjoining low horizontal which curves back on itself, perhaps ν 2] , high trace then mid-line dot [, sharply rising oblique with low bowing stroke extending from tip, μ or ν 4] , foot of upright, ι or π 7] , mid-line speck, perhaps ε 8] , shortish oblique with further stroke crossing it, α or λ ο , single unconnected upright 9] , upright with end of further stroke atop, π or ι in ligature [, upright with horizontal bar extending leftwards from tip and

further unconnected horizontal, γι or π 10] , high speck and end of medial bar adjoining upright, η or possibly ει in ligature .[, upright thickened at top and bottom with curving stroke extending from top which adjoins a slightly curving upright, π or possibly ιτ 11] , end of high horizontal, γ, ζ, κ, τ, or c

fr. 3

		v					
] κ	ικιεπεσ	.] κ	ικινεπεσ	.	
		.					
]νωχελεαικ	[]νωχελεα	ικκ	[
]ταισκοτησι	[]ται	σκοτήσι	[
]κτησιοςαμφ	[]κτησίος	άμφ	[
		τε					
5]ητεβηπεπ	.	5]η	τε βή	τε πεπ	.
]θελο	.]θελογ	[
]πραπ	.]πραπ	ίδ		
]πολυ	.]πολυ	.		
]ευουσι	.]ευουσι	.		
10]διςσασ	[10]διςσασ	[
]βαλαν	[]βαλαν	[
]ενζ	.]ενζ	.		
]η	[]η	[
		

1] , low arc κ , raised bottom arc, compatible with ο .[, slightly oblique descender breaching base-line, τ, υ or, less likely, ρ 2 `', upward tending oblique and horizontal, perhaps ε but missing bottom curve or c 4]κ, divergent obliques beginning at mid-line 5 .[, high sharply sloping oblique, υ or possibly λ 6 .[, obliques meeting to form an apex 7 π .[, upright with

high bar atop meeting further upright foot of upright, ι, γ, or π 8 .[, sharply rising oblique
with beginnings of sharply curving stroke, μ or ν 9 .[, high speck of ink 12] ., single
upright, ι, η, or ν .[, speck at mid-line

fr. 4

	· · ·		· · ·
	η .[η .[
	μν[μν[
	.νκκ[.] .[.] .[.]		ξνκκ[.] .[.] .[.]
	.ϋτεπερ[εϋτε περ[
5	.ι . . . ενκ .[5	.ι . . . ενκ .[
	οπποτεμ[οππότε μ[
	μ[.] η . . . [μ[.] η . . . [
	.[.[
	.ç[οç[
10	.α[10	δα[
	· · ·		· ·

1 .[, top of upright with oblique extending downwards, μ or possibly ν 3 ., high flatly curving
upright, ε or θ] .[, straight descender breaching base-line, ρ, τ, υ, or φ] .[, low speck 4 .,
medial bar, ε or θ 5 .ι, triangular letter, α or δ . . . , curved letter with bar slightly slanting
upright mid-line trace meeting curved upright, μ or η .[, trace of long descender, ι or ρ 7
. . . [, high specks 8 .[, trace 9 .ç[, small rounded letter lying at base-line, ο curved
upright stroke with further high stroke to right 10 .α, oblique converging on low horizontal, δ or
α

fr. 5

	· · ·		· · ·
	δειν[δειν[

	ερκε .[ἔρκεα [
	τοι . .[τοῖος [
	νιοθ .[νιόθι [
5	δε .[5	δε .[
	ἦτο .[ἦ το .[
	ιδειν[ιδειν[
	τωτ'ε .[τω τ' ἐ .[
	ηεκα .[ἦε καῖ[

2 .[, three traces, most compatible with smallish rounded letter lying at base-line, α or ο 3 . .[,
base of rounded letter, ο or c rounded letter with perhaps trace above, c, ε, or ο 4 .[, foot of
slanting upright, ι, η, or π 5 .[, slanting upright with further traces of high oblique to right
6 .[, foot of descender 8 .[, right-hand side of rounded letter 9 .[, descender reaching
slightly below base-line, ι, π, or ρ

fr. 6

	η[.].[η[.].[
	μ .ρων[μ .ρων[
	ε		
].αοντε[].αοεντε[
].χθονιδ[]γ χθονὶ δ[
5].πραπιδ[5].πραπίδ[
].ουδε .[]ος οὐδε .[
]νεσιθ .[]νεσιθι[
]εδαω .[]εδαωτ[
]. .ε .υ .α[]αελυσα[
10]αιγληεντ[10]αίγληεντ[

υϛδεδομ[υϛ δὲ δόμ[
κο . τεφ[.] . [κοι τεφ[ρ]η[
υ	
]. αλ . α[.] . []. αλ . υ[.] . [

1] . [, ends of two divergent obliques, λ or υ 2 μ . , rounded letter, ε or ο 3] . , edge of upright, ι, η, or π 4] . , upright with trace of oblique crossing at foot 5] . , high trace
6] . , originally ω then three strokes written above it so as to enclose it to make it ο . [, foot of forward slanting oblique, υ or λ 7 . [, thickened upright 8 . [, high slightly curved horizontal with end of descender to right, τ or υ 9] . . , strokes converging to form apex, α or λ small rounded letter, open on right-hand side, c . υ, two low divergent obliques, λ or χ . α, upright leaning forwards at top, c or γ 12 . τ, tip of thickened single upright . [, medial horizontal joining upright 13] . , large raised circular letter atop curving trace, β or possibly θ . α, small circular letter with trace of medial bar, ε or θ] . [, small high trace and upright

fr. 7

]. . []. . [
]. . βρι . []. . βρι . [
]δρεcc . [ἄν]δρεccι[
]δροτητ[ἄν]δρότητ[
5] . νκαι . [5] . νκαι . [
]υνητ . []υνητ . [
ι	
]οιδετ[]οιδετ[
]επιτα[]ἐπιτα[
c	
] . τινετ[] . τινετ[
10] . . cioi . [10] . . cioi . [

]νεvθ.[]νεvθ.[
v	
]ῡμoc[]υvoc[
] .av .[] .av .[
] .[] .[
.	.

1] . .[, straight descender, ρ, τ, or υ trace
beginning of upward tending oblique, v or λ
horizontal and bottom of long descender
upright
8 επ, foot of upright, high horizontal bar adjoining further upright
dipping stroke, c or ε
[, end of high horizontal,
c ? obliques crossing
[, large curving stroke made in two movements, c, ε, or θ
oblique, α or λ
13] . , tip of oblique, δ or λ
[, trace of upright stroke at mid-line
tip of upright

2] . ., low trace short upright, perhaps ι
3] .[, upright, ι, γ, or π
4 τ[, end of high
5] . , upright
[, flatly descending oblique converging
on horizontal at base-line, δ or α
6] .[, bar of preceding τ extended to meet next letter, foot of
upright
7] . , small high
dipping stroke, c or ε
9] . , small high
rounded letter at base-line, o or
10] . ., small rounded letter at base-line, o or
11] .[, foot of
upright
12] . ., small high
dipping stroke, c or ε
13] . , tip of oblique, δ or λ
14] .[, tip of upright

fr. 8

.	.
] . . . v [.] . [] . . . v [.] . [
] . ρικικληκ[] . ρι κικληκ[
] ιελαπιθηειν[] ιε Λαπίθηειν[
] . ενταυροικ[] Κενταύροικ[
5] ταο . . οτει . [5] ταο . . οτειδ[
ε	
] μελᾶθρω[] ε μελᾶθρω[
] . . [] . . [
.	.

1] . . . , end of oblique foot of descender, ρ, τ, or υ low arc] .[, end of descender ρ, τ, or υ
 2] ., end of high dipping stroke leading into loop of ρ, ε or c 4] ., end of upward tending oblique
 5 . . o, pair of uprights joined by top bar which is kinked, π or perhaps cτ ? two further uprights both
 slightly forward slanting .[, triangular letter with thickening at apex, δ or α 6 λα, oblique
 meeting further oblique oblique with circular stroke beneath ρ, raised loop with descender to
 left 7] .[, high arc, open on right hand side, c or ε trace

fr. 9

<p>].v.[`κτ'[]η·[.]χθ[]ενεc .[.]v.αβ[]κερηπουλυ.[οντι 5]δεεα[.]και[τ']οθαλλ[.]ω.[]πολλο[.]εν.[]ντεφιλ[.]ν[</p>	<p>].v.[]η·[.]κτ[]ενεc .[.]v.αβ[]κερη πουλυ.[5]δεοντι[.]και[]οτ'άλλ[.]ω.[]απολλο[.]εν.[]ντεφιλ[.]ν[</p>
---	--

1] ., end of descender, τ, ρ, or υ .[, raised rounded letter, o or perhaps ε 3 . .[, end of
 descender, ρ, τ, or υ low trace v ., end of oblique, λ or δ 4 ηπ, foot of forward slanting
 upright and vestiges of top bar meeting further upright υλ, ends of two obliques open at base .[,
 traces of possibly an arc, c or o 6 . .[, upward tending oblique stroke thickened at top, v or λ
 oblique meeting horizontal at base-line, α, δ, or ω 7] ., curved oblique tending on base-line, α
 or λ .[, rounded letter, o, c, or ε

fr. 10

· · ·	· · ·
] . ε . . . οσον[] δ ε . . . οσον[
ε ν .	
] α τ α ς . η δ ο[] α τ α ς . ε ν η δ . ο[
] α γ ε κ ε ι . . [] α γ ε κ ε ι . . [
· · ·	· · ·

1] ., meeting of several strokes, perhaps δ or α ε . . ., base of rounded letter, ο or θ foot of slanting upright and further upright with trace of high horizontal, π or γι upright with bar atop and further upright, π or γι 2 c ., high loop with upright, *prima facie* ρ, but vestiges of rounded stroke at base-line and the letter is altered by two strokes meeting beneath top loop so as to form a right angle, possibly β . upright with rounded stroke open on right-hand side immediately to right with high bar atop both, perhaps deformed π ? 3 . . [, high flatly oblique stroke perhaps end of arc

fr. 11

· · ·	· · ·
] . τ ι μ . [] . τ ι μ . [
] . ε ι ν ο ν [] . ε ι ν ο ν [
] ς ς α τ ' α [] ς ς α τ ' α [
] υ ς ο γ . [] υ ς ο γ . [
5] . . ς ε ω ν [5] . . ς ε ω ν [
] . . [] . . [
] . ο [] . ο [
· · ·	· · ·

1] ., descender, ρ, τ, or υ . [, foot of slanting upright, ι, γ, η, or π 2] ., high speck, τ or κ
4 . [, rounded stroke with medial, ε or θ 5] . ., upright with rightward tending stroke atop, c or π
high arc ε, ο, or c 6] . . [, oblique with small dash crossing it, λ or α rounded letter with medial bar, ε or θ 7] ., loop with descender on right-hand side, ρ or possibly β

fr. 12

]..[]..[
]οι.[]οι.[
]εσφετ[]εσφετ[
]ο.ο.ο'ίβ.[]ο.οιβα[
5]σαντε[5]σαντε[
		ι υ				
]σδεπερι[]σι δὲ πυρι[
		μεν...				
]ε.τρε[]εμεν.....τρε[
		· ·				
]..[...].κ.[]...[...].κ.[
]...[...].[]...[...].[

1] . [, end of descender, ρ, τ, or υ meeting of oblique and horizontal, δ, α, or ω 2 . [, convergence of oblique and near horizontal at base-line, α or δ 3 τ[, high horizontal and end of descender 4] ., low loop with traces of curved stroke above, perhaps β or φ .ο, slanting upright, ι or ρ β ., oblique meeting oblique at base-line, α or δ 7 in corr.]μ, trace υ . . ., traces traces upright in line] .ε end of oblique meeting upright, perhaps ν? .τρ two high obliques meeting, υ? medial trace 8 `', high bar, perhaps inserted τ] . ., trace oblique and near horizontal meeting at base-line with trace of letter meeting them on right-hand side, α or less likely δ .κ, pair of uprights .[, perhaps trace of rounded letter 9] .[, forward slanting upright meeting bowing stroke at tip, μ or ν] . .[, long descender perhaps with stroke extending from top rightwards and upwards, ρ or ι apex, perhaps ν

fr. 13

1] . . . [, low arc feet of two uprights foot of slanting upright meeting curving letter extending rightwards β? 3] . . . [, end of flatly rising horizontal tip of upright high horizontal

fr. 16

.
] . . . [,] . ξ . . [,
] ε ν ο [,] ε ν ο [,
] ν ο [,] ν ο [,
.

1] . . . [, oblique meeting upright, perhaps μ end of high arc with medial trace oblique tending upwards from base-line

fr. 17

.
] . ω ν [,] . ω ν [,
] τ ο τ ' . [,] τ ο τ ' . [,
.

1] . , downward oblique tending on base-line meeting upward tending oblique, α or possibly λ

2 . [, foot of upright with arching stroke above, ε or α

fr. 18

.
] . . [,] . . [,
] . ρ η . [,] . ρ η . [,
.

1] . [, low flatly descending oblique meeting upright, perhaps ν base of rounded letter, ε , θ , o , or c

2] . , upright, ι , η , ν , or π . [, upward tending oblique meeting bowed downstroke, ν or μ

fr. 19

· · · · ·
 [· · · · ·
 . [· · · · ·
 [· · · · ·
 . [· · · · ·
 [· · · · ·
 5 . . [· · · · ·
 τα [· · · · ·
 . . [· · · · ·
] . . [· · · · ·
 · · · · ·

5 . . [, low specks 7 . . [, end of slanting upright speck 8] . . [, perhaps oblique low speck

fr. 1

The fragment occupies the latter half of the hexameters.

1] ν τ ε is the likeliest interpretation of the traces, and] ν τ ε is the likelier articulation, but the many duals in hexameter poetry make it impossible to rule out] ν τ ε . The traces would also be compatible with] ν υ ε . While termination of the third person singular active imperfect or singular active present imperative of the verbs in – $\nu\acute{o}\nu\alpha\iota$ is – $\nu\upsilon\epsilon$, it may be ruled out because it would scan] $\nu\check{\upsilon}\check{\varepsilon}$; and, furthermore, some of the bowl of υ ought to be visible if this were the true reading.

δίκη. This might be articulated either as the nominative (or less probably vocative) δίκη or the dative δίκῃ. For the dative one might supplement e.g. ἔ]ν τε δίκῃ, cf. Hes. *Th.* 434 ἐν τε δίκῃ βασιλεῦσι παρ' αἰδοίοισι καθίζει.

κατέν[ε]υσε. The verb is singular, but the person who nods is lost. In theory, δίκῃ, might be a personification of Justice, but the idea of 'Justice nodding in assent' is difficult to parallel: Justice does not seem to have been able to determine anything for herself; she acts simply as the agent of Zeus e.g. at Hes. *Op.* 256 ff. Zeus is, furthermore, the likeliest candidate to nod here, as κατανεύειν is especially characteristic of him, above all in the *Iliad*, e.g. *Il.* 1.514ff.

2 ζωθαλπέος. The word elsewhere only occurs at Nonn. *D.* 1.454, ζωθαλπέλαιμῶ and *D.* 16.397 ζωθαλπέες ὦραι, but compound adjectives of this kind are attested from Homer onwards, e.g. *Il.* 17.549 χειμῶνος δυσθαλπέος, A.R. 4.926 πυριθαλπέος ὑπόθι πέτρης, Nic. *Ther.* 40 πυριθαλπέα ρίζαν, Q.S. 4.441 θέρευς εὐθαλπέος or Nonn. *D.* 40.286 ἀθαλπέι νάσσατο γαίῃ.

]ου ζωθαλπέος ἀκτείνεσσ[. ἠελίου ζωθαλπέος ἀκτείνεσσ[iv (l. ἀκτίνεσσiv) would be the obvious restoration. It would be paralleled by A.R. 4.126 νεφέλη ἐναλίγκιον ἢ τ' ἀνιόντος | ἠελίου φλογερῆσιν ἐρεύθεται ἀκτίνεσσiv.

π]άλιν αὐτίς. A fairly common collocation in hexameter poetry, often used with a verb of motion: Hom. *Il.* 2.276, 5.257, 17.533, 23.229; *Od.* 14.356, 15.431; Call. *Del.* 320; *Lav. Pall.* 141; Arat. *Ph.* 1.1070; *Orac. Sib.* 11.173; Opp. *Hal.* 4.298.

ἐπήν. The Ionic form is extremely common in hexameter poetry.

ποινητορ[-. ποινήτωρ occurs only in Nonnus, always in the oblique cases, and except for two occasions, viz. Nonn. *P.* 15.100, 16.34, it is always found in this metrical *sedes*: *D.* 6.208, 8.281, 13.4, 13.152, 13.488, 21.145, 29.355, 44.148, 48.380, 48.402, 48.663; *P.* 5.48, 7.70, 19.36. 19.77. Related forms are e.g. ποινήτηρ, Oppian, *Hal.* 420, and the Attic form, ποινάτωρ, A. *Ag.* 1281, E. *El.* 23 and 268.

4]κης περὶ πάντα δαμέντ[-. This seems to be an early instance of περιδάμνασθαι in tmesis, with πάντα perhaps as an accusative of respect. The verb is

8 ἄμαρτίνοιο. This somewhat uncommon word, which is derogatory in tone, occurs at Hes. *Th.* 511 of Epimetheus (ἄμαρτίνοόν τ' Ἐπιμηθέα | ὄς κακὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γένετ' ἀνδράειν ἀλφειῆσι), where M.L. West, *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966) ad loc. compares *Od.* 7.292, οὐ τι νοήματος ἡμβροτεν ἐσθλοῦ. He observes that it has a Homeric analogy in ἄμαρτοεπῆς at *Il.* 13.824, Αἴαν ἄμαρτοεπὲς βουγαῖε ποῖον ἔειπες, which is used abusively by Hector. Elsewhere ἄμαρτίνοος occurs at Solon, fr. 22a.2W, οὐ γὰρ ἀμαρτινόω πείσεται ἡγεμόνι, at A. *Supp.* 542, ἔνθεν Ἴω | οἴτρῳ ἐρεσσομένα | φεύγει ἄμαρτίνοος 540–2, and at Rhian. fr. 1.1, Ἡ ἄρα δὴ μάλα πάντες ἄμαρτίνοιοι πελόμεσθα | ἄνθρωποι, φέρομεν δὲ θεῶν ἑτερόρροπα δῶρα | ἀφραδέϊ κραδίη as well as at Nonn. *P.* 1.88; 6.188; 7.122.

μάλ' ἐόντε[. This expression seems to occur elsewhere only at Arat. 1.213, οἳ μιν ἔχουσι περὶσκεπτοὶ μαλ' ἐόντες. περ with a participle frequently does similar duty.

9 νόος ἐμπεδὲς ἦε . This is clearly modelled on *Il.* 11.813, νόος γε μὲν ἔμπεδος ἦεν, and presumably ἦεν is to be read here too, but the traces are too exiguous to be sure. A similar expression also occurs in Q.S. 14.192, τῆε δ' ἀμόμονα ἀνδρα ὅσοις νόος ἔμπεδος ἐστιν. It is odd that, while several corrections have been made in the line, the scribe has failed to correct ἐμπεδὲς to the normal epic form, ἔμπεδος. ἐμπεδῆς is only attested as a word only once in tragedy, viz. *TrGF* ii 208 (Adespota) *--*-x ἐμπεδῆς <δὲ> γαμόρος <ἔμαρψεν Ἄιδης, where it is a variant on ἔμπεδος.

μάκαρες θεοί. Commonly of gods in epic.

fr. 2

1]oco . διεμετ[. It is not easy to see how the correction is to be interpreted: a word could be made out of διεμετ[e.g. διεμέτ[ρεον as in Hom. *Il.* 3.315, Q.S. 12.136 or something similar, but the insertion appears to be above δ. If this is cancelled, it is quite unclear what is meant.

2] .πνοιομ[. One possibility is e.g. δε]ίπνοιο μ[έδηται, *Od.* 19.321, which would be consistent with the traces.]ύπνοιο μ[is to be ruled out because no trace of the bowl of υ is visible. Another possibility would be e.g.]πνοι δ[μ[with correption.

3]ν μεγαλ[. E.g. τιμή]ν μεγάλ[ην *Il.* 16.84 or perhaps]ν μέγα λ[αῖτμα, commonly.

5]νατων μα[. One possible articulation is ἀθα]νάτων μα[κάρων, Hes. *Op.* 706 (secl. Lehrs), which would pick up the μάκαρες θ[εοί of fr. 1.

fr. 3

1] .κ. .ικινεπεε .[. It might be possible to read] .κειοικιν ἔπεει[. While ἔπεει[(v) would be well comprehensible, its adjective would be elusive, for οικιν ἔπεει would not scan.

2]νωχελεα .ικκ[. The interpretation of the word is difficult. It is unclear whether the supralinear addition, which appears to be either ε or c, is to be inserted in place of α, or whether something else is meant. The word will need to scan as a choriamb, - ∪ ∪ -. If the addition is c, νωχελέαc would not scan because it is followed by ικκ, which would not close the syllable. There does not seem to be a way round the problem, because if one accepts ε as the correction of α, it would give a bizarre and unattested form of νωχελής, i.e. νωχελεεῖc. Whatever is meant, νωχελής is used of a variety of things, from people, Euripides *TrGF* v 727c.43, to stars, Arat. 1.391. It remains, however, quite unclear what might be ‘sluggish’.

3]ται κοτίηι[. This will likely be the adjective κότιος in agreement with a dative feminine plural; less likely, would be the noun κοτία in the dative plural: it is never used in this way elsewhere.

4]κτήτιος ἀμφ[. Perhaps]κτήτιος ἀμφι[βέβηκε, Greg. Naz. *Carm. Mor.* Col. 544.2 Ὅς δ’ἀλόχου τε φίλης καὶ κτήτιος ἀμφιβέβηκε. Alternatively κτήτιος might refer to Zeus in his role of protector of the property and the household, as at A. *Supp.*

455 or again at A. Ag. 1038, where the κτήσιος βωμός is mentioned, which might offer a link with the βωμοί of fr. 1.

5]η τε βίη τε πεπ[. The syntax is similar to e.g. Hom. *Il.* 9.498 στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί, | τῶν περ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμὴ τε βίη τε and Hom. *Il.* 23.578 οἱ πολὺ χεῖρονες ἦσαν | ἵπποι, αὐτὸς δὲ κρείσσων ἀρετῇ τε βίη τε. In contrast to these, however, τε βίη τε does not here fall at the end of the line so that something needs to be supplemented. The traces would suggest either πεπυ[or perhaps πεπλ[. The first possibility would point to some form of πυνθάνεσθαι, but ‘enquire with violence’ would seem to be an unlikely expression. The alternative might suggest some form of πλήσσειν, but ‘strike with violence’ would be tautologous.

6]θελογ[. Either some form of ἐθέλειν or possibly an aorist of αἰρεῖν,]θ’ ἐλόγ[τ- .

10]δικαα[. The most obvious interpretation is]δικάα[. This is not the only possible interpretation: e.g. A.R. 3.1311 has χαμάδις κάκος.

fr. 4

2 μυ[. Perhaps some form of μῦθος or μυθεῖσθαι; or possibly a form of μυελός.

3 ενκ[.] .[.] .[.]. Possibly ἐν κ[ο]τ[ί]ησι as fr. 3.3?

5 .ι . . ενκ[.]. One might consider e.g. αἰεὶ μὲν κ[.].

6 ὄπποτε μ[. ὄπποτε μ[iv is probably the likeliest supplement: it frequently occurs in Homer and Apollonius Rhodius in this *sedes*.

fr. 5

1 δειν[. Almost certainly some form of δεινός.

2 ἔρκεα[. The form occurs in this *sedes* at A.R. 3.39.

3 τοῖος[. A frequent incipit in Homer and Apollonius Rhodius, as well as in Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Moschus, and Oppian.

4 νιόθι [(1. νειόθι). Presumably this picks up νείατα fr. 1. It is first used as an incipit in Hellenistic poetry: Arat. 1.89. 1.386, 1.400; A.R. 1.255, 3.164, 3.706; Nic. Ther. 362, Nonn. D. 10.154, 11.380, 25.400.

5 ἡ το .[. The breathing suggests that ἡ τοι[is to be read.

6 ἰδειν[. Presumably εἶδει ν[is to be read, but this is very uncommon in epic in this *sedes*. It never occurs in Homer, but first in [Hes.] *Scut.* 5 = fr 195.5 M.–W., ἦ ῥα γυναικῶν φῦλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων | εἶδεί τε μεγέθει τε. It occurs only twice in Nonnus, D. 10.219 κάλλος ὑπέρβαλεν ἥλικος ἥβης | εἶδει φαιδότερω and D. 11.372 εἶδει λεπταλέω.

7 ηεκα .[. ἠὲ καὶ[would be compatible with the traces and frequent occurrence in this *sedes*.

fr. 6

4]ν χθονὶ δ[. E.g. ἐ]ν χθονὶ δ[ίη, Hes. *Th.* 866; πέλασε]ν χθονὶ, Hes. fr. 165.16 M.–W. Possibly this recalls νειόθι of fr. 5.4 and νείατα of fr. 1.5.

8]εδαωτ[. E.g. δ]εδαῶτ[ε as Emp. fr. 23.4, and a favourite of A.R. 1.52, 1.76, 1.140, 1.445, 2.247, fr. 8.2. Alternatively it might have been some form of ἄωτον or ἄωτειν, but the want of an apostrophe would rather tell against this as a possible interpretation.

9]αελυσα[.]αε ἔλυσα[?

10]αἰγληεντ[. Frequently in epic of Olympos, the sky or atmosphere and eyes.

11]υε δὲ δόμ[. δόμ[ουε / δόμ[ων / δόμ[οις, cf. e.g. κτητοὺς δὲ δόμους ἐπιμηχανόωνται Opp. *Hal.* 1.322

12]κοι τεφ[ρ]η[. Some form of τέφρη, or possibly τεφρήεις.

13] .αλ .υ[.] .[. It might be possible to read βάλξυ.

fr. 7

2 The only partly visible correction in line 1 obscures what is intended here.

4 ἀν]δροτήτ[. ἀνδροτήε occurs three times in Hom. *Il.* 16.857, 22.363, 24.6, but, curiously, it is not found elsewhere in epic.

8]ἐπιτα[. ἐπὶ τα[, or perhaps 1. ἔπειτα [.

11]γενθ[. Possibly]γ ἔνθα[.

fr. 9

The numerous corrections made in this fragment make articulation of the lines extremely difficult and unreliable.

4]κερη πουλυ[. E.g. γλυ]κερή ?

5]δεοντι[]και[. E.g. ἀφρα]δέοντι, Hom. *Il.* 9.32 or με]δέοντι as frequently, e.g. Q.S. 3.633–5, μηδ' ἀλύουσα / εἵνεκα παιδὸς ἐοῖο θεῶν μεδέοντι καὶ ἀνδρῶν κούζεο.

6]οτ' ἀλλ[]ω[. Perhaps]ο τ' ἄλλων δ' [

7]απολλο[]εν[. One might be tempted to restore] Ἄπολλο[ν] ἐν[, but the vocative only ever occurs at the end of a hexameter in epic. Alternatives, e.g. μάλ]α πολλόν Hom. *Il.* 3.121, would be more promising.

8]ντεφιλ[]ν[]ντε φίλ[ο]ν or]ντε φίλ[η]ν would suit the traces.

SECTION II: KNOWN LITERARY TEXTS

03. HOMER *ILIAD* 13.244–52

2 1B.104/H(b) part (2)

2.1 x 6.2 cm

First century

A narrow strip from a papyrus roll, which has been cut cleanly on all sides. The writing runs along the fibres. The back is blank. The papyrus was stuck to the back of **10**.

The hand is medium sized, upright, regularly spaced, slowly written, rounded and strictly bilinear; the feet of λ, α, and τ have small serifs pointing inwards beneath the body of the letter. The seriffing appears to be the only adornment. Letters do not differ markedly in size: e.g. ε, θ, ο, and Ϸ are nearly the same width as μ, κ, λ, and δ. No lectional signs are applied. Elision is once effected tacitly.

In many respects the hand is similar to XXIV **2387** (Alcman, *Parthenia*) = *GMAW*² 15 which is assigned to the ‘end of I BC or early I AD’. **10** is also assigned to approximately this date.

Some fifty-nine papyri are recorded in the Mertens–Pack³ database as transmitting parts of *Iliad* 13; of these two overlap with the portion preserved in **03**. They are BKT V.1.5 (P.Berol. 13046) (first cent. BC) = M–P³ 903 and PSI XIII 1298 + P.Laur. IV 130 + P.Flor. inv. 63 (fifth/sixth cent.) = M–P³ 904.

The papyrus shows no variation from the text offered by the medieval MSS. The MSS are unanimous in the portion of the text which has survived. Restoration of the text is based on the text of M.L. West, *Homeri Ilias* (Munich–Leipzig 1998–2000).

] . cημ[

245] . αλκoc[

] . . cδα[

]τ . κλιc[

]νοστ[
]ημολο[
 250]θεε .ο .[
]βληαι .[
] .γγελη[

244] ., foot of a slightly oblique stroke with trace of another oblique converging on it at mid point in the line
 245] ., two oblique strokes extending at 90° from a common point at mid-line, consistent with χ or κ
 246] . ., upright with small hook pointing backwards at base pair of uprights, with curved strokes at foot and tip
 247 τ ., single upright, ι
 250 .ο, curved foot of upright further curved stroke, π or η .[, end of high and low obliques
 251 .[end of high and low horizontal traces
 252] ., high bar, consistent with γ but not τ

δεικν]υε σημ[α βροτοικ αριζηλοι δε οι αυγαι
 245 ως του] χαλκος [ελαμπε περι κτηθεεσι θεοντοε
 Μηριο]νηε δ α[ρα οι θεραπων ευε αντεβοληεν
 εγγυε ε]τι κλιε[ιηε μετα γαρ δορυ χαλχεον ηiei
 οιομε]νοε τ[ον δε προεφη εθενοε Ιδομενηοε
 Μηριον]η Μολο[υ υιε ποδαε ταχυ φιлтаθ εταιρων
 250 τιπτ ελ]θεε πολ[εμον τε λιπων και δηιοτητα
 ηε τι βε]βληαι β[ελεοε δε εε τειρει ακωκη
 ηε τε α]γγελη[ε μετ εμ ηλυθεε ουδε τοι αυτοε

04. HOMER, *ILIAD* 17.446–489

62 6B.75/D(3-4)a

10.9 x 31.5 cm

Early third century

One partially preserved column from a large roll in five pieces. The writing runs with the fibres. The back is blank. The largely intact lower margin is 3.5 cm. The upper margin is only partially preserved. It is 1.2 cm, but some ink at the top, probably an annotation of which nothing can be made, indicates that it will have been rather larger. A partial intercolumnium of at least 3 cm survives.

The height of the column, which is preserved in full, is 26.5 cm. This sets **04** very much at the larger end of the ‘normative range’ of column height which Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* 119, holds ‘to encompass a fairly continuous set of examples from about 12 to 27 cm, with particular denseness over what remains a broad range, roughly 14 to 24 cm.’ The column has forty-three lines. If the same number of lines per column had been maintained throughout, Book 17 would have filled nearly 18 columns.

The hand is large, clear, regular and slants gently to the right. It well exemplifies the ‘Severe Style’ because of the marked angularity of its general aspect and the contrast between the broad and narrow letters. π is slightly larger than other letters; o is smallish and raised; the descenders of ϕ , τ , ι , υ , and κ violate bilinearity; α and δ are markedly angular.

Similar hands would include: e.g. XVII **2098** (Herodotus 7) = *GLH* 19b, assigned to the first half of the third century on the basis of a land survey on the back probably dating from the reign of Gallienus (253–68), is usefully comparable in several respects. A close similarity may be observed in the μ , done in three strokes with shallow bow; ν , with flat diagonal stroke; the smallish and raised o ; sharply triangular α ; and markedly oval θ . Further, XLV **3215** (Tragic trimeters, second cent.), which is the same papyrus as PSI XIII 1302 (Euripides *Alcmeon*, second cent.) and XXVII **2452** (Sophocles (?) *Theseus*) = *GMAW*² 27, displays several

strong affinities with **04**: e.g. the flattened body of φ with extravagant descender, ω with a kink in the base, and the occasional flourish on the end of descenders. LII **3672** (Plato *Laws*, third cent.) is also closely comparable. These latter two papyri are all dated on subjective criteria alone, but this should not make one reluctant to assign a date to **04** in the early third century.

Forty-seven papyri are recorded in the M-P³ database as transmitting part of *Iliad* 17 (they are no. 940.004–951). Four of these overlap with **04** in content. These are P.Oxy. inv. 22 3B 21/J(1-2)a (second cent.; 403–13, 460–73) = M-P³ 948.002 = West's Π^{1406} ; P.Oxy. inv. 62 6B 82/K(2-3) (second/third cent.; 456–88) = M-P³ 948.005 = Π^{1410} ; P.Ross. Georg. I. 4 (third cent.; 50–52, 86–99, 106–112, 136–171, 182–221, 236–267, 277–307, 323–351, 363–394, 406–435, 439–458, 461–478, 483–520, 523–761, with end title and marginalia) M-P³ 941 = Π^{230} ; and P.Berol. 21194 + 11913 (late sixth cent.; 16.631–63, 688–95, 17.268–337, 475–93, 512–27, 23.323–6, 357–60) = M-P³ 927.3 = Π^{636} .

The scribe is careless and inconsistent. Often he sets an inorganic diaeresis on ι (e.g. 460, 462, 464, perhaps 467 and 476). But he does use the diaeresis twice (460, although the word is mangled, and 462). No other lectional signs are applied. Elision is always tacitly effected. He writes iota adscript correctly once (c]ωι 489) but fails to add it on two other occasions (463 and 464). He is also aware of aspiration, although he does not signal it, as ουcχ ηρει (463) shows. At times he corrects his errors before he moves on (αιγυπι[δ]oc 460, ζωo[v]c 478), at times simply leaves his blunders (ουcχ 463). Once he omits a word altogether (γάρ 461). At times he forgets to apply the endings of the words e.g. υπε Τρω[ων] (l. ὕπεκ Τρώων 461) and ιδ οφ[θαλμοιcιν] (l. ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖcιν 466). Orthography is at times defective, e.g. 461 υπε l. ὕπέκ or 457 πο δ [α]πο l. τὸ δ' ἀπό.

In sum, the text offered by **04** is in general better than fair, but it has been marred by scribal error. Its chief points of note are the omission of a weakly attested

versem, which is likewise omitted by a papyrus of similar age and several good MSS (see 456–6 n.), and its support for a possibly correct variant reading (see 489 n.).

Information on the readings of medieval MSS is taken from reports made by M.L. West, *Homeri Ilias* (Munich–Leipzig 1998–2000). West refers to **04** in the apparatus of his edition as Π¹⁴⁰⁹.

] . . . [

] . ετι . [

. α [. .] . νο . . α [.] εγαια [

αλλουμανυμε [.] νγεκ [

εκτωρπριαμιδ [.] εποχ [

450 ηουχ [.] ι . ωσκατευ . [

] . ενγουνεσσιβ [. [

] . α . αυτομεδοντ [. [

] σεπιγλαφυρασετ [

454 . τ . . . εινεισοκενηας [

456 ωσε . . ωνιπποικινεν [

ποδ [.] ποχαιταωνκον . . [

ριμφεφερονθοοναρμαμ [. [

τοιειδεπαυτομεδωνμ [

460 ιπποιοϊσωνωσταιγυπι [δ] ος [

ρειαμενφευγεσκενυπετρω [

ριαδεπαϊξασκεπολυνκαθ [. [

αλλουσχηρειφωτασοτεσευ [

ουγαρπωσνηοιονεον [.] ιερωε [

465 ερχειφορμασθαικαι . πικ [. [

] . εδεδημινετεροσανηριδο [

-] . δωνυῖ[.] κλαερκεοσαι . [
-] πιθενδιφροιοκαιαυτ[
-] . εδοντιςτοιθυθεων[
- 470] . τηθεσσινεθηκεκαιεξε[
-] . ονπροστρωασμαχεαιπρο[
- μονοσαταρτοιετερο[.] απεκ[
- αυτ . . εχωνομοικιναγαλλε[
- τον[.] αυταυτομεδωνπροσε[
- 475 α . κιμεδοντιςγαρτοιαχαι . [
- ἴπωναθανατωνεχεμεν[
- ειμηπατροκλοςθεοφινμηστ[
- ζωο[ν]σεωννυναυθανατοσκ[
- αλλακυμενμαστιγακ . . . ν[
- 480 δεξαιεγωδιπωνα[
- ωσεφατακιμεδωνδ . [
- καρπαλιμωσμαστιγα[
- αυτομεδωνδαπαρου . [
- αυτικαδενειανπροσ[
- 485] νειατρωνβουληφ[
-] . πωτωδενοησα . . . [
-] σπολεμονπροφαν[
- . ωκεναιελποιμηνα[
-] ωιεθελοιςεπειουκαν . [

top margin, light traces of ink not forming part of the text cannot be read 446] ., medial trace, ε
 or θ .[, foot of stroke tending briefly upwards joining low flat oblique 447 . α, pair of
 parallel uprights] ., base of rounded letter leading to further curved low stroke . . α, base of
 upright with vestiges of small lip ε or c speck at midline and small low horizontal, ε or c 449

δ ., end of oblique 450 χ .[, oblique meeting horizontal at very acute angle, α or δ] .ω, upright
 with hook at base, ε or c υ .[, flatly rising obliques converging on each other and meeting above
 mid-line 451] ., mid-line speck, compatible with end of obliques meeting β .[, beginning of
 low oblique 452] . diverging obliques α ., single upright τ .[, low speck 454 .[,
 divergent obliques at midline . . . ε, tip of upright with bottom hook, ε or c foot of upright
 slightly curving upward stroke, compatible with right-hand side of ν, θ, or ω 456 . . ω, slightly
 sinusoidal upright breaching baseline, ι or γ meeting of upright and bar 457 ν . .[, upright ι
 vestiges of two further uprights, η or π 458 .[, upright with top bar and medial trace 460
 upright with vestige of bar 462 .[, curved upright 465 . π, tip of horizontal bar, consistent
 with ε .[, obliques crossing at mid-line 466] ., tip of a high stroke 467 .[, three bars at
 lower, mid and upper line . . .[, slanting upright, μ, ι, or ν 468 π and ι damaged yet both secure
 469] ., slightly curving upright 470] ., very tip of high and low horizontal, c or ε 471] .,
 base of upright .[, rounded letter set rather high, ω 473 . . c, high arc upright with further
 oblique extending rightwards, c or ε 475 . κ, two oblique strokes form apex, λ or δ .[, rounded
 raised letter 479 . . . ν, apex, α, δ, or λ tip of upright medial horizontal leading to upright
 481 .[, foot of upright with small horizontal at base, ε or c 483 .[, small upright appearing to
 curve rightwards at top and bottom, c, ε, or θ 486] ., upright . . . [high horizontal joining
 upright high arc apex, δ, λ, or α 488 . ω, upright set at least one letter in from the margin:
 no trace of bar extending to the right 489 .[, low arc, ε, ο, or c

] . . . [

ου μεν γαρ τι που] εστιν [οιζυρωτερον ανδρος
 πα[ντ]ων οςσα [τ]ε γαια[ν επι πνειει τε και ερπει
 αλλ ου μαν υμε[ι]ν γε κ[αι αρμασι δαιδαλειοιιν
 Εκτωρ Πριαμιδη[ς] εποχ[η]σεται ου γαρ εασω
 450 η ουχ α[λ]ις ως και τευχ[ε εχει και επευχεται
 σφωιν] δ εν γουνεσσι βα[λ]ω μενος ηδ ενι θυμωι
 οφρα] και Αυτομεδοντα [σαωτερον εκ πολεμοιο
 νηα]ς επι γλαφυρας ετ[ι γαρ σφισι κυδος ορεξω
 454 κτεινειν εις ο κε νηας [ευσελμους αφικωνται

- 456 ὡς εἰπὼν ἵπποισιν ἐν[επνευσε]ν μένος εὐ
πο δ [α]πο χαιτῶν κόνη[ν] οὐδάδε βάλλοντε
ριμφ ἔφερον θοὸν ἄρμα με[τα] Τρώας καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς
τοῖσι δ ἐπ' Ἀυτομέδων μ[αχετ] ἀχνομένοσ περ ἑταίρου
- 460 ἵπποιοῖσσι ὡς τ' αἰγυπτι[δ]οῦ [μετα] χήνας
ρεῖα μὲν φευγεσκεν ὑπε Τρω[ῶν] οὐρυμαγδοῦ
ρια δ ἐπαῖζασκε πολὺν καθ' ὀ[μίλον] οπαζῶν
ἀλλ' οὐσχε ἦρει φώτας ὅτε σευ[αίτο] διώκειν
οὐ γὰρ πῶς ἦν οἶον εὐν[θ] ἱέρω ε[ν]ι διφρῶ
- 465 ἐρχεῖ εφορμασθαι καὶ ἐπισχ[εῖν] ὠκέας ἵππουσ
ο]ψε δὲ δὴ μιν ἕτεροσ ἀνήρ' ἰδ' ὀφ[θαλμοῖσιν]
Ἀλκιμ]εδῶν υἱ[ο]σ Λαερκεοσ Αἰμ[ονίδαο]
στη δ' ο]πιθεν διφροῖο καὶ Αὐτ[ο]μεδόνταν προσήυδα
Ἀυτο]μέδον τίσ τοι νῦ θεῶν ν[ηκερδεα] βούλην
- 470 ἐν] ῥηθεσσιν ἐθήκε καὶ ἐξε[λετο] φρένας ἐσθλασ
ο]ῖον πρὸς Τρώας μάχεσσι πρῶ[τοι] ἐν ὀμίλῳ
μόνοσ ἀτὰρ τοῖ ἕτερο[σ] ἀπεκ[τατο] τεύχεα δ' Ἐκτόρω
αὐτοῦ ἔχων ὀμοῖσιν ἀγαλλε[ται] Αἰακίδαο
τον [δ] αὐτ' Ἀυτομέδων προσε[φη] Διῶρεοσ υἱοσ
- 475 Ἀλκιμέδον τίσ γὰρ τοῖ Ἀχαιοῦ[ν] ἄλλοσ ὀμοῖοσ
ἵππων ἀθανάτων ἔχεμεν [δμησιν] τε μένοσ τε
εἰ μὴ Πατρόκλοσ θεοφῖν μητρ[ῶρ] ἀταλάντοσ
ζῶο[ν]σ εὐν νῦν αὐθ' ἀνάτοσ κ[α]ὶ μοῖρα κίχανει
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν μάστιγα καὶ ἠν[ῖα] σιγαλοέντα
- 480 δεξάει ἐγὼ δ' ἵππων ἀ[πο]βησομαι ὄφρα μάχῳμαι
ὡσ ἔφατ' Ἀλκιμέδων δὲ [βοηθοὸν] ἄρμ' ἐπορούεασ
καρπαλίμωσ μάστιγα [καὶ] ἠνῖα λαζέτο χερσιν
Ἀυτομέδων δ' ἀπαρούε[ε] νόησε δὲ φαιδιμόσ Ἐκτόρω

αυτικά δ Ενειαν προσ[εφωνεεν εγγυς εοντα

485 Ε]νεια Τρωων βουληφ[ορε χαλκοχιτωνων
 ι]ππω τωδ ενοησα προδ[ωκεος Αιακιδαο
 ε]ς πολεμον προφαν[εντε συν ηνιοχοιαι κακοιαι
 πω κεν αιελποιμην α[ιρεσεμεν ει συ γε θυμωι
 ς]ωι εθελοισ επει ουκ αν ε[φορμηθεντε γε νωι

448 υμε[ι]ν (l. ὑμῖν).

453 επι with ADBCEFTWG: ἀνά R. The phrase νῆας ἀνά γλαφυράς occurs at 12.471, 15.488 and 16.296 (where no variation is reported) but elsewhere MSS authority strongly supports νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς. Nonetheless, on occasion a minority of MSS (but not always the same MSS) support ἀνά: at 10.389 ABCEFTYW read ἔπι whereas DRG read ἀνά; at 10.510 ADBCEFTYRWG and Π⁴²⁵ read ἔπι but O reads ἀνά; at 16.840 ABCEFR read ἔπι whereas DTWG read ἀνά; at 17.397 ADBCEFTYRWG read ἔπι but YRG^{yp} read ἀνά, which Eustathius also knew. This loose grouping of DRWG + TYO seems at least in part to corroborate West's view, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich–Leipzig 2001) 148, that (Z)DRWG tend to set themselves apart from ABCE.

454–6 The papyrus omits 455, δύηι τ' ἠέλιος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθηι, which Π²³⁰ (third cent.), BCEO and R (in the text) also omit. 455 is inserted into the text in FTWG, into the margin in R by the same hand that copied the text, and into the text in C by a second hand. Clearly 455 had never become settled in the main channels of the tradition.

The same verse occurs at 11.194, repeated at 11.209, where Zeus pledges Hector his support. The expression of that pledge is almost identical: οἱ κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω | κτείνειν, εἰς ὃ κε νῆας εὐκκέλμους ἀφίκηται, | δύηι τ' ἠέλιος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθηι (11.192–4). West, *Studies* 13, following G.M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925) 19, expels 455 as a

‘concordance interpolation’ from 11.192–4. The suspicion that 455 is interpolated only gains corroboration by its absence in two of the three papyri which attest this part of the poem. The omission in the papyri clearly foreshadows the weak attestation in the medieval MSS. Furthermore, modern commentators have also pointed out that 455 gives rise to inconsistency later in the story. For instance, M.W. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, (Cambridge 1991) 108 remarks that ‘the Trojans never again advance beyond the ditch (18.198, 18.215) and retreat before sunset (18.222 ff., 18.239 ff.)’.

456 εν[επνευεν μενοc ηϋ with Π²³⁰ Π¹⁴¹⁰ and ADBCEFTRWG. Zenodotus read μένοc πολυθαρεcς ἐνήκεν, then added a further line, αὐτὸc δ’ Οὔλυμπόνδε μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι βεβήκει.

457 πο (l. τώ). This might have been in the exemplar, because a similar mistake occurs at 488 where the scribe writes πω instead of τώ. The origin will have been a confusion of uprights with the bar of τ probably joining the first upright of ω.

458 ριμφ εφερον with Π²³⁰ ADBCEWG and as a *varia lectio* in T: ρίμφα φερον FTR.

460 ιπποιοῖccων (l. ἵπποισ ἀίccων). This is a curious corruption. Probably it will have been due to dittoblepsy to οι, or perhaps to some other lapse of concentration. But it is remarkable that the scribe fails to rectify it whereas he corrects his error in αἰγυπιόc a few words later.

461 ρεια with NMPCRW: ῥέα Π¹⁴⁰⁶ BEFTG, and Didymus reports that τὸ ῥέα ἄνευ τοῦ ι πᾶσαι εἶχον. ρεια must be scanned as a single syllable, ῥέα. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968) 66, notes on the synizesis that ‘certaines prononciations monosyllabiques paraissent particulièrement artificielles’. The idiosyncrasy will doubtless have caused both readers and scribes problems, and it will have been all the more confusing because the same word is to be scanned differently at the beginning of two consecutive lines. γάρ is omitted in this line. The exemplar might have been defective, or the scribe

might not have understood the synizesis and tried to save the metre by omitting γάρ: he might have believed that ρεα could be scanned as a spondee (although it cannot) so that the hexameter would be complete without γάρ.

461 υπε (l. ὕπεκ). κ was at times omitted before other stops, especially before τ, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 65.

462 ρια (l. ῥεῖα). Either the exemplar exhibited the varying orthography or the scribe understood that the prosody of the word here differs from that in the preceding line.

επαῖξακε with ADFTRWG: επαξεκε BCE. On the iterative, formed from a sigmatic aorist, see Chantraine, *op. cit.* 324. This error is one of a number of errors, enumerated by West, *Studies* 147, which are peculiar to BCE. He takes these common errors to provide a proof that BCE form a ‘clear-cut family’.

463 ουχ (l. ουχ). It is notable that the scribe does not cancel c in any way as he cancels the false letter in e.g. 460, αιγυπι[δ]οc.

οτε ευ[αιτο rr, -ετο Z: ὄτ’ ἔcc- ADBCEFTRWG (-αιτο W: -ετο TRG: -ατο F: -οντο BCE). W. Leaf, *The Iliad* (London 1900) 248, remarks ‘ὄτ’ ἔccεύαιτο of MSS represents not ἔccεύαcθαι (ἐν), for no such compound exists, but ὄτε ccεύαιτο. ccεύαcθαι is always treated as though it began with two consonants.’

465 ερχει (l. ἔγχει). Presumably the scribe mistook γ of the exemplar for ρ.

466 ετεροc (l. ἐταῖροc). The interchange of αι and ε ‘is the most frequent the interchange in the papyri next to [that] of ει and ι’, Gignac, *Grammar* i 192.

466 ιδοφ[(l. ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖcιν). The scribe has omitted the ending of ἴδεν which leaves the foot lacking one short syllable.

467 Αιμ[ονιδαιo rightly with Π²³⁰ and RG: Ἄρμονιδαιo ADBCEFTW.

471 προ[τω (l. πρῶτω).

473 ομοιcιν (l. ὄμοιcιν, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 275) with ADBCEFTRWG: ωμοιcιν r.

475 γαρ with Π⁶³⁶ and ADBCEFRG: τ' ἄρ TW. Denniston, *GP*² 70–71, who reads γάρ here, classes this usage as ‘resumptive or inceptive of the main clause’ which is then followed by a ‘hortative’ ἀλλά in 479. West prints τάρ.

476 ἀθανατων with Π²³⁰ ADBCEFTRW: ὠκυπόδων G, in the correction. Edwards, *op. cit.* 110, remarks that ‘ἀθανάτων replaces the formular ὠκυπόδων’.

477 μητ[ωρ with Π²³⁰ Π⁶³⁶ and ADBCEFTRW: μῆτιν is a *varia lectio* in G. It is only Zeus who is μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον (Hom. *Il.* 2.169, 2.407, 2.636, 7.47, 10.137, 11.200).

478 αυ with Π²³⁰ Π⁶³⁶ ADBCEFTWG and Eudoc. 1245: δ' αὖ RV: ϣ' αὖ van Leeuwen.

483 ἀπαρουμε (l. ἀπόρουμε): see Gignac, *Grammar* i 288.

484 and 485 Ενειαν (l. Αἰνείαν): see 466 n.

488 πω (l. τώ): see 457 n.

488 αιελομην (l. ἐελοίμην): see Gignac, *Grammar* i 193.

489 εθελοιc with BCEFWG: ἐθέλειc: TR. At 23.894 a very similar expression occurs in similar circumstances: ἀλλὰ cὺ μὲν τόδ' ἄεθλον ἔχων κοίλαc ἐπὶ νῆαc | ἔρχεc, ἀτὰρ δόρυ Μηριόνηι ἦρωϊ πόρωμεν, | εἰ cὺ γε cὼι θυμῶι ἐθέλοι. There, ADBEWG offer the optative and CFTR the indicative. At 23.894 there can be little doubt that the optative is preferable, but here it is not so clear. Edwards, *op. cit.* 111, remarks that ‘the indicative is best here, as Hektor can have little doubt of Aineas’ co-operation.’ But were it simply a matter of urging Aeneas to co-operate, an imperative or a wish would suit far better: ἐθέλειν still leaves the matter open. West prints the optative, following the papyrus.

489 ουκ αν with ADBCEFTRG: οὗ κεν WO.

05. APOLLONIUS RHODIUS, *ARGONAUTICA* 4.1020–50

123/65

8.7 x 18.4 cm

Early second century

A substantial piece of a papyrus roll, which is badly rubbed in places with some portions of text detached from the main piece. It preserves much of a complete column. The writing runs with the fibres. The back is blank. The upper margin is at least 2.5 cm and the lower margin 3 cm, but either or both may have been larger because neither is intact.

At its widest, e.g. at 1047, the column is 7.7 cm, but nine letters are missing. These would add approximately 2–2.5 cm, which would give a total width of some 10 cm. This would be slightly narrower than the normal. Johnson observes, *Bookrolls and Scribes* 116, that the column of hexameters is usually 11–14 cm wide. Furthermore, according to Chart 3.2.4b, in his sample of seventy-seven papyri with hexameters from Oxyrhynchus only six display columns of 10–11 cm.

The column has 30 lines. Were the same number of lines per column maintained for the whole of Book 4, it would have filled some 60 columns. The column is 13.2 cm in height. This sets the papyrus very much at the lower end of the ‘normative range’ of column height which Johnson, *op. cit.* 119, holds ‘to encompass a fairly continuous set of examples from about 12 to 27 cm, with particular denseness over what remains a broad range, roughly 14 to 24 cm.’

Johnson further observes, *op. cit.* 120–21, that in nearly half of the examples of papyri with verse texts on which he could draw (twenty-five out of fifty-four), column height is 16 cm or smaller and, moreover, that the verse texts which have smaller column heights tend to be of an earlier period. Yet, interestingly, no verse texts from his sample of Oxyrhynchite papyri from the Roman period fall under that category: only texts from the Ptolemaic period do. **05** bucks this trend.

The scribe writes small, neat, gently forward slanting and well rounded capitals that are somewhat decorated, e.g. apices of α , δ , and λ have small flourishes,

ι and η are slightly sinusoidal at their extremities, middle stroke of ω and right-hand apex of μ is often hooked backwards. It certainly has pretensions of being a stylised hand: e.g. ligature is entirely avoided. It is in the main bilinear except for φ and ψ and the flourishes at the tops of letters; ε, θ, ο, and c are well rounded; γ and π are squarer; μ is written in three or, at times, four strokes with a smooth bow reaching the base-line; β is slightly overlarge; υ is usually written as a shallow bowl with a gently oblique stem appended to right-hand side, but, at times, it can be squarer; ζ and ξ are written in one or two fluid movements. There is no especially conspicuous contrast between the letters either in width, e.g. between ε, θ, ο, c and δ, κ, μ, υ, π in spacing.

The hand inclines in several points to Turner's 'Formal Round' hand (*GMAW*², p.21). But it falls some way short of achieving this classification. Chiefly the small size of the letters, as well as some inconsistencies in their shapes, slight variation in their widths, and the rather compacted disposition of letters in the line make it incompatible with Turner's classification of 'Formal Round'. However, it is certainly not an informal hand, and Turner's criteria for classification are highly restrictive. His 'Informal Round' is in fact a rather formal hand.

In principle, a similar type of hand might include I 20 (Homer, *II. 2*) = *GLH 12b*, dated on the basis of accounts on the back written in second century hands. But that papyrus, like Bodl. MS. Gr. Class. a. I(P) = *GMAW*² 13 (Homer, *II. 2* 'The Hawara Homer'), is an example of the most refined Formal Round hand. On this type of hand and its classification, see *01* introd. p.3 para. 3.

In practice however, *05* only shares more loosely the characteristic shapes of the formal rounded hands, and it is more similar in many respects to XXVIII 2495 (Hes., *Catalogue* assigned by Lobel to the early second cent.). The letters in this papyrus are more spaciouly set out in the line and they are also somewhat more cursively written, especially e.g. ω, υ, and μ. Nonetheless, the hands of I 20 and XXVIII 2495 will serve as a good basis for comparison with the hand of *05*, and I

am inclined to assign the papyrus to a similar period. Furthermore, the small column height, as Johnson, *op. cit.* 120–21, observes, would indicate an early date.

The denseness of the lines and smallness of the script may well be due to the size of Book 4. It has 1790 lines which makes it the longest of the epic. One may usefully compare this format with e.g. XXXIV 2695 (late second cent.) which has 1.460–79. That papyrus has a similar density of text and a similar general aspect.

Lectional apparatus includes: accents (acute frequently; grave 1026, 1040; circumflex 1028, 1039); rough breathing (Turner's form 1, *GMAW*² p.11) 1030, 1034, 1040; it may have a smooth breathing at 1023, again Turner's form 1, but its right-hand side is missing so this may be false. Diaeresis is applied at 1027, and 1044. High stop is made at 1025, 1026, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1037, 1044, 1046. Elision is always effected. It is marked at 1026, 1031 and perhaps at 1025 (abraded), but not visibly marked at 1023, 1039 (again abraded), 1047 (though some stray ink). *Iota adscriptum* is written at 1044 (bis) and 1047. It is never lacking in the surviving portion of text where it is needed, but it is added superfluously at 1032. *Nu ephehystikon* is applied at verse end at 1049, and to prevent hiatus 1021, 1032, 1034, but the dative ending is missing at 1025 (δωμ]αc, l. δώμαciv). The scribe who copied the text is responsible for adding all lectional aids and making a correction at 1043.

All three accents are applied, but only sporadically, and it is difficult to discern the reasons behind the various cases accentuation: most obviously, some enclitics are marked to show that they form a single unit, e.g. 1027 βιοτόν τ[ε τ]ελεεφορον αγλαίην τε, others not, e.g. 1031, αμφι τ' αεθλοic, and the practice is further applied to other words, e.g. 1025 άχραυ[τοc] και ακηρατοc. Besides the frequent inconsistency in application of accents, the various systems of accentuation employed in papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods are complex, and they do not always adhere to the same principles. The various problems are treated in detail by J. Moore-Blunt, 'Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri' *QUCC* 29 (1978)

137–63 and C.M. Mazzuchi, ‘Sul sistema di accentazione dei testi greci in età romana e bizantina’, *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) 145–67. It is also to be observed that, at times, accents are set on letters which do not carry them, e.g. 1032 ἰοτήτι and 1040 βαρυὸς. The transposition of the oxytone to the right is well attested, see J.–L. Fournet, *Hellénisme dans l’Égypte du VI^e siècle: La bibliothèque et l’œuvre de Dioscore d’Aphrodité* (Cairo 1999) 22, but the displacement of the grave to the right runs counter to the usual practice of moving it to the left, see Fournet, *op. cit.* 24.

The scribe applies the diaeresis on a number of occasions, but he also sets one falsely on a correctly written *iota adscriptum*, 1044, δηῖωθηναί. Rough breathings are only set on words beginning with ε- or ει-.

The text offered by the papyrus is mainly very good, yet it is at times marred by errors of the most trivial kind (e.g. 1025 δωμ]αϛ, dat. pl., l. δώμααιν; 1032 ηϛ, gen. sing. fem., l. ἦϛ; 1041 θυν, l. κυν; 1049 τε l. κε). Nevertheless, it offers one very plausible new reading (δακρυοεσσα 1029), demonstrates the antiquity of a probable error ([ατ]ῖουσαν 1043), and offers ancient testimony for a reading which was conjectured by Brunck (εγαμοιβαδικ 1030). The reading is attested elsewhere in Apollonius’ MSS, and the MSS at 1030 have either wrongly divided the series of letters, or have something different; see 1030 n.

Information on the MSS is drawn from reports made by F. Vian in the Budé edition, on which restoration of the missing text is based except in one point. I have differed from Vian in applying *nu ephelkystikon* at line end in the restored parts of the text even when the next verse begins with a consonant because the papyrus does this at 1049.

The chief MSS of the *Argonautica* belong to two families. These are *m*, which is constituted of LA, and *w*, which is made up of SG. A further grouping of MSS is *k*, the ‘Protocretensis’. But according to F. Vian, *Apollonios de Rhodes Argonautiques* vol. i (Paris 1974) p.1, this grouping ‘n’est en réalité ... qu’une sous-famille de *m*.’ A full description of the MSS may be found in H. Fränkel, *Einleitung*

-].αρήτη . . [.] . αζετοδα . . υοεσσα· [
- 1030] . ετήων . . αμοιβαδικανδραῆκακτον· [
-]. . . [. . . .] ἔ . [.] . . ρτατοιαμφιτ'αεθλοις [
-]. ε . [. . . .] . [.] . ατύζομαιηιςιότητι [
-]. κ . ερος . . . [.] . [.] . ν . [
-]. . εῖνεκε . α [. .] ο . [. . .] . . [
- 1035] ωας . νάξετενοστ . . [
-]. υωλε [.] κατοκηας [
-] κα . ε . φροσυν . νβιοτοιο· [
-] νκαιδωματα ναιεμεναυτις [
-] σινετε . . . ψεσθετοκῆας [
- 1040] ν [.] . οια [.] . δηβαρυῆελετοδα . . [
-] τυ [.] . ρ υνοθνειοιαλάλημαι [
-] . . [. .] . [. . .] . . . ιορκιάδεικατερινυν [
- ι
-]. . . ες [.] τε . εω . ε . . . ειρας [ατ] ουσαν [
-] . ωβηιπολυπη . ο . ιδηῖωθηγαι· [
- 1045] . υπυ . . ον . . . ῥροθ . . ουκαλεωρην [
-]. ε . ρο ὀμ . [.] . . εασαυτους· [
-] . . ο . ιη . καιανηλεεσουδενιθυμωι [
-]. . επιγο . ν ανασσης [
-] . [.] . εινου [. .] ν . [.] . αλλατεπασιν [
- 1050] αωτ . [.] εμε . ξατεδουρατακόλχο . . [

1020 ο [high arc open on right-hand side, ε or ε] , end of high horizontal bar, γ or τ ο [, tip of high oblique flatly descending to meet upright 1021] . . . , two obliques tending on an apex, δ, λ, or α trace tending upwards, ρ, β, c, or ο oblique meeting oblique at mid-point, α or λ . [, tip of upright meeting tip of oblique with low horizontal trace grave accent] , convergence of two

strokes at acute angle with oblique continuing into tail nearly touching following letter, α or δ o .[,
 single slightly bowed upright, ι or η 1022]'[, acute accent beneath putative v in 1021] .[,
 high trace of flatly descending oblique, o , c , or ϵ 1023] first, lower portion of sharply
 rising oblique, α , δ , or λ second, high rounded stroke extending from tip of curved upright and end
 of low rounded stroke beneath, c or ϵ third, rounded letter with extravagant medial horizontal, θ or ϵ
 fourth, rising oblique meeting descending oblique extending into tail, α or δ fifth, single upright
 sixth, base and left-hand side of rounded letter, o , ϵ , or c [, low trace at base-line trace of
 single upright 1024] [, base of upright then second upright hooked backwards at tip and
 bowing slightly to right, perhaps meeting oblique stroke at base-line, v or η rounded letter with
 flattened top, ϵ or c] top of arc upright hooked back at upper tip τ , high trace hooked back
 and foot of upright ϵ , upright meeting curving oblique with further low horizontal [, tops of
 two bowed uprights with finials turned in on each other at tips 1025] end of oblique reaching
 base-line, α , δ , or λ v , end of descender reaching below the baseline oblique flatly curving from
 mid-line downwards touching upright, v or α κ , sharply descending oblique reaching base-line, α or
 λ o [, lower portion of rounded letter, c , o , or ϵ tip of high oblique, α , δ , or λ 1026]
 upright with cross-bar atop, τ or γ ϵ top of round letter closed on right-hand side, o or θ [,
 high bar extending from tip of upright, π or γ 1027 round letter, c or o raised rounded letter
 with speck in middle 1028 [, apex, α or δ] apex with right-hand oblique, α , λ , or δ π , left-
 hand side and base of rounded letter, o , c , θ , or ϵ 1029] α , medial speck triangular letter, α or
 λ [, foot of upright small horizontal at base-line and raised arc, o , c , or ϵ] upright bowing
 slightly outwards v , top of upright with small finial pointing leftwards, κ , ι , γ , π , or v foot of
 descender 1030] single upright α , upper left-hand side of rounded letter, ϵ or c tip of
 oblique 1031] [, upright with end of high bar curved stroke ϵ , o or c lower portion of
 upright, ρ , ι , or γ [, upright with bar extending rightwards from top, γ or π] vertical reaching
 well above and below the line, ϕ or ψ rounded letter open on right-hand side, ϵ or c 1032]
 high speck then top of upright with ornament pointing backwards then further small high speck, μ , η ,
 or ι [, end of high horizontal bar, τ or π] small sharply upward inclining oblique, c or ϵ]
 low oblique declining flatly to base-line, v or κ 1033 ϵ , curved stroke with bar extending
 rightwards from above mid-line, θ or ϵ [, high downward curving stroke, o , ϵ , or θ end of high
 very flatly descending oblique oblique, λ , α , or δ] [, high arc o or θ] vestige of sharply
 declining oblique, α , δ , or λ [, apex of squat letter, δ or λ 1034] trace of upright upright
 with small hook tending rightwards, η or ι ϵ bowing upright with finial, v or μ [, slightly
 curving oblique, v or μ] tip of upright slightly hooked back on itself, δ , α , or λ trace

1035 .v, foot of oblique and tip and lower portion of another oblique, α or λ . . . [, slightly sinusoidal upright hooked backwards at top and foot of second similar upright low curving stroke, c, o, ϵ , or θ 1036] ., bottom of rounded letter with, o, θ , c, or ϵ 1037 . ϵ , low speck . ϕ , end of upright .v, upright hooked backwards at tip, η or ι 1039 . . . ψ , tip of upright meagre vestiges of rounded letter further vestiges of rounded letter 1040] ., finial at base-line, μ , λ , α , or κ] ., base of rounded letter, o, ϵ , c, or θ . . . [, two traces 1041] ., low horizontal curving steeply upwards open on right-hand side, ϵ or cv, first, traces second and third, traces fourth, rounded letter with medial bar, θ or ϵ 1042] . . . [, foot of upright v, ι , or ρ low speck and small flat stroke, v or μ] . . . [, end of upright] . . . , high arc upright with divergent obliques long oblique, α , λ , or δ 1043] . . . , foot of upright high slightly bowing stroke with trace of curved stroke descending to base-line, open on right-hand side, ϵ or c top of upright hooked backwards and vestiges of sharply descending oblique tailing flatly off, μ , v, or λ . . . [, tip and foot of upright . ϵ , downward stroke curving sharply at base-line to flatten off, θ , ϵ , o, or c . ϵ , tips of two uprights, the first somewhat oblique, the second bowing outwards, v or η ϵ . . . , top half of single upright high curving stroke extending rightwards from curving upright, c or ϵ vestiges of two flatly crossing obliques with small upturned finial on end of left to left descending oblique 1044] ., end of low flatly declining oblique, λ or κ η ., sharply rising oblique meeting another oblique descending sharply and flattening out, μ , v, or λ o ., vestiges of two slightly oblique uprights with some confused ink in between, v or η 1045] .v, closed descending stroke curving backwards, o or θ . . . o, single vertical upright with blot at tip, ρ or ι speck of upright with horizontal above . . . ' ρ , rounded letter with medial bar, ϵ or θ upright with faint bar atop and further very faint upright tip and base of upright beneath accent . . . o, round letter, o or c low horizontal meeting upright bowing slightly outwards, v 1046] ., two obliques forming apex, δ or α . ρ , upright with finial π or γ ' .o, first, vestiges of high bar, τ , γ , or π second, tip of upright hooked backwards third, trace fourth, three triangular letters, α , δ , or λ fifth, round closed letter, o . . . [, sharply rising oblique reaching top of line meeting further stroke to form apex, α or λ] . . . , confused ink 1047] . . . , high bar with upright, τ or π trace . ι , raised speck . κ , ends of high bar at both ends of hole with vestiges of uprights, π η ., speck at base-line 1048] .c, single upright hooked backwards at tip with surroundings much rubbed, η or ι .v, slightly forward slanting upright with vestiges of shallow bowl atop v , first, oblique rising steeply left to right, α or λ second, vestiges of round letter, c or o traces of five letters from there onwards are too heavily rubbed to be at all confidently identified last two letters, left to right obliquely descending stroke meeting oblique at mid-point, α or λ left-hand side of round letter, c, ϵ , o, or θ 1049] ., right to left

downward curving stroke beginning at mid-line, ο or θ] , high bar, τ or π], apex, α, δ, or λ] , confused ink 1050], curve with medial horizontal, ε or θ], vestige of upright τε, high upward bowing stroke extending rightwards from upright with median bar beneath and open on right-hand side . .], single slightly sinusoidal upright downward and rightward curving stroke flattening out at base-line then tending upwards, c, ο, ε, or θ

- 1020 ιcτω νυκτιπολου Περc]ηιδoc [ορ]για κου[ρηc
μη μεν εγων εθελουca] cυν [αν]δραcιν ἀ[λλο]δαποι[cιν
κειθεν αφωρμηθην cτυγ]ερον [δε με τ]ἀ[ρβοc επει]c[ε
τηcδε φυγηc μνη]caςθαι οτ ηλι[τον ουδε τιc αλλον
μητιc ει]γ ε[τι μ]οι μιτρη μενει ω[c] εν[ι πατροc
1025 δωμ]αc ἀχρα]ν[τοc] και ακηρατοc· αλλ ελ[εαιρε
ποτνα] τεον τε π[οcιν] μειλιcceο· cοι δ' οπάcειαν
αθανατ]οι βιοτόν τ[ε τ]ελεcφορον αγλαί]ην τε
και παιδ]αc και κῶδ[οc] απορθήτοιο ποληοc·
τοια με]γ Αρη]τη γο[υ]γαζετο δακρυοεcca·
1030 τοια δ αρ]ιcτήων εγαμοιβαδιc ανδρα έκαcτον·
υμεων ω] περ[ι δη μ]έγ[α] φερτατοι αμφι τ' αεθλοic
ουνεκεν υ]μετ[εροι]c[ι]γ ατύζομαι ηic ιότητι
ταυρουc τ εζευξαcθε και εκ]θεροc ουλ[ο]ο[ν] ανδ[ρων
κειρατε γηγενεω]γ ηc έινεκεν Α[ιμ]ον[ιην]δε
1035 χρυceον αυτικα κ]ωαc ανάξετε νοcτηc[αντεc
ηδ εγω η πατρη]ν τε και] οuc ωλε[c]ca τοκηαc
η δομον η cυμπα]caγ ευφοροcυνην βιοτοιο·
υμμε δε και πατρη]ν και δωματα ναιεμεν αυτιc
ηνυca και γλυκεροι]cιν ετ ειcοψεcθε τοκηαc
1040 ομμαci]ν [αυταρ ε]μοι α[π]ο δη βαρὺc έιλετο δαιμ[ων
αγλαί]αc c]τυ[γ]ερη δε θυν οθνειοic αλάλημαι
δεικατε c]υγ[θε]ι[αc τ]ε και ορκια δεικατ Ερινυν

Ἰκεσιν] νεμεσι[ν] τε θεῶν εἰς χεῖρας [ατ]΄ ἴουσαν
 Αἰητεῶ] λῶβη πολυτημονι δηϊῶθηναι ·
 1045 ου νηουε] ου πυργον ἐπίρροθον ουκ αλεωρην
 αλλην οιοθι] δε προτιβαλλομα[ι] υμμεαε αυτουε ·
 εχετλιοι α]τροπιηε και ανηλεεε ουδενι θυμωι
 αιδειεθε ξειν]ηε επι γουναει χειραε ανασεηε
 δερκομεν]ο[ι] τεινου[ε]ν α[μηχανο]ν αλλα τε παειν
 1050 κωαε ελειν μεμ]αωτε[ε] εμειξατε δουρατα Κόλχοιε

1025 δωμ]αε (l. δώμαειν). This trivial error must have been due to a lapse of concentration because it leaves the dactyl wanting one short syllable.

τε rightly with *m*: δέ *w*. The injunction made to Arete is in two parallel parts, both introduced by ἀλλά. As commonly, here it comes near the end of a speech: see Denniston, *GP*² s.v. ἀλλά (4). The injunction is then continued, being only interrupted by the direct address, πότνα. τε makes the connection well, whereas δέ would not, first because the connection does not begin a new sentence, merely the continuation of the sentence which has been interrupted, and second because, since there are two members, μέν would probably be expected in the first: see Denniston, op. cit. s.v. δέ I A. τε simply and closely connects finite clauses without any implications for the rest of the sentence: see the illustrative examples collected by Denniston, op. cit. 498, s.v. τε I (ii) c. **05** now offers ancient corroboration for the simplest and most direct form of connection.

1028 παιδ]αε with all MSS. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (München 1968) 556, doubts ‘[o]b wohl Ap. wirklich der Königin durch Medea die sechs παῖδαε hat anwünschen lassen, die rund vier Jahrzehnte später in erwachsener Alter standen? Läge nicht ein nachgeschicktes καὶ παιδὶν näher: auch an ihren Kindern soll das Gleiche zu Teil werden?’ Nevertheless, he retains the reading of the MSS in the OCT. Intervention here is unwarranted. Fränkel avers quite rightly

that wishing one's descendants the same prosperity that the gods grant to one is a common topos in Greek literature (see his collection of testimony on the matter, op. cit. 556), but this is not adequate grounds to object to *παῖδας*, and still less to alter it when it is unimpeachable in sense: there is no cogent reason why Medea should not wish Arete fecundity. Vian, *note complémentaire* p.184, rejects the emendation, and remarks '[i]l est normale que Médée lui [Arete] souhaite d'avoir des enfants comme à une jeune mariée. La conjecture de Fränkel *παῖδιν* détruit l'ordonnance de la phrase et la gradation logique des termes: longévitité, bonheur personnel, descendance, pérennité de la cité'. R. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge 1993) 70, also rejects the alteration and observes that '[w]hen Medea wishes the queen "children" we reflect that Medea herself is cast in the role of an unhappy Nausicaa, Arete's daughter, and that her speech to the queen has an important model in Odysseus' plea to Nausicaa. That Medea is already implicated in the murder of her own brother and will go on to kill her own children is an irony that the poet does not need to belabour. Fränkel in fact emended this wish out of the text, but it is, for a married woman, the equivalent of Odysseus' wish for marriage for Nausicaa; children are seen as the natural fulfilment of marriage, just as marriage is the natural *telos* of a young girl's life.'

1029 *δακρυοεσσα*: *δάκρυ χέουσα* all MSS. *δακρυόειε* occurs in all the MSS at 1.535 and 4.1277 and *δακρυόειν* at 4.1291. *δάκρυ χέουσα* occurs in the MSS at 1.250 and this line.⁸ But neither occurs a variant reading of the other elsewhere. *δάκρυ χέων* in its various forms occurs on twenty occasions in the *Iliad*, sixteen in the *Odyssey*, once in ps.-Hesiod, and, except for *δάκρυ χέων*, only three times is it not in this metrical *sedes*. *δακρυόειε* occurs on fourteen occasions in the *Iliad*, only four in

⁸ Fränkel and Vian both read *δακρυχέουσα* at 1.250 and *δάκρυ χέουσα* at 4.1029, but neither says in either place what the MSS read so that it must be assumed that the word is given differently in the two places. Nevertheless, while ancient testimony on whether the word is to be written *disiunctim* at this period is limited, writing the same word in two different ways in the same author is quite perverse. For Homer, Schol. bT ad 1.357 (p.107 Erbse) holds that *δακρυχέων*, τὸ *δακρυχέων* ὑφ' ἐν ἀναγνωστέων, but elsewhere in the MSS it is *disiunctim*.

the *Odyssey*, once each in Hesiod and ps.-Hesiod, and oftener in this metrical *sedes* than not. δακρυόεις also has a more extensive usage in epic and in the melic and tragic poets than δάκρυ χέων, because it can be used of abstract things, e.g. πόλεμος, μάχη, ἰωκή, γόος etc. as well as of people.

δακρυόεσσα is well suited to this passage. It is used in a very similar context at *Il.* 21.505–6, ἦ δ' ἄρ' Ὀλυμπον ἴκανε Διὸς ποτὶ χαλκοβατῆς δῶ | δακρυόεσσα δὲ πατρὸς ἐφέζετο γούνασι κούρη and, moreover, Apollonius uses it marginally more frequently than δάκρυ χέων.

It is fairly easy to see what the process of corruption might have been. δάκρυ χέουσα, much commoner at verse end, dislodges δακρυόεσσα sometime in the later Roman period so as to become the settled reading of all MSS. It is improbable that δακρυόεσσα is an early corruption of δάκρυ χέουσα, which is isolated to this papyrus, and failed to leave any trace of its existence in any of the main channels of the tradition. δάκρυ χέουσα would be a very small corruption of δακρυόεσσα, which does not at all impair sense of the passage. Haslam, loc. cit. 68, observes that the text of the *Argonautica* in antiquity was ‘a dynamic, volatile tradition, steadily degenerating as false readings succeeded in ousting true; prone to superficial fluctuation, but reasonably stable in its main outlines, the number and the succession of the verses’. Here that steady process of degeneration is very probably to be seen in action: δακρυόεσσα ought here to be preferred over δάκρυ χέουσα.

1030 εἰναμοιβαδῖς: ἐν' ἀμοιβαδῖς L (in the second hand above the line) w: ἀμ- L: ἔτ' ἀμ- A: ἐπαμ- E: ἐναμοιβαδῖς conjectured by Brunck. The vestiges of the letter following ε are exiguous, but they are more consistent with ν than π. ἐναμοιβαδῖς occurs elsewhere only at A.R. 1.380 in all MSS, including PSI XV 1478 (first cent. BC or AD), and it has indirect MSS support here. The false articulation of ἐν' in L^{2sl} and w doubtless arose from unfamiliarity with a rare word: ἐναμείβειν seems to occur only at Pi. *N.* 11.42 (ἐναμείβοντι BD: ἐν ἀμείβοντι *edd. nonn.*) and Hipp. *Vict.* 8.3 (ἐναμείβει). ἐν' seems to be an attempt to make sense of an unfamiliar word.

Vian reads ἐναμοιβαδῖς after Brunck. Fränkel, however, reads ἐπαμοιβαδῖς with E here and at 1.380, where he defies the unanimous reading of the MSS. He is here followed by E. Livrea, *Apolloni Rhodii Argonauticon Liber IV* (Firenze 1973), who would, however, read ἐναμοιβαδῖς at 1.380. ἐπαμοιβαδῖς does not seem to have any special commendation from sense over ἐναμοιβαδῖς, although ἐπαμοιβαδῖς is attested in Homer, *Od.* 5.481. However, the unanimity of MSS at A.R. 1.380 in reading ἐναμοιβαδῖς, the fact that it was in the exemplar of the *diorthotes* of L and the text of *w* and now the ancient testimony of the papyrus strongly indicate that ἐναμοιβαδῖς as the correct reading.

1031 Fränkel, *Noten* 556–8, seeks to demonstrate that ὦ was missing from the text on which the scholia are based. Comparison of the disposition of the line of 1030 and 1032 in the papyrus suggests that there will have been space for a minimum of eight or nine letters before the break in 1031. Fränkel's arguments about the text from the scholia require several alterations of the text of the scholia itself to support his suggestion and a change in the text. Instead of ὑμέων ὦ περί ..., Fränkel would read ὑμείων περί ... The papyrus does not corroborate the alteration because the conjecture would fill still less of the space than the MSS reading.

1032 ηιϛ (l. ἦϛ).

1036 ωλε[ϛ]ϛα correctly with *wd*: ὄλεσα *m*.

1037 βιοτοιο·. This punctuation is stronger than that adopted by modern editors, who usually set a comma here.

1039 εἰϛοψεϛε rightly with *w*: ἐκοψ- L: ὄκοψ- A: ἐποψ- E, omitting ἔτ'.

1041 θυν (l. κυν). This is, again, a mere lapse of concentration, perhaps arising from the scribe glancing at the θ in ὀθνεῖοιϛ.

1043 εἰϛ with LA: ἐϛ *wE*. Either spelling is possible since a consonant follows, which closes the syllable.

[ατ]ΐουσαν with all MSS. ἰοῦσα Fränkel OCT: ἰούσης Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin 1924) 202, n. 2.

The false beginning of the word is probably due to the scribe having glanced at the ending of δείκατ' in 1042.

ιουσαν is the unanimous reading of the MSS and the scholia, so that it must have been the settled text from an early date. It involves some syntactical difficulty. The mangled scholia in *Lm* observe that τὴν ἰουσαν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τῶν θεῶν νέμεσιν, τουτέστι τὸ νεμεσητόν. Those in P, however, remark that τὴν δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἰκεσίαις γινομένην νέμεσιν εἰς χεῖρας θεῶν ἰέναι φησίν, ὅτι ὡς περ ἐνώπιον τῶν θεῶν ἰστάμενοι ἰκετεύομεν. But to construe νέμεσιν with ἰουσαν would leave the following verse without a sound syntactical relationship with the previous verse so that, as Fränkel points out, *Noten* 558–9, it would have to be ignored.

G.W. Mooney, *Argonautica* (London 1912) 361, reads ἰουσαν and remarks of it, 'ἐς χεῖρας ἰουσαν sc. ἐμέ. The construction is not clear: the acc. and inf. may depend on νέμεσιν, cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.156 οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας ... ἄλγεα πάσχειν or we may repeat δείκατε.' It is not impossible to suppose that ἐμέ is to be supplied, but it is not easy and the syntax might well be misconstrued. At Hom. *Il.* 3.156, the subject of the accusative and infinitive construction is absolutely clear, Τρῶας καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἄχαιοῦς, whereas it is not immediately obvious that ἐμέ is to be supplied here. Moreover, the construction δείκατε ... νέμεσιν τε θεῶν (ἐμέ) εἰς χεῖρας ἰουσαν | Αἰήτεω λῶβη πολυπήμονι δηωθῆναι is not an accusative and infinitive because δηωθῆναι is expegetic and appended to whatever form of ἰουσα- is to be read. The infinitive is of the same kind as that in βῆ δ' ἰέναι: cf. Kühner–Gerth, *Grammatik* ii, §473 a) 7, pp.16–17. Furthermore, words expressing emotions like indignation are commonly construed with the participle rather than accusative and infinitive, cf. Kühner–Gerth, *Grammatik* ii, §482.3 pp.53–4, as e.g. *Il.* 4.413–4, οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ νεμεσῶ Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν | ὀτρύνοντι μάχεσθαι εὐκνήμιδας Ἄχαιοῦς. It would be awkward to accommodate ἰουσαν were the construction an accusative and infinitive because it would have to be construed as circumstantial or conditional, which might also occasion the tense of the participle needing to be altered. This complicates the

matter considerably and unnecessarily.

ἰούσαν has also been defended by H. Erbse in his review of Fränkel's OCT, *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 18–27, 22. He holds that 'bisher ließ man den ersten Satz nach δηωθῆναι enden, so daß der Inhalt der von Medea geforderten Befürchtung als A.c.I. formuliert war, zu dem man das Personalpronomen ergänzte. Wilamowitz hielt diese Konstruktion für hart und schrieb ἰούσας. F. aber verlegt das Asyndeton, das die erneute emphatische Wendung an die Gefährten so kräftig hervorhebt (1045), vor die Worte, die das Medea drohende Schicksal andeuten (1043), er schafft dadurch eine nicht eindeutig bestimmbare Infinitivkonstruktion und erhielt einen fast pedantisch zerdehnten Satz. Beide Änderungen sind mit Nachteilen verbunden, und es ist zweckmäßiger, die Überlieferung hinzunehmen.' To rest one's case for the retention of the reading of the MSS on (1) traditional understanding of the passage, which itself is not based on an 'eindeutig bestimmbar' syntactical construction, and (2) the fact that suggested corrections of the MSS reading still involve difficulties is circular and does nothing to advance understanding of the passage.

It cannot be denied that the syntactic difficulties arising from what the papyrus and MSS offer give strong grounds for doubting ἰούσαν. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 202, n.2, basing his argument on what the text means as it stands in the MSS, was the first to reject ἰούσαν. 'Da kann keine Ausrede rechtfertigen, daß die Rache der Götter in die Hände des Aietes kommt, um schmachlich umgebracht zu werden; der frei angehängte Infinitiv muß dem Leser des Ap. geläufig sein. Was jetzt von der νέμεσις gesagt zu sein scheint, geht allein Medea an, und diese notwendige Beziehung erreichen wir durch ἰούσας.'

Fränkel, *Noten* 558–9, objects to ἰούσας on the grounds that 'wenn die grammatische Verbindung dieser Worte (1043–4) mit der Warnung vor der Erinys zu Recht bestünde, würde man erwarten, daß Medea nicht von ihrem 'Gang' (ἰούσας δηωθῆναι) spricht sondern direkt sagt δηωθείς, denn es ist der Mord selbst der die Erinys wirksam werden läßt und nicht die Preliminarien zum Mord.' This is rather

circular. Fränkel himself reads ἰοῦσα, which he holds to mean ‘[i]n dem Augenblick wo ich im Begriff stehe ... anheimzufallen’. There is no good reason to deny this same sense to the genitive absolute: in any case the indignation of the gods would be aroused at the very moment when the decision were made to reject Medea’s supplication and hand her over to a certain death, not only once she had perished.

Vian follows Wilamowitz in reading the genitive and remarks, *note complémentaire* p.184 ‘[o]n ne peut retenir ni la construction admise par les scholies (ἰοῦσαν rapporté à νέμεσιν) ni la correction (ἰοῦσα) et la ponctuation de H. Fränkel qui éliminent l’asyndète au v. 1045 ... Aussi convient-il de revenir à la correction de Wilamowitz (ἰούσης) qui satisfait la grammaire et donne à la phrase le sens attendu’.

While Wilamowitz’ conjecture is wanting a clearly expressed subject, it does nevertheless stand in a sound syntactical construction, for which he provides parallels. But its lack of a clearly expressed subject could well have led to ἰούσης being altered to ἰοῦσαν.

Fränkel’s ἰοῦσα, which is accepted by Livrea, does have the merit of formally resolving the asyndeton in 1045, and it gives ἰοῦσα a sound syntactical relationship to the rest of the sentence to which nothing need be supplied mentally by the reader, unlike the MSS reading and Wilamowitz’ conjecture. Furthermore, ἰοῦσα would fall prey to corruption to ἰοῦσαν much more easily than ἰούσης, above all at verse end. But ἰοῦσα does have one very great disadvantage over Wilamowitz’ ἰούσης, which is made clear by the punctuation of the papyrus. The sense of the passage is better when the period runs till δηῶθῆναι and a new sentence begins at οὐ νηοῦς, rather than the period’s being extended till ὑμέας αὐτοῦς because a specific reason is then given why Arete and the Argonauts ought to fear the Erinys and the indignation of the gods: Medea’s injunction is much more pointed if it brings sharply in on them that her death will provoke the gods’ indignation rather than simply urging them to fear these powers for no specific reason: this is somewhat the equivalent to urging them to piety. As Erbse maintains, both Wilamowitz’ and Fränkel’s alterations of the

MSS reading entail problems, but both seem less problematic than the MSS reading and, to my mind, Wilamowitz' is the better of the two solutions hitherto proposed.

1044 δηῖωθηγαι (l. δηωθήηναι). The superfluous diaeresis on the correct *iota adscriptum* corrupts the metre.

1046 προτιβάλλομα[ι]. Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung* 202, n. 3, objected to the suffix, which he proposed to alter: 'προτιβάλλομαι ist unmöglich; das Scholion hat noch das unvermeidliche προβάλλομαι. Das zeigt eine verkleisterte Lücke, die Madvig mit πρό νυ βάλλ. schlecht gefüllt hat. Zu schreiben ist οἴοθι δ' εἶο προβάλλομαι. So sagt er für ἐμεῖο 2.635 und der Genitiv ist sehr erwünscht.' The papyrus shows that προτιβάλλομαι was the settled text at least from a very early period. Apart from A.R. 4.1046, which is now corroborated by the papyrus, προτιβάλλεσθαι occurs once in Homer (*Il.* 5.879) and twice in Oppianus (*Hal.* 4.626 and 5.98, where ποτι- is a v.l. in some MSS at both places). προτιβάλλομαι gives good sense and objections can only be brought against its form. While προτιβάλλομαι is not a common form of προεβάλλομαι, its rarity is no good reason to reject it: rather, the argument of *lectio difficilior potior* will apply. προβάλλομαι in the scholia is likely to be a gloss on προτιβάλλομαι and, moreover, on the *utrum in alterum* principle, it is highly improbable that the common and immediately comprehensible προβάλλομαι should fall victim to corruption to a rare form of a different word. προτιβάλλομαι is almost certainly the true reading and now has ancient attestation.

1047 There seems to be some kind of interlinear correction, which is especially visible over ἀνηλεεσ ουδενι. It is very unlikely to be mere stray ink because there is simply too much of it, but I cannot read any letters. The MSS do not show any variation at this point, and the text seems sound.

1048 ξ[ε]ἰν[ι]ησ επ[ι]: ξείνησ μ' ἐπὶ all MSS. The personal pronoun must have been omitted inadvertently: it is necessary to clarify to whom τείνουσαν refers.

1048 γουναξι with L in second hand above the line and Aw: γούνατα Lk. The

dative is required.

1049 τε: κε S after correction: καὶ *mwk*. The certain corruption of the necessary κε to τε has probably arisen from interchange of mutes, yet this is particular interchange is not a common phenomenon, cf. the few examples collected by Gignac, *Grammar* i 68. Alternatively τε might have arisen as a false correction on metrical grounds from καὶ, itself a corruption arising directly from phonetic interchange of ε and αι which is ‘the most frequent next to [that] of ει and ι’, Gignac, *Grammar* i 192.

06. PLATO, *PHILEBUS* 36 D8–E1, 48 A1–B5

16 2B. 48D(b) part [fr.1]	5.8 x 12.6 cm	Late second/early third century
100/67(c) [fr.2]	4.6 x 12.5 cm	

Two fragments from a papyrus roll. The writing runs with the fibres. The backs are blank, save for an annotation in pen made by A.S. Hunt⁹ on the back of fr 2. It reads ‘A223’. 100/67(c) is, in places, much darker than 16 2B.48D(b) part. It is not known whether they were found in the same year. The identification of these two papyri as separate parts of the same copy of the *Philebus* was made by Dr W.B. Henry.

This is the third papyrus with the *Philebus* to appear: the other two are LII **3678** (18e9–19a5) and P.Köln III.135 (61c6–e8); they are both assigned to the end of the second century.

Fr. 1 must have been lying close to **3678** in the rubbish mound because the inventory numbers are extremely close: that of **3678** is 16 2B. 46/A(c). The copies are not by the same hand, but they must be connected in some way: it seems quite incredible that two different and unrelated copies of the same dialogue should have ended up so close together in a rubbish dump. They may very well have had the same owner. One explanation for two copies of the same dialogue in two different hands might be that **3678** contained the first part of the dialogue and **06** the second part. But, since **06** is a copy of a far higher standard of production than LII **3678**, it might be worth speculating that **3678** was a replacement for the first part of **06** which had been lost. **06** is unlikely to have been a replacement for the later parts of **3678** because one would not replace the lost parts of an ordinary copy with a luxurious copy. Unfortunately, it is not possible to discover where 100/67(c) was

⁹ See e.g. E.G. Turner, ‘The Graeco–Roman Branch’ in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.) *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 17–27, 20 or Grenfell’s letter to H. Grueber (EES inv. VI c.6) ed. D. Montserrat in ‘News Reports’ *ibid.* 28–39, at 34.

found in relation to these two others, because the inventory number does not provide the necessary information.

The upper margin, which appears to be complete in fr. 2, is approximately 2.5 cm. The lower margin, which may well be complete at one point in fr. 1, is approximately 4 cm. The intercolumnium, preserved in fr. 2, is slightly larger than 2.5 cm. A *kollesis* can be seen on the back of fr. 2.

The width of the columns is approximately 6 cm, as it appears from the reconstruction of fr. 1.8–9. This is almost exactly in the middle of the normative range for column widths of literary prose texts. This is shown by Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* 101, to be 4.3–7.5 cm with an especial frequency of texts which present columns of which the widths are in the range of 4.7–6.9 cm. The width of the column is further to be noted because it exemplifies the tendency, observed by Johnson with statistical evidence, *op. cit.* 152–5, for the columns of philosophical texts to be narrower than wider.

Maas' Law, that is the tendency for lines of the column to be begun ever further to the left as the column descends, may be observed in col. ii of fr. 2. On Maas' Law, see Johnson, *op. cit.* 91–99.

If the reconstruction of the lines is correct, the number of letters varies between ten and fourteen, with the average a shade under twelve letters per line. This figure obtains in both fragments: fr. 1 gives an average of 11.8 letters per line; and fr. 2 gives 11.6 per line. This is remarkably close given that the fragments are separated by quite some distance. The papyrus corroborates Johnson's conclusions, *op. cit.* 50–4, that it was customary, from the Roman period onwards, that near uniformity in the width of columns was observed, even when they were widely separated. It follows from this that close consistency in this may be expected to have been maintained the length of the papyrus.

The height of the column may be roughly calculated from fr. 2 if one takes the number of letters per line as the basis of calculation. There are one hundred and

eighty letters between the last letter preserved in col. i of fr. 2 and the first letter preserved in col. ii. If these letters are divided by the average of the number of letters in fr. 1 and 2, i.e. 11.67 per line, that would be sufficient to fill just over fifteen lines. This figure is, moreover, borne out by dividing the words *exempli gratia* by syllable. This suggests that the column had twenty lines.

Each line has a lead of approximately 0.5 cm. Letters are slightly taller than 4 mm so that the column of twenty lines with their lead spaces of 0.45 cm added would be in the region of 19 cm. This would suggest 25.5 cm for the total height of the papyrus.

A letter count of the *Philebus* in the OCT gives a figure of approximately 84,800. If the OCT text was similar to the text which the scribe copied, and the scribe kept to the average number of letters per line which the two fragments suggest, the *Philebus* will have taken up some 7270 lines. If, furthermore, the scribe was consistent in writing twenty lines per column, the whole dialogue will have filled some 365 columns. With the width of the column being approximately 6 cm and the intercolumnium of slightly more than 2.5 cm, 365 columns would give a roll of slightly greater than 31 metres in length. *06* is an *édition de luxe* by any standard, and Johnson observes, *op. cit.* 155–56, that the contents of *éditions de luxe* can be of great length. However, 31 metres exceeds anything that he discusses by quite some length. Johnson discusses roll length, *op. cit.* 143–52. He concludes, 149, that ‘[b]etween 3 and 15 metres, one finds a steady stream of works of all sorts, with ... rolls of drama ranging as long as 11 metres, and books of history, on the other hand, seldom falling short of 10 metres. Unless one supposes that the use of multiple rolls for single ‘books’ was widespread, defining a normative range of 3–15 metres seems in order. Rolls with extrapolated lengths above 15 metres are not few (16 in the Oxyrhynchite data, 3 in the comparison set), but the monochromatic character of the data urges caution. With only the odd exception (two examples of Aeschines *In Ctesiphontem* and a couple of lengthy Plato dialogues) almost all of these examples

are books of Herodotus or Thucydides.’ A roll of 31 metres would be unwieldy and immensely inconvenient to use, and it will, therefore, be worth suggesting that the dialogue was divided into a number rolls and that fr. 1 comes from the one roll and fr. 2 from another. Moreover, the difference in colour of the two papyri and the different quality of the papyri (fr. 1 is finer than fr. 2) would corroborate this.

But this is not a certain nor a necessary conclusion: it is possible that the whole dialogue was written on one roll. Two useful points of comparison for this would be two copies of Plato’s *Gorgias*: P.Laur. IV 134 + III **454** + PSI II 119 which contains 471d4–472b8, 507b8–508d6, 522b5–526a6 and XLIV **3156** + LII **3669**, which has 491a5–b6, 494e2–495e6, 508d4–e2. However, Johnson, *op. cit.* 146 n. 58, remarks on the case of XLIV **3156** + LII **3669**, that ‘3156 + 3669 has, however, the curious feature that the fragment latest in the dialogue (3156 fr. 3) is written with slightly compressed letters and much narrower leading (5.5 mm vs. 7 mm or so for the rest, the change goes unremarked by the editor). Could this be a sign of a second roll in a slightly different format? Or is the compression a confirmation of the extreme roll length, a sign that the scribe is trying to reduce somewhat the size of an already massive roll?’

The physical differences between fr.1 and 2 indicate that **06** probably will have come from a single copy of the *Philebus* which was in several rolls; and the close inventory numbers further suggest that **3678** may have been part of this copy.

The hand is a very large, well formed, consistent in the main, and fairly upright specimen of the ‘Severe Style’. See the list of the papyri written in the ‘Severe Style’ with some discussion for the dating of hands of this kind by L. Del Corso, ‘Lo “stile severo” nei P.Oxy.: una lista’ *Aegyptus* 86 (2006) 81–106.

Save for the descenders of ρ and υ and the small ever raised ο, bilinearity is achieved in the main. α and λ are sharply angular; κ, μ, ν, τ, and ω are quite wide but ε, θ, and c are not markedly narrow in contrast; the bow of μ is a deep smooth curve; the base of ω is only slightly kinked.

The papyrus is probably assignable to the later second or earlier third century on comparison with similar hands: these would be e.g. XVII 2098 (Herodotus 7) = *GLH* 19b, assigned to the first half of the third century on the basis of a land survey on the back probably dating from the reign of Gallienus (253–68). Furthermore, LII 3672 (Plato *Laws*, third cent.) is very similar, and so too is XLV 3215 (Tragic trimeters, second cent.), which is the same papyrus as PSI XIII 1302 (Euripides *Alcmeon*, second cent.) and XXVII 2452 (Sophocles (?) *Theseus*) = *GMAW*² 27. But these papyri are assigned on subjective criteria alone.

Lectional apparatus: smooth breathing is marked (fr. 2 col. ii 8, but its form is obscured by the paragraphus). The paragraphi lie either above the line in which change of speaker occurs (fr. 1.2, fr. 2 col. ii 2 and 8), or below it (fr. 1.9, fr. 2 col. ii 10). There is also a dipole (fr. 2 col. ii 5). At fr. 1.9 a small space seems to have been left between words to signify the change of speaker where the new speaker begins. There is also a space left at the end of fr. 1.5 for no discernible reason. An acute accent in fr. 1.6 denotes that ὄτωιοῦν is a single word.

A number of annotations, made by a different hand, can be seen in the margins of the text of fr. 2. Of these, only three letters can be read in one (fr. 2 col. i 11). Other editorial interventions are visible in the intercolumnium beside fr. 2. col. i 6 and 8. Small line fillers are used in fr. 2 (col. i 3 and 6), but they are not visible in fr. 1. In the lower margin of fr. 1, the ends of two oblique strokes with a small horizontal stroke beneath it are visible, but I have failed to identify it more closely.

Elision is not effected on the one occasion where it might have been (fr. 1.11, γῆ ε[χεῖ). *Iota adscriptum* is added in the read text in the only place where it is needed (fr. 1.6, ὄτωιο[υν). *Nu ephelkystikon* is applied before a vowel (fr. 1.5, μηκεῖν). Orthography is faultless, and the papyrus is free from other signs of carelessness.

The papyrus' chief point of interest is that it offers the preferable form of a pronoun where BTW, the principal medieval MSS, are at variance; see 11 n.

In sum, this seems to be a scholarly text on which much care has been lavished; its one point of interest for the text is almost certainly correct.

Information on the readings of medieval MSS is taken from the reports made by A. Diès, *Platon Œuvres Complètes* vol. ix (Paris 1949).

fr. 1

	(36d)
	c]κεπ[τεον
	ι]̄ω̄ς τουτ[ο γε χαι
	ρει]ν τοιγ[υν δει
	λε]γειν τ[οις αλ
5	5
	λοι]c μηκειγ (vac.) [
	η κ]αι ότωιο[υν
	τω]ν παρα το [προ
	σηκον λεγομε (vac.) [
	ν[ω]ν ορθως λε (vac.) [
(36e)	
10	10
	γ[̄ε δ]η μο[ι] θαυμα[
	γαρ εμε γε ε[χει
]. [
]. [

1] . . . , traces of two feet, widely spread apart and a second oblique end of upright with hook, ε or c
 feet of two parallel strokes, π or η 2 υ . , very end of high horizontal bar, either τ or π 3 ι . ,
 upright with single oblique extending rightwards from 2/3 from top, ν or μ 4] . , high speck, γ or

τ 5 . , traces at baseline 7 τ .[, raised rounded stroke 8 c . , upright with horizontal stroke extending rightwards from slightly above mid-point, η but ν not excluded μ . , low flatly curving stroke at baseline, ε or c 10 .[, paragraphus above trace, top of upright with very beginning of horizontal stroke extending rightwards from top] . , top of single upright with tiny speck of ink protruding from mid-point] . , top of an arc with bar above mid-point in line, θ or ε two sharply oblique strokes converging to form an apex, α or λ 11 α . , end of descender below baseline on smaller piece and trace of oblique stroke on larger piece, ρ or υ μ . . . , low rounded stroke open on right-hand side with trace of long horizontal at mid-point, ε or c upright with horizontal extending rightwards from tip upright curving lightly rightwards with cap, ε or c

fr. 2

	col. i		col. ii
		
] . . .		[
] .		π̄ .[
] . ε >		ου[
] ου		π̄ .[
5] . .	5 >	το .[
] . >	.	ειν[
]	εκ .[
] .	δ̄ουκου[
]	κενε .[
10] .	10	μ̄εν . .[
]	τοτο[.].[
] . c ^k		λονο .[
]		.στερ[
] .[
		

col. i

1] . . . , upright with hooked cap extending rightwards from top, c or ε high rounded stroke open at top left with beginning of bar at mid-point, ε or perhaps broken o foot of upright with oblique descending from above with tip of parallel upright, v or μ 2] . , two strokes converging on each other to form apex, α or λ 3] . , tip of upright, μ, η, ι, or ν 5] . . , similar to 2 above, vestiges of apex, α or λ single upright, fibres at top broken, ι or γ 6] . , high speck, perhaps tip of upright so compatible with ν, η, ι, or μ but admits of no conclusive interpretation in mg. next to α]γ> . , a long broken oblique stroke with much stray ink surrounding it 8 speck of ink 12] . c^k, nearly diagonal oblique with end of stroke meeting it at mid-point on left-hand side just visible, μ, α, or λ

col. ii

2 π . , vestiges of paragraphus end of single oblique at baseline, α or λ 4 π, vestiges of upright with beginning of top bar, very similar to that in 2, and second speck at baseline trace at baseline and second trace well below it, ρ or υ 5] . , high speck, υ or τ 7] . , end of sharply oblique stroke at baseline and speck to right, α, λ, or δ 9] . , upright, μ, η, ι, κ, or ν 10] . , upright with horizontal bar extending rightwards from top, γ, π, or τ vestiges of slightly curved upright, ε, θ, or c 11] . , rounded raised letter 12 ο . , rounded letter, c or ο 13] . , tip of upright with oblique crossing it then further thick upright of which the ink is confused and much surrounding stray ink, compatible with ν but very unclear 14] . , much stray ink, convergence high up in line of at least two strokes, of which second seems to be oblique descending from first and then tip of upright to the right, ν but μ not excluded

	ηδονα]ϛ εγ	(48a)		[πανυ κατανω	
	λυπαισ ουσας] α			πα[νταπασι γαρ	(48b)
	ναμεμειγ]με >			ου [ραιδιον ω	
	νασ ουκ αλλα] ου			Πρ[ωταρχε εν	
5	τω ταυτα γε κ]αι		5 >	του[τωι συννο	
	ουκ αλλωσ α]γ>	.		ειν [το τοιουτον	
]		εκα[στοτε παθος	

]		ᾠκου[ν ὡς γε εἰ
]		κεν ἐμ[οι λαβῶ
]	10	ᾠεν γε [μην αὐ
]		το το[ς]ο[υτωι μαλ
]ακκ(-)		λον ος[ωι κκοτει
]		γοτερ[ον εκτιν
		ι]γ[α

fr. 1

6 κ]αι with BT: om. W. The omission of καί in W does not improve the sense at all: BT's καί simply intensifies ὁτωιοῦν. The papyrus offers ancient corroboration of the rightful place of καί in the text, which is later reflected by its presence in BT, the most important MSS.

11 γαρ ἐμε γε ε[χει with TW: γάρ μέ γε B, and printed by Diès and Burnet. Hermann and Bury print γὰρ ἐμέ γ' with TW. Bury notices B's reading (which he calls 'Cl.' in his *app. crit.*) but gives no explanation why he prefers to read what TW offer. Yet the reading of the papyrus, as followed by TW, is preferable for two reasons.

First, the decisive point in favour of what the papyrus and TW offer is γε. Denniston, *GP*² 114, holds that 'the essential force of the particle appears to be concentration'. He divides the usages of γε into two categories, viz. 'emphatic' and 'limitative'. Here, γε throws greater emphasis on the already emphatic ἐμέ. TW's ἐμέ allows the required emphasis, whereas B's με does not: ἐμέ is, therefore, preferable.

Second, B's reading would be unique in Plato, whereas TW's ἐμέ γε is extremely common. Elsewhere in Greek, the cases where γε apparently follows an enclitic form of the first person singular pronoun are mostly the result of editorial decision. They are, therefore, open to objection. E.g. at Ar. *Lys.* 938, Dindorf, van

Leeuwen, Coulon and Henderson print Kinesias' exclamation as $\mu\acute{\alpha} \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \text{ } \acute{\Lambda}\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\omega \mu\acute{\eta} \mu\acute{\epsilon} \gamma\epsilon$. Yet the series of letters $\mu\eta\mu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ could equally be interpreted, by the simple expedient of prodelision, as $\mu\eta \text{ } \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon} \gamma\epsilon$, which Wilamowitz, Hall–Geldart, Sommerstein and Wilson all print.

Furthermore, it is also tempting to draw on the case of $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}/\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}$ followed by $\gamma\epsilon$ as evidence of the necessity of the emphatic form of the pronoun preceding the enclitic here. E.g. at Ar. *Lys.* 922 Dindorf, van Leeuwen, Coulon and Henderson all print $\mu\acute{\eta} \mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota} \gamma\epsilon$; equally, however, this can be interpreted as $\mu\eta \text{ } \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota} \gamma\epsilon$, which Wilamowitz and Hall–Geldart print or $\mu\eta \text{ } \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$, which Sommerstein and Wilson print. The same holds for Pl. *Hipp.* 229e7 and 9, where Burnet prints $\mu\acute{\eta} \mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota} \gamma\epsilon$, which is the reading of BTW. Herodianus, inter alia but most explicitly at *περὶ παθῶν* 199, holds that, in Attic, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota} \gamma\epsilon$ ought to be a single proparoxytone word, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$, on analogy of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\gamma\epsilon$. Apollonius Dyscolus also refers to this ‘Attic’ accentuation at *Pron.* 49.9, *Adv.* 181.30, and *Synt.* 138.9. One could not, however, argue that $\mu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon$ could be a correct form. It is difficult to say whether these dogmas ought to be allowed credence, but this does not alter the contention that the emphatic form of the first person pronoun preceding $\gamma\epsilon$ can always be read, whereas it is never necessary to read the enclitic form.

B's reading here is a slip, and it is odd that both Burnet and Diès followed B.
fr. 2
col. i

In mg. 12 $\text{]}ακκ(-)$. There are no textual variants at this point reported by Diès or Burnet. Bury, however, notices that his MS called Π¹⁰ offers $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota$, which is clearly a corruption of $\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omega\varsigma\iota$. But this does not seem to offer an explanation of the annotation. Furthermore, nothing in the marginalia in the papyri of Plato collected by

¹⁰ The MS seems to be Cod. Ven. Gr. 185, which is D in the revision of the OCT E. A. Duke et al., (eds.) (Oxford 1995).

K. McNamee, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt* (2007) 349–54 seems to be compatible with the abbreviated annotation here.

col. ii

5 It is not clear what the *diple* is here used to notice. The use of critical sigla in the papyri of Plato suggest a number of possibilities: much as a system of annotations was developed by Aristarchus for Homer, a similar system was evolved for Plato. Diogenes Laertius 3.65 enumerates the sigla and explains their various usages. According to him, the *diple* is used to notice τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα Πλάτωνι. However, there does not seem to be any point that might justify especial notice of that kind. An alternative is that the *diple* noticed some point in the text that was of interest to the reader, e.g. a difficult word, or some point that was treated in a hypomnema or commentary of some kind: see MacNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Bruxelles 1992) 15–17. But it is not easy to see what point could be particularly noteworthy of illustration or pose such difficulty as to require an explanatory gloss.

07–08. DEMOSTHENES, *IN TIMOCRATEM*

Two texts are edited here from towards the beginning of the text. They both cover parts of the text which have not otherwise been preserved in ancient copies. **07**, much the larger of the two, contains a number of points of interest. **08** offers nothing of interest for the constitution of the text.

07 is also the latest copy of this speech published to date, of which five come from Oxyrhynchus. Hitherto the published papyri are: P.CtYBR inv. 3077 (M–P³ 317.01, second cent. of unknown provenance) §§3–5; II **232** (M–P³ 318, second/third cent.) §§53–4, 56–8; XXXI **2548** (M–P³ 318.1, second cent.) §60; IV **701** (M–P³ 319, second/third cent.) §§63–5; P.Aberd. 120 (M–P³ 320, second cent. perhaps from the Fayum) §§65–6; P.Ant. II 80 (M–P³ 321, fourth cent. from Antinoe) §§73–7; BKT IX 71 + P.Berol. 13233 (edited by H. Maehler, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 116–9 and W. Müller, *Forsch. u. Ber.* 10 (1968) 129–30 respectively; M–P³ 321.1, third cent. from Hermopolis) §§83–4, 86–7, 89, 92–3; PSI inv. 208 (edited by J. Landon, *Comunicazioni dell’Istituto Papirologico “G. Vitelli”* 5 (2003) 1–5; M–P³ 321.11, second cent. of unknown provenance) §§83–4; P.Alex. inv. 544 b (M–P³ 321.2, of undisclosed date and unknown provenance) § 121; II **233** (M–P³ 322, third cent.) §§145–6, 149–50; XV **1811** (M–P³ 323, third cent.) §§183–8.

As the number of published papyri of Demosthenes stands, he was the most popular prose author in Egypt, just ahead of Isocrates and Plato. The height of his vogue seems to have been the second and third centuries, but they are, of course, the two centuries from which most papyri originate. The published papyri of *In Timocratem* demonstrate that this speech aroused quite some interest, with eleven papyri hitherto published, but it could not capture the same readership as e.g. *De Corona* (twenty-six), or *De Falsa Legatione* (twenty-four). Nor is this surprising: *In Timocratem* deals with Timocrates’ introduction of a law and the ramifications of it for Athens’ public finances; it lacks the drama of e.g. the *De Corona* or *De Falsa Legatione*.

The chief medieval MSS are SAFY; a complete catalogue of MSS of Demosthenes is provided by L. Canfora, *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene* (Padua 1968). The most important discussions bearing on the history of the text are: G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*² (Firenze 1952) 269–88, H. Erbse in H. Hunger et al. (eds.), ‘Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur’, *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Zürich 1961) i 262–4; and D. Irmer, ‘Beobachtungen zur Demosthenesüberlieferung’ *Philologus* 112 (1968) 43–62. I have not been able to consult R. Passweg, *The Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes’ Oration 24, In Timocratem* (Diss. New York 1975).

Information on readings of the MSS is drawn from the reports of the editions of M.R. Dilts, *Demosthenis Orationes* (Oxford 2005) ii and I. Sykutris post C. Fuhr, *Demosthenis Orationes*² (Leipzig 1944) ii. They are both used in the reconstruction of the lost portions of text.

07. DEMOSTHENES, *IN TIMOCRATEM* 7, 9–10

64 6B.55/B(1-3)a

22.4 x 9.7 cm

Later fifth century

The lower portion of a leaf from a papyrus codex with a single broad column. It will originally have been a very fine document. The lower margin is intact and up to 5 cm on both sides; the left margin on the ↓ side is at least 3.5 cm and that on the right is up to 6 cm. The left margin on the → side is up to 6 cm and that on the right is probably very similar. The width of the column on the → side is up to 14.5 cm; that on the ↓ side is possibly up to 1 cm narrower. A *kollesis* can be seen which runs almost exactly down the middle of the ↓ side.

The number of letters per line before any corrections made ranges from 29 to 36. The lines on the → side tend to have a higher average number of letters per line than those on the ↓ side, at 34 against 32.5. Overall, the average is 33.25. On that a basis, there would be sufficient letters to fill 25 lines between the last line on the ↓ side and first preserved line of the → side. This means that the → side will have contained 31 lines. If that figure is correct and obtains for the portions up till the beginning of the ↓ side, 07 will have been pages 3–4 of the codex if it contained only *In Timocratem*.

A letter count of *In Timocratem* in Dilts' OCT comes to approximately 75,200. This figure includes the documents, all of which Dilts holds to be spurious, with the exception of the Heliastic Oath at §149–51. The origins of these documents and their status in the text of Demosthenes are a matter of some controversy. See e.g. D.M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes Against Meidias* (Oxford 1990) 43–8, for a good discussion of the problem with further bibliography on the matter. He concludes that each document must be judged on its own merits and that some of the documents which are in the text of *In Midiam* are in fact genuine. This seems to be a much more sensible policy than Dilts' simply opting for blanket exclusion.

At times the documents are transmitted in the papyri, at times they are not, just as they appear in some medieval MSS and not in others. According to H. Wankel, *Demosthenes Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (Heidelberg 1976) i 70, S and F contain all the documents in the text, Y has them but they have been added in the margin by a second hand, and A has only some of them. This is borne out in *In Midiam* for which S contains the documents, but A does not: see MacDowell, *op. cit.* 48–9. As far as the papyri of *In Timocratem* are concerned, those published papyri with parts of the text which coincide with the documents always transmit them: they are II 232 (§53–4 and 56–8), II 233 (§145–6 and 149–50), and IV 701 (§63–5), and they are all approximately datable to end of the second or beginning of third centuries.

If one reckons on 33 letters per line and 31 lines per page, the whole speech would fill approximately 36.5 leaves of a codex. Obviously however, it is unwise to press this reconstruction too far, because it would rest on the assumption that the scribe was scrupulously meticulous in keeping to those exact figures and, further, that the documents which Demosthenes calls to be read out were also in the papyrus, although this is fairly probable.

One line and its lead is approximately 1 cm. If the page had 31 lines, the height of the column of text would be some 30 cm. The lower margin is 6 cm and the upper margin will most likely have been smaller than the lower margin, e.g. 3 or 4 cm: see E.G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Pennsylvania 1977) 8. Once these are added to the height of the column, the page would approach some 40 cm. Its breadth is 22.4 cm. This codex ought to be placed in Turner's category of the largest codices, Group 1 (*Typology* 14). It will be consistent with those which are termed 'less broad, still very tall'. It might be compared with e.g. P.Berol. 11739 (no. 84 in Turner's catalogue, Table 16, Prolegomena to Galen) of the sixth century, which is 21.5 x 40.4 cm = 45a in *GBEBP*.

(↓ 6). Doubtless more lectional signs will have been applied in the missing portions of the text.

At so late a date, objective criteria to establish a reliable dating of the papyrus are rare, especially since codices could not be re-used. Hands similar to this include e.g. PSI 126 (Menander, *Aspis* = *GBEBP* 15b ‘first half of v’) and even more similar is XI 1373 (Aristophanes, *Pax* and *Equites* = *GBEBP* 17a ‘middle or second half of v’). Both of these papyri are assigned to their dates on subjective criteria alone. I would be inclined to assign the papyrus later still than XI 1373 but for the very square μ which seems to be a feature of earlier hands.

07 exhibits all the characteristics which would lead it to being classified as an *édition de luxe*: it is physically large, its letters are tall and consistently fine in execution, and its margins are sumptuous.

The text offered by **07** is on the whole good. Like many papyri of Demosthenes it is inconsistent in that it agrees now with the better, now with the worse readings which are to be found in SAFY, the most important medieval MSS. On these, see **07–08** introd. Its chief points of interest lie in its support of an unusual form of a word which SAFY offer, which is probably correct (see ↓ 1 n.), and in word order. In one instance (↓ 4), the papyrus offers different word order from that of SAFY, which is paralleled elsewhere in Demosthenes and perhaps superior to that of SAFY. In another instance (→ 6), it offers a word order which is in agreement with AFY against S, but probably inferior to that of S.

The preserved portion of the text, as copied by the scribe, has a tendency to agree with A. This is a phenomenon which has previously been noticed in the papyri, see LXVII 4569–80 introd. para. 3. The *diorthotes* seems, however, to have compared it with a text related to S from which he has made one correction (see → 5 n.). This would seem to support the hypothesis that the split in the tradition between S and A took place in antiquity but no view on the date of this split has commanded assent as *communis opinio*: see the contrasting views of e.g. G. Pasquali, *Storia della*

steep oblique, α or λ . . . τ , two obliques reaching baseline and forming apex, second of which has small upturned lip, and vestiges of third oblique to right, most consistent with ν , but λ not excluded top of faint slightly oblique upright followed by high speck of ink top of single forwards slanting descender but surface here much abraded 3] . . . [, base of triangular shaped letter, δ or α speck of ink compatible with descender or upright two strokes curving in on each other at base, o or θ] . . . [, base of upright meeting end of curving stroke converging on it but almost square . . . [, base of oblique with hook meeting second oblique at base line, o , c , or θ base of single upright, ι or γ , but too close to preceding trace to be τ] . . . [, tiny speck of ink at baseline, compatible with foot of upright . . . ρ , faint upright slanting slightly forwards with vestiges of ink high and to right of upright, most compatible with γ , but π less likely two uprights form apex, α , δ , or λ 4] . . . , faint triangular letter, α or δ perhaps top of a single descender high speck with vestiges of upright [, upright with cross bar extending rightwards from just below tip, γ or η] . . . , base of letter with low horizontal and small tail at left-hand side end, α or δ rounded base, ν , o , θ , or c rounded base of second letter with upright on right-hand side, o or θ ν . . . , upright with small cap at top upright curving in on it, ϵ rather than η ρ . . . , three traces forming a triangular shape, consistent with head of ρ faintest high arc of ink, o , c , ϵ , or θ three faint oblique strokes, compatible with ν or λ . . . ν , very tip of oblique stroke, ν , η , ι , or χ τ . . . , top and bottom of slightly lunate upright, o or θ 5] . . . [, high horizontal bar with vertical, τ or γ lower half of curving stroke, o , ϵ , θ , or c τ . . . [, base of upright with hook joining upright, o or θ base of upright and rounded base, ν or ι convergence of oblique with horizontal at $c.40^\circ$, α or δ] . . . , high speck of ink compatible with cap of ϵ or c . . . c , two obliques forming sharply acute apex, α , δ , or λ ρ . . . , meeting of horizontal with oblique at $c.40^\circ$, α or δ 6] . . . , tip of oblique, compatible with end of upper arm of κ top of single thick upright stroke, α , ι , or δ vestiges of high horizontal stroke, τ , γ , or π] . . . , two oblique strokes converging on each other to form an apex, α , λ or δ 7 ϵ [, slightly lunate upright with horizontal bar] . . . , end of descender breaching baseline, compatible with ρ or ν o . . . , upright with low horizontal and high horizontal with lip, c or ϵ

↓

.

]αν, εξην (§ 7)

ουδε ο κοινον απαειν εστιν αλλ]αγηναι του

βιου ρα]διδι[ν ην α]ν μοι [α]ι[τιακαμεν]οc γαρ με

]`ε' [

α κ]αι λεγ[ειν] αν οκνεϊσειε τις [ευ φ]ρογων τον
 5 εμαυ]το[υ] πατερα ως απεκτονα [α]ξεβ`είας γρα
 φην] κατασκευασαα. εις α[γ]ωνα [κ]ατεστη
 εν εν δ]ε τουτω`ί· το πεμπτον με[]ρος

→

· · · · ·
 χρ ω[
 λιγαπο .[. . . .] .[. . . .] .[. . . .]
 βου . ηε .[. . . .] .μουκα[. . .] .[. .]κατ .[.] . . .
καθειετ[. . . .] .ιανδετακοιναδιαρ .[. .]ειν
 5 βουλομ .[.]ω .εποικικεν`υπερδ[ε]ητουτω[. .]π[
 τωγλυα .[.]ταυτηνευρικομενδουα[. .] . .

1 , first, vestiges of two parallel uprights, η or π second, upright and two clear oblique strokes followed by foot of upright third, convergence of ends of horizontal and oblique, α or δ fourth, single upright, τ, ι, or γ 2 ιγ, lower half of upright then downward curving stroke reaching baseline and turning upwards and high speck, .[, high speck] .[end of slanting descender breaching baseline, ρ or υ] .[, rounded stroke at baseline with apparent horizontal bar at mid-line, ε or θ end of upright followed by rounded stroke, ν or μ 3 η, lower end of single oblique reaching baseline, λ, κ, or possibly μ ηε, top of upright meeting short horizontal then turning downwards .[, single upright, κ ,γ, or ι] ., tip of upright, η, ι, or κ] .[, end of descender, υ or ρ .[upright with horizontal bar extending from mid-point] . . . , base of single upright ι, γ, or τ rounded base with upright extending from right-hand side, ο or θ long descender with beginning of one rightwards extending arm 4] ., small, high oblique, compatible with δ, α, or λ .[, upright and cross bar extending from top, π or γ] ., top bar and vestiges of curving upright ε or c 5 .[, lower half of slightly curved upright, ε, θ, or c .ε, pair of parallel uprights, π or η τω[high horizontal bar with foot of upright at baseline rounded stroke most compatible with ω 6

ωγ, rounded stroke at baseline followed by round letter two uprights on either side of a hole
 [, high trace, ι, κ, or η] . . , foot of upright tops of two high strokes

→

· · · · ·
 χρηματῶ[ν τους θεους των οσιων δε την πο (§ 9)

λιν απορ[τερει ακυ]ρ[α δε τα γνωσθ]εγ[τα υπο της

βουλης κ[αι του δ]ημου κα[ι το]υ [δι]κακτη[ρ]ιου

καθειτ[ησιν α]δ[ιαν δε τα κοινα διαρπ[αζ]ειν

5 βουλομε[ν]ω πεποιεικεν· υπερ δ[ε]η τουτῶ[ν α]π[αν (§ 10)

των λυσι[ν] ταυτην ευρισκομεν ουσ[αν] μο

↓

1 εζην with SAFY: all editors emend to ἕζων. Normally in the MSS of Attic authors, the form of the first person singular imperfect indicative of ζῆν is ἕζων. Unfortunately there is no epigraphical evidence of the form at Athens from any time: see L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (Berlin–New York 1996) ii 521. The form offered by **07** and SAFY may not be summarily dismissed as aberration or barbarism: there are, in fact, strong grounds to conclude that **07** and SAFY offer the correct reading.

First, the strongest piece of evidence to corroborate this reading is a papyrus from the Ptolemaic period. P.Louvre inv. 7172 (second cent. BC) = *PCG* viii (Adespota) 1001.3–4 may be adduced to show that this form of first person singular imperfect indicative seems to have occurred in Attic comedy. This reads ἐγὼ τὸν ἄλλον, ἄνδρες, ἐτεθνήκειν ἴπάλαι | ἄπανθ' ὄν ἕζην, τοῦτό μοι πιτεύετε. ἕζην is the reading of the papyrus. The editor restored the usual form. But Kassel–Austin reject the restoration, and they draw support for ἕζην from the reading here of SAFY. **07** now adds further evidence to SAFY to support the argument that ἕζην was an ancient

form. Furthermore, the alteration of ἔζων to ἔζην in the papyrus could not convincingly be explained as having arisen from phonetic changes: Gignac, *Grammar* i 293, offers only a single instance of the vocalic interchange ω > η in documentary papyri and that is, in any case, curious for reasons other than the phonetic change.

Second, there is a good deal of evidence from the ancient lexicographers to demonstrate that this form was correct and there is even some slight evidence that it was to be found specifically in the text of Demosthenes. Moeris, *Atticista* ε 36, *Das Attizistische Lexikon des Moeris*, (Sammlung der griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, vol. ix ed D. U. Hansen Berlin–New York 1998) 99, holds that ἔζην Ἀττικοί· ἔζων Ἑλληνες. Furthermore, ps.-Herodianus¹¹, *De locutionum pravitatibus*, in *Anecdota Graeca* ed. J. A. Cramer (Oxford 1835–7) iii 259 holds that ἀμαρτάνουσιν οἱ λέγοντες ἔζων ἐγὼ, δεόν λέγειν ἔζην· μόνως γὰρ οὕτως ἡ χρῆσις εὐρίσκεται· ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον πρόσωπον ἐφύλαξε τὸ η· οἶον ἔζην, ἔζης, εὐρίσκεται παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνη διὰ τοῦ ω· καίτοι τότε ἦν ἐγὼ ζῶν' (*sic*). Clearly the last part of the text here is garbled: Cramer reports that Hermann emended παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνη διὰ τοῦ ω to παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνη τὸ ω. The quotation is from *Ar. Ra.* 1072, καίτοι τότε γ', ἠνίκ' ἐγὼ ἔζων, and the form is corroborated by the MSS at *V.* 709¹² and *Lys.* 625. This does not discredit the testimony of ps.-Herodianus entirely: it may be that, while the reference to Aristophanes has been corrupted, the testimony is still valid, even for Aristophanes, for it is not wholly to be excluded that ἔζην was indeed to be found in his non-extant works. Linguistic variation is common in

¹¹ In the appendix of the fragments of Herodianus in Lobeck's edition of Phrynichus, p.457, the version of this entry reads τὸ ἔζων γράφεται καὶ ἔζη (*sic*) παρὰ Δημοσθένει πολλαχοῦ. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐφύλαξε τὸ η; but Lobeck reports that de Pauw observes that 'lectio hic a Nunnesio vulgata peccat. Scribendum τὸ ἔζων γράφεται καὶ ἔζην παρὰ Δημοσθένει. Secunda et tertia persona primam aperte requirit in principio. V. Moeris p.148 et Etymol. in ζωπυρεῖν.' In later editions of ps.-Herodianus the text printed is πλημμελὲς τὸ ἔζων· δεόν δὲ ἔζην ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐφύλαξε τὸ η. εὐρίσκεται δὲ διὰ τοῦ ω ὡς ἔπλων, ἔπλων. Notably here, the mention of Demosthenes' practice in the matter is expunged. It is not at all clear where the information on Demosthenes originated, nor why it later disappeared; yet it seems nevertheless clear that this unusual form of the word was associated with Demosthenes from an early period.

¹² D.M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford 1971), records in his apparatus at 709 that R omits ἔζων; this omission is nowhere else reported.

comedy, where it is not always simply a matter of orthography, e.g. the case of ποιεῖν/ποιεῖν. For instance, phenomena such as ἐώρακα/ἐώρακα are equally correct or the still more curious οἶδα/οἶθα/οἶθα are all acceptable forms of the second person singular present active indicative of εἰδέναι. Variable forms of this kind are enumerated and discussed in detail by W.G. Arnott, ‘Some Orthographical Variants in the papyri of Later Greek Comedy’ in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 191–217. Arnott does not treat the ἔζην/ἔζων variation, although there is no dispute that it occurs in P.Louvre inv. 7172. Clearly linguistic licences which are admitted in comedy cannot be directly transferred to formal forensic oratory. Nevertheless they demonstrate the variability of the spoken language, and this is no less relevant to oratory: if variant forms of Attic words are admitted in Old Comedy they must have been equally acceptable in all Attic, even if they were not used in some circumstances.

Third, the unusual form further appears in the *Etymologicum Magnum* with a reference to its appearance in tragedy. *E.M.* Kallierges 413.9 s.v. ζωπυρεῖν quotes Euripides’ *Alc.* 295 as κ᾿γωγ’ (*sic*) ἄν ἔζην καὶ εὐ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον. It then adds that ὄφειλεν εἶναι ἔζων and advances the objection to the form that the contraction is Doric. ἔζην is, however, the reading of BOLP, which are the the principal medieval MSS in this play, at *E. Alc.* 295. The verse is then repeated with small changes at *Alc.* 651 where LP read ἔζων but BO still read ἔζην. J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae* i (Oxonii 1984), excises 651–2. The Scholia (B) knew of ἔζην at 651, and remark of it, ἀπὸ τοῦ ζῆμι, καὶ ὁ παρακείμενος ἔζην.

Choeroboscus, *Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione verborum*² in A. Hilgard (ed.), *Grammatici Graeci* (Hildesheim 1965) iv 2.59, also maintains that the contraction of ἔζαον into ἔζην is Doric.

Besides the fact that the form is curious and, consequently, the argument of *lectio difficilior potior* will apply, there is no solid evidence to deny that ἔζην offered

by *07* and SAFY could not go back to Demosthenes. There will be very few places in ancient literature where the medieval MSS are unanimous in offering a plausible if admittedly odd reading, which can be supported from external sources of both direct and indirect tradition, where modern editors will unanimously emend. *07* now offers further support to the case that it is unwarranted to emend the unusual form to the usual: it will have been in the text since from the later fifth century.

3 ραδ[ιου] (l. ῥάδιον). It is impossible to tell whether the *diorthotes* added iota adscript above the α, as he does elsewhere, since only the very bases of the letters remain.

μοι with SF: ἐμοί AY. The papyrus and SF probably offer the correct form of the pronoun, although it is difficult to judge, as either might be the true reading. One possible argument in favour of ἐμοί would be that, according to the statistical analysis of D.F. McCabe, *The Prose-rhythm of Demosthenes* (New York 1981) 122, the clausula to which ἐμοί would give rise, - - - - -, occurs on 123 occasions in his sample of Demosthenes speeches (nos. 2, 32 and 60) or 4.49 %, whereas the clausula which would result from μοι, - - - - -, only occurs on 36 occasions or 1.31 %. The most frequent clausula is - - - - -, which occurs on 241 occasions or 8.8%. While the difference in frequency of the two clausulae is substantial, it does not provide a really cogent argument in favour of ἐμοί: no special emphasis on ‘me’ seems to be required. On balance, the testimony of the papyrus and S ought to be preferred.

4 οκνεῖε (l. ὀκνήσειε). See Gignac, *Grammar* i 239.

α και λε[γει]ν αν οκνεῖε τις [ευ φ]ρονων: α και λεγειν αν τις οκνήσειεν εδ φρονων: SAFY and Aristides, *lib. rhet.* I 94 (ed. W. Schmid, Leipzig 1926). Demosthenes here substantially repeats what he says at 22.2, αἰτιακάμενος γάρ με α και λεγειν αν οκνήσειε τις, εἰ μὴ τύχοι προσόμοιος ὢν τούτῳ, τὸν πατέρα ὡς ἀπέκτονα ἐγὼ ἐμαυτοῦ, και κατασκευάσας ἀσεβείας γραφήν οὐκ ἐπ’ ἐμέ, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὸν θεῖόν μου, γράσας ἀσεβεῖν οὐκ ἐμοὶ συνιόντα εἰς ταῦτόν ὡς πεποιηκότι ταῦτα, εἰς ἀγῶνα κατέκτησεν. SAFY offer no variation there. The word order offered by the

papyrus throws emphasis on the condition implied in εὖ φρονῶν, ‘one would hesitate, were one of sound mind’, which is perhaps an improvement. This is expressed more fully in 22.2 by the conditional clause. This position of τις is, furthermore, corroborated by an almost identical expression at 23.202, Τιμοθέου δόξαντός τι ποιῆσαι τῶν δεόντων ὑμῖν, πρὸς τῷ πάνθ’ ἃ μέγιστ’ ἦν αὐτῶι δοῦναι προσέθησαν αὐτῶι Φρασιηρίδην καὶ Πολυκθένην, ἀνθρώπους οὐδ’ ἐλευθέρους, ἀλλ’ ὀλέθρους καὶ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκότας οἷα λέγειν ὀκνήσειεν ἂν τις εὖ φρονῶν. But the supralinear]c might suggest that the *diorthotes* has inserted τι]c above οκνήσειε, which would restore the order of the medieval MSS. The τις of the original scribe is not visibly cancelled, but this would not be unprecedented. K. McNamee, *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri* (Diss. Duke University 1977) 42, observes, that ‘[a] few corrections have dots either side but no cancellation, and in many cases there is neither cancellation nor other identifying mark’.

If the papyrus’ word order gives what Demosthenes wrote, it is curious that the papyrus’ word order was subsequently altered to become that of SAFY, which Aristides had read before this papyrus was produced. On balance, however, the word order of the papyrus does seem to be marginally preferable to that offered by SAFY and Aristides on account of the parallels for it at 23.202.

5 F adds a superfluous καί before ἀβεβεία, possibly under the influence of 22.2 cited above. 07 and SAY rightly omit it.

→

4 καθειτ[ησιν (l. καθίκτησιν), see Gignac, *Grammar* i 190.

α]διαν (l. ἄδειαν), see Gignac, *Grammar* i 189.

διαπ[αζ]ειν with SFY: αρπαζειν A, before correction.

The scribe has omitted the necessary τῷ, which all MSS offer. The papyrus is rather broken around here, but the top layer of fibres is intact and there is certainly space for it on the papyrus. The omission of the article would account for the siglum

which the *diorthotes* has applied at the beginning of the line. The *diorthotes* has not added the missing word where the original scribe would have written it, but he may have added it supralinearly, because there are very faint traces of ink around the edges of the holes.

5 βουλομε[ν]ω (l. βουλομένω). *Iota adscriptum* is not applied here.

5 πεποιεικεν (l. πεποίηκεν), see Gignac, *Grammar* i 239.

δ[ε]η. The original scribe wrote δε, but this is overwritten by the *diorthotes*.

δέ with A: δή SFY. δέ of A is not impossible. δή of SFY is, however, preferable for two reasons. First, Demosthenes here recapitulates what he has just been saying; this falls conveniently into Denniston's category of 'Resumptive δή', *GP*² 225. Second, δή would better suit τούτων ἀπάντων for, as Denniston suggests, *op. cit.* 205, δή emphasises 'adjectives expressing indefinite quantity or number' – here 'the solution for all these things'. This is paralleled exactly in D. 4.33, ὑπὲρ δὴ τούτων ἀπάντων οἶμαι δεῖν ὑμᾶς πρεσβείαν ἐκπέμπειν.

6 λυειν ταυτην ευρισκομεν ουε[αν] μο[ν]η[ν] with AFY: λύειν εὐρίσκομεν ταύτην οὐεαν μόνην S. The word order of S, as printed by Dilts, is preferable. The separation of the participle from the demonstrative pronoun with which it closely coheres offered by 07 and AFY slightly diminishes the emphasis which Demosthenes throws on the uniqueness of his solution to the supposedly untenable prevailing situation that has arisen from Timocrates' decree. Moreover, according to McCabe, *op. cit.* 122, the clausular rhythm - - - ∪ - in S is commoner (228 occurrences in his sample = 8.33%), than ∪ - - ∪ - in AFY (161 = 5.88%). Since this is the second commonest clausula, and only marginally less frequent than - - - - -, this seems to be sufficiently compelling evidence to accept the order of S over that of the papyrus and AFY.

ὄυε[αν]. The form of the accent remained in use till the sixth century: see J.–L. Fournet, 'L'influence des usages littéraires sur l'écriture des documents:

perspectives' in (ed.) A. Bülow-Jacobsen, *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists* (Copenhagen 1994) 421.

08. DEMOSTHENES, *IN TIMOCRATEM* 13

112/74(e)

4.7 x 4.2 cm

Third century

A small and heavily lacunose scrap from a papyrus roll which is broken on all sides. The text runs with the fibres. The back is blank. If the restoration of the text printed is correct, lines will have been approximately 5 cm wide. This is at the lower end of the normative range of prose column widths, which Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes* 101, shows to be 4.3–7.5 cm with a particular frequency of widths in the range of 4.7–6.6 cm. But a width of some 5 cm will have been unexceptional for papyri written in the ‘Severe Style’: see Chart 3.2.1e in Johnson, *op. cit.* 105. He further notes that, of papyri with a median date of c.150, 39 examples are in the range of 4.3–5.9 cm but 15 are in the range of 6.0–7.5 cm. This is consistent with both the kind of hand and the likely dating of the papyrus.

The length of lines varies between 13 and 16 letters, with an average of approximately 14. The sample is very small, but, if similar line lengths were consistently maintained, the whole speech would fill some 5250 lines. It must be noted that this reckoning includes the many documents which Demosthenes calls to be read out; on this point see 07 introd. para. 3–4.

The hand is medium sized, slowly written, regular, and slanting slightly forwards with rather pronounced angularity. o is small and raised to mid-line. It is not strictly bilinear: the descenders of ρ, τ, and υ stray, at times, beneath the baseline (neither ψ nor φ is exemplified). π, μ, ν, and η are fairly wide. The base of ω has a kink. The bow of μ is a smooth shallow curve. δ is sharply triangular as is α, save for the last stroke. υ is in three straight strokes. No ligatures are made. The may be compared with e.g. XVII 2098 (Herodotus 7) = *GLH* 19b, securely datable to the first half of third century because of a document on back, and XXVII 2452 (Sophocles, *Theseus* ?) = *GMAW*² 27, assigned on subjective criteria initially to the second century, although in addenda, p.149, Turner writes “my assigned date, ii AD,

is uncertain; iii AD might be better.” A date of later in the third century would, therefore, seem suitable.

Neither lectional signs nor any kind of punctuation are applied so far as can be ascertained from the papyrus. In the read text, *iota adscriptum* is never required. *Scriptio plena* occurs once (επαυσαντο ουτ[οι, 4). Orthography is faultless, and the papyrus is free from other signs of carelessness.

The read text does not differ from that offered by SAFY, the oldest and best medieval MSS which are unanimous in this portion of the text. This portion of the text also has an indirect tradition: it is quoted by an anonymous rhetorician who introduces a clearly false variant (8 n.), but the word in question is not actually preserved in the text of the papyrus.

The restoration of the lost portions of the text is based on Dilts' OCT, except in the matter of *scriptio plena*: I have allowed *scriptio plena* in 2, [ταῦτα], because the lacuna will accommodate five letters, and also in 3, [ποτε] | επαυσαντο, because the scribe does not elide on the one occasion in the preserved portion of the text where he might have in 4.

· · ·	· · ·	
]ταχρη .[]τα χρημ[ατα	§13
]ακουσα[ταυτα] ακουσα[ντων	
] .μ[. .] .π . . δ .[υμ[ων] επειδη [ποτε	
]επα . καντοου .[επαυσαντο ουτ[οι βο	
5]ωντε . εδωκε .[5 ωντες εδωκε γ[νω	
]μηνευκτημ .[μην Ευκτημω[ν ως	
]υ . . τ . νδ . κα[δ]υγατον δικα[ιοτα	
]μεν[την υμα]ς μεν [εις	
].[πρατειν] τ[ους	
· · ·	· · ·	

1 η .[, upright with oblique extending downwards and rightwards from tip, μ or ν 3] .μ[, speck
 of ink at mid-line, consistent with lower half of upright] ., bottom of upright with very
 beginning of stroke extending from base, ε or c]π . ., foot of letter with small hook, ε or c foot
 of single upright, ι or γ .[, upright with vestiges of bar extending from mid-point 4 .c, foot of
 a single upright, υ, γ, or ι .[, beginning of high horizontal bar, τ or γ 5 .ε, end of high stroke
 slightly hooked back on itself, compatible with ε or c ε .[, upright with slight kink at very base,
 γ, ι, μ, or ν 6 μ .[, spherical and slightly raised stroke, ω or ο 7 . .τ, tip and base of high
 upright after small hole, i.e. right-hand side of wide letter, most compatible with ν or perhaps μ two
 oblique strokes forming apex, α, δ, or λ τ ., tip of arc, ο, ε, θ, or c δ ., foot of single
 upright, ι or γ 8] .[, high horizontal stroke, compatible with τ, γ, or π

09. PLUTARCH, *ALEXANDER* 42.9, 8–10

17 2B.59/A(a)

3.6 x 6.0 cm

Third century

A small scrap, broken on all sides, from the right hand side of a column of a roll and part of the intercolumnium. The papyrus has been re-used for the Plutarch: the writing runs against the fibres and the sheet-join, which can be seen on the back, proves that the text on the back was written first. Only meagre ends and beginnings of two columns of an unknown text with an intercolumnium remain. It is in a different hand, which is an example of the ‘Severe Style’, and rather less compressed than that of the Plutarch. It will also have been a literary text.

The lines of the Plutarch seem to have varied in length between 28 and 31 letters; the intercolumnium may have been greater than the 1.5 cm which survive: some ink is visible at the right-hand edge of the papyrus (approximately corresponding to 6–7), which may have been some kind of critical siglum. If it were the beginning of a line, one would have expected that the beginnings of the lines above and below would also have been visible.

The text was written quickly and rather cursively: ligatures are common. The hand is small, fairly regular, much cramped, slightly flattened, and slants forwards with a tendency for wide letters like μ , ν , and ω (e.g. in 5, 8, and 9) to be turned slightly upwards. It would be best described as an informal hand. It is approximately bilinear but descenders of ι , ψ , and ϕ drop below the baseline. ω is flat based. μ is in two movements with a deep rounded bow. ν has rounded arms and is done in a single sequence. The bar of ϵ is extravagant and tends to continue into the next letter. The loop of ϕ is very flattened.

The hand has certain affinities with V 842 (*Hellenica Oxyrhynchita*) = GLH 17b, although it is far more formal than this papyrus, dated to the second half of the second century on the basis of a document on the back (VI 918) which belongs ‘most probably to the reign of Antoninus or Marcus Aurelius’; and it also has close

similarities with LXI 4118 (third cent.) especially in μ , α , κ , ε , β , and υ , dated to the later third century by its content, a memorandum to a comarchs, who were reintroduced in approximately 245.

A third century date for the papyrus accords well with the dates of almost all of the other fourteen published papyri of Plutarch. With the exception of two, they are dated to the second or third centuries: see LXXIII 5153–8 introd., para. 3, where the information is stated in full and it is observed that the consistently early dates ‘sugges[t] an early popularity, continuing into the third century and then a slump more distinct even than what would normally be expected from the general survival rate’.

Initial ι has an inorganic diaeresis (6); a horizontal stroke over letter ω abbreviates ν (2). In the read text, *nu ephelkystikon* is applied on the one occasion where it is needed (5). There is no instance where elision might occur nor is *iota adscriptum* anywhere required. Orthography is faultless.

This is the fourth papyrus with Plutarch’s *Vitae* to come to light, but the first of the *Alexander*. The other three are LVII 3684 (*Lycurgus*, third cent.); P.Heid. Siegmann 209 (inv. 51) = M–P³ 1429 (*Pelopidas*, c.180); and P.Duk. inv. 773 (once P.Rob. inv. 36, not edited) + P.Genav. inv. 272 a–b + P.Köln I 47 = M–P³ 1431 (*Caesar*, third cent.). It is interesting to see that the Greek parallel of Julius Caesar’s *Life* is now represented in the papyri.

As things stand, the publication of 09 brings the total number of papyri with works of Plutarch or those belonging to the *corpus plutarcheum* to fifteen. They are listed in full in LXXVIII 5153–8 introd. Of the fourteen enumerated, three are of unknown provenance, one comes from Antinoe, and one perhaps comes from Panopolis but eight certainly come from Oxyrhynchus and probably so does one further papyrus.

The papyrus offers one probably wrong though possible variant from that transmitted in the medieval MSS (see 5 n.) and arouses suspicion about the text

where K. Ziegler, *Plutarchus Vitae Parallelae* ii.1 (Leipzig 1968), printed a conjecture based on a paraphrase of the text of Zonaras (see 8 n.).

Information on the readings of the medieval MSS is taken from reports made Ziegler.

· · ·

] . [

] α λ λ α σ [.] . [.] ω̄

] ν ε κ ε ι ν ο υ ς

] . ε λ α β ε ν ε ι ς

5] ε ψ α μ ε ν ο ς δ ε

] τ ο ν ἰ π π ε ι ς

] . α ι κ ε ρ α λ α ι ς

] ε π ο ν τ α ς α

] . γ ε ς α τ ο υ ς

10] φ η π ι ω μ ο ν [.] .

] ε ν ο ι δ ε τ ῆ [

] υ . [

· · ·

1] . [, foot of upright, then end of further flatter oblique 2] . [, speck at baseline, compatible with base of upright 4] medial curving stroke 7] . , very end of horizontal bar leading into α, τ or ψ 9] . γ, top of single upright, ι, η, or π 10] . , high horizontal, consistent with cap of c or ε η [, vestiges of mark over η 12] υ . [, end of oblique at mid-line

· · · · · · ·

] . [

ε ν υ ι ο ι ς ε φ α ς α ν ἰ δ ι ο ι ς] α λ λ α σ [ο] υ [ζ] ω (ν)

τ ο ς ε τ ε ρ ο υ ς π ο ι η ς ο μ ε θ α κ α] ν ε κ ε ι ν ο υ ς

απολεσωμεν ταυτ ακουσ]αc ελαβεν ειc
 5 ταc χειραc το κρανοc περιβλ]εψαμενοc δε
 και θεασαμενοc τουc περι αυ]τον ι]ππειc
 απανταc εγκεκλικοταc] ταιc κεφαλαιc
 βλ]επονταc α
 πεδωκεν ου πιων αλλ επα]ινεσαc τουc
 10 ανθρωπουc αν γαρ αυτοc ε]φη πιω μον[ο]c
 αθυμησουcιν ουτοι θεασαμ]ενοι δε τη[v
 εγκρατειαν αυτου και μεγαλοψ]υχ[ιαν

1] [. The traces are too minimal to confirm or refute any reading suggested by the MSS.

2–3 c[o]υ [ζ]ω(v)]τοc with ΛQ: coṽ cόζοντοc P. Λ is ‘consensus codicis L cum suis apographis’. L is the oldest and best medieval MS, but P is still classed by Ziegler (praefatio to vol. ii, fasc. 1) along with L and K as ‘antiquisim[i] et purissim[i] (id est interpolatione plerumque carentes).’ The papyrus offers superfluous confirmation that ΛQ’s reading is right. The clearly false reading offered by P arose in all likelihood from dittoblepsy to the preceding word, coṽ. cόζοντοc is a vain attempt to make a Greek word out of the confusion. cόζοντοc would have to be passive, cωθέντοc, to make any sense.

4 εic. Two blots are visible over the ε of ειc, with one higher than the other. They do not form a diaeresis, nor is there any break in the text or *varia lectio* recorded at this point. I am unable to explain their significance; they may have been accidental.

5 περιβλ]εψαμενοc: περιβλέψαc ΛPQ. περιβλ]εψαμενοc ought not to be dismissed summarily: it is possible that the papyrus is right and the MSS wrong. At Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 37.7 the middle is used in exactly the same sense as it is used here: τοῦ

δὲ Βάρκα κελεύσαντος ὅπου βούλεται (sc. Κάτων κατακλινεῖν), περιβλεψάμενον (all MSS) εἶπεῖν παρὰ Μουνάτιον. The distinction in meaning between the active and middle voices is very fine. Elsewhere Plutarch uses the active with a scarcely perceptible difference, if there is, indeed, any at all: at *Pelop.* 11.4 ἐπεὶ δὲ περιβλέψαντες (all MSS) ἐν κύκλῳ τὸ συμπόσιον, καὶ τῶν κατακεκλιμένων ἕκαστον ἀκριβῶς καταμαθόντες, ἐπάσαντο τὰς μαχαίρας κτλ. and, again, at *Brut.* 17.6 ἤδη δὲ παιόμενος ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ κύκλῳ περιβλέπων (all MSS) καὶ διώσασθαι βουλόμενος, ὡς εἶδε Βροῦτον ἐλκόμενον ξίφος ἐπ' αὐτὸν, τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Κάσκα κρατῶν ἀφῆκε κτλ.

In general, the middle voice, περιβλέπεσθαι, seems often to be used transitively, whereas it is the intransitive sense which is required here: Alexander simply looks about him; his reflection on what he sees is expressed by θεασάμενος. Although the middle περιβλεψάμενος can bear this sense, the simple act of looking around is more concretely expressed by the active περιβλέψας. Moreover, it seems quite probable that the scribe's eye jumped to the true middle ending of the subsequent θεασάμενος in his exemplar and that he assimilated the ending of περιβλέψας to this. Further, it would be difficult to explain how a middle ending was lost without trace so as to become the active ending in all the most important MSS, ΛΡQ. While it is true that περιβλέψας might have arisen from simplification of the word by a scribe, its sense is unimpeachable and, given the unanimity of the MSS, it ought to be preferred here against the testimony of the papyrus.

8 βλ]εποντας: πρὸς ποτὸν βλέποντας ΛΡQ: πρὸς τὸ ποτὸν βλέποντας C: πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ἀποβλέποντας Zonaras: πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποβλέποντας Ziegler. The papyrus casts doubt over both the reading of the MSS and Ziegler's conjecture. The end of the line in the papyrus falls at the same place as the other lines: this means that some 20 or so letters will still be required to fill the line before βλ]εποντας. Neither the MSS reading nor Ziegler's conjecture will adequately fill it.

If one accepts the addition of the probably necessary article in C, convincing objections on grounds of sense or linguistic usage cannot be raised against the MSS reading. But the papyrus suggests that something has gone awry in the direct tradition. Furthermore, the indirect tradition varies from the direct at this point. In the *Epitome Historiarum*, 1.295, Zonaras presents the story as follows: ὅτε Μακεδόνες τινὲς ἐν ἄσκοις ὕδωρ κομίζοντες αὐτῷ συνήντησαν, καὶ πλήξαντες κράνος προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ κακῶς ὑπὸ δίψους διακειμένῳ· ὁ δὲ τὸ κράνος λαβὼν, καὶ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ἀποβλέποντας, οὐκ ἔπιεν, ἀλλ' ἐπέδωκεν τοῖς δοῦσιν αὐτό, εἰπὼν ὡς 'εἰ ἐγὼ πίομαι μόνος, ἀθυμήσουσιν οὗτοι.'

While Zonaras often follows Plutarch nearly verbatim, as with all epitomators, he must condense and paraphrase. ἰδὼν here corresponds with θεακάμενος and is quite superfluous, and ἀποβλέποντας probably meant as an embellishment of the simplex. Zonaras' testimony ought not, therefore, to be allowed credence against APQ, and Ziegler's conjecture should have no place in the text.

This does not, however, solve the problem of what the text was. If πρὸς <τὸ> ποτὸν βλέποντας is accepted, space for at least six letters still needs to be filled. Solutions to this might include e.g. something having fallen out of the text, scribal error or the surface of the papyrus being unsuitable to be written on at this point. The last is fairly improbable because this would have affected other lines too, yet there is no indication that the surrounding lines are short of letters. It is plausible enough in itself that the scribe might have made a mistake of some kind: he has probably already made an error out of carelessness (5). However, the absence of the article in the older and more important APQ makes one suspect that perhaps more than the article has dropped out of the text here: its addition in the much less important C is surely due to its scribe seeking to restore a more usual syntax. Moreover, the reading of APQ in any case will not supplement the space. Perhaps the best solution is then to retain πρὸς ποτὸν βλέποντας and postulate a lacuna of some 5–7 letters.

8–9 α|[πεδωκεν ΛΡQ: ἐπέδωκεν Zonaras. This is a slightly odd word division: one would have expected ἀπ|έδωκεν, or the whole word to have been written in the next line. But similar odd divisions are to be found elsewhere, e.g. V 843 (second/third cent.) (Plato, *Symp.*) col. xvii 1.794–5 has α|φ' ου and P.Berol. 5879 (first/second cent.) = M–P³ 300 = B. Hausmann, *Demosthenis fragmenta in papyris et membranis servata* (Diss. Leipzig 1921; Pap. Flor VIII; Firenze 1981) XXIX, (Demosthenes, *In Lept.*) col. i 24–5 has α|[φ]αιρειεθα[ι]. (I owe these parallels to Dr D. Colomo.)

Zonaras' reading may be dismissed: ἐπιδιδόναι would require an indirect object, which Zonaras supplies by τοῖς δοῦσιν, but no indirect object is in Plutarch's text.

10. POLYBIUS, *HISTORIAE* 5.67, 9–10

2 1B.104/H(b) part (1)

2.6 x 6.7 cm

First century

03 (Homer, *Il.* 13. 244–52) was stuck on to the back of the present papyrus. The adhesion may have occurred in antiquity. The papyrus of Polybius is very fragile, especially on the upper left-hand side, and that of Homer has likewise been heavily abraded in roughly the same place. This indicates that they will both have been damaged once they had become stuck to each other. The edges of **03** are cut very neatly: its corners almost form right angles. It will undoubtedly have been cut with a knife to fit this size and shape. Presumably then, it was used to mend or reinforce **10** where **10** was especially weak. However, it does seem odd that a papyrus with Homer, which appears to be quite a fine production, should have been used to this end rather than a e.g. an old document which no longer had any validity or a papyrus which had already been used on both sides so that it could not have been re-used for any other purpose. The back of both of the papyri is blank. On the restoration of rolls of papyrus in antiquity, see E. Puglia, *La cura del libro nel mondo antico* (Napoli 1997) 29–62, esp. 51–2.

When **10** was prised apart from **03**, it sustained some damage, and several letters, which were previously visible in the image, can no longer be discerned in the papyrus. I transcribe the papyrus according to the image taken before the restoration, rather than what it is possible to see now.

The papyrus is a small scrap from a roll, broken on all sides. The writing runs with the fibres. The column appears to have had between 15 and 17 letters per line.

The hand is formal, rounded, large, very regular, slowly written, upright, and decorated at the extremities; it is roughly bilinear (but φ violates this as it almost spans the distance between lines) and carefully executed. The feet of uprights have serifs of varying size and the tops of κ, τ, μ, ι, and υ are alike adorned. δ is in three almost equilateral strokes and α is the same, save for the mid-bar. κ is slightly large

and the bar of τ is wide. μ is in four strokes all reaching the base line. The bodies of ϵ , o , and c are in two movements and show downward compression. The bar of ϵ has a small downward stroke.

With so small a sample of letters, it is fairly difficult to date the hand, but an example of a hand similar to this would be P.Fouad inv. 266 (Septuagint, *Deuteronomy*) = *GMAW*² 56. Turner regarded it as belonging to the middle of the first century BC, and this papyrus could well be assigned to a similar date. In the read text, no lectional signs are applied. *iota adscriptum* is applied on the one occasion that it is required; there is no opportunity to observe the scribe's practice in the matter of *nu ephelkystikon*.

This is only the second papyrus to appear of which it is certain that Polybius is the author. The other is in two pieces in separate collections, P.Ryl. I 60 + P.Berol. 9570 (=M-P³ 1433, from the Fayum). It contains parts of book 11. That much larger papyrus, which was assigned to the second century, contributes several improvements to the text transmitted in the medieval MSS. There is also possibly a third papyrus which might contain part of the lost portions of the *Historiae*, viz. P.Ryl. III 491 (second cent. BC, from the Fayum). It has, however, been disputed whether that papyrus indeed has Polybius or something else.

Much of Polybius' *Historiae*, which were originally composed in forty books, are now lost. The text of the first five books is relatively secure. Besides these, parts of the text of books 6–18, which are the *Excerpta Antiqua* are principally preserved in F, Vaticanus Urb. Gr.102 as well as a number of other MSS, which are enumerated in full by J.M. Moore, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius* (Cambridge 1965). Naturally the text of these later books is founded on a less secure basis than that of the first five books. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that a papyrus would improve the text of these books. Furthermore, some of the text is preserved in the various collections of *Excerpta Historica* of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus.

10 contributes nothing to the constitution of the text. Nor is this very surprising given its exiguity and the fact that the text of the first five books established by the medieval MSS, principally AB, appears to be of high quality. The papyrus simply assures us of that quality.

The read text of the papyrus is free from orthographic error as well as other signs of carelessness. This is clearly a very fine copy, and it is of interest that so early a copy of an extremely uncommon author was found at Oxyrhynchus. This would seem to demonstrate an interest in the recent history of the Ptolemaic kingdom.

Information on the readings of medieval MSS is taken from reports given by P. Pédech in the *apparatus criticus* of the Budé edition (Paris 1977).

]. .ον .[γ]εγονο[ε εις παρα
]δημα[επον]δημα [την Θεοδο
] . .οδο[του]προδο[ειαν και
]δ .να[την εφο]δον α[ναγον
5]αν .ιο .[τες την] Αντιοχ[ου προ
] .δεκα[εφεροντ]ο δε κα[ι τας
] .μαιουτ[επι Πτολ]εμαιου τ[ου
]ησειφ .[Λαγου κτ]ησειφ α[κκ
] .ουτωι .[οντες επι] τουτωι ς[υμ
10] .ιc[.] .ευ[πολεμης]αι C[ε]λευ[κωι

1] . ., base of curving letter, open on right-hand side, ε or c foot of an upright, γ or ι .[, speck
3] . ., upright curving slightly left to right π or ι base of a high round letter with descender
extending from left hand side 4 .v, arc, o or c 5 .ι, foot of upright, τ, ι, or γ .[, low
horizontal stroke, consistent with seriffing, χ, κ, μ, or η 6] ., rounded traces on heavily abraded

fibres, compatible with o, ε, or c [7] ., rounded letter open on right-hand side, consistent with ε or c [8] .[, corner of a letter with two strokes meeting at a low to mid point in line with lower trace seriffed, consistent with α or δ [9] ., end of high horizontal, τ or γ [10] .[, left hand side of round letter compatible with c or o [10] .ι, end of oblique with serif, α [10] ., long oblique compatible with right-hand oblique of λ

5–6 [προ][εφεροντ]ο. προεφεροντο: AB: προεφεροντο: R = consensus codicum CDE, vel omnium vel duorum. R is related to AB but inferior to it. The wrong variant is a banalisation of προεφέροντο of the best MSS: προφέρειν does not mean ‘allege’, cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. 2. Moreover, προεφέροντο can be excluded because the papyrus does not commend it on grounds of space. Line 5 will have contained 17 letters if one follows the best MSS in restoring the line, and they seem already to be crowded in the space to judge from the preserved portion. It would be difficult to accommodate a further letter in the line.

SECTION III: PARALITERARY TEXT

11. SCHOLIA MINORA TO *ILLIAD* 13.703–829

101/204(a)

8.4 x 14.8 cm

First century

A sheet of papyrus with the foot of what is likely to have been a document of some kind which was subsequently re-used on both sides for Homeric scholia. The papyrus was excavated on March 13th 1903 when it was the 37th papyrus to be unearthed, as Hunt's annotation at the foot of the ↓ side, M.13 37 demonstrates.

On the ↓ side is a complete column which carries a small selection of the scholia minora: it has lemmata from 703 to 803, which is the last glossed in Book 13, as the dipole at the foot of the column shows. The beginnings of another column, of which only the first letter or the first stroke of the letter of the lemmata appear (15, 17, 18, 20, 22), is discernible. The second column will presumably have carried the beginnings of the lemmata of Book 14, but this is beyond proof. At the top end of the → side (upside down in relation to the scholia) is a somewhat puzzling set of quotations of common verses from various parts of the *Iliad* which seems in part to concern the usage of ὄc. A *kollesis* almost squarely in the middle of the → side proves that the document, or whatever it is which is written in the cursive hand, was the first use of the papyrus.

On the ↓ side, upper margin is 1.2 cm; lower margin is at least 3.1 cm and an intercolumnium of approximately 1 cm survives. Column height is just under 10.5 cm. The lemmata on the ↓ side are followed, after a gap of approximately 0.5 cm, by their 'metaphrases' which, if they are longer than one line, are put in *eisthesis* of approximately 0.5 cm.

On the → side, an upper margin of 1.8 cm survives. Only six lines of text remain. The quotations, some of which are incomplete, cease just before the *kollesis*. The rest of the → side between the end of the quotations and the document was left blank: the reason behind this is unclear.

The scribe writes tiny, almost jejune, neat and largely upright capitals. Letters differ only slightly in width. Bilinearity is regularly breached by the descenders of ρ, φ, ψ, and, at times, of υ too. α and λ are triangular, with the two obliques tending on each other at an angle of approximately 35°. δ is similar yet the right-hand oblique often continues beyond the apex slightly. The cross bars of ε and θ are at times detached from the body of the letter. c has a flat top bar which often extends beyond the body of the letter. At times, o has a flattened lid, at times, it is made of two curving strokes meeting at the base-line. ω is conspicuous for its formation which is almost a c and an o squashed together. μ is in four straight strokes with the mid-strokes tending to meet about half way down the line. The verticals of φ and ψ are extravagantly large, and φ is at times a c with its mirror image and a vertical running through the middle, at times simply a flattened circle with the vertical either running through the middle or to the right-hand side. ζ is in one flowing movement with upper and lower horizontals bowing slightly inwards.

Overall the hand gives an impression of a certain fastidiousness in the execution of the letters. Great care has obviously been lavished on **11**, and moreover, it clearly has pretensions at being a highly stylised kind of script (e.g. ligature is entirely avoided). But it is of a kind which is not common, and this makes it somewhat difficult to assign a date the papyrus. In several points it recalls the ‘epsilon-theta’ style, which has been discussed by G. Cavallo, ‘Lo stile di scrittura ‘epsilon-theta’ nei papiri letterari: dall’Egitto ad Ercolano’ *CErc* 4 (1974) 33–6 = id. *Il calamo e il papiro: la scrittura greca dall’età ai primi secoli di bisanzio* (Pap. Flor. XXXVI; Firenze 2005) 123–8. Cavallo provides a number of examples of the style. Some of the characteristic letters of this hand have close affinities with those examples offered by Cavallo, and by far the closest similarity is XXXI **2545** (= *GMAW*² 37, which is assigned to late first cent. BC or early first cent. AD). The hand of XXXI **2545** is similar in size, if a little larger, and gives the impression of even greater care of execution, but ω is formed identically with that of **11**, and other

strong similarities in the letters appear in e.g. α, δ, ε, κ, λ, μ, and ν. On these admittedly tenuous grounds, one might be inclined to assign **11** to a similar date as **XXXI 2545**, or perhaps slightly later.

Lectional apparatus is confined to tremas on ι (↓ 18, 21) and a dipole at the foot of the column. Orthography both in the lemmata and quotations and the interpretations is in the main correct, save for some minor phonetic errors (see ↓ 1, 6 nn.). If I have read the word correctly, *iota adscriptum* is applied (↓ 12), which is the only occasion when it might have been applied. Punctuation and accentuation seem to be entirely wanting. The scribe corrects himself by striking through words which he has falsely copied. He is not, however, always sure of his Greek, e.g. irrational iotas are applied to the endings of words (φαληριόωντα{ι} 16 and τετυμμένω{ι} 17). There is quite some confusion about what he is trying to express in the metaphor on βουγᾶιε (21).

The lemmata do not always follow consecutively the order of their occurrence in the text of Homer, e.g. 13 ἀμοιβοί (793) and 17 τετυμμένω (782), and, furthermore, they are not always identical with the settled text cf. e.g. 24 πεφήεται, where the correct reading of all other papyri and MSS is πεφήεαι. But trivial defects of this kind are of very common occurrence in papyri of Homeric scholia, as A. Henrichs, ‘Scholia Minora zu Homer I’ *ZPE* 7 (1971) 97–149, observes, ‘Sprünge und Auslassungen in der Abfolge der Lemmata sind ebenso häufig wie Änderungen in der Rektionsform’ (102). It is noticeable that the lemmata can skip almost as many as forty lines, which might lead one to think that the notes come from various sources, which may have been imperfectly combined.

The papyrus has only thirteen lemmata, whereas the D-Scholia have seventy-two. This discrepancy makes one wonder about the criteria used in the selection of what was to be glossed and what was passed over in silence. All in all, in the sense specific to the passages in which they occur, the words glossed by the papyrus are probably to be counted among the slightly more recondite of the epic *Kunstsprache*.

Equally, however, a number of words which appear to be no less recondite than those in the papyrus occur in the D-Scholia without notice in the papyrus. One may be tempted to speculate that the papyrus was made to the needs of one particular reader of Homer. It is clearly the production of a person well versed in writing, and, since the → side has an odd selection of quotations, which must surely be a writing exercise rather than some form of *παίγνιον*¹³, one might be inclined to think that it may be the private copy of a teacher or similarly interested and educated person. On account of the idiosyncratic selection, it is impossible to extrapolate the evidence that the papyrus provides to cover the rest of the book or, more broadly, to try to reconstruct the papyrus beyond the expectation that the rest of Book 13 will have preceded what remains of the papyrus, and that the papyrus continued beyond the end of Book 13, probably to cover parts of Book 14.

The papyrus offers several points of interest. First, it is the first papyrus to transmit the Scholia Minora which attest this part of the text. Second, some of the interpretations or ‘metaphrases’ are new in the sense that they offer hitherto unattested variations on the standard explanations which are to be found in abundance elsewhere in the extant texts of the Roman and Byzantine periods bearing on the *Homererklärung*. And third, if the papyrus is correctly assigned to the first century, it would be among the earliest published Scholia Minora. It is, therefore, of particular interest for the coincidences with the Lexicon of Apollonius Sophista, as well as more generally offering a valuable *aperçu* on the kinds of texts dealing with the poems of Homer available at Oxyrhynchus in the earlier Roman period.

Scholia Minora dated to the first century are rare, although the dating of these texts is almost always subjective. Those registered in M-P³ as dating from the first century are: P.Mich. inv. 1588 (M-P³ 1158.1) *Il.* 1.1–9; P.Yale II 126 (M-P³ 1163.11) *Il.* 1.189–223; LXVII 4630 = J. Spooner, *Nine Homeric Papyri from*

¹³ As P. Parsons suggests, ‘P.Köln XI 431: A Further Note’ *ZPE* 171 (2009) 15, ‘a serious *παίγνιον* should challenge the reader by its virtuosity’; there is no challenge discernible here: it is merely an exercise in writing Homeric verses.

Oxyrhynchus (Firenze 2002) 43–55, *Il.* 2.24–40 (M–P³ 1169.31); P.Berol. 11518 (M–P³ 1173.2) *Il.* 3 1–8, 433–61 and 4.2–26, 46–76 (*ed.* W. Müller, *Forsch. u. Ber.* 10 (1968) 113–8) and P.Ryl. I 24 (M–P³ 1175) *Il.* 4.306–16.

A complete list of the Scholia Minora published till November 2012 is in J. Lunden, *The Scholia Minora in Homerum: An Alphabetical List*^{1,0}, Trismegistos Online Publications 7 (Köln–Leuven 2012) 241–5.

↓

- οινωπε ο[.]ω...ο.[
οιδεαυτο.[.]ου...φ.[
παραπλησιονκατα.[
τες
- 5 ωλκα τηναυλακαεν[
γηγεινομ...νουδε[
ηδεβαθεα...νω.[
τελες...ν τελος
συνεκλονεον συνετ...α.....
- 10 αποστησωνται απολαβω...απ...κο[
μικωντα[.]...υ...ιωσδε...α...οσ.[
σασθαι...[.]τα...μωια.....
αμοιβοι ο...αδοχοι
παφλαζοντα τητωνκ...α...ωνφ.
- 15 νης
φαληριοωνται...ευκα...νομενα
τετυμμενοι π[.]πληγοτεσαποτου
τυψαιδυϊκω.
θαρσυνος τεθαρρηκω.
- 20 λειρ[.]οεντα απαλον

βουγαῖε με . αλωc . αυ . . ωνμεγ[αλ]α
 . . . χε . ογ . ρβο . ε[.] . . ουμε . αλου[. αc]
 c . [ται]τοαυχεινκα . . αυρ . αν
 πεφηcεται φονευθηcεται

1 . . . ο, high speck before missing fibres then end of high horizontal meets vertical, possibly ι or π
 rounded letter, ο or θ perhaps single upright or high dot . [, upright with horizontal extending
 slightly to left of upright, π or γ 2 . [, top end of oblique or slanted upright, ι or υ . . φ, rounded
 letter with mid-bar, ε or θ high horizontal meeting curved downward tending stroke, ο or ε . [,
 rounded letter with mid-bar, ε or θ 3 . [high horizontal meeting upright, τ, γ, or π 6 . v, left-
 hand side of rounded letter, open on right 7 v, first, rounded letter, with trace at mid point,
 ε or θ second, rounded letter, open on right-hand side, c or ε third, upright perhaps with bar atop,
 τ, π, or γ fourth, upright ω . [, ω heavily damaged apex, α or λ 8 . v, bottom of curving
 stroke, ο, ε, or c 9 τ . . , ends of two divergent obliques, α or λ small raised loop with faint
 descender, ρ or β α , first, faintest downward tending oblique, c, ε, or θ second, downward
 tending oblique with bar atop, c or ε third, traces fourth, oblique meeting base-line 10 . .
 α, rounded letter with flattened top, c or ο single upright oblique and perhaps upright . ο,
 rounded letter, ο or θ 11] . , foot of hooked upright with flatly diverging obliques . ι, curved
 mid-line stroke with long descender, ρ or ι . . . α, high horizontal with sharply descending oblique
 extending from left-hand side, c, τ, or γ upright rounded letter, open on right-hand side with mid-
 bar . ο, trace of high horizontal, π or τ . [, high bar with upright descender, τ or π 12 . . . [, top
 bar with descender extending from middle two oval shaped strokes foot of upright, ι or γ . μ,
 rounded letter, θ or ο α , first, low speck second, upright third, upright perhaps with
 high bar fourth, possibly rounded letter fifth, perhaps further rounded letter sixth, upright with
 oblique extending rightwards and downwards, perhaps v seventh, oblique eighth, upright 13
 ο . , perhaps foot of an upright ` . ' high apex, δ, α, or λ ` . ' . , upright 14 . α, high speck two
 further high specks with trace of upright . ω, upright with thickening at top from further stroke
 φ . , flattened stroke at base-line with oblique tending on base-line and rounded stroke curving back
 upwards 16 . ε, feet of two diverging obliques, λ or α . v, foot of single upright 18 ω . ,
 end of high horizontal with some ink at base-line, c or τ 19 ω . , sharply oblique stroke with high
 horizontal extending rightwards, c or τ 21 . α, high horizontal γ or τ . α, high horizontal, γ or τ

ω, long descender foot of upright, ι or π 22 χ, long flattened oblique, λ or α apex, α or λ
 high flatly descending oblique, υ or χ ο, foot of upright ρ, two obliques forming apex, α or λ
 c, small upright with short oblique above] , foot of single upright upright meeting horizontal, τ
 or γ α, upright with tip of horizontal [, two strokes, perhaps τ 23 ο , rounded letter with
 mid horizontal stroke, perhaps ε or θ . α, tip of single upright upright with horizontal atop
 extending rightwards from tip ρ , foot of upright

↓

	οἴνωπε ο[. .]ω . . . ο . [703
	οἱ δὲ αὐτο[. .]ου . . φε[
	παραπλήσιον κατὰ τ[
	τες	
5	ὠλκα τὴν αὔλακα εν[707
	γῆς. γεινομένου δὲ [
	ἠδε βαθεα ε νω . [
	τέλρον τέλος	707
	συνεκλόνεον συνετάρρασρον	722
10	ἀποστήσονται ἀπολάβωξιν ἀποκο[-	745
	μίσωντα[ι]. κυρίως δε . . . ἀποστ[ή-	
	σασθαι τῶι [c]ταθμῶι α	
	ἀμοιβοί οἱ ἄδοχοι	793
	παφλάζοντα τῆς τῶν κυμάτων φω-	798
15	νής	.
	φαληριόωντα {ι} λευκαινόμενα	799
	τετυμμένω {ι} π[ε]πληγότες ἀπὸ τοῦ	782
	τύψαι δυϊκῶς	.
	θάρσυνος τεθαρρηκῶς	823
20	λειρ[ι]όεντα ἀπαλόν	830 ς[
	βουγάϊε μεγάλως γαυριῶν μεγ[αλ]ά	824

λαυχε τὸ γὰρ βου ἐ[π]ὶ τοῦ μεγάλου[γας]

ε[

σε[τα]ι τὸ αὐχεῖν καὶ γαυριᾶν

πεφίχεται φονευθήσεται

829

—

→

]μεντρο[.]φυλακ

]μεντο[.]υταπροαλ

]υαγορευον

]ωνεμπνευσεμε

5]εγαποιμεναλαων

]παμειβομε

2 .υ, lower end of oblique, α or λ 4] ., feet of two uprights with bar atop, ε ., high mark 6
] . ., low trace two strokes forming apex, α or λ

→

ὡς οἱ] μὲν Τρω[ε]ς φύλακ-

ὡς οἱ] μὲν το[ι]αῦτα πρὸς ἀλ-

λήλο]υς ἀγόρευον

ὡς εἰ]πὼν ἔμπνευσε μέ

5 νος μ]έγα ποιμένα λαῶν

τὸν] δ' ἀπαμειβομε-

Ap. = Apion, *Fragmenta de glossis Homericis*, ed. S. Neitzel in *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax* (Berlin 1977)

Ap.S. = *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum*, ed. I. Bekker (Berlin 1833)

D = *Scholia D in Iliadem*, ed. H. van Thiel, available at:
<http://www.uni-koeln.de/philfak/ifa/vanthiel/scholiaD.pdf>

E.Gen. = *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum Magna Grammatica, Etymologicum Magnum Auctum*, edd. F. Lasserre-N. Livadaras, vol. I, Rome 1976, vol. II (Athens 1992)

E.M. = *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford (Oxonii 1848)

E.S. = *Etymologicum Symeonis* (v. supra, s. E.Gen.)

- Eu. = *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi*, ed. M. van der Valk (Lugduni Batavorum 1971–87)
 Gal. = Galenus, *Linguarum seu dictionum Hippocratis explicatio* ed. C.G. Kühn (Leipzig 1830)
 Hsch. = *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, edd. K. Latte (a-o), (Hauniae 1953–66); M. Schmidt, (Ienae 1858–68)
 L.A.S. = *Lexicon Artis Grammaticae* (e cod. Coislin 345) ed. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca* (Leipzig 1828)
 L.H. = *Lexeis Homericae* (codd. Urb. clvii et Selestadiensis cvii) pars prior (α–ε) ed. V. de Marco (Vatican 1946)
 L.S. = *Collectio verborum utilium e differentibus rhetoribus et sapientibus multis, Lexica Segueriana*, ed. L. Bachmann, *Anecdota Graeca* (Leipzig 1828)
 Or. = *Orionis Thebani Etymologicum*, ed. F.G. Sturzium (Lipsiae 1820)
 Phil. = *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*, ed. C. Theodoridis (Berlin 1976)
 Phot. = *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*, ed. C. Theodoridis (Berlin–New York 1982–2012)
 Porph. = *Porphirii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae*, ed. H. Schrader (Leipzig 1880)
 ps.-Z = *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis*, ed. J.A.H. Tittmann (Leipzig 1808)
 Sch. = *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (Scholia vetera), ed. H. Erbse (Berolini 1969–88)
 Sch. in Theoc. = *Scholia in Theocritum* (scholia vetera) ed. K. Wendel (Leipzig 1914)
 Su. = *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler (Lipsiae 1928–38)
 Zo. = *Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon*, ed. J.A.H. Tittmann (Leipzig 1808)

↓

1 οἴνωπε (l. οἴνωπε). On the change of vowel, see Gignac, *Grammar* i 277.

ο [.]ω . . : The testimonia all suggest some form of οἴνώδης, but it does not appear possible to read it.

ο [.]. The trace is an upright with a small mark atop: ι at times has a tiny lead stroke when it adjoins a letter which ends high in the line and this may be the explanation of the mark, otherwise one must read π or perhaps γ.

οἴνωπε. The word is glossed in LXXI 4818 15 (ad *Il.* 1.350) as οἴνωπα· μελανογ, and in P.Stras. inv. 33 9.15 (ad *Il.* 1.350) as οἴνωπα· οἴν[ο]ε[ι]δη την χροαν εχοντα. οἴνωπε = οἴνώδεις ἢ μέλανες D ἦτοι μέλανες ἢ ξανθοί; Ap.S. 119.17, οἴνωπα μέλανα, οἴνώδη κατὰ τὴν χροάν; Hsch. ο 327.1 οἴνωπα μέλανα, οἴνώδη τῆ χροά, Sch^{AbT} οἴνώδεις εἰς τὸ ὄραν. οἱ δὲ μέλανες, ὡς ‘οἴνωπα πόντον’; Eu. III.540.21 οἴνώδεις ἰδεῖν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μέλανες, καθότι καὶ πόντον οἴνωπά φαμεν τὸν μέλανα; Eu. II.37.24 (ad *Od.* 13.32), οἴνωπε δὲ βόες ἢ μέλανες διὰ τὸ, μέλας ἢ πυρροὶ διὰ τὸ, οἴνος ἐρυθρός; Eu. II.185.40 (ad *Od.* 18.372), αἴθωνες δὲ βόες οἱ θερμοὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ἢ μέλανες, οἱ ἐν ἄλλοις οἴνωπε, ἢ καὶ πυρροὶ ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ, οἴνος

ἐρυθρός; *E.M.* 618.32 οἴνοπε : βόε οἴνοπε, τουτέστι μέλανες ὡς αἶθοπα οἶνον, τὸν μέλανα ἐν αὐτῷ.

2 οἱ δὲ αὐτο [. . .]ου . . . φε[. Nothing in the testimonia carries any similar paraphrase, and the sense is obscure.

3–4 παραπλήσιον κατὰ τ[c.?]]-τες. Again, nothing in the testimonia has any similar expression, but since the lemma concerns ploughing oxen one may think that παραπλήσιον refers to them drawing the plough and perhaps elaborates ἵκον θυμὸν ἔχοντε τιταίνετον. One might try e.g. παραπλήσιον κατὰ τ[ὸν/ τ[ὴν/ τ[ὰ etc. in the sense of ‘perinde ac’.

5 ὦλκα = αὔλακα: *Ap.S.* 170.31; *D*; *Sch*^{AbT}; *E.M.* 821.35; *Eu.* III.541.19; *Hsch.* τ 1189 (Ἰῶλκα, which *Su.* τ also 484 carries); *Or.* 171.1; *Phil. fr.* 634; *ps.-Z.* ω 1885.20; *Su.* ω 74; *Z.* τ 1139.11.

5–7 τὴν αὔλακα ἐν [c.9] γῆς. γενομένου δὲ [c.10] | ἦδε βαθεα ε . . . ν ω [. The ‘metaphrase’ has no parallel in the testimonia and it is not easy to see how to supplement it: approximately 9 letters are missing between ἐν and γῆς. After this the subject changes to a masculine or neuter noun, and the almost certain δέ requires a full stop before γενομένου. What the new subject is remains unclear, but it may have been in a genitive absolute. Following this, one might supplement e.g. ἦδε βαθεῖνά ἐστιν ὦλ[ξ, or less likely ἦδε βαθεῖνα ἐς γῆν ὦλ[ξ, cf. *Call. Del.* 180 τέμνειν ὦλκα βαθεῖαν and next lemma.

8 τέλκοι τέλος. τέλκον = τέλος: *Gal.* 19.145.10 τέλκον τέλος καὶ ἔρχατον *D*; τέλκον = πέρας: *Ap.S.* 150.32; *Hsch.* τ 447; *Eu.* III.542.5, τέλκον δὲ ἀρούρης, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαγῶς κείται, ἢ ἀπλῶς τὸ τέλος ἢ τὸ κατ’ ἐπιφάνειαν πέρας; *Sch*^{AbT} τέμνει τὸ ἄροτρον τὸ βάθος ἢ τὸ πέρας τῆς γῆς *D* τέμνει δέ τε τέλκον ἀρούρης τέμνεται δὲ εἰς βάθος ἢ γῆ.

9 συνεκλόνεον συνετάρασσον. συνεκλόνεον = συνετάρασσον *D* (συνεκλονέοντο συνετάρασσοντο, συνεκινούντο).

10–11 ἀποστήκωνται ἀπολάβωσιν ἀποκομίσκωντα[ι]. ἀποστήκωνται = ἀποκομίσκωνται: *Ap.S.* 39.11 ἀποκομίσκωνται σταθμῶ; *Hsch.* α 6663 ἀποκομίσκωνται. σταθμῶ γὰρ ἀπεδίδοσαν; ἀποστήκωνται = ἀπολάβωσιν *Sch^A* (*Arist.*) χθιζὸν χρεῖος τῶ ἴσῳ σταθμῶ ἀποκαταστησῶσι τουτέστι μὴ ὃ ἡμεῖς ἐλάβομεν χθὲς νικῶντες, σήμερον εἰσπράξωσιν; *Porph.* 118.16 = *Sch^T* ἤγουν ἴσον ἀπολάβωσιν, ὡς ἐν ζυγῶ τὸ ἴσον στήσαντες; *Eu.* III.549.22 ἤγουν σταθμῶ ἀποδώσουσιν ἢ λήψονται, καὶ ὅπερ ἡμεῖς χθὲς νικῶντες ἐλάβομεν, αὐτοὶ σήμερον εἰσπράξονται; *ps.-Z.* 271.18 ἀποστήκωνται, οἶον σταθμὸν λάβωσιν ἴσον. καὶ ἀποστήσασθαι, ἀποδοῦναι χρέος; *L.H.* α 680 σταθμῶ ἀποκομισθήσονται; *L. S.* 134.17 = 29b.10 οἶον σταθμῶ λάβωσιν ἴσον; *E.M.* 725.20 ὃ χθὲς οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐδάνεισαν χρέος, σήμερον ἀπολάβωσι· τουτέστι, τὴν νίκην ἣν δεδώκασι ἡμῖν χθὲς ἠττηθέντες ὑφ’ ἡμῶν, μὴ σήμερον ἡμᾶς νικήσῶσι. τὸ γὰρ ἀποστήκωνται ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπολάβωσιν.

11–12 κυρίως δε . . . ἀποστ[ή]κασθαι τῶι [c]ταθμῶι α κυρίως, ‘properly’, is a frequent occurrence in scholia and other explanatory texts. κυρίως δ’ ἐστὶν κτλ. cannot be read.

13 ἀμοιβοὶ οἱ ἄλλοδοχοί. ἀμοιβοὶ = οἱ διάδοχοι: *Ap.S.* 27.28 οἱ ἐκ διαδοκῆς ἦγοντες σύμμαχοι; *Hsch.* α 3704 οἱ διαδεχόμενοι τοὺς προεστρατευκότας; *D* ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς καὶ ἐναλλάξεως παραγεγονότες συμμαχεῖσθαι τοῖς Τρωσίν, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῶν πρότερον συνεργούντων αὐτοῖς πολιτῶν ἢ οἱ ἀμοιβὴν ἀποδιδόντες τῷ Πριάμῳ ἢ πεζοί; *E.Gen.* α 675 σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐπάλληλοι ἢ ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς καὶ ἐναλλάξεως παραγεγονότες συμμαχεῖσθαι τοῖς Τρωσίν; *Eu.* III.554.13 εἰς δὲ νῦν ἀμοιβοὶ πολέμου διάδοχοι τοῖς προτέροις ἴσοι, ἢ τὸ ἀμοιβοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ πεζοί, ἀμοιβαίᾳ ποδῶν ἐξαλλάξει ἀνύοντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἢ ἀμειβόμενοι Πριάμον ὑπὲρ ὧν αὐτὸς ἐπεκούρησε τοῖς Φρυζίποτε; *E.M.* 85.32 σημαίνει τὸ ἀλλεπάλληλοι, ἦτοι ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς ἢ καὶ ἐναλλάξεως παραγεγονότες συμμαχεῖσθαι τοῖς Τρωσίν, ἀντὶ τῶν πρότερον συνεργούντων αὐτῶν πολιτῶν; *E.S.* 1.416.25 σημαίνει τὸ ἀλλεπάλληλοι – οἱ ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς; *Sch^{AbT}* (*Arist.*) οἱ διαδεξάμενοι τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν παραγενομένους ἐπικούρους, ἦτοι οἱ ἐξ ἀμοιβῆς καὶ ἐναλλάξεως παραγεγονότες συμμαχεῖσθαι τοῖς Τρωσίν ἀντὶ τῶν πρότερον

συνεργούντων αὐτοῖς πολιτῶν; Sch^{bT} οἱ δέ, ἀμειβόμενοι Πρίαμον ὑπὲρ ᾧν ἐπεκούρησε Φρυξίν· οἱ δέ, διάδοχοι τῶν προκαμνόντων ἵνα ἦ ἔπαινος τῶν Ἑλλήνων διαδοχῇ μὴ κεκρημένων; *L.H.* α 438 ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀποστελλόμενοι.

14 παφλάζοντα τῆς τῶν κυμάτων φωνῆς. τῆς τῶν κυμάτων φωνῆς is a hitherto unattested gloss on παφλάζοντα. Possibly it is in the genitive because the source of a sound is conventionally expressed by the genitive, or perhaps e.g. κατὰ μίμησιν vel sim. as in e.g. Apollonius Sophistas' gloss is to be understood. The other glosses are: *Ap.S.* 129.8 τῶν πεπονημένων κατὰ μίμησιν; *Hsch.* π 1160.1 ἠχοῦντα. καχλάζοντα ἀναβράζοντα, θερμαίνοντα; *Phot.* π 403.10 ἠχοῦντα· ἀναζέοντα; *Su.* π 827 idem; *L.S.* π 334.30 idem; *D* ἠχοῦντα, ἀναζέοντα, ὀνοματοποιία ὁ τρόπος; Sch^{AbT} ἐν τῷ ἀναζειν ἠχοῦντα, πρὸς τὸν Τρωϊκὸν πόλεμον; *Eu.* III 555.14 ἔχει δὲ καὶ χάριν ἰδίαν τὰ ὀνόματα, τὸ παφλάζοντα πρὸς τὸν ἦχον.

16 φαληριόωντα{ι} λευκαινόμενα. φαληριόωντα = λευκαινόμενα *Hsch.* φ 102 λευκανθίζοντα ἢ λευκαινόμενα; *D* λευκανθίζοντα. τουτέστι λευκαινόμενα ὑπὸ ἀφροῦ; *Sch.* in *Theoc.* 5.102–3 = 8.27a καὶ Ὅμηρος κύματα φαληριόωντα λέγει τὰ λευκαινόμενα; φαληριόωντα = λευκανθίζοντα: *Ap.S.* 161.12; Sch^{AbT} λευκανθίζοντα τῷ ἀφρῷ, ὡς καὶ οὗτοι τῇ παντευχία; *Eu.* I.667.1 κύματα φαληριόωντα παρ' Ὅμηρου τὰ λευκά. The *iota impurum* is a little odd but it is not uncommon; it also occurs in the next lemma: see Gignac, i 185–86.

17–18 τετυμμένω{ι} π[ε]πληγότες ἀπὸ τοῦ | τύψαι δυϊκῶς. This is, again a new gloss. Sch^{AbT} (*Arist.*) τὸ τῷ ἐτέρῳ συμβεβηκὸς ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τέταχεν· οὐ γὰρ ἀμφοτέροι ἐτύπησαν, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἑλενος ἐβλήθη, ὁ δὲ Δηϊφόβος ἐτύπη; *D* τετρωμένω ἐκ χειρός; *Eu.* III.553.12 δοκεῖ οὐ καλῶς εἰρηθεῖν τὸ τετυμμένω. Δηϊφόβου μὲν γὰρ δουρὶ βραχίονα ὁ Μηριόνης ἔτυψεν, Ἑλένου δὲ τὴν χεῖρα ὁ Μενέλαος ἔβαλε. Just as the line above, the scribe has added an irrational iota to the ending of τετυμμένω{ι}.

19 θάρκυνος τεθαρρηκώς. θάρκυνος = τεθαρρηκώς. P.Stras. inv. 1015 col. iii.2 (ad *Il.* 5.124) has θαρ]ων · τ[εθ]αρ[]νηκος; Hsch. θ 116; Phot. θ 29.1; Su. θ 57.1; *L.S.* θ 254.7; D; Sch^{AbT} ἀντὶ τοῦ τεθαρρηκυῖα; *L.A.G.* 449.3 θρακύς.

20 λειρ[ι]όεντα ἀπαλόν. λειριόεντα = ἀπαλόν λείριον (γὰρ τὸ ἄνθος) παρὰ τὴν λειότητα: Ap.S. 107.24 = Ap. fr. 67.1; Hsch. λ 547.1; Phot. λ 152.1; Su. λ 394.1; *L.S.* λ 289; Sch^{AbT} ἀνθηρόν, κιατραφηθέντα. χροά δὲ καλεῖ τὴν ἕως ὀκτῶν cάρκωιν; D εὐανθῆ, τρυφερὸν, ἢ λιπαρόν.

21 βουγαῖε. Ap.S. 52.11 τὸν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν μεγάλως γαυριῶντα ἦτοι ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου; Sch.^{AbT} ὅ ἐστι γαυριῶν; D μεγάλως ἐπὶ σεαυτῷ ἀγλαιζόμενε καὶ γαυριῶν ἢ βουεργέτα = Sch.^{Gen}; *E.M.* 207.10 παρὰ τὸ γαίειν, τὸ γαυριᾶν, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ παρὰ τὴν γαῖαν γέγονεν· ἴν' ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς γῆς, ὁ μεγαλόφρων. Porph. τὸ βουγαῖον ἀκουτέον διὰ τὸ ὑπερμεγέθη ἔχειν βοεῖαν ἀσπίδα, ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν· ὁ γαῖων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσπίδι, ὡς κύδει γαῖων (ad *Il.* 1.405); *L.H.* β 92 μεγαλόσωμε

21–3 μεγάλως γαυριῶν μεγ[αλ]ἀ|λαυχε τὸ γὰρ βου ἐ[π]ὶ τοῦ μεγάλου[γαζ] | σε[τα]ι τὸ αὐχεῖν καὶ γαυριᾶν. The scribe seems to have misread his exemplar and written the ending of πεφίεσται in 23, but there is quite some confusion about what the scribe meant after ἐ[π]ὶ τοῦ μεγάλου; e.g. γαί(ειν) will not be accommodated.

22 τὸ γὰρ βου ἐ[π]ὶ τοῦ μεγάλου. This is almost identical with the explanation of Ap.S.: τὸ μὲν γὰρ βου ἦτοι ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ βούπαιδος καὶ βουκύκου. The word βου is used in the same way as ἵππο- to mean 'huge' or 'monstrous', cf. Hsch. β 865: βοῦ · τὸ μέγα καὶ πολὺ δηλοῖ and LSJ⁹ s.v. βου.

24 πεφίεσται φονευθήσεται (1. πεφίεσαι φονευθήσεται). The form πεφίεσαι does not occur again in the Scholia Minora, but cf. πεφίεσται does at P.Berol. 10509.13–14 (ad *Il.* 15.140), where it is the correct lemma. Phil. fr. 160.1 φονευθήσεται; Hsch. π 2110.1 τολμήσειε, ὑπομενεῖε, τεθνήξει; Eu. III.562.12 φονευθήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ φῶ φήσω γίνεται, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ φάζειν; *E.M.* 667.19 ἀντὶ τοῦ

φονευθήκη· ἀπὸ τοῦ φῶ, τὸ φονεύω; Sch^{AbT} ἐκ τοῦ φῶ τὸ φονεύω; D ἀναιρεθήκη, φονευθήκη.

→

1 [ὥς οἱ] μὲν Τρῶ[ε]ς φύλακ-. The verse, ὥς οἱ μὲν Τρῶες φύλακας ἔχον ..., is from *Il.* 9.1. It is curious that the scribe only writes out the first three feet of the verse, whereas he writes out the next two verses in full, and only two feet of the last. The hand of the verses is the same as that of the Scholia Minora, who was clearly a learned man, which puts out of court the idea that this was some form of exercise in dividing the verse into feet.

There are a few examples in which only parts of verses are written out for no immediately explicable reason: see e.g. R. Criore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Georgia 1996) no. 291, p.243 = P.Ryl. III 545 and her remarks on half-verses in a text of the *Odyssey* and T. Gagos–N. Litinas–N. Priest, *Homerica Varia Michiganensia BASP* 41 (2004) 46–50 for odd half-verses in a text of the *Iliad*.

2–3 [ὥς οἱ] μὲν το[ι]αῦτα πρὸς ἀλ[λήλο]υς ἀγόρευον. The verse occurs frequently in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: *Il.* 5.274; 5.431; 7.464; 8.212; 13.81; 16.101; 18.368; 21.514; *Od.* 4.620; 7.334; 8.333; 14.409; 15.493; 16.321; 17.166; 17.290; 18.243; 20.172; 20.240; 22.160; 23.288; 24.98; 24.203; 24.383.

4–5[ὥς εἰ]πὼν ἔμπνευσε μέ[νος] μ[έ]γα ποιμένα λαῶν (1. ποιμένι λαῶν). The verse occurs at *Il.* 15.262 and 20.110. The scribe has made a trivial blunder in giving ποιμήν in the accusative rather than dative.

6 [τὸν ?] δ' ἀπαμειβομε-. The formula τὸν/τήν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη occurs on thirty-nine occasions in the *Iliad* and seventy-three in the *Odyssey*. It is curious that the scribe stops in mid-sentence; and the connection between this verse and the other three is also obscure: it does not begin with ὥς as the others do.

SECTION IV: DOCUMENTARY TEXTS FROM THE ROMAN PERIOD

12. DECLARATION OF LIVESTOCK

106/8(d)

4.9 x 5.3 cm

21

The beginning of a declaration made by a single individual for thirty sheep. Livestock declarations of the Roman period may be allocated to one of the three chronological categories, established by S. Avogadro, 'Le Ἀπογραφὰι di proprietà nell'Egitto greco-romano' *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 131–206, at 168–9. **12** belongs to the first category, which presumably ran from the accession of Egypt to the Roman Empire (P.Oxy. Hels. 8, dated to 9 BC, is the earliest hitherto published) till the end of Claudius' reign in AD 54 (cf. II **297** 5–6 (54), a letter which concerns a supplementary declaration¹⁴). During this first period, livestock owners were only required to submit a single annual declaration of their holding in late Tybi or early Mecheir. The declaration did not refer to the number of animals held in the previous year. Only mature animals were required to be registered, since only they were subject to taxation. Juvenile animals were included as belonging to the flock (ἐπακολουθεῖν), but they were not enumerated specifically.

For an up-to-date list of the declarations published from the whole of Egypt, see M. Langellotti, *L'allevamento di pecore e capre nell'Egitto romano: aspetti economici e sociali* (Bari 2012) 131–53. On the taxation of livestock, see S.L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938) 82–8, and Langellotti, *op. cit.* 35–58.

Oxyrhynchite declarations from the reign of Tiberius are numerous. They are: SB XVI 12759 (15) = II **354** descr., P.Oxy. inv. 106/127(b) recto¹⁵ (18/19),

¹⁴ This supplementary declaration, made in Epeiph, of the young born to the animals registered in Tybi–Mecheir is the chief difference between the first and second categories. On this see Avogadro, *loc. cit.*, and C. Balconi, 'Ἀπογραφὰι προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν dell'età di Tiberio e Caligola', *Aegyptus* 64 (1984) 35–60, at 47–8.

¹⁵ Although they come from mixed boxes, both the inventory numbers of **12**, P.Oxy. inv. 106/127(b), P.Oxy. inv. 106/140(a), P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(a), P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(b) + P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(c) as well as their dates of submission suggest that they might well have been found in the same area in the same

P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(a) (20/1), LV 3779 (20/1), P.IFAO III 43 (20/1), P.NYU II 12 (20/1), P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(b) + P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(c) (21), P.Oxy. inv. 106/127(b) verso (21), P.Princ. II 24 (21), SB XII 10794 (21), LV 3778 (21), SB XVI 12760 (23 or 25) = II 350 descr., P.Oxy. inv. 106/140(a) (25), II 245 (26), SB XVI 12761 (27) = II 356 descr., C. Pap.Jud. III 482 (27/8) = II 353 descr., SB XII 10795 (28) = II 351 descr., SB XVI 12762 (28) = II 352 descr., XXXVIII 2850 (29), SB XX 14094 (29), SB XVI 12763 (41) = II 355 descr.

12 is addressed to a single official, the *strategus*. Avogadro, loc. cit. 148–9, maintains that the declarations which were addressed to several different officials, viz. the *strategus*, *basilicus grammateus*, and the competent authorities of the nome (οἱ γράφοντες τὸν νομόν), were copies of the declaration, whereas those addressed only to a single official, viz. the *strategus* or occasionally the *toparch* (e.g. SB XVI 12759), were the declarations themselves. If that hypothesis holds, **12** will have been the declaration itself. However, the docket is also an important factor in determining exactly what role the papyrus will have played in the whole process of registering the livestock. On these dockets, see C. Balconi, ‘Απογραφὰ προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν dell’età di Tiberio e Caligola’ *Aegyptus* 64 (1984) 35–60, at 41–2, P.Heid. IV 302.1–2 n. and LXXI 4825 1 n. Usually the dockets were made by a different hand from that of the text. Normally they fulfil one of several functions. They may state a sequential number of the *tomos sunkollesimos* into which the declarations were made by the authorities, such as e.g. II 245 and SB XVI 12763. They may name the village in which the livestock were declared, such as e.g. LV 3788 and P.NYU II 12. They may name the village and also give the number and kind of livestock declared, such as e.g. 4825 or P.Köln IV 188. Rarely they give the month in which the declaration was made, such as e.g. SB XVI 12763.

year. It is unfortunate that the inventory numbers of the other papyri found by Grenfell and Hunt in Oxyrhynchus, which date from around the 20s have been lost, because they might all have been part of an archive.

Balconi, loc. cit. 41–2, speculates that only those declarations addressed to the *strategus* alone which carry the sequential number of the *tomos sunkollesimos* in the docket were certainly meant to lie in state archives, whereas those which carry the name of the village and number of livestock declared or no annotation at all were the copies returned to the declarant. But as the editor of 4825 1 n. cogently argues, annotations of this kind would have been without useful purpose for the declarant.

The address to the *strategus* alone and, more importantly, the docket stating the name of the village in which the declarant was resident indicate that this papyrus was the declaration itself, which most probably will have remained in the possession of the authorities and have been placed in the archives of the nome.

So far as the papyrus has survived, it follows closely the customary formulae as they are set out by Balconi, loc. cit. 39–40. It breaks off after the number of sheep is declared. After the break, it will have named the village where the sheep were to be tended, the shepherd and the village in which the shepherd was registered to pay the poll tax, if it were known. On this point cf. P.J. Sijpesteijn, ‘Bemerkungen zu einigen Papyri’ *ZPE* 70 (1987) 133–8, at 135. It will also have contained a pledge to pay the required taxes for the sheep. A secretary or scribe of the *strategus*, or perhaps the *toparch*, will have made a subscription on the declaration noting the number and kind of livestock declared and dating it.

The writing runs along the fibres. The back is blank.

(m.2) Cενεπ(τα)

(m.1) Ἰέρακι στρατηγῶι

π]αρὰ Θεόωνιος τοῦ

] . υθου. ἀπογράφου[αι

5 ε]ἰς τὸ ἐνεστὸς ζ (ἔτος)

Τι]βερίου Καίσαρο[ς

Çεβαστοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχ(οντά)

μοι πρό]βατα τριάκογτ(α)

1 σενεπς 5 L 7 υπαρ^χ 8 τριάκογ^τ

(2nd hand) ‘Senepta’

(1st hand) ‘To Hierax, *strategus*, from Thoonis son of ...uthes. I register for the present seventh year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus thirty sheep which belong to me ...’

1 Σενεπ(τα). In the Middle toparchy, Senepta is one of the best attested villages in Oxyrhynchite papyri: see Benaissa, *RSON*^{2.0} s.v. Senepta. This is the first declaration of sheep to emanate from the village. Only donkeys and cattle have been attested till now.

2 Ἱέρακι στρατηγῶι. Hierax is known from several declarations: SB XII 10794.1, P.IFAO III 43.2, LV 3778 2, LV 3379 2, P.NYU II 12.2, and P.Oxy. inv. 104/12(a). He is not attested in P.Princ. II 24.3 (the *strategus* is his successor, Chaereas). This attestation is to be deleted from J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt*² (Pap. Flor. XXXVII, Firenze 2006) 89.

4] υθου. One might try e.g. C]εῦθου. The putative ε would be well compatible with the traces, and the name is attested fairly frequently in the Oxyrhynchite nome, including at this period: see B.W. Jones–J.E.G. Whitehorne, *Register of Oxyrhynchites 30 BC–AD 96* (Chico 1983) no. 4450–52 pp.214–5 and also perhaps PSI VI 687.4 (first or second cent.).

8 πρό]βατα τριάκογτ(α). The numbers of sheep and goats to be registered by these declarations are listed in full by Langellotti, op. cit. 106–112 for Oxyrhynchus, and 113–9 for the other nomes. It would be unusual if no goats were declared with the sheep, although they were usually fewer than the sheep declared. C. Balconi, ‘Le dichiarazioni di bestiame ed il controllo del patrimonio zootecnico nell’Egitto

romano' *Aegyptus* 70 (1990) 113–22, at 121, enumerates several reasons why it is beneficial to have goats mixed in with flocks of sheep.

Thirty sheep is a modest number of sheep to be declared by an individual. The number of livestock to be registered by the declarations made by individuals ranges from 4 lambs in P.Oxy. inv. 73/61(a) (59) to 375 sheep and 100 goats in SB XVI 12759 (15). W. Habermann, 'Die Deklarationen von Kleinvieh (Schafe und Ziegen) in römischen Ägypten. Quantative Aspekte' in P. Herz, G. Waldherr (eds.), *Landwirtschaft im Imperium Romanum* (St. Katharinen 2001) 82, suggests that single declarants distinctly tend to register approximately twenty animals. From this observation he infers that when the declarant had fewer than twenty animals it was uncommon to herd them individually, whereas if he had more than twenty animals it was uncommon to herd them jointly with other animals.

13. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF MONIES FOR MAINTENANCE OF MINORS

20 3B.34/C(3–4)a

10.4 x 18.9 cm

26 January–24 February 123

Sintheus, a widow acting with her guardian (κύριος), acknowledges receipt of 140 drachmas through the bank at the Sarapeum of Heliodorus and Numenius from Diogenes, who is one of the several guardians (ἐπίτροποι) of her two children. The money is an annual stipend, established by the will of her late husband (also called Diogenes) to be used to purchase clothing for both herself and her children, who are minors. Sintheus further acknowledges that, following the records of proceedings of the previous year of the former *exegetes*, she had similarly received from Diogenes in the previous year 140 dr. for clothing, and also a monthly stipend of two artabas of wheat, one hundred dr., one tetrachous of wine, and extra payments in kind from the lease of a vineyard bequeathed to the children by their father. Before the papyrus breaks off, she states that she will not take proceedings against Diogenes provided that this stipend remains.

Provisions for widows and children issuing from marriage are common in wills, of which BGU I 86 = M. *Chr.* 306 (155) and SB V 7558 (173) are illustrative examples. However, **13** is of special interest because acknowledgements of payments due from these provisions are uncommon. The closest parallel texts to **13** are P.Fam. Tebt. 53 A–C (208 (or 209?)–218). In these somewhat less complex texts, a mother acknowledges receipt of monies for food and clothing for her son, who is a minor, and a maid servant (παιδίσκη), but not for herself. The sums paid fluctuate wildly, and the frequency of payments made is very irregular. At times arrears for seventeen months are paid (B.1.9–10, 476 dr.), at times for two months (C.11–12, 14 dr.). Similar too is P.Münch. III 101 (150), a payment made for the maintenance of a child, who is a minor, by his guardian. **13** is more complex than these documents. It acknowledges payment for the current and previous years and, moreover, it deals not only with the monies stipulated in the will of the deceased but also the monies

accruing as rent from a lease of land and the agricultural products, which will have been bequeathed to them in the deceased man's testament. In the other documents, payment is only made in arrears. *13*, therefore, makes a useful contribution to the understanding of the functioning of testamentary provisions, because it demonstrates, at least for the Roman period, how the monies were claimed from the guardians.

Another important text in connection with payments made for the maintenance of minors is LVIII 3921–2 (219). This is the annual account of a guardian of two boys who is charged, by the will of the boys' father, with managing their inheritance. LVIII 3921–2 are duplicate texts, the private and rough copies of the account respectively. They carry no addresses. LVIII 3921 records monies received from the interest on capital lent out, the rent of a house, and wages of a slave working as a weaver. It also records payments, although it does not specify to whom the payments are made. These are for the boys' maintenance: 216 dr. for nine months, then 32 dr. for two months and then 40 dr. for one month is paid; for the boys clothing, 60 dr. is paid; for the rent of a room in a house for six months, 16 dr. is paid. This is rather less than the monies paid to Sintheus, although it is impossible to know what other monies or capital Diogenes, the father of the minors in *13*, had bequeathed. Doubtless an account similar to LVIII 3921–2 will have been drawn up for the two minors of *13*.

A subscription recapitulating the document's essential information and giving the date of the acknowledgement will have been made once the main body of the text had been completed. Down to the break, the papyrus is preserved nearly intact. It is only slightly broken on the right-hand side with two letters at most having been lost. Line fillers are used. The back is blank. The papyrus has been folded on the vertical at least once on the left hand side, where the break is clearly visible, and at least three times on the horizontal, where the upper layers of fibres show signs of stress or are broken and the text is difficult to read. It will have been rolled from top to

bottom, because the top is undamaged. The break at the foot of the papyrus is rather scrappy and leaves many straggling fibres, some with traces of ink on them.

α . . . ()

- (m.1) Cινθεῦς Ἴσοκράτους τοῦ Πλουτάρχου
μητρὸς Θατρῆτος μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ συν-
γενοῦς Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ καὶ Φιλωνᾶ Ἡρα-
5 κλείδου μητρὸς Πλουτάρχης ἀμφοτέρω
τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως Διογένει
Διογένους τοῦ Διογένους μητρὸς Ἡρα-
κλείας ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως τῷ ἐν
ἄλλοις ἐπιτρόπῳ τῶν ἀφελίκων μου
10 τέκνων Διογένους καὶ Τρενβηκάτος
ἀμφοτέρων Διογένους χαίρειν. ὁμο-
λογῶ ἀπέχειν παρὰ σοῦ διὰ Ἡλιοδώρου
καὶ Νουμηνίου τῶν .[. .] .[. . .] ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς
Ὀξυρύγχων πόλει Σαραπείου τραπέζης
15 ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα
οὔσας ὑπὲρ ἱματισμοῦ ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τῶν
ἀφελίκων τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἐβδόμου
ἔτους Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ἀκο-
λούθως τοῖς γενομένοις ἐπὶ Δημητρίου
20 γενομένου ἐξηγητοῦ τῷ διελθόντι ἔτει
ὑπομνηματισμοῖς καὶ κατὰ προσφώνη-
σιν τῶν αὐτῶν τραπέζιτων ὁμοίως
ἀπεσχηκέναι παρὰ σοῦ ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ διελ-
θόντος ἔτους τὰς τοῦ αὐτοῦ διελθόντος
25 ἔτους τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ δραχμ[ὰ]ς ἑκατὸν

- τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἀπὸ μηνὸς Φαωφι τοῦ
 αὐτοῦ διελθόντος ἔτους ἕως τοῦ ἐνεστ[ῶ-
 τος μηνὸς Μεχειρ καὶ αὐτοῦ Μεχειρ τὴν ε .[c.1–2
 θειαν διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ὑπομνηματικῶν
 30 χωρηγηθῆναι ἡμῖν χωρηγίαν κατὰ
 μῆνα [π]υροῦ ἀρταβῶν δύο καὶ ἀργυρίου
 δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν [καὶ] οἴνου τετραχόου
 ἐνὸς ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διελθόντος
 ἔτους ἑκτακτα τοῦ ἐν μισθώσει πατρι-
 35 κοῦ τῶν ἀφηλίκων ἀμπελικοῦ κτήματος
 καὶ μηδὲν σοὶ ἐγ[κα]λεῖν μενούσης
 τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξῆς μηνὸς Φαμενωθ μ .
ιαςχωρηγίας (m.2) `χορ .[. . .]` κα[ὶ ἀπ]ὸ τοῦ εἰσιόντος
 ἔτο[υ]ς] τηςμ[c.6]χ[.]στοις
 40] . αγου
] . . νυσι .[
][
][
] . εστω[

2 ἰσοκρατους 3–4 l. συγγενουδς 30 l. χωρηγηθῆναι l. ἡμῖν, η corr. from υ
 χορηγίαν 38 l. χορηγίας l. εἰσιόντος

‘Sintheus, daughter of Isocrates, son of Plutarchus, mother being Thatres, with her guardian, her relative Heraclides, alias Philonas, son of Heraclides, mother being Plutarche, both from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, to Diogenes, son of Diogenes, mother being Heracleia, from the same city, who with others is the guardian of my children, who are minors, Diogenes and Tsenbesas, both (the children) of Diogenes,

greetings. I acknowledge that I have received from you through Heliodorus and Numenius, the ... of the bank at the Sarapeum at the city of the Oxyrhynchi, one hundred and forty silver drachmas, which are for clothing for me and my children, who are minors, for the present seventh year of Hadrianus Caesar the Lord in accordance with the records of proceedings which were taken before Demetrius, *exegetes*, in the previous year and in accordance with the communication of the same bankers similarly that I received from you from the previous year the one hundred and forty drachmas for the previous year for clothing, and from the month of Phaophi of the previous year till the present month of Mecheir and for the same Mecheir the provision appointed by the same records of proceedings that is made monthly to us of two artabas of wheat and one hundred silver drachmas and one tetrachous of wine as well as the extra payments in kind from the lease from the same past year of the vineyard estate of the minors bequeathed to them by their father and that I make no claim against you provided that (?) the provision of the subsequent month of Phamenoth remains ... [and] from the incoming year ...'

1 α . . . (). This may be a signature or mark signifying that the document has been approved. It may have been made in the office of the *exegetes*, as he was the competent authority to deal with the affairs of minors, see 9–10 n. I have not been able to read it. The first letter is likely to be α, and there is probably an abbreviation at the end. Nothing suggests that it refers to the amount of money that has been received, but e.g. ἀνέγνω, 'I have read it' said by the *exegetes*, does not seem to be compatible with the traces. Nor does e.g. ἀντίγραφον, 'copy' appear to suit them.

2 Cινθεῖς. This is not a particularly common women's name. It is attested in twelve instances, and only in Oxyrhynchite texts. Her father and grandfather have Greek names. Her mother has an extremely common Egyptian name which is attested countrywide.

Ἴσοκράτους τοῦ Πλουτάρχου. Ἴσοκράτης is a very rare name in Oxyrhynchus, where it occurs only in XLIV 3163 8 (71) and XIX 2241 23 and 51 (283–4). But it appears in many ostraca from Kysis in the Oasis Magna in the Western Desert and also occurs on several occasions in the Arsinoite nome. Πλούταρχος is very much commoner.

4 Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ καὶ Φιλωνᾶ. This is the first attestation of the name Φιλωνᾶς in Oxyrhynchus. Instances of its attestation are mainly in ostraca from Thebes, viz. O.Ashm.Shelt. 61.5 and 8 (second/third cent.), O.Bod. II 1163.2 (third cent.), O.Bod. II 1435.5 (157?), O.Bod. II 1638.6 (258?), O.Bod. II 1873.10 (c.170?), O.Leid. 307.4 (second/third cent.), O.Stras. I 486.1 (152/75), P.Dion. Herm. 8.85 (second cent.?, from Dionysias in the Arsinoite nome).

8–10 τῶ ἐν | ἄλλοις ἐπιτρόπῳ τῶν ἀφελίκων μου | τέκνων. The ἐπίτροπος was the legal guardian of children whose father was deceased, but who had not yet reached legal majority, the ἔννομος ἡλικία. The ages at which majority was attained differed between Egyptians and Roman citizens. It was attained at fourteen for Egyptians, whereas for Romans it was twenty-five: see R. Taubenschlag, ‘Ἐννομος ἡλικία nel diritto dei papiri’ *Aegyptus* 12 (1932) 141–4 = *Opera Minora* (Warsaw 1959) ii 347–51.

ἐν ἄλλοις. It was fairly common occurrence to appoint several people to act jointly as guardians. Patently it will have been prudent to appoint more than one person to look after one’s affairs to provide for the possibility that one of those nominated should himself die or be rendered incapable of fulfilling the duties stipulated in one’s will before one’s children reached their majority and also to prevent the guardian from abusing his position to the detriment of his wards’ well-being.

The ἐπίτροπος is to be distinguished from the κύριος, in that, in most cases, the κύριος accompanied a woman whenever she wanted to conduct any kind of business, which she did either in his presence (μετά) or through his agency (διά).

There were exceptions to this, e.g. if she was a natural born Roman citizen and had three children by the power of *ius trium liberorum*, she did not need a guardian when she transacted business. See A. Arjava, *Women and the Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 1996) 118–23.

The ἐπίτροπος was charged both with the management of the estate inherited by his wards who had not yet come of age as well as their legal representation in conducting business. Under certain circumstances, the mother of children whose father was deceased could herself act as their ἐπίτροπος. She was then sometimes called ἐπακολουθήτρια, e.g. VI 909 4–5 (225) or M. Chr. 323.7–8 (218). On this, see Taubenschlag, *Law*² 153–5. Occasionally a woman would even be appointed ἐπίτροπος in her marriage contract for the eventuality that her husband might die leaving children who were still minors, see e.g. II 265 28–30 (81–95) or III 496 12–14 (127). She might also be appointed in a will, see e.g. SB VI 9065.4–7 (after 50–49 BC). Much oftener, however, near male relatives acted in this capacity, see Taubenschlag, *Law*² 159–61. This might well be the case here.

Men could also be appointed in a variety of ways, e.g. by testament of the deceased, see e.g. VI 907 18–21. If a child was left without a legal representation on the death of his father, a guardian could be appointed by the authorities. The competence to appoint a guardian (ἐπίτροπον καθιστάναι, ἐπιδιδόναι, or χειροτονεῖν) seems chiefly to have lain with the *exegetes*, see e.g. P.Mert. I 26 (274); P.Fam. Tebt. 49 (205?) and 50 (205); BGU IV 1070 (218). But, under certain circumstances, other authorities were also competent to make these appointments. They seem to have been the *strategus*, see e.g. P.Tebt. II 326 (266), or the acting *strategus*, e.g. VI 898 (123). When the proposed guardian resided in a different nome, it was the *epistrategus*, e.g. SB V 7558 (173). On this last appointment, see Taubenschlag, *Law*² 161.

Children required an ἐπίτροπος chiefly because it was they, along with the relatives of the deceased, who inherited the estate, and not the spouse of the

deceased. The two estates remained separate throughout the marriage. A spouse might make bequests to his or her surviving spouse of money or rights of habitation in the marital home in his or her will, but his or her children and relatives were customarily the heirs of the estate. On this, see H. Kreller, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1919) 174–5, and, more recently, H.–A. Rupprecht, ‘Zum Ehegattenerbrecht nach den Papyri’ *BASP* 22 (1985) 291–5. On the order of precedence in inheritance, see Kreller, *op. cit.* ch. 4 *passim*.

The ἐπίτροπος was obliged to manage the estate inherited by his ward until the ward came of legal age. In carrying out this duty he was accountable to the *exegetes*. At least in the time of the Alexander Severus, the guardian took an oath on taking up the guardianship. The only example of this which has survived is SB XVI 12557.6–11 (222–35): [ὄμ]νύω τὴν Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου | [Cεουήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου Εὐ]σεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου | [τύχην ὑγιῶς καὶ πιετώς] ἀντιλήμψεσθαι (l. ἀντιλήμψεσθαι) τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς | [τῆς προκειμένης καὶ τῆ]ν πρᾶσιν τῶν καταλειφθέντων ποι[ήσκειν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ὧ]ν τοὺς λόγους τάξομαι καὶ καταχωριῶ | [τῷ εἰς ἀρχαίῳ ἀναγραφῆ]ν [ἢ] ἔνοχος εἶην τῷ ὄρκῳ. It is not clear when this practice was introduced, nor whether the oath remained the same. See F. Zucker, ‘Beeidete Übernahme der Vormundschaft über eine Minderjährige (P.Jen. 32)’ *Festschrift für Leopold Wenger* (München 1944–5) ii 149–67, and P.J. Sijpesteijn, ‘Sammelbuch VI 9049 – A Sworn Declaration to be a Guardian of a Minor – Reconsidered’ *RHD* 50 (1982) 197–200.

The ἐπίτροπος was also required to submit lists of the property inherited by his ward which was under his management to the *exegetes*. An example of such a list is X 1269 (early second cent.). It is not known whether these lists had to be submitted regularly during the guardianship or only at the beginning of it.

10 Τρενβησᾶτος. The name does not occur elsewhere. Βησᾶς is, however, common, and the formation of Τρενβησᾶς is regular. In Demotic, ‘Τρεν’ means ‘daughter of’: see LXXVI 5116 5 n. and J. Bingen, ‘Akoris: épigraphie et

onomastique’ *CE* 63 (1988) 165–72. The women of this family, save for Plutarche, all carry Egyptian names, whereas the men have Greek names. This follows a fairly common practice of the metropolitan elites of Roman Egypt. On the practice, see e.g. J. Bingen, ‘Notables hermopolitains et onomastique féminine’ *CE* 66 (1991) 324–9.

12–13 Ἡλιοδώρου | καὶ Νουμηνίου. These two bankers appear in P.Sijp. 49.7–10, a repayment of a loan: ὁμολογῶ ἀπέχειν παρὰ [κοῦ] | διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς Ὁξυρύ[γ]|χων πόλει *Carapeίου* Ἡλι[ο]|δώρου καὶ Νουμηνίου τρ[α]|πέζης ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς κτλ. This document dates from the second century, but not later than 153/4 when the bank was confiscated by the state: see *LXXVIII 5173* 3–4 n. The date of *13* implies that Heliodorus and Numenius had a long career at the bank.

13–14 τῶν .[. .] .[. . .] ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς | Ὁξυρύχων πόλει *Carapeίου* τραπεζῆ[c. In 21, Heliodorus and Numenius are called τῶν αὐτῶν τραπεζιτῶν, which implies that they have already been described as τραπεζιτῶν. But τραπεζιτῶν is incompatible with the traces. This must be a new formula, and τῆς will probably also need to be read or supplemented *exempli gratia* before ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς | Ὁξυρύχων πόλει *Carapeίου* because τραπεζῆς does not occur without its definite article.

13–14 ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς | Ὁξυρύχων πόλει *Carapeίου* τραπεζῆ[c. The temple of Sarapis occupied a prominent position at the centre of the city. It was also the centre of banking activity: on its attestation in the papyri and geographical position, see J. Whitehorne, ‘The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus’ *ANRW* II 18.5 (Berlin–New York 1995) 3078–9.

On the banking system in Roman Egypt in general, see R. Bogaert, ‘Liste géographique des banques et des banquiers de l’Égypte romaine, 30–284’ *ZPE* 109 (1995) 133–73, and on the history of the bank at the Sarapeum in Oxyrhynchus in particular, see 151–7. The bank at the Sarapeum was one of at least three private banks at Oxyrhynchus which operated from 30 till 154, when it was taken over by the state and its function was put out to public tender. Besides this, the other two were that of Didymus, τὴν Διδύμου τράπεζαν πρὸς τῇ | βιβλιοθήκῃ, ‘near the

records office', XXXIV 2726 24–5 (second cent.), and [τῆς τοῦ N.N.] τραπε() [Δ]ρῶμου Ἱερα[-], 'the bank of of N.N. in the quarter? of Hiera-', PSI VI 715.2 (92).

15–17 ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκον[τα] | οὐκὰς ὑπὲρ ἱματισμοῦ ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τῶν | ἀφελίξων. There is some information on the price of particular garments, e.g. the ἱμάτιον for which a rough search in the DDBDP shows the following prices: P.Ryl. II 128.22 (30) 4 dr., LXXIII 4954 4 (c.49) 16 dr., BGU VIII 1860.3 (first cent.), 32 dr., P.Mil. Vogl. II 71.8 (161–80) 40 dr. It is, however, difficult to establish even an approximately accurate price for clothing, because garments of differing quality, size, etc. will have varied in price.

Provision for women's clothing is often found in marriage contracts, but normally no amount to be spent is stipulated. Rather the provision is expressed in terms of 'what befits a married woman'. Commonly the formula runs e.g. τὰ δὲ δέοντα πάντα καὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα προσήκει γυναικὶ γαμετῆ παρεχέσθω. Interestingly however, the clause never occurs in Oxyrhynchite contracts.

The examples of provisions for ἱματισμός in which an amount of money is stipulated are very few. They are enumerated by H.–J. Drexhage, *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians*¹⁶ (St. Katharinen 1991) 364–6. In the main, they come from wills or contracts for apprenticeships. Clearly these will differ because apprenticeship contracts have to do with children whose clothes will have been smaller than those of adults. It is, therefore, well to separate the two:

(i) provisions for clothing (ἱματισμός) not in apprenticeship contracts. These are P.Lond. III 1171.66–7 (8 BC, an account) 20 drachmas each for two slaves; P.Mich. V 321.20 (42), 12 dr. per annum for a man for clothing, oil and other items; P.Mich. V 322a.34 (46, a will), 300 dr. p.a. for both parents on relinquishing control of estate

¹⁶ A note of caution must be sounded on the accuracy of Drexhage's reporting of details: at least one inventory number, two descriptions and two of the figures given, all in different cases, are false in this short list alone.

to their children, for clothing and other items; BGU I 86.17 = M. *Chr.* 306 (155, a will), 20 dr. p.a. for a woman for clothing; III 494 18 (156, a will), 200 dr. p.a. for a man for clothing; PSI XII 1263.2 (166/7, a will), 24 dr. p.a. for a woman for clothing; P.Fuad I Univ. App. I. 2.8–9 and 14–16 = P.Flor. II 135a (262, a letter), 48 dr. p.a. for two slaves for clothing. Perhaps also add to the list BGU XV 2462.9 (third cent., fragment of a petition or will ?) 200 dr. p.a. for clothing?

(ii) provisions in apprenticeship contracts: P.Wisc. I 4.13–15 (53), 14 dr. for one year for a boy's clothing; P.Oxy. Hels. 29.26–7 (54), 12 dr. for a boy's clothing; II 275.21 (66), 12 dr. for a boy's clothing; P.Mich. V 355.9–10 (c.48–56), 28 dr. p.a. for a man for clothing and oil.

In comparison with the other amounts, the 140 dr. p.a. which Sintheus receives for clothing alone for herself and her two children is at the very least generous: only III 494 is significantly greater. It seems likely that an amount around the 20 dr. p.a. of BGU I 86 will have been nearer the amount spent on clothing by the wider population of villagers and metropolitan non-elites. On the *Alimentationspflicht*, see 29–32 n.

18–21 ἀκο|λούθως τοῖς γενομένοις ἐπὶ Δημητρίου | γενομένου ἐξηγητοῦ τῶ διελθόντι ἔτει | ὑπομνηματιμοῖς. On the ὑπομνηματιμοῖς (Lat. *commentarius*), see Wilcken, ‘Ὑπομνηματιμοί’ *Philologus* 53 (1894) 80–126, esp. 97–102, R. Haensch, ‘Das Statthalterarchiv’ *ZRG* 109 (1992) 219–45, esp. 233–5, and B. Anagnostou–Cañas, ‘La documentation judiciaire pénale dans l’Égypte romaine’ *MEFRA* 112 (2000) 764–7. The ‘Amtstagebücher’, in which all proceedings before the office holder were recorded, were available for consultation by interested parties. Before the original was laid in the state archives at Alexandria, a copy of it will have been made which was placed in the local archives where it might be consulted.

19–20 ἐπὶ Δημητρίου γενομένου ἐξηγητοῦ. On the meaning of ἐπὶ in the sense of ‘before Demetrius, former *exegetes*’, (Lat. *coram*) and not ‘whilst Demetrius, former *exegetes*, was in office’, see E. Bickermann ‘Testificatio

Actorum. Eine Untersuchung über antike Niederschriften' *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 333–55, at 336. Demetrius is to be added to the list of *exegetae* in the 'Prosographie der Exegeten der Städte und Metropolen Ägyptens' in P.Hamb. IV pp.217–68. The length of the term which the *exegetes* served in office is unknown. Probably the term varied widely like other ἀρχαί. On this, see P.A. Brunt, 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt' *JRS* 65 (1975) 124–47 at 126–7, dealing with length of tenure of the prefecture, and 129–30 dealing with the length of tenure of the subordinate offices. On the office and functions of the *exegetes*, besides P. Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine* (Paris 1911) 315–8, F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie: Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens* (Leipzig 1917) 325–9, and C. Drecoll, *Die Liturgien im römischen Kaiserreich des 3. und 4. Jh. n. Ch.* (Stuttgart 1997) 98–9, see the recent survey of its development over the period of Roman rule from a state to a municipal office by D. Hagedorn, 'The Emergence of Municipal Offices in the Nome Capitals' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 194–204 at 198–201.

20–21 κατὰ προφώνησιν τῶν αὐτῶν τραπεζιτῶν. F. Preisigke, *Girwesen im griechischen Ägypten* (Straßburg im Elsaß 1910) 25 n. 7, explains προφώνησις as a sworn statement which functions as a 'Benachrichtigung der Bank an ihren Girokunden über eine eingegangene Giro-Einzahlung, wie sie auch den heutigen Girokunden zugeht'. The editor of P.Köln III 148.2–4 n., however, makes a different suggestion. It is that προφώνησις rather as 'eine Meldung über den Abschluß des Vertrages zu verstehen ist, welche die Bank bei einer Zentralbehörde oder auch beim Agoranomeion zu machen hatte.' The suggestion is attractive. It makes much good sense that communications concerning matters which the authorities are charged with managing should have been conveyed directly to the competent authorities rather than to them through the hands of the parties in the proceedings. This would surely have greatly facilitated efficient proceedings, because it would have availed the authorities of accurate information which might otherwise have been subject to

fraud, although sworn declarations made to authorities were still liable to the provisions in law for perjury. (On this latter point see R. Taubenschlag, *Das Strafrecht im Rechte der Papyri* (Leipzig–Berlin 1916) 50–1.)

27–30 τὴν c [1–2]|θειαν ... χωρηγίαν. The trace after c looks to be most compatible with τ. One might restore τ[α]|θειαν (l. τ[α]|θεικ>αν). The sense would be suitable, and the supplemented letter would be commensurate with the space available after the break. ἰctάναι does bear the sense of ‘to stipulate’, and it may be used of financial transactions, such as loans e.g. LXI 4125 22–5 (322) ἐκτίειν co[ι τ]οῦ | ὑπερέκοντος χρόνου τόκον τὸ<ν> σταθέντα πρὸς | ἀλλήλους. But the construction χωρηγίαν ἰctάναι is not attested, and one might rather expect καθιctάναι than the simplex. Moreover, besides the violation of the Lex Youtie, one objection which may be brought against τ[α]|θειαν is that the feminine forms of the aorist passive participle only very seldom lose their c. I can find only one example of corruption of this kind, viz. P.Giss. I 8.3 (119), τῆ[ν συμ]φωνηθεικ>αν τιμῆν.

30–33 χωρηγηθῆναι ἡμῶν χωρηγίαν κατὰ | μῆνα [π]υροῦ ἀρταβῶν δύο καὶ ἀργυρίου | δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν [καὶ] οἴνου τετραχοῦ | ἐνός. On the duty of provision of a guardian established by testament, see R. Taubenschlag, ‘Die Alimentationspflicht im Rechte der Papyri’ in G. Baviera (ed.), *Studi in onore di Salvatore Riccobono* (Palermo 1936) i 505–18 = *Opera Minora* (Warsaw 1959) ii 539–555.

33–5 τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διελθόντος | ἔτους ἔκτακτα τοῦ ἐν μισθώσει πατρικῶν τῶν ἀφελίμων ἀμπελικῶν κτήματος. ἔκτακτα are extra payments-in-kind, which are separate from the payment of the rent proper. These arrangements were common in leases of vineyards, see e.g. P.Col. X 284.11ff. (311), XIV 1631.30 (280), XLVIII 3406.5–6 (301–400). It is unclear what became of the rent itself on the vineyard property. On the ἀμπελικὸν κτήμα, see D.W. Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third Century AD Egypt* (Cambridge 1991) 33.

36–9 καὶ μηδὲν σοὶ ἐγ[κα]λεῖν μενούσης | τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξῆς μηνός Φαμενωθ

. . | . . ιαc . χωρηγίαc (m.2) `χορ . [. . .]' κα[ὶ ἀπ]ὸ τοῦ ἰκίόντοc | ἔτο[υc]. Something has gone awry in the syntax of the *Nichtangriffsklausel*. It has partly been corrected, but the construction remains obscure. It is tempting to delete τοῦ in 36, which seems quite superfluous and only disturbs the construction. But I refrain from this, because I have failed to read what stands at the end of this line and beginning of the next. This may be an adjective in agreement with χωρηγίαc, e.g. ‘owing’, but I cannot think of anything which would be compatible with the tracing. The supralinear correction `χορ . [. . .]' is also odd, because the spelling is correct only here. It is not clear whether it was inserted to complement the syntax.

P.Fam. Tebt. 53 B.2.54–5 and C 12–13 both have a very simple *Nichtangriffsklausel*, being μένοντόc μου (l. μοι) τοῦ λόγου περὶ ὧν | ἔχω πρὸc cé and μένοντόc μου (l. μοι) τοῦ λόγου π[ε]ρ[ὶ] ὧν ἄλλ]λον (l. ἄλλων) ἔχω πρὸc αὐτόν, respectively. On the *Nichtangriffsklausel* in the papyri in general, see H.–A. Rupprecht, *Studien zur Quittungen im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri* (München 1971) 94–103. It falls into Rupprecht’s second type, op. cit. 97–8, which ‘erfaßt alle Beziehungen zwischen den Parteien von früherer Zeit bis zum Tage der Urkundsaustellung’. It extends, therefore, over a greater period of business dealings than Rupprecht’s first type which deals only with the object of the business.

The clause here seems to differ from the regular kind of expression in that it seems to be made on condition that the provision continues to be paid. Usually the *Klageverzicht* is established by the document itself and is then final.

14. ANTIRRHESIS TO A SUMMONS TO ASSIZES

51 4B.22/C(1–3)a

5.5 x 14.4 cm

11 November 133–26 May 137

Teos, a temple-craftsman, addresses a petition to Apolinarius, the *strategus* of the Oxyrhynchite nome. Teos appears to refute allegations that he owes money made against him in a διατολικόν by another Oxyrhynchite, Dionysius, which has been communicated to him by a member of Apolinarius' official retinue.

The context in which this dispute occurs is mainly obscure, but some details emerge which allow a tentative reconstruction of the context in which this dispute occurs. Dionysius seems to have claimed that Teos owes him money. Since Teos speaks of κεφάλαια (25), it will probably have been a loan. Presumably Teos has failed to repay it when it was due to be redeemed. One will suppose that Dionysius will have attempted to recover the money from Teos whenever the loan contract stipulated that it was due. But clearly that has failed to resolve the matter to the satisfaction of Dionysius, because he has resorted to legal action.

Teos mentions a διατολικόν issued against him. This is usually understood to be the *Mahnbescheid*, essentially an 'order to pay' used by creditors against defaulting and recalcitrant debtors. It is issued by the *strategus* once a fairly complex process through the various channels of high administration has been completed; see 10–11 n. Ultimately it permits the creditor to seize the possessions of the debtor if the debtor fails to pay whatever is owed.

But διατολικόν in the context of 14 means 'summons'. Not only does Teos report that Dionysius 'claimed to have a case against me and declared that he wants me to appear at the coming *conventus*' (10–20), but the process by which Teos was served with the διατολικόν is exactly that of the summons to the *conventus*. This use of the διατολικόν is not unexampled, but a summons is usually called a παραγγελία. Dionysius seeks to have Teos summoned to appear before the prefect at the *conventus* in order to have his case settled. The *conventus* was the prefect's

annual tour of inspection of the province under his jurisdiction where he exercised his judicial functions to settle disputes. The prefect was the final authority on all legal matters in the province (unless the emperor was in the province or an appeal could be made to him). It was, therefore, through him that any legal matter was ultimately to be resolved. Presumably Dionysius will have hoped that the prefect would make a judgement in his favour.

The papyrus breaks off before anything of Teos' contention can be made out, save that he appears to deny Dionysius' claims outright, 21–2 [ἔχει δὲ ?] οὐδὲν ἀπλῶς [πράγμα ?] πρὸς ἐμέ. The purpose of Teos' petition will probably have been to lodge with the *strategus* his official dispute (the ἀντίρρησης) of the claim on which Dionysius' διατολικόν is based. If this succeeded, it might have prevented Dionysius from taking further legal action to recover the money due, or at least, delayed him taking further action till Teos' dispute of the validity of Dionysius' claim had been settled.

I have not succeeded in finding any papyri that are identical with **14** in form and content, but other texts show a variety of parallels. Examples of *antirrheseis* from the Roman period include I **68** (131), BGU VII 1574 (176/7) and PSI Com. 14 (mid to late second cent.).

One would expect that the rest of the papyrus will have consisted of a detailed elaboration of Teos' contention why Dionysius' claim against him was unfounded (including a summary of the terms of the loan and whatever counter claims Teos made about its redemption) and perhaps a request to rescind the summons to the *conventus* as well as the usual subscription and date.

The papyrus further offers some interesting prosopographical information. It appears from III **579** descr. (131–7) that Teos belonged to a family of temple-craftsmen of the temple of Athena Thoeris in Oxyrhynchus.

The papyrus is ragged and heavily lacunose. Two further fragments have become detached from the main piece. The writing runs with the fibres. The back is blank.

Ἀπολιναρίῳ στρα(τηγῶ)
πα]ρὰ Τεῶτος Ἀρθών[ιος
το]ῦ Θεῶνος ἀπ' Ὁξυρύ[γ-
χων πόλεως ἱεροτ[έ-
5 κτονος. Διονύσιου[ς
Διονυσίου τοῦ Διονυ-
σίου ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς π[ό-
λεως μετέδωκέν
μοι δ[ι'] ἐνόξ τῶν ὑπη-
10 ρε]τῶν σου ἀντίγ[ρα-
φ]ον διατολικοῦ δ[ι'] οὐ
προηένκατ[ο ἔ]χειν
π]ρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ βού-
λεσθαί με παρατυ-
15 χεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπ' ἀ[γ]α-
θῶ ἐκόμενον ὑπ[ὸ
τοῦ κρατίτου [ἡγεμ]ό-
γ[ος] Περτρωνί[ου Μα-
μ]ερτείνου το[ῦ] νομοῦ
20 δι]αλογισμόν.[
ο]ὔδὲν ἀπλῶς [
π]ρὸς ἐμὲ οφε[
. .]. ιαγραφως[
ἐγγραφ . . α . . [

25 κεφάλαια κα .[
 .. γ μεταδο .[
 μ .[.] .τουτο .[
] .δημεν .[
] . .[.] .[.] το[
 30] .[

fr. 1

.

][
] . .[
] .δε[
] .[
] κοπ[
] . [
] ξ[

fr. 2

.

] . .[
] . .[
][

1 στρ^λ 12 l. προηγέκατ[ο

‘To Apolinarius, *strategus*, from Teos, son of Harthonius, son of Theon, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, temple-craftsman. Dionysius, son of Dionysius, son of

Dionysius, from the same city communicated to me by one of your *hyperetes* a copy of a *diastolikon*, through which he claimed to have a case against me, and declared that he wanted me to appear at the propitious *conventus* of the nome to be held by the prefect Petronius Mamertinus, *vir egregius*. He has no case against me ...’

1 Ἀπολιναρίῳ στρα(τηγῶ). Apolinarius is first positively attested as *strategus* of the Oxyrhynchite nome in P.Oxy. Hels. 19.1, dated to 12 March 134, and last attested in III 484 2, dated to 28 January 138. No further evidence on his term of office has emerged since J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt*² (Pap. Flor. XXXVII; Firenze 2006). Apolinarius’ last known predecessor is Asclepiades, who is last attested in office on 22 December 131 (XLIX 3470 3 and 3471 3), and his next known successor is Petronius Dionysius who is first attested in office on 17 December 138 (LXI 4113 1).

2 Τεῶτοϥ. Τεῶϥ is a common name throughout Egypt, but it occurs especially frequently in the Arsinoite and, to a lesser extent, Oxyrhynchite nomes. It is also attested frequently in Demotic texts, where it is transliterated as *dd-hr*. The instances are assembled in the *Demotisches Namenbuch* XVII 1368–9. Its meaning has been variously discussed, last in detail by J. Quaegebeur, ‘Tithoes, dieu oraculaire?’ *Enchoria* 8 (1977) 103–13. He upholds, 103, the *communis opinio*, established since H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (Glückstadt 1935) i 411, that the name itself means ‘a parlé le visage (du dieu NN)’. It also occurs, from the seventh century onwards, in a very few Coptic texts as Τεῶϥ.

2 Ἀρθῶν[ι]τοϥ. Ἀρθῶν[ι]τοϥ rather than Ἀρθῶν[ι]τοϥ: on the form of the name, see Appendix. Ἀρθῶν[ι]τοϥ is a theophoric name: it consists of Horus and Thonis. Ἀρθῶν[ι]τοϥ is not itself listed by Ranke, nor does it occur in the indices of the *Demotisches Namenbuch*. J. Yoyotte, *Notes de Toponymie Egyptienne MDAI(K)* 16 (1958), 414–30, at 423–30 suggests that Thonis is connected with the cult of the Horus as the falcon god of Cynopolis. The Demotic word *dwn*, from which Thonis is derived,

seems to mean ‘extend’. Yoyotte remarks that ‘il ne serait pas impossible de voir dans le dieu Tón ou Tóon de l’onomastique de Moyenne Égypte un aspect tardif de l’Horus faucon de Cynopolis, importante métropole de la région, puisque ce dieu était couramment appelé “celui qui étend (*dwn*) les ailes”’(426).

It should also be noted that an alternative view, which has not commanded scholarly assent, has been proposed for Ἀρθοῶνις by the editor of P.Turner 17. This view holds that Ἀρθοῶνις is in fact from *hr-tnr* ‘with the omission of the final *r*’. According to Ranke, *op. cit.* i 251, *hr-tnr* means ‘Horus ist stark’.

The worship of Thonis seems to have been especially prevalent in Oxyrhynchus. This is suggested by the numerous attestations of theophoric names consisting of Thonis or, like Harthonis, Thonis combined with another name or word, e.g. Ctvθῶνις, ‘daughter of Thonis’, which is almost exclusively Oxyrhynchite. See especially J. Whitehorne, ‘The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus’ *ANRW* II 18.5 (Berlin–New York 1995) 3050–91 at 3083 and P.Köln IV 202.1 n.

4–5 ἱεροτ[έ]κτωνος. This may have been a priestly title, rather than simply the designation of the profession of a layman employed as a carpenter at the temple. P.Mich. XVIII 788.2–4 (173) demonstrates that one priest was also a ἱεροτέκτων engaged at the Thoeum in Oxyrhynchus: Θῶνις Φρατέως τοῦ Ἀρθῶνιος ἀ[π ± 6] | ὠν πόλεως ἱερεὺς κα[ὶ] περαφόρος κα[ὶ] ἱεροτέ[κτων] | Θοήριδος καὶ Εἴσιδος καὶ Cαραπίδος καὶ ναο[ῦ θεοῦ] | Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος [καὶ] τῶ[ν συν]ν[άων θεῶν]. This may apply to the other ἱεροτέκτωνες.

ἱεροτέκτωνες are only certainly attested at Oxyrhynchus, and only in six other instances, viz. SB XIV 11958.33 and 57 (117), III 579 descr. (c.138), XII 1550 7 and 14–17 (156), P.Rein. II 93.4 (159/60), P.Mich. XVIII 788.2 (173), P.Rein. II 93.8–9 (193–8). The designation also occurs on one other occasion, a ‘Mummienetikett’ SB I 789.2 (third cent.), but this is most unlikely to have originated in Oxyrhynchus. Clearly the office, whether it was priestly or lay, was peculiar to Oxyrhynchus.

Many of those attested as practising as ἱεροτέκτονεσ have similar names, which suggests that they will probably have been related. This might lend further weight to the view that the temple-craftsmen were priests because priestly appointments were customarily hereditary. Besides **14**, five of the other six attestations of the title concern men called either Harthonis or Thonis, and they are all engaged at one of the temples of Athena Thoeris in Oxyrhynchus. III **579** descr. establishes that Teos and his brother Thonis were also ἱεροτέκτονεσ of one of the temples of Athena Thoeris. They may have been priests of this cult: the editor of P.Mich. XVIII 788.1 n. observes that ‘die Namen Thonis und Harthonis sind unter Priestern des Kultes von Thoeris, Isis und Sarapis geläufig’.

Nothing is known of the competences or responsibilities of the ἱεροτέκτονεσ. ‘Temple-craftsman’ does not suggest that the bearer of the title would have had any particular religious authority or dignity. Presumably the ἱεροτέκτονεσ were charged with carrying out the physical maintenance of the temple. But this would not seem to require the man to be in any particular religious standing, unless only some ritual or notional restriction applied, which permitted only priests to take charge of the upkeep of temples.

A number of temple personnel emerge from the papyri whose exact function and position in the hierarchy is not understood. P.Mich. XVIII 788.3, ἱερεὺσ κα[ὶ] πετραφόροσ κα[ὶ] ἱεροτέ[κτων], suggests that they will not automatically have been priests. One might speculate that the occupation of the ἱεροτέκτων could have been similar in status to that of e.g. the πυραίθησ, fire-kindler. Two fire-kindlers who are brothers (one of whom incidentally also called Thonis) are attested in XXXIV **2722** 3 and 6 (154) where they are called πυραίθαι Ἀθηνᾶσ Θοήριδοσ θεᾶσ μεγίτησ. They are also attested at L **3576** 3 and 14 (252) where they are πυραίθαι καὶ πατοφόροι Ἀθηνᾶσ Θοήριδοσ θεᾶσ μεγίτησ. As the editor observes, 3 n., ‘the fact that this man and his father were also πατοφόροι shows that they were not priests of the highest class.’ It may have been the case that other professional personnel at the temples,

such as e.g. *λυχνάπται*, the temple-lamplighters, XII 1453 8 (30–29 BC), were similarly engaged as working priests.

For a list of temple personnel engaged at the Thoereum, see Whitehorne, loc. cit. 3081–2. Furthermore, town-criers who operated from the temples ought to be added to this list: see J.R. Rea, ‘On κηρυκίνη: P.Heid. IV 334, P.Köln VI 279, and CPR I 232’ *ZPE* 79 (1989) 201–6 who notes, at 202, that ‘some town-criers were organised as a corporation or college for cult as well as for business activities and that they had fixed their headquarters at this particular temple of Thoeris [that in Oxyrhynchus], which therefore acquired the name of ‘the Thoereum of the Proclaimers (Proclamations?)’.

8–10 μετέδωκέγ | μοι. μεταδιδόναι is the term used to signify that a legal document such as a petition or a registration of a deed of mortgage, e.g. XVII 2134 4 (170), is officially to be communicated to the addressee. On this see G. Foti Talamanca, *Ricerche sul processo nell’Egitto greco-romano ii: l’introduzione del guidizio* (Milan 1979) 80.

9–10 δ[ι’] ἐνόχ τῶν ὑπη[[ρε]τῶν σου. The *hyperetes* was a member of the *strategus*’ official retinue. One of his charges was the delivery of petitions directly to the person to whom they were addressed, ἐνώπιον. On the responsibilities and duties of the *hyperetes* in general, see H. Kupiszewski–J. Modrzejewski, ‘Υπηρέται’ *JJP* 11–12 (1958) 144–55, and more recently, S. Strassi, *Le funzioni degli ὑπηρέται nell’Egitto greco e romano* (Heidelberg 1997) 39–71, esp. 41–5.

10–11 ἀντίγ[ρα|φ]ον διατολικού. The διατολικόν is usually understood as the *Mahnbescheid* or ‘order to pay’. This was the procedure which legally compelled the enforcement of the terms of a contract on a defaulting party. On this see especially LXXV 5062 21 n., O. Primavesi, ‘P.Cair. Inv. 10554 r: Mahnverfahren mit Demosiosis’ *ZPE* 64 (1986) 99–101, and on the various strategies employed to recover debts, B. Tenger, *Die Verschuldung im römischen Ägypten* (St. Katharinen 1993) 99–140. The process of having a διατολικόν issued was briefly as follows.

A contract had to be registered in the public archives before it could be enforced. If it was a private document, e.g. a loan agreement, it first had to be made public by the process of *demosiosis* before the procedure to enforce its obligations could be begun. On the procedure of *demosiosis* see H. J. Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens* (München 1978) 129–35, Primavesi, loc. cit. 101–3, LXX 4772 introd., and most recently, P. Sängler, *Veteranen unter den Severern und früheren Soldatenkaisern: Die Dokumentensammlung der Veteranen Aelius Sarapammon und Aelius Syrion* (Stuttgart 2011) 66–81.

Once the contract was a public document, the plaintiff sent a *ὑπόμνημα* to the *archidicastes*, who presided over the *καταλογεῖον* in Alexandria, setting out his demands and requesting of the *archidicastes* to authorise the *strategus* to serve the defaulter with the notification of the requirement to fulfill the obligations of the contract. In the *καταλογεῖον* a copy of the *ὑπόμνημα* will have been produced to which the *archidicastes* will have appended his authorisation to the competent *strategus* to notify the defaulter. The plaintiff will then have received back a copy of the *ὑπόμνημα* with the *archidicastes*' authorisation which he then will have copied into a petition to the *strategus* requesting the *strategus* to communicate it with the defaulter. The *strategus* will then have had a copy of the petition made which he will have communicated with the defaulter in person by one of his *hyperetae*, and the defaulter will have acknowledged receipt of it. It acquired its legal force by being delivered through these official channels. The official notification of the requirement to fulfil the obligations arising from the contract was the *διατολικόν*. If the defaulter either failed to fulfill his obligations or did not dispute the validity of the *διατολικόν*, i.e. did not lodge an *ἀντίρρησις*, the plaintiff could move to further legal action through the *archidicastes* to gain authorisation to seize the property of the defaulter. This is *ἐνεχυρασία*.

ἀντίγ[ρα|φ]ον διατολικοῦ does not bear the usual meaning of ‘copy of the *Mahnbescheid*’. Here it means rather ‘copy of the summons’. Summonses to the

conventus are usually called παραγγελίαι. Presumably, in order to have the summons issued as a διατολικόν, the same process as that outlined above will have been completed, and it will, therefore, have carried the same force of authority.

10–20 ἀντίγ[ρα|φ]ον διατολικοῦ δ[ι' οὔ] | προηένκατ[ο ἔ]χειν | [π]ρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ βού|λεσθαί με παρατυ|χεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπ' ἀ[γ]α|θῶ ἐκόμενον ὑπ[ὸ] | τοῦ κρατίτου [ἡγεμ]ό[ν]ο[ς] Π[ε]τρωνί[ου] Μα[μ]ερτείνου το[ῦ] νομοῦ | δι|αλογισμὸν. The closest parallels to this collocation are a pair of papyri from the ‘Laches Archive’: P.Mil. Vogl. VI 265 and P.Mil. Vogl. III 129. P.Mil. Vogl. 129 is a petition from Sabinus, alias Ninnus, addressed to the *strategus* of the nome concerning a dispute. He applies to have two people summoned to appear at the *conventus*. He has had a διατολικόν issued. It runs, 11–16, ἀξιῶ δι' ἐνὸ[ς] τ]ῶν περὶ ἐ ἐ ὑπηρετῶν μετα|δοθῆναι τοῦδε τοῦ διατολικοῦ τὸ ἴσον τῶ | τε Πόσι καὶ Κρονίῳ, ἵν' εἰδῶσι ὀφείλειν αὐτοὺς | παρεῖναι ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερώτατον τοῦ κρατίτου ἡγε|μόνος βή[μα] ὄ]που ἐὰν τὸν τοῦ νομοῦ διαλογισμὸν ἢ δ[ικαι]οδοσίαν ποιῆται. P.Mil. Vogl. 265 is the reply to P.Mil. Vogl. 129. In P.Mil. Vogl. 265 Cronius, one of the two summoned in P.Mil. Vogl. 129, addresses a counter petition to the prefect, M. Petronius Mamertinus, in which he denies outright that Sabinus has any case against him. P.Mil. Vogl. 265 runs, 8–17, [C]αβε[ίν]ο[ς] ὁ καὶ Ν]ίννο[ς] | Πτολεμαίου ἀπὸ τῆς | αὐτῆς κόμης πρᾶ]γμα τοῦ καθόλου | πρ[ὸς] ἐμὲ μὴ ἔχων, | [μετ]έ[δοκ]᾽[δωκ]᾽[έν] μοι δια|τολικόν ὑπόμνη|μα ὅπως παρατύχω | ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερώτατόν | [c]ου βήμα.

Other applications for summonses include XLIX 3464 (c.54–60). This concerns a long standing dispute over some land which the petitioner claims to have been illegally appropriated by a number of men. The petitioner had a διατολικόν issued against them, and there was a case in which the ownership of the land was settled in his favour. But the men failed to appear at the hearing and took flight. They subsequently re-appeared and again claimed ownership of the land. The petitioner now seeks to have them summonsed to the *conventus* to have the matter settled. P.Ryl. II 119 (54–67) is another example. It is a petition addressed to an *exegetes* of

Alexandria concerning a dispute over mortgaged land. The petitioner has succeeded in having his creditors, who appear to have occupied the land and taken the income accruing on it in distraint, summonsed by a διατολικόν to appear at the *conventus*. Two of them failed to appear. A further text is XXXVIII 2852 (104/5). It concerns a dispute about money from an inheritance which the petitioner claims has been usurped as well as a further debt. Interestingly, the text text makes no mention of διατολικόν but refers to a παραγγελία, 29–33, ἴν' ἔχοντος (l. ἔχοντες) ἔνγραπτον (l. ἔγγραπτον) παραγγελίαν (l. παραγγελίαν) παραγένονται ὅπου ἐὰν ὁ νομὸς διαλογίζεται | ἢ δικαιοδοτῆται. The docket on the back written by a second hand, however, reads διατολ(ικόν) | Καβοῦτ(οc). The editors remark that the hand would be 'that of a government clerk, docketing the application for the files (the files of the *strategus*' office, presumably)'. This would appear to demonstrate that the διατολικόν could be identical with the παραγγελία in function. In Roman legal terms, this appears to be the *evocatio*. On the *evocatio*, see M. Kaser, *Das römische Zivilprozessrecht* (München 1966) 371–3.

The essential character of the διατολικόν, whether it means 'order to pay' or 'summons to appear', seems to lie in the fact that it is an official instruction directed to the addressee by an authority and delivered to him by the agent of that authority. Compliance with it is, therefore, mandatory.

The summons could certainly be used as a tool to threaten or coerce. For instance, it is explicitly recognised as a form of menace in a dispute over an inheritance in BGU II 613.18 = M. *Chr.* 89. A veteran complains in a petition to the prefect that those with whom he has fallen into dispute μάτην ἐπέδωκάν μοι ἔμφοβοῦντές με διατολικόν ὑπόμνημα.

Dionysius' attempt to have Teos summoned to appear before the prefect at the *conventus* might well have been a tactic to co-erce Teos into settling the matter before it reached the prefect in order to forestall any further litigation. This would save him the trouble and, presumably, the expense of pursuing the matter through the

law. But if the inconvenience or threat of having to appear before the prefect did not push Teos to repay what he allegedly owed, and the matter did end up before the prefect, Dionysius will presumably have hoped that the prefect would issue an immediate and binding judgement against Teos ordering him to repay the money. The only possible appeal against this would have been to the Emperor, if he were to have been in the province at the time or if the petitioner were to be able to have his petition brought to the Emperor elsewhere.

17–19 τοῦ κρατίτου [ἡγεμ]όλυ[ος] Πετρωνίου Μαμ]ερτείνου M. Petronius Mamertinus is attested as holding office as prefect of Egypt between 11 November 133 and 26 May 137; see G. Bastianini's collection of the testimonia, 'Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto' *ZPE* 17 (1975) 263–328 and id., 'Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto dal 30^a al 299^p: Aggiunte e correzioni' *ZPE* 38 (1980) 75–89.

When the new prefect came to office, he will probably have wanted to find out what the prevailing situation in the country was as soon as he arrived. It is, therefore, quite possible that Mamertinus held his first *conventus* in early 134. High officials, such as the prefect of Egypt, were not often men chosen for proven experience and sound administrative abilities. On this see P.A. Brunt, 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt' *JRS* 65 (1975) 124–47 at 132–41. The *conventus* would have afforded him a convenient opportunity to get to know the the lie of the land.

But it is unlikely that, when Teos mentions τὸν ἐπ' ἀ[γ]α|θῶ ἐκόμηνον ... το[ῦ νομοῦ δι]αλογισμόν, he will have been referring to the *conventus* of 134. Several stages of administrative procedures will need to have been completed, and at each stage a decision reached which will have needed to be communicated to each of the several parties concerned in the case before Dionysius could have Teos summoned to the *conventus* held between late January and April 134. The bureaucracy will have occasioned significant delays between the διατολικόν being issued, Teos' response to it and any further action on Dionysius' part.

20 [δι]αλογισμὸν. The *conventus* was held usually in three locations. They were Pelusium for the Eastern Delta, Memphis or occasionally Arsinoe for Middle and Upper Egypt, and Alexandria for the Western Delta. The prefect himself had some discretion to set the precise location of the *conventus*, hence the several common formulae in applications for summonses which do not specify where nor when those summoned must appear. They only state that they must appear, e.g. XLIX 3464 27–9 (54–60), ὅπου ἐὰν ὁ κ[ύριος ἡγεμ]ὼν Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Βάλβιλλος | τὸν ἔγγιστα διαλογισμὸν ποιῆται.

The *conventus* for the Heptanomia (i.e. the Memphites, Aphroditopolites, Heracleopolites, Oxyrhynchites, Kynopolites, Hermopolites and Antinoopolites) and the Thebais was held between late January and April: see G. Foti Talamanca, *Ricerche sul processo nell'Egitto greco-romano i: l'organizzazione del 'conventus' del prefectus aegypti* (Milan 1974) 31–78, where the documentation bearing on the *conventus* is fully collected and discussed. On the processing of petitions and summonses to the *conventus*, see R. Haensch, 'Die Bearbeitungsweisen von Petitionen in der Provinz Aegyptus' *ZPE* 100 (1994) 487–546, esp. for this period 489–98. Clearly the advantages of obtaining a judgement directly from the highest authority in the land will have been significantly more appealing than pursuing a case through the more normal judicial and administrative channels. It is, therefore, small wonder that petitions would be made in immense numbers. P.Yale I 61.3–7 (209?) attests that 1804 petitions were submitted in two and a bit days: ὁ λαμπρότατος ἡγεμὼν Couβατιανὸς | Ἀκύλας κατὰ τὴν εἰς πάντα αὐτοῦ πρόνοιαν | ἐκέλευεν τὰ ἐπιδοθέντα αὐτῷ βιβλίδια ἔν Ἀρσινόῃ | τῇ κς καὶ κζ καὶ μέρει τῆς κη τοῦ Φαμενωθ | μηνὸς ἀριθμῷ Αωδ προτεθέντα.

No deterrence seems to have been in force to prevent petitions applying to have people summoned to the *conventus* over relatively petty amounts of money owed. For instance, SB V 8001 (c.120) is dispute is over 66 drachmas. The expenses incurred in pursuing the usual procedures may well have been greater than the sum

owed in the debt. A direct appeal to the prefect might well have been an overtly pragmatic approach to enforcing the contract because, if it was successful, it might have saved much time and expense.

20–5 [c.6] | [ο]ὐδὲν ἀπλῶς [c.6 | π]ρὸς ἐμὲ οφε[c.6 | . .] .ιαγραφοῦ[c.6] | ἐγγραφ . . α . . [c.6] | κεφάλαια κα . [c.6] . I have failed to find close parallels for the expression beyond the very common construction ἔχειν πρὸς τινα, as illustrated above by P.Mil. Vogl. III 129.10–12, πρᾶγμα τοῦ καθόλου πρ[ὸς] ἐμὲ μὴ ἔχων. 20–2 are likely to have run e.g. [οὐκ ἔχει] or [ἔχει δὲ | ο]ὐδὲν ἀπλῶς [πρᾶγμα | π]ρὸς ἐμὲ. Then it is fairly likely that some cognate of ὀφείλειν follows but the syntactical structure is not easy to see.

21–2 [ο]ὐδὲν ἀπλῶς [c.6 | π]ρὸς ἐμὲ. It ought to be borne in mind that Teos' counter petition to refute Dionysius' allegations against him might have been genuine, or it might simply have been chicanerie to evade Dionysius' attempts to have him forced to repay the money which he allegedly owes. The actual enforcement of repayment of a debt was a long and complicated process. Teos might have frustrated it by any number of attempts to adjourn the proceedings, failure to appear at the proceedings, or outright disregard the judgements issued against him done with the intention to draw it out so long as make Dionysius despair of ever recovering his money and eventually give up trying. On the many problems of bringing successful litigation, see B. Kelly, *Petitions, Litigation and Social Control in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2011) 94–111.

24 ἐγγραφ . . α . . [. The traces would be compatible either with ἐγγραφοῦ α . . [or ἐγγαφᾶς α . . [. The articulation ἐγγαφᾶς α . . ['registrations' would be possible, but the word in the plural is without parallel, and it would be unclear what would be meant here. The only other attestation of ἐγγραφή occurs in LXXV 5062 14–15 (later third cent.), where it seems to be an essential step in the procedure to recover a debt by means of a διατολικόν: see 14–15 n. for discussion of the significant difficulties of interpretation of the meaning of the word there.

26 μεταδο.[. μεταδοῦ[ναι might be restored here. This would relate to the communication of the διατολικόν.

Appendix

III 579 descr.

4.8 x 10.7 cm 13 December 131–20 October 137

This papyrus appears to be the top of a petition, chiefly because it is addressed to the *strategus* and *basilicus grammateus* of the Oxyrhynchite nome. Only the address and petitioners' names and their profession survive. One of them is the same man who appears in 14, where he addresses a petition to the *strategus*. His profession is here again that of the ἱεροτέκτων. On this see 14 4–5 n.

The writing runs with the fibres; nothing is reported on whether the back has anything written on it, so that one must assume that it is blank.

Χ

(m.2) σεση(μείωμαι)

(m.1) Ἀπολιναρίῳ στρα(τηγῶ) καὶ Ἰέρακι βασιλ(ικῶ) γρα(μματεῖ)

καὶ οἷς ἄλλοις καθήκει (vac.)

5 παρὰ Τεῶτος καὶ Θώνιος ἀμφοτ(έρων) Ἀρθώνιος

τοῦ Θέωνος μητ(ρὸς) Τεπεῖτος τῆς Τεῶτος τῶν

ἀπ' Ὀξυρρύγγ(ων) πόλ(εως) ἱεροτεκτόνων Ἀθηναῖς Θεή[-

[ριδος]

.

2 σεση^η

3 στρα^η

βασι^λ γρα^η

5 αμφο^τ

6 μη^τ

7 οξυρυγγ πολ

(2nd hand) ‘I have signed.’

(1st hand) ‘To Apolinarius, *strategus*, and Hierax, *basilicus grammateus* and the others whom it concerns from Teos and Thonis, both sons of Harthonis, son of Theon, mother Tepeis, daughter of Teos, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi temple-craftsmen of the temple of Athena Thoeris’.

1 The symbol is a large cross that is somewhat flattened. I can find no other example of a similar symbol.

2 $\epsilon\epsilon\eta(\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\mu\alpha\iota)$. Presumably it will have been a member of the *strategus*’ office who wrote $\epsilon\epsilon\eta(\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\mu\alpha\iota)$, on the instructions of the *strategus*.

3 Ἱέρακι. Hierax is attested in office first in 127/8 (XII 1452 2) and last on 22 December 131 (XLIX 3470 3 and 3471 3). The first attestation of the next *basilicus grammateus*, Ptolemaeus, is PSI XII 1262.ii.9 and iii.11 on 20 October 137.

7–[8] Ἀθηναῖς Θεοή[[ριδος]. On the worship of Athena Thoeris, see J. Whitehorne, ‘The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus’ *ANRW* II 18.5 (Berlin–New York 1995) 3050–91, at 3080–82.

15. ORDER TO SUPPLY SEED

5 1B.53/E(f)

10.9 x 7.7 cm

Second/third century

This may be a copy of an order to supply seed. It gives an instruction for fifty-four artabas of seed to be dispensed to an Oxyrhynchite, who is a farmer of public land around a well-attested village.

There can be little doubt that, in the Oxyrhynchite nome at any rate,¹⁷ the person who had the authority to issue the instruction will have been the *strategus* of the nome. He, apparently acting jointly with someone else (see 6 n.), will have ordered the *sitologi* to dispense the seed to the applicant. On the dispensation of loans of seed, see especially the introduction to LVII 3902–09 with the literature cited there.

Usually these disbursements were loans made by the state in the sense that the seed was to be repaid, but 15 carries no such requirement. Furthermore, it lacks an address and greeting, and breaks off before the subscription. Besides these oddities, 15 also exhibits several differences in content and wording from those which orders of this kind usually contain: see the introduction to LVII 3907–09 where the essential information is summarised and a list of orders to supply is given. To that list, the following papyri are to be added: BGU XVI 2560–76 (8/7–3/2 BC), SB XX 14286 (88) and 14287 (88–9), P.Bodl. I 19 (198?). 15 differs from all the others in that: (i) it uses an unusual verb to express ‘dispense’; (ii) it makes no mention of the quality of the seed; (iii) it lacks a sowing clause, any mention of supervision of the farmer’s activities or any prohibition on deductions in the seed being made for private purposes; (iv) it lacks a repayment clause; and (v) the receipt

¹⁷ In the Heracleopolite texts from Berlin, BGU XVI 2560–76 (8/7–3/2 BC), which are mentioned in the next para., it is a *τοπάρχης καὶ καταπορεύς* who issues the instructions. Toparchs occasionally appear in Oxyrhynchite *διατολικά* e.g. LXVII 4588 1–2 (33), but there is no evidence that they had the authority to issue disbursements of this kind there. The *καταπορεύς* occurs in Oxyrhynchite documents only at SB XX 14287.3–6 (88–9), where he is only a party to the transaction, *συνεπι[τελλόντων Γαίου] | βασιλικού γραμ[ματέως] | καὶ τῶν τοῦ νο[μοῦ κατα][πορέων* and at P.Wisc. II 61.5 (303), which is not relevant to the discussion.

clause makes reference to ἀποχαῖ ἐσφραγιζόμεναι, which are unexampled in the papyri (7–8 n.).

The lack of an addressee might suggest that this is a copy of the order which was perhaps retained in the *strategus*' office or a memorandum of some kind employed in the internal administrative system. But its purpose is unclear.

If the usual ratio of one artaba of seed per aroura of land obtains here, Chariton will have held the lease on an unusually large amount of land (see 4–5 n.). **15** offers further information on the agricultural conditions in the areas surrounding one of the best attested villages of the nome, Palosis; see 4 n.

No reliable evidence concerning its date emerges from the papyrus' content. Orders to supply of this kind date from 78 BC or 49 BC (SB V 8755/6) till 170 AD (P.Stras. 238). The first Oxyrhynchite order is from 88 (P.Köln III 137). Nor does **15** share any apparently strong affinity with any of the securely dated examples, but these dates are not reliable for the functioning of this system. One piece of positive evidence for the date might lie in the plural, ἔχθαμεν (see 6 n.), used by those issuing the order. As the introduction to LVII 3902–06 states, 'the *strategus* was no doubt the official to whom such applications were normally addressed in the early Roman period ... [f]rom the late second century the picture is much more complicated.' If the *strategus* is acting jointly, this might be evidence that **15** dates from later in the second century or third century.

The writing runs with the fibres; a *kollesis* runs down the papyrus about one third from the left-hand side on the front. The back is blank.

παράδος Χαρίτωνι Ἀπολλωνί-
 ου μητρὸς Τεθεῦτος ἀπ' Ὁξ(υρύγχων) πόλ(εως)
 ἄς ἡτή(κατο) εἰς λόγ(ον) σπερμ(άτων) βασιλ(ικῆς) περὶ
 Παλῶσιν ἀρτάβας πεντήκον-
 5 τα τέσσαρας ὧν τὰς αἰτή-

σεις ἔχθαμεν. λάμβ(ανε) παρ' αὐ-
 τοῦ τὰς ἀποχὰς ἐσφραγιμέ-
 ν]α[ε

2 μη^τ ὄξπο^λ 3 ητ^η λο^γ σπερμς βασι^λ 6 λαμβς

‘Supply to Chariton, son of Apollonius, mother Tetheus, from the city of the Oxyrhynchi for seed for public land around Palosis the fifty-four artabas which he requested, for which we have received the applications. Take from him the sealed receipts ...’

1 παράδος. Without exception, the orders to supply hitherto published use μετρεῖν to express ‘dispense’. It is not obvious why this should differ here.

1–2 Χαρίτωνι Ἀπολλωνίου. The name Chariton occurs rarely in the Oxyrhynchite nome: it occurs at IV **826** 1 = CPGr II 1 (2/3), XII **1446** 83 (c.161–210) and XIV **1728** 5 (third cent.). It is characteristic of the metropolitan elites to have Greek names.

2 Τεθεῦτος. This is an exclusively Oxyrhynchite name, attested only in the second and beginning of the third century. It does not appear in the *Demotisches Namenbuch*. A Tetheus from Pela appears in an application for seed-corn, LVII **3905** 11 (99), but she is not identical with the one of **15**. Whereas men from the metropolitan elites commonly had Greek names, women of the same social status commonly had Egyptian names. On this, see e.g. J. Bingen, ‘Notables hermopolitains et onomastique féminine’ *CE* 66 (1991) 324–9.

3 ἄς ἡτή(κατο) εἰς λόγ(ον) σπερμ(άτων). The formula in applications for seed usually runs αἰτοῦμαι ἐπιταλῆναι εἰς σπέρματα δανεία; on this see LVII **3902–3906** introd., section B: the request clause. εἰς λόγ(ον) σπερμ(άτων) occurs

infrequently and only in contexts of loans of seed: P.Hamb. I 66.2–3 (164–96), P.Stras. I 171.4–5 (first cent.), P.Stras. V 460.7 (231), SPP XX 22.11 (216), SPP XX 151.30 (sixth cent.?)

βασιλική. On the category of ‘royal’ land, see J. Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 1996) 38–40, and on its tenure for cultivation, 93–101.

4 Παλωσιν. This village, in the Thmoisepho toparchy, is one of the best attested in the Oxyrhynchite nome: see the copious information collected on it by Benaissa, *RSON*^{2.0} s.v. Palosis. The *sitologia* of Palosis seems to have served not only Palosis but a number of other villages in the the Thmoisepho toparchy, as PSI XII 1262 demonstrates. The *puros sunagorastikos* of Phoan and probably Netro are both processed through the *sitologia* of Palosis. Clearly it was a place of economic and administrative importance.

4–5 ἀρτάβας πενήκοντα τέσσαρας. If the usual rate of one artaba per aroura obtains here (and it is odd that the amount of land to be sown with the seed is not mentioned), Chariton’s plot will have been substantial. If the information on landholding in Palosis from the tax schedule preserved in VII 1044 (234–5?) bears any similarity to the implications of the amount of seed dispensed here, Chariton would be by far the most significant tenant of public land in terms of the amount held in lease around the village. Table 7, assembled by Rowlandson, *op. cit.* 307–10, conveniently enumerates the various amounts of land on which tax is due. Much of it is thought to be γῆ βασιλική. The amounts range from 5/12 of an aroura to 13 21/31 arouras. Furthermore, in comparison with holding of public land throughout the whole nome, Chariton would have leased an impressively large amount of land at any period. From Rowlandson’s Table 5, *op. cit.* 294–304, Chariton would appear to be leasing the largest amount of public land recorded in the Roman period. P.Matr. 1, a report of a *comogrammateus* of Tholthis on the lands under cultivation for the year

119/20, records 210 arouras, but they seem to be the total sum of public land under cultivation of the whole village, not the plot leased by an individual.

5–6 τὰς αἰτή|σεις. These are the applications for the seed which the landowners made. The requests for the loans were usually cast in the form αἰτοῦμαι ἐπιαταλῆναι εἰς σπέρματα δανεία, hence they are called αἰτήσεις here. But the designation for the requests is uncommon: it occurs at BGU VIII 1861.3 (64–44 BC), XVIII 12747.4 (87/86 BC) and VII **1024.20** (129).

6 ἔρχαμεν. Normally, in the Oxyrhynchite nome these applications were addressed to the *strategus*: see the introduction to LVII **3902–06** section A where the matter of addressees is treated in full. Here it is probably to be inferred from the plural verb that the *strategus* is acting jointly with another person. This might be e.g. the *basilicus grammateus*, as in P.Hamb. I 19, or a commission of people as in XLIX **3474** 3–5, αἶρε[θ(εῖσι) ἐπὶ κατασποράς] καὶ ἀν[α]|δόσεως σπερ[μ(άτων)] χ[ωρο]ύντ(ων) εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐνε[σ]τ(ῶτος) σ(ἔτους) κατασ(ποράν).

λάμβ(ανε). This is another peculiarity which the papyrus exhibits. The present active imperative of λαμβάνειν is uncommon: the aorist is far more widespread.

7–8 τὰς ἀποχὰς ἐσφραγισμέ[ν]α[ς]. This is a curious expression. Receipt clauses usually run παρ' ὧν λάβετε τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀποχὴν διςσὴν ὧν τὴν ἑτέραν ἔμοι ἀναδώσετε, although some variation in the wording occurs, e.g. CPR XXIII 10 has παρ' οὗ λαβόντες τὰς συνήθειαι ἀποχὰς ὧν διςσὰς εἶς με γεγону[ίας] ἀνάδοτέ μοι, and P.Bodl. I 19 similarly. At times, instead of ἀποχή, χειρογραφία is used. On the difference between the terms, see the introduction to LVII **3907–09** section E. The validity of the receipts will not have been affected by being sealed, but it will have guaranteed their authenticity. On this see F. Preisigke, *Griewesen im griechischen Ägypten* (Straßburg im Elsaß 1910) 226–7.

16. RECEIPT FOR DYKE, POLL AND PIG TAXES

106/28(a)

6.5 x 8.8 cm

3 August 231

This is a cumulative receipt for a number of capitation taxes. The papyrus' chief point of interest is that it is the fourth Oxyrhynchite poll tax receipt to appear which post-dates the *constitutio Antoniniana* of 212. The others are XLIV 3172 (219), SB XXIV 15968 (223), and XLIII 3107 (238). It attests, for the Oxyrhynchite nome, that the tax continued to be collected after Caracalla's grant of Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire and, furthermore, that Roman citizens were liable to pay capitation taxes as well as the poll tax, from which they ought to have been exempt by the fact of their Roman citizenship (see 11 n.). It is also the second latest Oxyrhynchite papyrus, after XLIII 3107 (238), to attest the dyke, poll, and pig taxes.

The payments recorded are made jointly for a Roman citizen and a slave belonging to a woman. Their relationship is not stated. Receipts of this kind for payments of multiple taxes were quite usual, since capitation taxes were often paid all together, especially the three paid here.

The papyrus breaks off in the enumeration of the taxes paid. No sums survive. After the last tax had been listed a summary, in abbreviated form, will have been given which will have stated the sums paid, and the official issuing the receipt will have signed it. Probably not much of text has been lost.

The writing runs across the fibres, and line fillers are used. The back is blank.

ι (ἔτους) Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου

Κεουήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου

Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου

Μεσορη ἰ διέγρα(ψαν) Αὐρηλ(ίω)

5 Διοσκουρίδ(η) πράκ(τορι) ἀργ(υρικῶν)

μητροπ(όλεως) Παμμένους
 Παραδείκου Αὐρήλ(ιος) Διογέ-
 νης Ζοίλου καὶ Ἀμμ[ώ-
 νιος, δοῦλ(ος) Τααμόιτ[ος,
 10 χωμ(ατικοῦ) τοῦ διελθ(όντος) θ (ἔτους).[
 λαο]γρ(αφίας) ι (ἔτους), ο. . . δϛ. [.
 ύϊκ]ήϛ . . [.
]. [.

1 ι^ϛ 4 διεγρ^ϛ αυρη^λ 5 διοσκουρι^δ πρα^κ αρ^γ 6 μητρο] 7 αυρη^λ
 9 δου^λ 10 χω^μ διελ^θ θ^ϛ 11]γρ^ϛ ι^ϛ

‘In the tenth year of Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Imperator the Lord, Mesore 10 Aurelius Diogenes, son of Zoilus, and Ammonius, slave of Taamois, paid to Aurelius Dioscurides, collector of taxes of the metropolis for (the district of) Pammenes Paradisus, for dyke tax for the past ninth year ... for poll tax for the tenth year ... for pig tax ...’

5–6 πράκ(τορι) ἀργ(υρικῶν) | μητροπ(όλεως). For metropolitan tax collectors operating in ἄμφοδα, see also IV 733 2–3 (147), XII 1521 3 (113), XLIII 3107 5 (238), SB XXIV 15968.8–9 and 14–15 (221?) = SB I 5677.

6–7 Παμμένους Παραδείκου. On this well attested quarter, see S. Daris, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell’Egitto greco-romano*, iv (Milan 1935–83) s.v. Παμμένους Παράδεικος, and now also S. Daris, *Supplemento 3°* to the *Dizionario dei nomi* (Pisa 2003) 101 and 118. It was the most populous of the ἄμφοδα of the Oxyrhynchite nome with more than 400 inhabitants.

7 Αὐρήλ(ιος). Only Diogenes is a Roman citizen, so that only he will be an Aurelius.

9 δοῦλ(ος). Slaves were liable to pay capitation taxes at the same rate that their owners paid it. On this point, see PSI X 1146 (after 138, ‘estratto dai registri di censimento’), which cites exemptions for priests and their *κόνναοι* from the poll tax and other *ἐπιμερισμοί*. It reads, 11–12, οἱ δοῦλοι λαογραφοῦνται ὡς οἱ δεσπότηαι. Further on this point, see J.A. Straus, ‘Le statut fiscal des esclaves dans l’Égypte romaine’ *CE* 48 (1973) 364–9. Further evidence of the fiscal liabilities of slaves is provided by several columns of P.Thmouis. These deal with the purchase of slaves by people who enjoyed higher privileges in taxation than the vendors, e.g. purchases by Alexandrian citizens, who automatically enjoyed *ἀτέλεια*, which the previous owners did not. The slaves were accordingly exempted from poll tax just as their new owners were. See the remarks of S. Kambitsis on this in P.Thmouis I, introd. 23.

9 Τααμόιτ[ος]. A common women's name, attested on some 20 occasions, and nowhere certainly except at Oxyrhynchus or in Oxyrhynchite papyri.¹⁸ The great majority of attestations of the male version, Ἄμόις, likewise come from the Oxyrhynchite nome. Unlike the female version (the prefix Τα- means ‘daughter of’ in Egyptian), it is also attested in other nomes in Middle Egypt: e.g. Arsinoites, P.Mil. Vogl. IV 211.9 (second cent.); Heracleopolites, P.Hib. II 218.19 (late first/early second cent.); and Cynopolites, P.Pher. 71, 72 and 96 (196/7). Later, it is also found in the Hermopolite nome, P.Cair. Preis. 16 and 24 (356/57).

10 χῶμ(ατικοῦ). On the dyke tax see. S.L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton, 1938) 140–3 and LXXVIII 5172 3 n. In the Roman period, this tax was usually set at 6 dr. 4 ob. in all parts of Egypt, but some variation is still recorded. For instance, in P.Tebt. II 353 and 354 (192 and 186–8 respectively) and P.Ryl. II 194 (134–6), it was 7 dr. ½ ob. The situation in the

¹⁸ It is found on the ‘verso’ of PSI XII 1237, of which the ‘recto’ certainly concerns the Arsinoite nome, but the editors ad loc. observe that ‘[n]el verso, di diversi nomi sono infatti indicazione che, a giudicare dai nomi, parrebbero di provenienza in parte del Fajûm in parte dell’Oxyrhynchites’.

Oxyrhynchite nome is not well documented: it varies from 6 dr. 4 ob. to 7 dr. ½ ob. e.g. P.Köln III 138 (165).

11 [λαο]γρα(φία). On the poll tax, see Wallace, *op. cit.*, 116–34, A.K. Bowman and D. Rathbone ‘Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt’ *JHS* 82 (1992) 107–27, 112–4 and 120–21, and on the origins of capitation taxes in general, D.W. Rathbone ‘Egypt, Augustus and Roman taxation’ *Cahiers G. Glotz* 4 (1993) 86–99.

At Oxyrhynchus the poll tax for the privileged, the μητροπολίται δωδεκάδραχμοί, was set at 12 dr., which was regularly paid in two instalments of 8 dr. and 4 dr. Those who enjoyed no fiscal privileges probably paid 16 dr. See Wallace’s remarks, *op. cit.* 126–7.

Published Oxyrhynchite poll tax receipts are few, considering that from all nomes poll tax receipts are the commonest of all tax receipts, cf. Wallace, *op. cit.* 116. They are SB X 10243 (=II 308 descr.) (50), II 289 (65/83), P.Oxy. Hels. 12 (99); XII 1520 (102), XII 1521 (113), P.NYU II 41 (131/2), IV 733 (147), P.Köln III 138 (165), XLIV 3172 (219), SB XXIV 15968 (222–3), XLIII 3107 (238). They are fairly evenly spread out in date of their issue.

The full consequences for the poll tax arising from Caracalla’s grant of universal citizenship remain unclear. For Oxyrhynchus, three receipts for poll tax, XLIII 3107 (238), XLIV 3172 (219), and SB XXIV 15968 (222–3), and the mention of it in a petition to a phylarch, XLIII 3114 15 (267) put beyond doubt that it continued to exist after 212. After 212, a sharp decline in the number of receipts issued from all nomes may be observed, but the decline does not seem to occur at the same rate in all nomes. H.I. Bell, ‘The Constitutio Antoniniana and the Egyptian Poll Tax’ *JRS* 37 (1947) 17–23, held that, rather than its being abolished, the poll tax fell into disuse because it simply became an inefficient means of raising revenue. Wallace, *op. cit.* 134, similarly maintains that the *constitutio Antoniniana* did not do

away with distinctions in the classes of ratepayers nor did it at once free Egyptians from poll tax.

One factor which must have contributed significantly to the decline of the poll tax was the cessation of the fourteen-yearly census in the mid-third century, cf. R.S. Bagnall–B.W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1994) 9–11. Naturally, effective collection of capitation as well as other taxes must have been heavily dependent on accurate lists being maintained of those liable to taxation. When the census ceased to be taken sometime after 257/8, the effect must surely have been the almost complete cessation of collection of the tax, if it had not already largely ceased to be collected before then.

12 ὄκ]ηç . .[One might try reading e.g. ἀρ[γυρίου δραχμὰς *n*, which probably will have been abbreviated. On the pig tax, see Wallace, *op. cit.* 143–5, LXXV **5053** introd. and LXXVIII **5167** introd. At Oxyrhynchus, some variation in the rates paid is recorded: SB XX 14665.4 shows that 2 dr. 1 ½ ob. was paid in 30 but SB X 10242.6–7 demonstrates that the rate drops 1 dr. 4 ½ ob in 47. This latter rate seems generally to have prevailed throughout Egypt from then onwards and is probably to be supposed here. Yet even after the regularisation of this rate, small variations do still appear: e.g. 1 dr. 5 ½ ob in IV **733** 4 and SB XXIV 15968.11

17. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REPAYMENT OF MONEY AND GOODS

18 2B.73/E(d)

12.1 x 34.5 cm

263

A woman from Memphis, acting with a guardian who has been appointed to her, acknowledges that she has received monies and goods as capital with interest owed to her by a freedman from a village in the Oxyrhynchite nome and the son of a former *agonothetes* of Oxyrhynchus.

The purpose of the loan is not explained, nor is it clear what exactly was lent other than that it was money and some unspecified goods, which will presumably have been agricultural products. Furthermore, the relationship between the debtors themselves as well as with the creditor remains obscure, though this is often the case, because the parties involved will naturally have known what the situation was. The vagueness of the clause 'I have received whatever you owe me' in 8 might lead one to suspect that the woman was practising usury or had some reason to conceal the details of the loan.

Acknowledgements of this kind are numerous. E.g. XIV 1715 (292) and XXXI 2587 (289) are almost identical in form with 17. They differ only in content, because they are partial repayments of loans. E.g. P.Harr. II 236 (329), PSI VII 775 (third cent.) and P.Yale I 65 (138?) are repayments in full.

The chief interest of the papyrus lies in two points. First, the woman to whom the money is owed is from Memphis, but she is transacting her business in Oxyrhynchus. Second, the *Nichtangriffsklausel* is elaborate. Furthermore, 17 presents some novelties of expression and some points of prosopographical interest.

The writing runs with the fibres. The back is blank. The papyrus was cut from a large sheet. Its layout is careful and rather sumptuous: its left-hand margin is 1.7 cm; upper margin is 1.5 cm. At the bottom, some 11 cm of the papyrus is left blank. The left-hand side of the column is intact, only being rubbed slightly in one

place, but the right-hand side has suffered more extensive damage. In the upper half of the column, only a few letters are missing at the extremity, but in the lower half, much greater damage has been sustained.

- (m.1) Αὐρηλία Ἀσκλη[π]ιάς Ἀρητίωνος μητρ[ὸς] Ἀμμων[ίας]
 ἀπὸ Μέμφεω[ς] μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ δεδομέ[νο]υ μοι κατὰ [τὰ Ῥω-
 μαίων ἔθῃ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Σαραπίωνος [Ἀὐρ]ηλίοις [. . .] .[c.4
 ἀπελευθ[έ]ρω Ὠ[ρ]εΐωνος Ὠρεΐωνος τοῦ Ἀμόιτος ἀπὸ κόμ[η]ς
 5 Ἀθύχ[ε]ως [ωρ] τοῦ Ὀ]ξυρυγχείτου καὶ Ἰσιδώρῳ υἱῷ Πόσει ἀγ[ωνο-
 θετ[ή]σαντος τῆς Ὀξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως μητρὸς . . [c.6
 . . . ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως χαίρειν. Ὁμολογῶ ἀ[περχη-
 κέν]αι παρ' ὑμῶν ὅσα ὀφείλετέ μοι ὁμόσε καὶ . . . [c.6 τὰ
 ἀρχ[υ]ρικά τε καὶ [γ]ενικά κεφάλαια καὶ τούτων τόκου[ς] καὶ τὰ
 10 διάφορα ἀκολουθῶς χειρογράφοις ὑμῶν, πάντα δὲ π[λή]-
 ρη καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν ἐγκαλῖν μὴ ἐγκαλέειν μηδ'
 ἐπελεύεσθαι μήτε περὶ τούτων μηδὲ περὶ ἄλλ[ου]
 μηδενὸς ἀπλῶς ἐγγράφου ἢ ἀγράφου πράγμα[τος]
 ἢ ὀφλήματος τὸ σύνολον παρευρέσει μηδεμιᾶ [κατὰ
 15 μηδένα τρόπον, ἄκυρα δὲ εἶναι τὰ δη[λο]ύμενα
 χειρόγραφα ὧν τὰ παρ' ἐμοὶ ὄντα ἀνέ[δ]ωκα ὑμῖν
 εἰς ἀκοίρωσιν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ παραπεπτοκῆναι [καὶ
 ὁμοίως ἄκυρα εἶναι ἐμοί τε καὶ παν[τὶ τῷ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ
 ἐπιφέροντι διὰ τὸ μηδένα λόγον μ[c.12
 20 τινὰ ἔχειν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς κατὰ μηδεμίαν παρεύρεσιν.
 κυρία ἢ ἀποχὴ διςσὴ γραφεῖσα ἦνπερ [ὀπηνίκα
 ἐὰν αἰρήσθε [δ]ημοσιώσετε διὰ τοῦ κα[τα]λογείου
 οὐ προσδεόμε[ν]οι μεταλήμψεός μο[υ] διὰ τὸ ἐν-
 τεῦθεν εὐδοκίην με τῇ ἐσομένῃ ὑφ' ὑμῶν δη-

25 μοσιώσει, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ταῦτα ὀρθῶς καλω[ς γενέσθαι
 ἐπερωτηθε[ί]σα ὑφ' ὑμῶν με[τὰ κυρίῳ] μοι δοθέντος
 ὁμολόγησα. (ἔτους) ια // Αὐτ[ο]κράτορ[ος Καίσαρος
 Πουπλίου Λικιννίου Γαλλη[νο]ῦ Γερ[μανικοῦ
 Μεγίστου Εὐσεβοῦ]ς Εὐτυχ[οῦς] Σεβ[αστοῦ] (month, day).

(m.2) Αὐρηλία Ἀσκληπιάς Ἀρητί[ωνος
 ἄπεσχον πάντα τὰ ὀφειλ[όμενά
 μοι πλήρη καὶ οὐδὲν ἐγκ[αλω] ὑμῖν καὶ
 εὐδοκῶ τῇ ἐσομέν[ῃ] δημοσιώσει, πάν-
 35 τα δὲ ὡς πρόκει[ται] καὶ ἐπερωτη-
 θεῖσα ὁμολ[ό]γη[σα]. Γάιος Ἰούλιος Σα-
 ραπίων ἐ[πιγέγραμμαι] αὐτῆς κύρι-
 ος δοθεὶς αὐτῇ καὶ ἔγρ[αψα] ὑπὲρ αὐ-
 τ[ῆς] γράμμ[ατα] μὴ εἰδυῖς.

3 γαῖου Ἰουλιου	4 l. Ὠρίωνος (bis)	5 l. Ὀξυρυγίτου	ἰσιδωρω	ὑιω	6 l.
Ἰοξυρυγιτών	8 ὑμογ	10 ὑμων	11 l. ἐγκαλεῖν μη<δὲ> ἐγκαλέσειν		13 l.
ἐγγράφου	14 l. ὀφ<ει>λήματος	16 ὑμ[ι]ν	17 l. ἀκύρωσιν	20 ὑμας	24 l.
εὐδοκεῖν	ὑφ	26 ὑφ	27 L	32 ἐγκαλω	

(1st hand) ‘Aurelia Asclepias, daughter of Aretion, mother Ammonia, from Memphis with the guardian assigned to me according to the customs of the Romans, Gaius Julius Sarapion, to the Aurelii N.N., freedman of Horion, son of Horion, grandson of Amois, from the village of Athychis of the Oxyrhynchite nome and Isidorus, son of Poseis, ex-agonothetes of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, mother N.N., from the same city greetings. I acknowledge that I have received from you whatever you owe me together with ... the capital in money as well as in goods and interest on them and

extras according to your deeds, and that all is in full and that I make no claim against you nor will I make a claim against you nor will I take proceedings against you concerning these things nor about any other matter or debt whatsoever written or unwritten by any pretext in any way, and that the aforementioned deeds are null and void. Those of which I have kept custody I have made over to you to invalidate and the rest have been mislaid and are alike null and void to me and all bearing them in my behalf because I have no claim ... to proceed against you under any pretext. The receipt, of which two copies were made, is valid. Whenever you choose, you are to publish it through the record office without requiring my concurrence because I hereby agree to its publication by you. Having been asked the formal question by you whether this was done rightly and fairly I, with the guardian assigned to me, gave my consent. Eleventh year of Imperator Caesar Publius Licinnius Gallienus Germanicus Maximus Pius Felix Augustus (month, day).’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Aurelia Asclepias, daughter of Aretion, have received from you all that is owed to me in full and I make no claim against you. I agree to publication by you. All is as it is stated above, and having been asked the formal question I gave my consent. I, Gaius Julius Sarapion, have been registered guardian of her, having been assigned to her, and wrote this for her since she is illiterate.’

1 Αὐρηλία Ἀσκλη[π]ιάς Ἀρητίωνος. A certain Aurelius Aretion appears in P.Lond. II 214.1 (272–5) = W. *Chr.* 177 (from Memphis), where he is a steward of the estate of a municipal official. It runs, 1–5, Αὐρήλιος Ἀρητίων [ἀπὸ τῆς] | Μεμφ[ι]τῶν π[ό]λε[ω]ς . . .] | πρὸν[ο]ητῆς οὐσίας (πρότερον) Ἀνουβᾶ | γενομένου ὑπομνηματογράφου), νυνὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερωτάτου ταμείου. The name Aretion occurs fairly commonly in the Fayum, where it is attested in more than thirty instances, and occasionally in Oxyrhynchus e.g. XL 2937 5 (270–5), LV 3786 51 (third cent.) and LVIII 3927 40 (after 246) (these last two attestations are of the same man), LXXV 5054 5 (second cent.).

The name and the origin of the man in *17* and the London papyrus would appear to match perfectly, and the Aurelius Aretion of *17* may very well be identical with the man in the London papyrus.

2 ἀπὸ Μέμφεω[ς]. Nothing in the document indicates Asclepia's connection with Oxyrhynchus, nor can any inference be drawn from it why she was doing business there. It seems highly likely that she was not married to an Oxyrhynchite and probable that she had no close male relatives in Oxyrhynchus, at least at the time when the loan was drawn up, because she needed an apparently unrelated man to act as her κύριος and accompany her when she carried out her business affairs there. Plainly she was of sufficiently independent means that she could lend money to two Oxyrhynchites and travel there to collect the money on redemption of the loan.

For a detailed investigation into travel between nomes for private reasons and public duties, see H. Braunert, *Die Binnenwanderung Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit* (Bonn 1964) 127–31.

2–3 μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ δεδομέ[νο]υ μοι κατὰ [τὰ Ῥω]μαίων ἔθνη. Just as under Greco-Egyptian Law, under Roman Law women usually needed a guardian to accompany them whenever they transacted business affairs: see Taubenschlag, *Law*² 170–8, and, more recently, A. Arjava, *Women and the Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 1996) 118–23. On most occasions when a woman conducted some piece of business, it will have been her father, brother or other relative who fulfilled the function of guardian if she were not married or were widowed, and her husband if she were married.

It may be the case that Aurelia travelled to Oxyrhynchus without her usual guardian, who presumably will have resided, like her, in Memphis, so that she needed to have a guardian appointed to conduct her business there. I 56 (203) would provide an example of such an appointment. It is a petition to appoint a guardian for a single transaction. The woman has borrowed six thousand drachmas on security of a vineyard. She needs to redeem the loan and therefore needs a guardian. It runs, 12–

17, αἰτοῦμαι διὰ σοῦ ... ἐπιγραφῆναί μου κύριον πρὸς μόνην ταύτην τὴν οἰκονομίαν. P.Mil. II 39 (second cent.) is also similar. The woman wishes to make a will and therefore needs to have a guardian appointed for this purpose. It runs, 3–5, βουλομένη περὶ τῶν ἐμῶν διαθήκην | θέε[θ]αι αἰτοῦμαι διὰ [σοῦ, πρὸ]ς μόνην[ν τ]αύ[την] | οἰκονομίαν, ἐπιγ[ραφη]κόμενο[ν κύ]ριόν [μου].

It is not entirely clear who the authority was who was competent to appoint a guardian for a woman. In II 273.4–6 (95), it is stated that the prefect appointed a guardian to a woman, ὁμολογεῖ Ἰουλί[α Ἡ]ρακ[λ]ᾶ μ[ε]τὰ κυρίου τοῦ δεδομένου | αὐτῆ κατὰ τὰ [Ρω]μαίων ἔ[θ]η ὑπὸ Γαίου Σε[πτ]ιμ[ί]ου Ο[ὐ]εγέ[τ]ου τοῦ [ἡ]γεμονεύσαντος. In I 56 (203) = M. Chr. 320, however, the petition is addressed to the ἐνάρχῳ ἐξηγητῆ because both the *strategus* and the *basilicus grammateus* are absent. It runs, 12–15, αἰτοῦμαι διὰ σοῦ ... τῷ τὸν διαδεχόμενον τὴν στρατηγίαν βασιλικὸν γραμματέα μὴ ἐνδημεῖν (*BL* VIII 231). These seem to be the only cases in which it is explicitly stated who appointed the woman's guardian. It is rather remarkable that it was as highly ranked an official as the prefect himself who appointed the guardian in II 273, and, moreover, it is still surprising that the *strategus* and *basilicus grammateus*, the highest ranking municipal officials, were concerned with such everyday matters as the appointments of guardians.

3 Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καπαπίωνος. Γάιος Ἰούλιος are not common names terribly common names in the third century.

3–6 [Αὐρ]ηλίου[ς] [. . .] [c.4] | ἀπελευθ[έ]ρω Ὠ[ρ]εῖωνος Ὠρεῖωνος τοῦ Ἀμόιτος ἀπὸ κόμ[η]ς | Ἀθύχ[ε]ως [ωρ] το[ῦ] Ὀξυρυγχείτου καὶ Ἰσιδώρω υἱῷ Πόσει ἀγ[ωνο]θητ[ή]σαντος τῆς Ὀξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως. These two seem to be an odd couple, for they are clearly from different social strata. Isidorus, as the son of a former *agonothetes*, will have been a member of the gymnasial elite; he will have enjoyed significant fiscal privileges, whereas the freedman, as a mere villager, will have enjoyed none of these privileges. One will, therefore, wonder on what kind of enterprise they appear to have jointly ventured. On the social stratification within the

metropoleis in the Roman period, see A.K. Bowman and D. Rathbone, ‘Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt’ *JHS* 82 (1992) 107–27, at 120–7.

3–5 [Αὐρ]ηλίσις [. . .] .[c.4] | ἀπελευθ[έ]ρω Ὀ[ρ]εῖωνος Ὀρειώνος τοῦ Ἀμοίτου ἀπὸ κώμ[ης] | Ἀθύχ[ε]ως. In XLIII 3109 (253–6), an undertaking on oath by villagers to supply oxen for Valerian’s campaigns in Syria, a representative of the village of Athychis is attested, 11–12, as Ἐρμία | ἀπελεύθερος Ὀρειώνος ἀπὸ Ἀθυχέως. Naturally it is tempting to try to restore Ἐρμία here, but it would not be compatible with the traces. But the Horion of XLIII 3109.12 might very well be the same man as the man in 17: it would be a fairly remarkable coincidence if two different Horions from the village of Athychis, who both had freed slaves, occurred in Oxyrhynchite papyri separated by at most ten years.

4 Ὀ[ρ]εῖωνος Ὀρειώνος τοῦ Ἀμοίτου. The name Ὀρειών occurs frequently throughout Egypt, but Ἀμοίσις is much more specifically tied to Oxyrhynchus, even though it does appear here and there in other locations. There seems to be no evidence to suggest that its origin in Oxyrhynchus lay in a local cult; see 169 n.

4–5 ἀπὸ κώμ[ης] | Ἀθύχ[ε]ως. The village, which was situated in the upper toparchy, is well attested in the papyri. Its latest attestation seems to have been in 311, PSI VII 819.17. For details, see Benaissa, *RSON*^{2.0} s.v. Ἀθυχίς.

5 Πόσει. The name does not in this case admit of declension; hence the genitive is an odd form.

5–6 ἀγ[ωνο]θητ[ή]σαντος τῆς Ὀξυρυχειτῶν πόλεως. The ἀγωνοθέτης is rather obscure. Festivals at which contests in many kinds of athletics, music and drama, and horse-racing were staged were entrenched in life in earlier Ptolemaic and later Roman Egypt right from the time of Alexander’s conquest. See e.g. Arr. *An.* 3.1.4 who relates that Alexander, once he had arrived in Egypt and had travelled through Heliopolis, came to Memphis, καὶ θύει ἐκεῖ τοῖς τε ἄλλοις θεοῖς καὶ τῷ Ἄπιδι καὶ ἀγῶνα ἐποίησε γυμνικόν τε καὶ μουσικόν· ἦκον δὲ αὐτῷ οἱ ἀμφὶ ταῦτα τεχνῖται ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος οἱ δοκιμώτατοι.

The contests which featured in the festivals are attested in the papyri with some frequency, but it is rather striking that a hiatus occurs in which non-judicial or non-metaphorical ἀγῶνες seem never to be attested either in the papyri or in the epigraphical sources from roughly between the middle of the second century BC and the late second century AD. The reasons which lie behind this are unknown. P. Frisch, *Zehn agonistische Papyri* (Pap. Col. XIII; Köln 1986) 12, connects the re-emergence of the festivals with Septimius Severus' introduction of town councils. This would imply that the lack of civic status of *metropoleis* in the Egyptian χώρα deterred or prevented such contests from being held till that status had been acquired.

The earliest attestation of ἀγῶνες dates from 267 BC. It occurs in a notable inscription perhaps from the Memphite, Heracleopolite or Arsinoite nome, SEG XXVII: 1114 = L. Koenen, *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste* (Meisenheim 1976). This also happens to provide the earliest testimony of the existence of the ἀγωνοθέτης. The inscription records the victors at the Basileia in contests in athletics as well as several categories of music broadly conceived and horse-racing. On this festival, see Koenen, *op. cit.*, 29–32. The inscription runs, 1–4, Βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι Σωτήρῳ Ἡράκλειτος Λεπτίνου Ἀλεξανδρεὺς | ἀγωνοθετήσας καὶ πρῶτος ἄθλα προθεῖς χαλκώματα, | ἔτους ὀκτωδεκάτου Δύστρου δωδεκάτη γενεθλίῳι | Βασίλεια τιθέντος Ἀμαδόκου, τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν νικῶντων. It then lists the various categories of contest and their winner. The latest attestation for these contests in the Ptolemaic era is from Alexandria, SEG XX 498 (163–145 BC). This inscription attests another former *agonothetes*: [ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου] | καὶ βασιλίσση[ς Κλεοπάτρας] | θεῶν φιλ[ομητόρων] | καὶ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν | Διοτέλης Μενε[τρᾶτου (?)]] τὰ βάθρα τοῦ γ[υμνασίου ἀνέθηκεν (?)] ἀγωνοθετή[σας Ἑρμεί Ἡρακλεῖ (?)].

The hiatus then begins. It seems to last till the late second century AD when the next attestation of games seems to be XXXI 2611 14 (192/3), a badly broken document apparently from Oxyrhynchus. It mentions someone who had competed

being crowned, ἀγωνικάμενος ἐτεφανώθη (13), and those who staged the games, παρὰ τῶν ἀγωνοθετῶν (14). It is unknown where the competition had taken place even though it is an Oxyrhynchite papyrus. The latest attestation in the Roman period seems to be from Oxyrhynchus, LX 4079/4080 11–12 (328), a duplicated document which mentions an *agonothetes* of the Capitoline games.

It is very curious that these formally staged contests in the three Greek *poleis*, i.e. Alexandria, Naucratis, and Ptolemais, cease to be mentioned after the mid-second century BC both in papyri, which are admittedly few in number from the Ptolemaic period, and, what seems still more curious, in epigraphical sources. It is as if all of a sudden they ceased to be held in the mid-second century BC. It may all be simply a matter of chance that no papyri have been recovered referring to games which date from earlier than the end of the second century. It is, however, difficult to accept that the institution of the Ephebate, which was introduced in the Ptolemaic era, did not regularly stage contests throughout Egypt right from its earliest period of activity, because these contests were an integral part of the Greek παιδεία. As far as Oxyrhynchus is concerned, the first mention of Ephebic games occurs in IV 705 49 (202). The papyrus is a petition made by an Alexandrian for 10,000 Attic drachmas as an endowment to augment an already existent endowment to fund prizes for games. The capital is to be loaned out and the interest accrued to be used to fund the prizes. The petition does not mention when the original foundation was made, but if such a large sum of money is required, it might indicate that the games had recently taken on a new significance in cultural life.

Holders of the office of the ἀγωνοθέτης are attested six times in epigraphical sources, viz. SEG XXVII 1114.2 (267 BC, unknown provenance); SEG XX 498.7 (163–145 BC, Alexandria); SB IV 7286.3 (Ptolemaic, Ptolemais Hermiou); *Portes* 10.3 (second cent., unknown provenance); OGIS 713.5 (third cent., Alexandria?); *Portes* 15.5 (third cent., Antinoopolis). One may presume that the holders of this office in the Ptolemaic period belong to the very highest stratum of

society. In this period, the ἀγωνοθέτης seems to have held an independent office, since he is spoken of only in this capacity: SB IV 7286, ἔδοξεν τῆι β[ο]υλῆι καὶ τῶι [δῆ]μοι, Ποσειδώνιος Διοσκ[ου][ρ]ίδου ἀγωνοθέτης εἶπε[ν]; SEG XX 498 cited above; and SEG XXVII 1114, cited above.

By contrast, in the Roman period, the epigraphic evidence might suggest that the office was subsumed within the office of the gymnasiarch in the three original Greek *poleis*, to which Antinoopolis was added in the reign of Hadrian. It is only in *Portes* 10.2–3 where the ἀγωνοθέτης is not also called γυμνασίαρχος. Much more usual is the cumulation of titles, e.g. *Portes* 15.4–8, Μ(ἄρκος) Α(ὐρήλιος) Καραπίων ὁ καὶ Ἱερακαπόλλων, | ἀγωνοθέτης, γυμνασίαρχος, ἔναρχος | [π]ρύτανις, βουλευτής, τὸν τῆς πατρί[δος τ]ῆς λαμπρᾶς Ἀγτινοουπόλεως | εὐεργέτην. But this contention can be made on only limited evidence and cannot be pressed.

The official is attested more frequently in the papyri. With two clear exceptions, viz. P.Genova III 107, from the Arsinoites, and P.Ryl. II 117.18–19, from Hermopolis Magna, the papyri all come from Oxyrhynchus. Only one papyrus is from the Ptolemaic period: P.Genova III 107.7 (236 BC?). References in the papyri of the Roman period to the office are: XXXI 2611 14 (192/3); XVII 2105 6 (231–6/8); X 1284 9 (250); P.Oxy. Hels. 25.9 (= Pap. Agon. 4) (264); P.Ryl. II 117.18 (269); SB XVI 13034.9 (= Pap. Agon. 1) (273/4); XXVII 2476.12 (= Pap. Agon. 3) (288/9); XII 1416 5 (298); XVII 2144 27–8 (III); XXXIV 2711 2 (268–71); SB VI 9421.4 (III); XXXI 2610 8 (= Pap. Agon. 5) (late III); LX 4079 11–12 and 4080 11–12 (duplicate) (328).

It is apparent from the papyri that the holders of the office in the Roman period are from the highest stratum of Oxyrhynchite society. Only one of them would become gymnasiarch, Aurelius Horion, son of Anicetus, XXXIV 2711 2. But several are of the buleutic class and hold other municipal offices e.g. Tiberius Claudius, son of Diogenes, who had been *cosmetes*, X 1284 8–9. In contrast to the

epigraphic evidence concerning the *poleis*, it seems that the office of *agonothetes* did not become subsumed within that of the gymnasiarch in Oxyrhynchus.

Nothing is known of the specific competences of the *agonothetes* either in the Ptolemaic or Roman periods, nor is it even clear where the office ranks in the municipal hierarchy. It will have been a liturgy, and almost certainly a costly one, if the games were to be splendid and numerous as e.g. the several musical contests staged in XXII 2338 (after 289) would seem to imply: it enumerates various poets, trumpeters and heralds. Nevertheless in spite of the considerable financial outlay that it would have entailed, it will doubtless have been a prestigious office to hold.

9 ἀργ[υ]ρικά τε καὶ [γ]ενικὰ κεφάλαια. The expression λόγος ἀργυρικὸς καὶ γενικὸς is fairly familiar in private documents, but it recurs less often in public documents, cf. L 3569 introd. ἀργυρικὸν κεφάλαιον is nearly ubiquitous in documents bearing on loans, but this seems to be the first occurrence of this particular collocation. γενικόν will mean ‘in kind’, i.e. agricultural goods as opposed to the capital in money.

9–10 τούτων τόκου[ς καὶ τὰ] | διάφορα. Both τόκος and διάφορα mean ‘interest accrued on a loan’. The difference between them is that τόκος is interest owed on money, whereas διάφορα is interest on the *Naturalien*. On these terms, see N. Lewis, ‘The meaning of *cὸν ἡμιολία* and kindred expressions in loan contracts’ *TAPhA* 76 (1945) 126–39 = *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1995) 17–30.

10 ff. This is an elaborate example of the *Nichtangriffsklausel*, which frequently occur in receipts. On the clause, see especially H.–A. Rupprecht, *Studien zur Quittung im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri* (München 1971) 94–103. As Rupprecht remarks, op. cit. 97, ‘die Ausdrücke in ptolemäischer Zeit nur selten gehäuft werden, in römischer Zeit dagegen sehr oft, Regeln lassen sich aber nicht aufstellen’.

19–20 διὰ τὸ μηδένα λόγον μ[c. 12] | τινὰ ἔχειν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς κατὰ μηδεμίαν παρεύρεσιν. It is not entirely clear what is to be supplemented in the lacuna. The expression μηδένα λόγον ἔχειν is very common in acknowledgements after 265, as Rupprecht notes, *op. cit.* 97. But it is difficult to restore the end of 19. One might think of supplementing e.g. διὰ τὸ μηδένα λόγον μ[ηδ' ἔτερά] | τινὰ ἔχειν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. This would give approximately the sense that one would expect here, but it is too short by at least five letters and is at best a stop-gap: it cannot be paralleled. The infinitival construction with με would, however, be paralleled from 23–5 [διὰ τὸ ἐν]τεῦθεν εὐδοκίῃ με τῇ ἐσομένῃ ὑφ' ὑ[μῶν δη]μοσιώσει.

21 κυρία ἢ ἀποχὴ διςτὴ γραφεῖσα. On the *Kyria-Klausel* see H.–J. Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen papyri Ägyptens* (München 1978) 155–62 who notes, 155, with approbation that ‘die herrschende Meinung glaubt der Kyria-Klausel entscheidende Bedeutung für den juristischen Charakter der mit ihr versehenen Urkunde beimessen zu sollen.’

21–5 ἢ ἀποχὴ διςτὴ γραφεῖσα ἥνπερ [όπηνίκα] | ἐὰν αἰρήσθε [δ]ημοσιώσετε διὰ τοῦ κα[ταλογείου] | οὐ προεδεόμε[ε]νοι μεταλήμψεός μο[υ διὰ τὸ ἐν]τεῦθεν εὐδοκίῃ με τῇ ἐσομένῃ ὑφ' ὑ[μῶν δη]μοσιώσει. δημοσιώσις is the publication of private documents, i.e. by the registration of the documents in the public archives. Once the documents have been registered, they acquire the authority and legal status of public documents. The terms of the contract may then be enforced by law. On the process of δημοσιώσις, see **14** 10–11 n.

17 is unusual in including the δημοσιώσις: it is a deed of redemption of a loan, which was apparently repaid in full to the satisfaction of all. Usually δημοσιώσις concerns loans which have not been repaid when they were due to be redeemed. The creditor takes action to enforce the terms of the contract by law: on this see LXX **4772** introd. Other contracts which it would make sense to publish in this manner would be deeds of sale so as to enforce the transaction e.g. IV **719** (193, sale of a house), or P.Mich. XI 615 = SB XXIV 16265 (259/260 sale of a vineyard).

P.Mich. XI 615 provides an illustrative example. The deed of sale for the vineyard has been made, but the purchaser has not paid. By publication of the sale agreement, the purchase could then be enforced.

In *17*, the money has been paid in full including interest, and the goods have been received. This makes the point of δημοσίωσις of the deed of redemption redundant because there is nothing else which might admit of legal enforcement. Perhaps one reason why the other party might want to publish the document might be so as to have an extra form of proof that the loan has been repaid in full, i.e. to acquire a quasi legal protection from false prosecution by Aurelia over alleged non-payment of the loan. But the very fact that they have this χειρόγραφον stating as much, which has complete legal validity, might not have seemed sufficient protection for them. Perhaps it is all just *Floskel*.

22 διὰ τοῦ κα[ταλογίου]. The *katalogeion* was the *archidicastes'* office situated at Alexandria. On it, see Wolff, op. cit. 28. The contract to be published was submitted to the *katalogeion* in order that, once it had been copied, the original would be registered in Hadrian's Library and the copy in the Naneum. On these two public institutions, see Wolff, op. cit. 47–8.

SECTION V: DOCUMENTARY TEXTS FROM THE BYZANTINE PERIOD

18. LEASE OF AN IRRIGATION MACHINE

105/44(e)

19.8 x 30.2 cm

8 December 538

A complex document which does not fit into any of the usual categories of leases, because it combines elements which have been held to be characteristic of several distinct kinds of document. It is the lease of μηχανή, an irrigation machine, with all the usual appurtenances. It is called the ‘Eastern machine’, and it is situated in the hamlet of Sceuomisthiou. The lessee is an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός, with his father, also an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός, acting as his guarantor. Leases of irrigation machines are, in effect, leases on the plot of artificially irrigated land on which the machine is situated. On this point, see LV 3803 (411) introd. Essentially however, the terms of this lease make it function as a sharecropping agreement. The share of the crop granted to the lessee is explicitly described as the wages for the work which he performed in cultivating the crop. Furthermore, the terms of the lease make provision for an advance of four gold solidi. This arrangement is known as προχρεία.

Oxyrhynchite land leases from this period are rare. The closest parallel to 18 is P.Berl. Zill. 7 (574). The other leases are enumerated by R. Mazza, ‘Gli affitti fondiari dell’Ossirinichite nell’età tardoantica’ in B. Palme (ed.), *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (Wien 2007) 439–46. To Mazza’s list LXVIII 4687 (441), perhaps LXXII 4914 (465), and LXXII 4915 (467?) must now be added.

Besides the rarity of Oxyrhynchite leases of land, the published examples have seemed to show many peculiarities in the provisions and formulae which they exhibit, and few similarities with leases from other parts of Egypt. As noted above, the lessee here and his father are ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί, ‘registered farmers’. This is very unusual: ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί are lessees of land elsewhere only in LXVII 4615 (505). The duration of lease is the agricultural cycle, i.e. one year, but the

landholder may demand the return of the advance of the money at any time and, therefore, in effect terminate the lease. The rent is unspecified, but it is according to the γεουχικὸν ἀπατήσιμον (17), the landholder's list of exactions. Wages for performing irrigation operations, μισθοῦ τῶν ὑδροπαροχικῶν ἔργων (22), will be paid to the farmers and an otherwise unspecified vine dresser. The wages will have been a (half?) share of the vine crop. The lessee also undertakes to perform various agricultural duties, pay all of the costs arising from the tenure of the land, and put an ox at the disposal of the public baths. Furthermore, he receives the advance of four gold solidi, which is free of interest and to be repaid whenever the landholder requires.

Leases of land of this kind, which are essentially sharecropping agreements with advances or *Teilpachtverträge*, are common from other parts of Egypt, but Oxyrhynchus seems not to have produced an instance of a similar document. On byzantine *Teilpachten*, see A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten* (Heidelberg 1990) 243–60, and T.M. Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus* (Michigan 2012) 74–9. In the *Teilpachtverträge* from elsewhere in Egypt, the advances tend to be in the form of *Naturalien* or animals, which will be used to exploit the land, rather than in the form of money. An illustrative example is P.Mich. XIII 666 (sixth cent., from Aphrodito). It is a lease of land and sharecropping agreement with a προχρεία, which is in the form of the use of oxen. The farmer has to repay a quantified sum for their use. SB VI 9589 (sixth/seventh cent., from the Arsinoites?) is another lease and sharecropping agreement with an advance made in seeds.

Leases from Oxyrhynchus on other forms of property which admit of exploitation make similar arrangements. XVI 1890 (508), for instance, is a lease for a mill and bakery in which twelve solidi are advanced to the lessees, again a προχρεία. The money is not, however to be repaid, but the lessees must perform

milling and baking for a certain period, and pay rent in money, loaves of bread, chickens and eggs. On this kind of contract, see Jördens, *op. cit.* 260–70.

A further point of interest exhibited by **18** is that the lessors do not belong to the Flavii Apiones, who were the largest and by far the best attested landholders in late antique Oxyrhynchus. The lessors might be connected with two brothers who are attested in several documents as landholders in Oxyrhynchus at a period somewhat earlier than the date of **18**; see 3–4 n.

The papyrus also seems to have an unusual prescript. It seems to deviate from the normal addresses in contracts of this kind in that it seems not only to specify the addressee but also perhaps to offer a something of a summary of the contract before its terms are made out in full: e.g. 6 reads τῆς] ὀ[λο]κλήρου μηχανῆς, and 7 κ[αὶ] προχρείας ἐμοῦ τοῦ [ς]προειρημέγου. Since it is so heavily fragmented, it is difficult to know what to make of it.

The left hand-side of the papyrus has been sheared off, and much of the top has been lost. The back is blank, but it may well have had a summary of the document inscribed along the now lost left-hand edge. Restoration of the lost text is made difficult by the marked irregularity of the hand. I have assumed that space for some twenty letters has fallen away from the left-hand side on the basis of the standard formulae which have been restored in 14, 15, 20, 24 and 27, but this may have varied widely. The papyrus was folded a number of times vertically as the fissures demonstrate.

- † ὑπατείας Φλαουίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐνδοξο]τάτου ἐπάρχ[ου τῶν ἱερῶν πραι]τωρίων Χοιακ ἰβ̄ /// ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) β //
- Φλαουί- N.N. c.15 τῷ μεγαλοπρ]επεστάτῳ [καὶ περιβλέπτῳ κόμ]ε[τ]ι τοῦ θεοῦ κονσιτωρίου καὶ
 N.N. c.30]ις . . [c.18]ικ c Καμουηλίου τοῦ τῆς
 μνήμης διὰ]υ Παύλου[c.15]καὶ ἐπιτρόπου αὐτῶν. Αὐρήλιος
 5 Ἰσακ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου] . ς μετ[c.30] . παραδόςει καὶ
 τῆς] ὄ[λο]κλήρου μηχανῆς καλ[ου-
 μένης Ἀπηλιωτικῆς] . . . [κ]αὶ προχρείας ἐμοῦ τοῦ [ς]προειρημένου
] ἀμφο[τεροι ὀρμώ]μενοι ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Cκεομιθίου
 διαφέροντος τῆ ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρ(επεία) τοῦ Ὁ]ξυρυγίτου [νομοῦ ἐναπό]γραφοὶ αὐτῆς γεωργοὶ
 10 χαίρειν. ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώ]σασθαι ἐπὶ [c.10] . μενος . . . ακ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος
 ἔτους ειε ρπδ τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας ἰ]νδικτίω[νος κατασπορᾶς δ]ὲ καὶ συλλογῆς καρπῶν τρίτης
 ἐπινεμήσεως ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρ]χόν[των τῆ] ὑμῶν [μεγα]λ[οπρεπ]εῖα δι[α]κειμένων ἐμ πεδίοις
 c.15 τοῦ] αὐτοῦ [κτήματο]ς ὀλόκλ[ηρο]ν μηχανῆ]ν καλ[ου]μένην Ἀπηλιωτικὴν
 ἐξηρτικὴν πάση ξυλικῆ] ἑξαρτία καὶ εἰδηρώμ[α]σιν, με[τ]ὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐπικειμένου ἐν αὐτῇ
 15 λάκκου καὶ ὑδρεύματο]ς καὶ κυκλευτηρίου καὶ μηχαν[ικ]ῶν ὀργάνων καὶ φυτῶν
 παντοίων καὶ παντὸς ἑτέρο]υ δικαίου ἐκ ταύτης καὶ τῶν συ[γγε]ωργουμένων καὶ ὑποστελλουσῶν

- ἀρουρῶν *n*] ἀκολουθῶς γεουχ[ι]κῶ ὑμῶν ἀπαιτησίμῳ ἐξ ὧν ἐν εὐεστάει
 c.20] .ν ἡμῖν εἰς ἐπορὰν ὧν ἐὰν [α]ἰρῶμαι γεννημάτων καὶ τελέσω
 c.20] . φόρου ἀποτάκτου ταύτης καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ τε
 20 νελοβρόχου καὶ ἀβρόχου ἀκο]λοῦθως τῷ αὐτῷ γεουχικῷ ὑμῶν ἀπαιτησίμῳ, τὰς δὲ ἀντλήσεις
 καὶ ὑδροπαροχίας ἀμέ]μπτως παρασχεῖν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἄμπελον διὰ τῶν προσόντων
 c.20 κα]ὶ μισθοῦ τῶν ὑδροπαροχικῶν ἔργων λαβεῖν με ἅμα τῷ ἀμπελουργῷ
 c.20 ἀ]μπέλου ἐκβησομένου οἰνικοῦ γενήματος, δώσιν δέ με τὰ
 ἕκτακτα πάντα καὶ τὰς κατ]ὰ καιρὸν γεουχικὰς ὑπηρεσίας καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἔθους ὀπτόπλινθον
 25 c.20]ας πάσας, ἀνενεγκ[εῖ]ν δέ με τὴν ἐμὴν βουὴν ταύτης τῆς πόλεως
 c.20] λουτροῦ. προσομολογῶ δὲ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ὁ τούτου ἐγγυητῆς ἐσχηκέναι παρὰ τῆς
 ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρ(επείας) ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη λ]όγῳ προχρείας χρυσοῦ νομισμάτ[ι]α τέσσαρα, ἀκίνδυνος ὁ φόρος ἀπὸ παντὸς
 κινδύνου, τῶν τῆς γῆς δη]μοσίων ὄντων πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρ(έπειαν) τὴν κεκτημένην
 καὶ ἐπάναγκες ἀποδώ]ειν τὸν φόρον ἐνιαυσίως ἐν τῷ δέοντι καιρῷ ἀνυπερθέτως ποιούμενον
 30 τὴν ἀναβολὴν τῶν ναυβίων, τὴ]ν δὲ νομὴν τῶν προειρημέγων πάντων πραγμάτων ἄτρωτον ἀβλαβῆ
 c.20] . μετὰ καὶ τῆς προχρείας τῶν τεσσάρων νομισμά[τ]ων ὁπότεν βουλευθ(εῖη) ὡς καὶ
 παρείληφα. κυρ(ία) ἢ μίσθ(ωσις) ἀπλῆ] γραφ(εῖς) καὶ ἐπειρ(ωτηθεῖς) ὁμολ(όγησα). Αὐρήλιος Ἰϛᾶκ υἱ[ὸ]ς Ἰωάννου ὁ

προγεγραμμένος πεπίημαι

c.20] μηχανῆς καὶ ἀποδώσω τὸν φόρον ταύτης ἐνιαυ[ί]ως, ἐςχηκῶς δὲ λόγῳ προχρείας

χρυσ(οῦ) νομ(ισμάτια) δ καὶ συμφωνεῖ μο]ι πάντα ὡς πρό(κειται). Αὐρήλιος Ἰωάννης υἱὸς Ἰσακ ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐγγυῶμαι τὸν
αὐτόν μου υἱὸν

35 Ἰσακ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα] ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μίσθωσει κινδύῳ ἐμῶ ὡς πρό(κειται). Αὐρ(ήλιος) Μηνᾶς υἱὸς Θεοδώρου
ἔγραψα ὑπ(έρ) αὐτῶν

γράμματα μὴ εἰδόντων.]

✠ di emu Filo]xepu etelioth X(οιακ) . (ἰνδικτίων) . . . ††

1 ἰνδ	8 ἰ. Σκευομισθίου	10 ἰσακ	12 ὑμων	1. ἐν	16 ὑποτελλουσων	17 ὑμων	20 ὑμων	22 ὑδροπαροχικων	23 ἰ. δώσειν
24 ὑπηρεσιας	26 ἐγ'γυητης	28 ὑμων	μεγαλοπρ	29 ἀνὑπερθετωσ	30 πραγ'ματων	31 βουληθς	32 γραφ	επειρ	ὠμολ
ἐπερ(ωτηθείς)	ἰσακ ὑι[ο]ς ἰωαννου	1. πεποίημαι	34 προ	ἰωαννης υἱος ἰσακ	ἐγ'γυομαι ἰ. ἐγγυῶμαι	ὑιον	35 προ	αυρς	υπ

‘In the consulship of Flavius Ioannes, *vir gloriosissimus*, prefect of the imperial praetoria, Choeac 12, indiction 2.’

‘To Flavius N.N. *magnificentissimus et spectabilis comes sacri consistorii* and N.N. ... of Samuelius of ... memory ... through ... Paul ... the guardian of them Aurelius Isac son of Ioannes (with ?) ... on production (of ?) and ... the entire plot of irrigated land called ‘Eastern’ ... and the advance of me the aforementioned (Isac?) ... both enrolled farmers of yourself originating from the hamlet of Sceuomisthiou belonging to your magnificence in the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. I undertake of my own volition to take on lease from your magnificence for a period of ..., from the present year 215 = 184 of the second indiction, for the sowing and gathering of the crop of the third *epinemesis* from the possessions of your magnificence lying in the fields ... of the same property the entire irrigated plot of land called ‘Eastern’ equipped with all the wooden and iron implements, with the cistern situated in it and the well and the wheel and the machine of the irrigator and the plants of all kinds and every other right bearing on them from it and those n aruras under cultivation dependent on the plot in accordance with the list of exactions of you the landowner out of those ... n aruras which are in the charge of ... n and a half aruras to be sown with whatever crop I may choose and I shall pay you ... the fixed rent accruing from this yearly both when the Nile waters the lands and when it fails in accordance with the same roll of exactions of you, the landowner, and ... to provide the water drawing ... to the same vineyard without reproach by means of the available ... and as remuneration for the irrigation operations I shall take, along with the vinedresser, the n^{th} share of the future grape crop, that I will make all of the extra payments in kind and perform all of the services owed to the landlord and provide the customary baked brickwork ..., and that I shall bring my ox to ... bath of this town. Furthermore, I agree that I myself, the guarantor of this man, have already received from your magnificence here an advance of four solidi of gold. The rent is free of all risk, with the public charges attendant on it being the responsibility of your

magnificence, and I shall perforce deliver the rent yearly at the proper time without delay, and also raise the irrigation earthworks, and ... the possession of the aforementioned things preserved free of injury or damage ... with the advance of the four solidi of gold whenever you want, just as I took it. The lease, written in a single copy, is valid and, in answer to the formal question, I gave my assent.’

‘I, Aurelius Isac son of Ioannes, the aforewritten person, have concluded ... for the plot of irrigated land and I shall deliver the rent on it yearly, also having taken an advance of four solidi of gold, and agree to the terms of the contract as stated above. Aurelius Ioannes son of Isac the aforewritten I pledge my said son Isac to all the provisions set out in this lease at my own risk as set out above. I, Aurelius Menas, son of Theodorus, have written this contract for them since they are illiterate.’

‘Completed through me, Filoxenus, Choeac *n* indiction ...’

1 For the conversion of the date, see Bagnall–Worp, *CSBE*² 149 and 160. On the consulship, see R.S. Bagnall et al. *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta 1987) 610–11.

ὑπατείας Φλαοῦίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐνδοξο]τάτου ἐπάρχ[ου τῶν ἱερῶν πραι]τωρίῳ. This is the infamous Ioannes ‘the Cappadocian’. On his career, *PLRE* iii (a) 627–35, where he is ‘Ioannes 11’. Curiously, he is called ἑπαρχος τῶν ἱερῶν πραιτωρίων elsewhere only at XVI 1974 1–3 (538). The instances of his attestation in the papyri are not numerous: XVI 1887 1, P.Cair. Masp. II 67252.1, P.Flor. III 284.2, P.Lond. III 1000.14, P.Lond. III 1001.1 (539), P.Petra I 2.4, I 3.3, I 4.3, I 16.1, PSI VIII 933.1, P.Stras. V 481.1, SB XVI 12488.2 (all 538, unless stated).

2 [Φλαοῦί- N.N. c. 15]. Φλαοῦί- may have been abbreviated, which would give c.19 letters missing before the epithets. No compelling candidates emerge from the hitherto published prosopographical information, but another Oxyrhynchus papyrus which dates from 543 might offer a possibility. This is 19, ‘a sale on

delivery' of wine. The connection turns solely on the mention of the deceased father, who is also called Samuelius (3). It runs, 5–7, [Φλαο]υῖω Θεοδώρω τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ | [καὶ περιβλέπτῳ κόμετι τοῦ θείου κονκιτωρ(ίου) | [c.5] . ω υῖω τοῦ τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης Ἰαμουηλίου. The name Theodorus might be too short to supplement the space available before the epithets, but Flavius might have been written out extravagantly.

[τῷ μεγαλοπρ]επεστάτῳ [καὶ περιβλέπτῳ]. On the epithets, see R. Delmaire, 'Les dignitaires laïcs au concile de Chalcedoine' *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 141–75 at 157–61, and O. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (Giessen 1930) 28 and 31–2.

[κόμ]ε[τ]ι τοῦ θείου κονκιτωρίου. By this period, this was purely an honorary title, which was often granted on retirement from some civil function. It did not confer membership of the Senate at Constantinople in any real sense. On the office, see especially CPR XXIV Exkurs III (68–71), 'Comes Sacri Consistorii in den Papyri und Inschriften Ägyptens' and cf. P.Heid. IV 331 introd., A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 1964) i 333–9.

3–4]κι c Ἰαμουηλίου τοῦ τῆς | [μνήμης]. The word preceding Samuelius has eluded me. One would expect either υῖω (or possibly θυγατρὶ) or κληρονόμῳ. None of these possibilities is compatible with the traces.

Samuelius was a moderately common name at this period. It was borne by both aristocrats and non-aristocrats. It is tempting to try to find some kind of link between the Samuelius of **18** and the Samuelius of the Oxyrhynchite landowning brothers, Phoebammon and Samuelius, who appear in a number of Oxyrhynchite papyri. They date from slightly earlier than **18**. The instances of their attestation are: VI **994** 1 (499), XVI **1945** 1 (517), XVI **1946** 1 (524), LXVIII **4697** 3 (489), LXVIII **4701** 3–5 (505), PSI Com. 20.12 (fifth cent.), SB XX 14964.4 (517). On these two brothers, see esp. LXVIII **4697** 3 n. (489). No conclusive evidence can be adduced to assure the connection, but two pieces of evidence in favour of it may be

be advanced. First, XVI 1946 2 (524) connects the brothers with the same hamlet that is mentioned in 18, Sceuomisthiou. This is one of only two previous attestations of this toponym. Second, Samuelius is dead in 538. His age would, therefore, make him well compatible with the Samuelius who was active at the beginning of the sixth century.

Samuelius' *epitheton ornans* of will have depended on his rank in life. If he is identical with the man in 19, he will have been ἐνδοξότατος in life, and therefore τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης in death. But this might exclude the connection between the Samuelius, brother of Phoebammon, and the Samuelius of 19, because from what can be inferred from the published sources, Samuelius, brother of Phoebammon, does not seem to have advanced beyond the second senatorial rank: the epithet which denotes his highest rank is περίβλεπτος. His brother, Phoebammon, did, however, advance further. In LXVIII 4701 3–6 (505?) they are addressed as [Φλαουίους Φοι]βάμ[ω]νι τῷ μεγαλοπρε[πε]τάτῳ καὶ ἐνδο[ξο]τάτῳ κόμετι τῶ]ν καθοσιωμένων δομεστικῶν | [καὶ Καμουηλίῳ τῷ μ]εγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ καὶ περιβλέπ[τ]ῳ κόμετι | [τοῦ θείου κονσιετ]ωρίου ἀμφοτέροισ αἰδεσ[ί]μοισ πολιτευομένοι[ς].

ἐ[πι]τρόπου αὐτῶν. An ἐπίτροπος was a legal guardian who acted for those who were incapable of acting alone, usually minors: see 13 8–10 n.

5] .ς μετ[. Probably this will have referred to the guarantor, and μετ' [ἐγγυητοῦ ... is to be restored.

6 [τῆς] ὀ[λο]κλήρου μηχανῆς. On the μηχανή as a physical object, see D. Bonneau, *Le régime administratif de l'eau du nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* (Leiden 1993) 105–15.

6–7 [τῆς] ὀ[λο]κλήρου μηχανῆς καλ[ο]υ[μένης Ἀπηλιωτικῆς]. Cf. 13; the object of the lease is the watering machine itself, as stated above, but the lease is in effect on the land which the machine irrigates; see LV 3803 (411) introd. and Bonneau, op. cit. 220–23. 'Eastern' will refer to the land in the territory of the hamlet where the machine is situated.

8 ἀπὸ ἐποικίου Σκεομίσθιου. This is the third attestation of this hamlet. The other two are P.Heid. III 248.4 (sixth or seventh cent.) and XVI 1946 2 (524). P.Heid. III 248 is the pledge of an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός to remain with his family and all of his goods and chattels in the same plot of land. **18** supplements current information on the place beyond what XVI 1946 provides, namely that Sceuomisthiou had vineland, and the land was equipped with artificial irrigation, which would have allowed the cultivation of crops other than the wheat mentioned in XVI 1946 3.

9 [ἐναπό]γραφοὶ αὐτῆς γεωργοί. These are the *colonii adscripticii*, on whom a voluminous bibliography has appeared in the last thirty years. See especially I.F. Fikhman, ‘Coloni adscripticii – ἐναπόγραφοὶ γεωργοί in den Papyri’ in A. Jördens (ed.), *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im spätantiken Ägypten: kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart 2006) 190–250, id. ‘Esclaves et colons en Égypte byzantine’ *APapyrol* 3 (1991) 7–17, J. Banaji, ‘Agrarian History and the Labour Organisation of Byzantine Large Estates’ in A.K. Bowman and E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times* (PBA 96 1999) 193–216, esp. 208–12. For *colonii adscripticii* working in viticulture, see Hickey, op. cit. 81–9. Besides these references, *colonii adscripticii* are the subject of much of the discussion by the various contributors to E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Terre, proprietari e contadini dell’impero romano: dall’affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico* (Roma 1997).

The legal status of the *enaopgraphoi georgoi* is discussed by A.J.B. Sirks, ‘The colonate in Justinian’s reign’ *JRS* 98 (2008) 120–43. He summarises their relationship with the estate to which they were registered and their obligations: the *colonus adscripticius* ‘had to perform tasks on the estate, till the land, or perform the work of a *colonus*, he had to remain on the estate, he disposed of assets called *peculium*, and he, and his children, stood under the *potestas* of the estate owner’ (134).

10 [έκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώ]ζασθαι. Besides this instance and that of LXVII 4615 (505), *colonii adscripticii* are nowhere else party to contracts to rent anything. This raises a number of questions, chiefly concerning the status of the *colonii adscripticii*: if, as Sirks suggests, they ‘stood under the *potestas* of the estate owner’, how can they also rent land from him.

10–13 [έκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι μισθώ]ζασθαι ἐπὶ [c.10] .μενος . . . ακ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος | ἔτους $\overline{\text{ει ρπδ}}$ τῆς παρούσης δευτέρας ἰ]νδικτίω[νος καταπορᾶς δ]ὲ καὶ συλλογῆς καρπῶν τρίτης | [ἐπινεμήσεως]. Information on the lengths of validity of leases is assembled by Mazza, loc. cit. 443–6. ἐπί will stipulate the length of the lease, which is one year, as the sowing and reaping clauses demonstrate, 10–12, but I am uncertain how to supplement the lacuna.

11–12 τρίτης | [ἐπινεμήσεως]. The missing article before τρίτης is unusual. The reaping clause normally runs e.g. LVIII 3955 10 (611) καταπορᾶς δὲ καὶ συλλογῆς καρπῶν τῆς σὺν θεῶ) πρώτης ἐπινεμήσεως. As the example demonstrates, one expects σὺν θεῶ to precede ἐπινεμήσεως in Oxyrhynchite texts when it refers to the future, but σὺν θεῶ most probably cannot be accommodated in the available space. In spite of the overwhelming instances of such dating clauses having it, some variation on the clause does occur, e.g. P.Berl. Zill. 7.10–11 (574) has καταπορᾶς δὲ καὶ συλλογῆς καρπῶν τῆς προελαυνούσης ἐνάτης ἐπινεμ(ήσεως).

12–13 δι[α]κραιμένων ἐμ πεδίοις|[c.15 τοῦ] ἀπτοῦ [κτῆματο]ς. The standard clause to designate the location of the machine and its land is offered by e.g. LXVII 4615 11–12 (505), which runs ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων | τῆ ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ διακραιμένων ἐμ πεδίοις τοῦ ἡμετέρου κτῆματος. No variation on this formula is attested, but one will not willingly postulate a lacuna of space for some fifteen letters in an otherwise regularly written papyrus. The standard formulae in these land leases are based on a limited number of examples; it may be the case that some adjective to describe the fields might be supplemented.

14–17 [ἐξηρτικμένην πάχη ξυλικῆ] ἐξαρτία καὶ ριδηρώμ[α]σιν, με[τ]ὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐπικειμένου ἐν αὐτῇ | [λάκκου καὶ ὑδρεύματος]ε καὶ κυκλευτηρίου καὶ μηχαν[ικ]ῶν ὀργάνων καὶ φυτῶν | [παντοίων καὶ παντὸς ἑτέρο]υ δικαίου ἐκ ταύτης καὶ τῶν συ[γγε]ωργουμένων καὶ ὑποτελλουσῶν | [ἄρουρῶν *n*]. The supplements are based on P.Berl. Zill. 7.13–18, which provides a very close parallel: ἐξηρτικμένην πάχη | ξυλικῆ ἐξαρτία καὶ ριδηρώμασιν, μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ἐπικειμένου | ἐν αὐτῇ λάκκου καὶ ὑδρεύματος καὶ κυκλευτηρ(ίου) καὶ μηχανικῶν ὀργάνων | καὶ φυτῶν παντοίων καὶ παντὸς ἑτέρου δικαίου ταύτης καὶ | τῶν συγγεωργουμ(ένων) καὶ ὑποτελλουσῶν αὐτῇ μηχανῆ ἄρουρῶν | δώδεκα ἢ ὅσαι πλείους ἐὰν ᾧσιν. The supplement for 17 might be [αὐτῇ μηχανῆ ἄρουρῶν *n*], which would leave space for approximately five letters. This would suffice for δύο, τρεῖς, πέντε, ἕξ, ἐπτά, ὀκτώ, ἐννέα and δέκα. Alternatively, μηχανῆ might be omitted, because P.Flor. III 325.11–13 (489, from the Oxyrhynchites) offers μετὰ καὶ ... τῶν συγγεωργουμ(ένων) αὐτῇ ἄρουρῶν εἰκοσιμιάς, | [ἢ ὅσαι ἐὰν ᾧσιν ...] and PSI I 77.16–21 (551, from Oxyrhynchus) has μετὰ καὶ τῶν | ... συγγεωργουμένων αὐτῇ ἄρουρῶν . . [. .] . . . | ᾧσιν. There is no room for the clause ἢ ὅσαι πλείους ἐὰν ᾧσιν, but it is not indispensable.

17 ἀκολούθως γεουχ[ι]κῶ ὑμῶν ἀπαιτησίμω. Inscription in the rent rolls of the usually absent owners of great estates largely replaced the contracts which were made individually in the earlier Roman period. On these registers of tenants, see R. Mazza, ‘P.Oxy. XVI 1911 e i conti annuali dei pronoetai’ *ZPE* 122 (1998) 161–72, esp. 171, and J. Gascou, ‘Les grands domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine’ *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 18–19 = *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* (Paris 2008) 140–41. No amount of rent is set out; but this is not a rare occurrence; see LV 3803 introd. para. 3, where the editor observes that ‘the rent [on a plot of land] is unspecified but is as laid down in previous rent rolls and on the same terms as for other machines, which suggests that the lessor was a landowner on more than a small scale’ and the remarks of N. Gonis, ‘A Late Byzantine Land Lease from Oxyrhynchus: P.Oxy. 1968 Revisited’ *Tyche* 15 (2000) 94.

17–18 ἐξ ὧν ἐν συστάσει | [c.20] ,ν ἡμῶν. This collocation has not hitherto appeared in Oxyrhynchite land leases. It appears seldom in land leases from Hermopolis, all of which concern vineyards: BGU XVII 2682 (481), P.Giss. 56 (sixth cent.), P.Heid. V 352 (558), SB IV 7369 (512). The formula of these runs, SB IV 7369.9–10, χωρί[ο]ν ἀμπελικὸν ζωόφυτον ἐν συστάσει ἀρουρῶν ὅσων ἐστὶν ἐν φυτοῖς πᾶσι [κα]ὶ φοίνιξι. H.H. July, *Die Klauseln hinter den Massangaben der Papyrusurkunden, (Insbesondere die Klausel ἢ ὅσαι ἐὰν ὄσων und ihre Synonyme)* (Diss. Köln 1966) 44 observes that ‘ἐν συστάσει weist ausdrücklich daraufhin, dass der Umfang [sc. of land] zur Zeit des Vertragsschlusses Vertragsbestandteil ist.’

The Hermopolite formula suggests that ἀρουρῶν will have been in agreement with ἐξ ὧν in the lacuna. Possibly the ownership of the land will have been stipulated, which might have been signalled e.g. by ἔχετε or αὐτῶν, and a number will have followed. The traces immediately preceding ν appear to be most compatible with α, which would suggest μί]αν ἡμῶν. If this is correct, twenty or so letters would remain to be filled. One might try e.g. ἐξ ὧν ἐν συστάσει | [ἔχετε ἀρουρῶν εἴκοσι μί]αν ἡμῶν. The amounts of land leased in Oxyrhynchus range widely: the smallest plot recorded is two aruras, SB XX 15027 = SB XXVI 16507 (475), and the biggest is thirty and three-quarters of an arura in P.Mich. XI 611 (412).

18–19 τελέσω [c.20] . φόρου ἀποτάκτου. The standard formula in Oxyrhynchite land leases is τελέσω ὑπὲρ φόρου ἀποτάκτου e.g. LXVIII 4687 11 (441). The letter after the break is uncertain: it is not ρ, which rules out ὑπὲρ. It might be ω, or it might be ν, although it would be a slightly different form from the usual ν. One possibility with ω would be λόγ]ω.

19–20 ἐπί τε | [νειλοβρόχου καὶ ἀβρόχου]. The genitive is an almost certain restoration based on P.Berl. Zill. 7.19–20, XVI 1968 5 = SB XXVI 16722 and LVIII 3955 16, in spite of e.g. P.Flor. III 325.14 (489, from Oxyrhynchus) which has the

dative and runs καὶ τελέσομεν ὑπὲρ λόγῳ (l. λόγον) φόρου | [ἀποτάκτου ἐπὶ τε ἐμβρόχῳ καὶ ἀ]βρόχῳ.

20–21 τὰς δὲ ἀντλήσεις | [καὶ ὑδροπαροχίας ἀμέ]μπτως παρασχεῖν. The restoration is based on a clause in three Oxyrhynchite receipts for components of irrigation machines: XVI 1899 19–20 (475), XVI 1982 20 (497), XXXIV 2724 18–19 (469). It runs ὁμολογῶ τὰς ἀντλήσεις καὶ ὑδροπαροχίας ἀμέμπτως ποιεῖσθαι/πληρῶσαι. On ἀντλήσεις and ὑδροπαροχία, see Bonneau, *op. cit.* 212–20.

21–22 διὰ τῶν προκότων | [c.20]. One might think of restoring e.g. διὰ τῶν προκότων | [μηχανικῶν ὀργάνων] from 15 above. The suggestion is merely a stop-gap, for it would probably be slightly too short to fill the space. But it is not clear by what other means the irrigation might have been carried out.

22–23 [κα]ὶ μισθοῦ τῶν ὑδροπαροχικῶν ἔργων λαβεῖν με ἅμα τῷ ἀμπελουργῷ | c.20 ἀ]μπέλου ἐκβησομένου οἰνικοῦ γενήματος. Perhaps read τοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἀ]μπέλου, with τοῦ in agreement with γενήματος. The wages which the lessees are to receive will have been share of the vinecrop. On the term μισθός see F. Morelli, ‘Τιμὴ ε μισθός: vendita e prestazione di lavoro’ *Istituto Papirologico ‘G. Vitelli’ Firenze, Comunicazioni 2* (1997) 7–29.

The quantity of the crop which the farmers receive varies widely by region; see Jördens, *op. cit.* 253–7 and Hickey, *op. cit.* 74–9. The terms of an Oxyrhynchite lease of land suggest that a ratio of 1:1 in the share of the crop between the lessor and lessee might be expected, cf. VI 913 10–17 (443), which runs ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς ταύτας | [σπεῖραι οἶς] αἰρώμεθα γενήμασιν ἐφ’ ἡμῶν πάντων τῶν | [περιγινομ]ένων καρπῶ[ν] ἐφ’ ὧτε ἡμᾶς παρασχεῖν σοὶ τῇ γεούχῳ | τὸ ἡμῶν μέρος ἀντὶ φόρου τῶν περιγινομένων καρπῶν | μ[ετὰ καλῆ]ς πίστεως, ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς μεμισθωμένους ἀνθ’ ὧν | ποιούμ[εθα] καμάτων τῆς γεωργίας καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν καταβαλλομένων | παρ’ ἡμῶ[ν c]περμάτων τῇ γῆ ἔχειν τὸ ἄλλο ἡμῶν μέρος ἀνυπερ[θέτ]ως. But the evidence is very limited and does not allow the suggestion to be pressed far.

22 τῶν ὑδροπαροχικῶν ἔργων. This expression is peculiar to Oxyrhynchite land leases. Instances of its attestation are: P.Col. X 284 + P.Heid. V 343.5 (311), SB XXII 15769.6 and 11 (311) = P.Heid. V 344, and L 3582 6 (442). Interestingly, the instance in *18* is significantly later than the other three attestations. On the class of contract called μίσθωσις τῶν ἔργων, see Jördens, *op. cit.* 222–32, and Hickey, *op. cit.* 79–81.

23–25 δώσω δέ με τὰ | [ἔκτακτα πάντα καὶ τὰς κατ]ὰ καιρὸν γεουχικὰς ὑπηρεσίας καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἔθους ὀπτόπλινθον | [c.20]ας πάσας. The supplement is based on P.Berl. Zill. 7.23–5 δώσω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκτακτα πάντα καὶ τὰς κατὰ καιρὸν γεουχι(κὰς) | ὑπηρεσίας πάσας καὶ καὶ τὰ ἑορτικὰ καὶ τὰ ἀναλώματα τοῦ καιροῦ τῶν φόρων, LVIII 3955 20 δώσω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκτακτα πάντα καὶ τὰς κατὰ καιρὸν γεουχι(κὰς) | ὑπηρεσίας πάσας καὶ τὰ ἑορτικὰ | [c.30], and PSI VIII 920.5–7 (sixth cent.) δώσω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκτακτα πάντα καὶ τὰς κατὰ καιρὸν γεουχικὰς | ὑπηρεσίας πάσ[ας καὶ | τὰ ἑορτικὰ καὶ τὰ ἀναλώ]ματα (*BL* XII 253) τοῦ καιροῦ τῶν φόρων. One might supplement 25 e.g. [καὶ τὰ ἑορτικὰ καὶ τὰς συνηθεί]ας πάσας, ‘the festal contributions and perquisites’, but τὰς συνηθεί]ας πάσας would be without parallel, and might be slightly too long for the space in the lacuna. On συνήθειαι in leases, see K.A. Worp, ‘Deliveries for συνήθεια in Byzantine papyri’ in T. Gagos–R.S. Bagnall (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas* (Exeter 2001) 51–68. It might also be a remote possibility that [καὶ τὰς ἑορτικὰς ἐξαλλαγ]ὰς πάσας could be read. ἐξαλλαγή is only attested in P.Palau Rib. 23, a share-cropping land lease from Aphrodito (sixth cent.), as clarified by N. Gonis, ‘Korr. Tyche 330’ *Tyche* 14 (1999) 330. It may very well be that neither of these supplements is right. But some further expenditure is expected, and one might accept τὰς συνηθεί]ας πάσας as a stop-gap, which would provide the approximate sense that one might expect here.

25–26 ἀνενεγκ[εῖ]ν δέ με τὴν ἐμὴν βοῦν ταύτης τῆς πόλεως | [c.20] λουτροῦ. The only other Oxyrhynchite land lease to mention oxen is PSI VIII 920.8, which runs [c.?]ε .εκ[.] τὴν ἐμὴν βοῦν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει πρὸς ἀντλησιν τῶν

μηχανῶν τ[c.?]. This does not lead far. Possibly the ox in **18** is to be deployed on some activity relating to a bath, which might have been either the public bath, [τοῦ δημοσίου] λουτροῦ or that of the landlord, [τοῦ γεουχικοῦ] λουτροῦ. But ταύτης τῆς πόλεως points to a public bath. The ox might have been employed in filling the public bath or in its repair. If the ox was to be used for filling it, one might try e.g. [εἰς ἄντλησιν τοῦ δημοσίου] λουτροῦ, modelled on the PSI text above.

26–27 προκομολογῶ δὲ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ὁ τούτου ἐγγυητῆς ἐσχηκέναι παρὰ τῆς | [ύμων μεγαλοπρ(επείας) ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη λ]όγω προχρείας χρυσοῦ νομισμάτια τέσσαρα. The topic of προχρεία has proved controversial, and it has given rise to strongly divergent opinions on its nature and its place in the economic and agricultural system of late antique society.

Essentially προχρεία is an advance of money, *Naturalien* or animals, which is interest free and forms part of the terms of certain contracts dealing with labour. At times, it is simply an advance in money which does not need to be repaid. When it takes this form, it will be a simple advance in wages. An illustrative example of the advance functioning as an advance in wages is XVI **1890** (508), a lease for a mill and bakery, mentioned above. But it must be noted that this form of agreement is not common in Oxyrhynchite texts.

At times, it is an advance in money which does not need to be repaid until the person engaged to do the work ceases from it, either because of the fitness to work of the labourer or because the work has been completed, or at the desire of the employer.

The interpretation of the exact nature of the two forms of advance has been the point of controversy. One important discussion of προχρεία is that of J. Banaji in a number of publications. He maintains that προχρεῖαι represent the wages of a permanent labour force. He claims, loc. cit. 211, that ‘*georgoi* or other agricultural labourers such as those tending gardens or vineyards were assigned to individual irrigated plots or farms (or gardens or vineyards), or vice versa, usually paid cash

wages (in the prevalent gold currency) and entitled to advances out of them. That these advances (*prochreia*) were in fact wage payments is especially clear from a Hermopolite document, dated 627, [P.Flor. I 70] where the concluding formula is the standard clause promising to pay back the advance should the employee abandon or cut short his or her assignment.’ But the contract, like many, is for an indefinite period of time: at some point of necessity the employee must cease from his work, and must then return the advance. (I owe this serious objection to Banaji’s interpretation of προχρεία as advances of wages to Mr James Cook). This essentially makes this προχρεία agreement, like many others, an interest free loan of indefinite duration.

Another important discussion of προχρεία is that of Jördens, op. cit. 276–84 and ead. ‘Die Agrarverhältnisse im spätantiken Ägypten’ *Laverna* 10 (1999) 134–5. She sees the agreements as essentially being a landholder’s instrument by which to ensnare peasants in dependency, because they give rise to spiral of ever increasing obligation. She observes, op. cit. 281, that ‘[d]ie bereits vom Grundherren abhängige Bauer vertieft diese Abhängigkeit durch die Verschuldung weiter. Durch die bei Vertragsbruch automatisch eingesetzte Rückgabepflicht wird sich der “Schuldner” in der Regel gezwungen gesehen haben, jegliches Risiko zu vermeiden, denn das geliehene Geld dürfte normalerweise für den eigenen Lebensunterhalt benötigt und also verbraucht worden sein. War einmal dieser Punkt erreicht, ließ sich das Schuldner-Gläubiger-Verhältnis nicht mehr korrigieren’.

Hickey, op. cit. 85, broadly accepts Jörden’s view of προχρεία agreements as the landholders’ instrument of dependency, but also points out that they ‘ought to be reckoned as a possible symptom of dependency – in other words, as an influx of capital, often to be consumed during the completion of a task, for those lacking adequate capital.’

28 τὴν ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρ(έπειαν) τὴν κεκτημένην. This is an unusual expression, for which the only parallel is PSI I 77.29 (551), τῶν τῆς γῆς δημοσίων

ὄντων πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν λαμπρό(τητα) τὴν κεκτημένην. It might perhaps be a synonym of γεοῦχος. κεκτημένην does not seem to have an object, although both papyri break off immediately after the word, so that it might refer to being a ‘your magnificence who is the possessor sc. of the land’.

30–31 [τὴ]ν δὲ νομὴν τῶν προειρημένων πάντων πραγμάτων ἄτρωτον ἀβλαβῆ | [c.20] . μετὰ καὶ τῆς προχρείας τῶν τεσσάρων νομιμα[τ]ῶν ὁπόταν βουληθ(εῖ)ν. Pledges to keep the machine and its appurtenances safe often run e.g. P.Berl. Zill. 7.26–28, τὴν δὲ νομὴν τῶν προειρημ(ένων) πάντων | πραγμάτων ἄτρωτον ἀβλαβῆ φυλάξω καὶ παραδώσω αὐτῇ ὁπόταν βουληθεί(η) | ὡς καὶ παρείληφα. Two infinitives will not be accommodated in the available space but one might expect 31 to run, [παραδώσειν τῇ ὑμῶν μεγαλαπρ(επεία)]. The single verb is paralleled by PSI VI 709.23–5, although this is a lease of a house.

33 Αὐρήλιος Ἰζᾶκ υἱ[ὸ]ς Ἰωάννου ὁ προγεγραμμένος πεπίημαι | [c. 20] μηχανῆς. One might supplement e.g. [ταύτην τὴν μίσθωσιν τῆς] μηχανῆς. For the demonstrative, cf. PSI VIII 881.11–12 (sixth cent., from Oxyrhynchus?), which runs, [πεποι]ήμεθα ταύτην τὴν μίσθωσιν τῶν προγεγραμμένων πραγμάτων | [c.? καθ]ὸ γέγραπται καὶ συμφ(ωνεῖ) ἡμῖν πάντα ὡς πρόκ(εῖται).

36 Ⲫ di emu Filo]xenu etelioth X(οιακ) . (ἰνδικτίων) . . . ††. Filoxenus is the notary in six other Oxyrhynchite papyri, viz XVI 1900 34 (528), XXXVI 2779 28 (530), XVI 1986 24 (549) = SB XII 11231.24, and I 130 28 (550), I 140 32 (550) and PSI VIII 964.31 (sixth cent.). In each of these cases where the full subscription survives, he signs: di emu Filoxenu etelioth in Roman characters, and then the month (abbreviated), day, indiction, and some signs in Greek characters. The clearest example is I 133 (550). After etelioth here, there is what could be a χ with an abbreviation. It is not possible to resolve the abbreviation as ιβ, but nor is there any reason to assume that Philoxenus dealt with the lease on the day on which it was written, e.g. the notarial subscription of I 133 is dated the day after the contract is concluded. Following this is the same abbreviation for (ἰνδικτίων) as in I 133 and

others. There is then a mark, which ought to be β, but it is difficult to read it as this. What seems to be another abbreviation follows before two crosses. The same thing appears in 1 133. Conceivably it might be θε(ὸς) κ(ύριος) in some form. However, nothing similar from Oxyrhynchite papyri is used in these notarial subscriptions, nor in any notarial formula listed by J.M. Diethart–K.A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten* (Wien 1986) 14–20.

19. SALE ON DELIVERY OF WINE

50 4B.25/B(1–2)b

11.4 x 30.2 cm

12 October 543

Aurelius Phib, an ἐναπόγραφος γεωργός from the hamlet of Nesos Sarapiou, agrees to deliver one hundred and ten ‘large *sekomata*’ of wine to Flavius Theodorus, *magnificentissimus et spectabilis comes sacri consistorii*, son of Samuelius, the owner of an estate in the Oxyrhynchite nome, for an unspecified but mutually agreed price which Phib has already received.

This ‘sale of wine on delivery’ is cast in the standard formulae of Oxyrhynchite documents of this kind. On their structure and typical components, see the detailed discussion by A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten* (Heidelberg 1990) 296–341, N. Kruit, ‘Local Customs in the Formulas of Sales of Wine for Future Delivery (A Supplement to P.Heid. V)’ *ZPE* 94 (1992) 167–184, and the most recent update on the list of sales on delivery in S. Hodecek–F. Mitthof, ‘Ein Weinlieferungskauf aus dem Herakleopolites’ *APF* 51 (2005) 76–86, at 78.

This document is by and large well preserved. The left-hand side has sustained some damage, and some portions of the text have fallen away towards the middle of the document. The hand is a highly practised cursive. The writing runs with the fibres. The papyrus has been folded a number of times on the vertical as well as the horizontal.

- (m.1) † βασιλείας τοῦ θειοτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν
 δεσπότη]υ Φλαουίου Ἰουετιανοῦ τοῦ αἰωνίου Ἀγούετου
 Αὐτο]κράτορ(ος) ἔτους ιζ̄, τοῖς μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν Φλ(αουίου)
 Βασιλίου
 τοῦ λ]αμπροτάτου Φαωφι ιδ̄, ἰνδ(ικτίονος) ζ̄ ἐν Ὁξυρύγγ(ων).
 5 Φλαο]υίω Θεοδώρῳ τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ

- καὶ περιβλέπτω κόμετι τοῦ θεοῦ κοντσιτωρ(ίου)
- c.8] .ω υἱῷ τοῦ τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης Σαμουηλίου
γεουχ]οῦντι ἐνταῦθα τῇ λαμπρᾷ Ὁξυρυγχιτῶν
πό]λξι Αὐρήλιος Φιβ υἱὸς Παμουθίου μητρὸς
- 10 N.N.] ὀρμώμενος ἀπὸ ἐποικί[ο]υ Νήσου
Ca]ραπίου, κτήματος τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνδοξότητος
τοῦ Ὁξυρυγχίτου νομοῦ, ἐναπόγραφος αὐτῆς γεωργὸς
χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ] ἐρχικέναι παρὰ τῆς ὑμῶν λαμπρ(ότητος)
ἐντεῦθεν τὴν] πρὸς ἀλλήλους συμπεφωνημ(ένην)
- 15 καὶ ἀρέσασάν μοι τιμ]ῆν πλήρης οἴνου ὀκταξεστι(αἰών)
- c.11] γεουχικοῦ σηκώ[ματος c]ηκωμάτων
ἐκατὸν δέκα] γί(νονται) οἴν(ου) (ὀκτα)ξ(εστιαῖα) ἐκ τοῦ μεγάλ(ου)
σηκ(ώματα) ρι
- ὄνπερ οἴν]ον παρὰ {λ}ληνὸν ἀπὸ γλα[ύ]κους
ἀδόλου, τῆς ὑ]μῶν μεγαλοπρεπείας παρεχούσης τ[ὰ]
20 κοῦ]φα, ἐπάναγκες ἀποδώσω α[ὐτῆ] ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ
μέρ]ους τοῦ γεωργοῦ τῶν ὑπ' ἐμὲ γε[ου]χικῶν χωρίων
ἐν τῇ τ]ρύγῃ τοῦ Μεσορη μηνὸς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους
ε̄κ ρ]π̄θ τῆς παρούσης ἐβδόμης ἰνδικτί]ονος οἴνου
ρύσε]ως τῆς σὺν θεῷ ὀγδόης ἐπινεμήσεως ἀνυπερ-
25 θέτως], ἀναδέχομαι δὲ τὴν καλονὴν καὶ παραμονὴν
μέχ]ρι τοῦ Τυβι μηνὸς καὶ εἶγε εὐρηθείη ἐν αὐτῷ ὄζει
ἥ]γουν φαῦλα ἐμὲ ταῦτα ἀλλάξαι καὶ τὰ ἴσα αὐτῆ παρασχε(εῖν)
ἐ]ν πρωτίῳ οἴνω κινδύνῳ τῶν ἐμοὶ ὑπαρχόντων
ὑποκειμ(ένων) εἰς τοῦτο. κύριον τὸ γραμμ(ατεῖον) ἀπλοῦν γραφὲν
30 κ]αὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖς) ὁμολόγησα. (m.2) † Αὐρ(ήλιος) Φιβ υἱὸς
Παμουθίου ὁ προγεγραμ(μένος)
π]εποίημαι τοῦτο τὸ γραμμ(ατεῖον) τῶν τοῦ [ο]ἴνου ὀκταξεστιαίων

κη(ωμάτων)] ἑκατὸν δέκα καὶ ἀποδώσω αὐτὰ ἐν οἴνῳ] ἐπιτηδία
καὶ συ]μφ(ωνεῖ) μοι τὰ προγεγραμμένα ὡς πρόκ(εῖται). Ἰωάννης
υἱὸς [τοῦ] μακαρίου Ἰσακ
ἔγρα]ψα ὑπὲρ αὐτ(οῦ) ἀγραμμ(άτου) ὄντος.†

35 (m.3) † di emu [. . .] . . . etelioth†

Back, downwards with the fibres:

† [γραμμ(ατεῖον) Αὐρ(ηλίου)] Φ[ιβ] υἱ[οῦ] Παμουθίου ἀ[πὸ] ἐποικίου
Νήσου Καρ]απίου οἴν(ου) (ὀκτα)ξ(ετταίων) κη(ώματων) ρι //

	2 φλαουῖου ἰουστινιανου	3 αυτο]κρατορ	ὑπατιαγ, 1. ὑπατεῖαν	φλς	4 ἰνδ
οξυρυγχο	5 φλαο]υῖω	6 κονσειτωρ	7 υἱω	9 υἱος	11 ὑμων
λαμπρ	14 συμπεφωνημς	15 οκταξεστι	17 γλ	οινς	ηξ μεγαλ
18 1. γλεύκουσ	21 ὑπ	1. χωρίων	23 ἰνδι[κτι]ονοσ	24–5 ἀνὑπερ[[θετωσ]	25 1.
καλλονήν	26 1. ὄξεα	27 παρασχ	28 1. πρωτεῖω	ὑπαρχοντων	29 ὑποκειμς
γραμμς	30 επερ	αυρς	υἱος	προγεγραμς	31 γραμμς
συ]μφ	προγεγρας	προσ	33 ἰωαννης	ἰεα[κ	34 ὑπερ
				αυτς	αγραμμς

Back οινς ηξ κησ

(1st hand) ‘In the reign of our most godly and most pious master Flavius Justinanus, the eternal Augustus, Imperator, year 17, under (the consuls) after the consulship of Fl. Basilius, *vir clarissimus*, Phaophi 14, indiction 7, in the city of the Oxyrhynchi.’

‘To Flavius Theodorus, *magnificentissimus et spectabilis comes sacrii consistorii*, ... son of Samuel of glorious memory, landowner here in the splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius Phib, son of Pamuthius, mother N.N., originating from the hamlet of Nesus Sarapiou, possession of your glory in the Oxyrhynchite nome, registered farmer of yourself, greetings.’

‘I acknowledge that I have received in full from your splendour on the spot the price, jointly agreed and accepted by me, of one hundred and ten eight-*sextarii sekomata* measured from the ... estate *sekoma*, total one hundred and ten eight-*sextarii sekomata* from the large *sekoma*, which I shall necessarily deliver to yourself at the wine press from unadulterated must, with your magnificence providing the jars, from my share the farmer of the estate lands under me, in the grape harvest in the month of Mesore of the current year 220 = 189 of the present seventh indiction for the flow of the wine of the D.V. eighth indiction without delay, and I guarantee the good quality and durability of the wine till the month of Tybi and, if any soured or spoiled should be found, I shall exchange it and supply yourself with the same amount of wine of the first quality at the risk of my property which has been pledged to this end. The deed, written in a single copy, is valid and in answer to the formal question I gave my assent.’

(2nd hand) ‘I, Aurelius Phib, son of Pamuthius, have made this deed of one hundred and ten eight-*sextarii sekomata* of wine, and I shall deliver them to you on the appointed day; and the aforewritten satisfies me as it is set out above.’

‘Ioannes, son of the blessed Isac, wrote this on his behalf since he is illiterate.’

(3rd hand) ‘Completed through me N.N.’

(Back) ‘Contract for one hundred and ten eight-*sextarii sekomata* of wine of Aurelius Phib son of Pamuthius from the hamlet of Nesus Sarapiou.’

1–4 For the conversion of the date, see Bagnall–Worp *CSBE*² 149, 206, 252. Phaophi 14 fell on 12 rather than 11 October, because 543 was a leap year.

3 τοῖς μετὰ τὴν ὑπατίαν Φλ(αουίου) Βασιλίου. This is the second post-consulate year of Fl. Basilius (cos. 541), yet it is a slight curiosity that none of the papyri securely dated to 543 mentions this either by the ‘old’ method of reckoning, which would be ‘p.c. year 2’ or the ‘new style’, which would be ‘year 3’. But, as

Bagnall–Worp observe, *CSBE*² 95, ‘there are scribes who do not, in the early years after 542, add such numerals to dates after Basilius.’ It seems that the year of Basilius’ post-consulate is first explicitly mentioned in LI **3641** 2 (544), where the number is wrong, then in LXIII **4397** 3 (545), where the number is, again, wrong.

4 ἐν Ὀξυρύγγ(ων) sc. πόλει. On the common omission of πόλις in this period, see D. Hagedorn, ‘Ὀξυρύγγων πόλις und ἡ Ὀξυρυγγιτῶν πόλις’ *ZPE* 12 (1973) 277–92 at 291.

5–6 [Φλαο]υτίῳ Θεοδώρῳ τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ | [καὶ περιβλέπτῳ κόμει τοῦ θείου κονκιτωρ(ίου)]. The addressee does not conclusively fit any hitherto attested person. Theodorus is an immensely common name, but the Theodorus of **19** has achieved a high rank in the imperial hierarchy which will have made him notable in Oxyrhynchus even if he may not have resided there. He may be identical with the Theodorus who appears in XVI **2020** 27 (567–88) where a payment is made δ(ιὰ κληρονόμων) Θεοδώρου Καμουηλίου (ἀρτάβα) ρμδ. The date would be entirely consistent with the man of **19**. The absence of titles served to distinguish namesakes from each another, cf. LV **3805** 12 (566) δ(ιὰ κληρονόμων) Ἰωάννου Τιμαγένοϋς which refers to the grandfather, the important Oxyrhynchite who was active earlier: see LXVIII **4696** 5 n.

But he must be distinguished from another notable Theodorus, who was also a landowner in Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere, had obtained a high rank, and is attested in two papyri from a similar period, viz. SB XXIV 16312 (549?, from Oxyrhynchus) and CPR V 18 (538?, from Heracleopolis). The date of CPR V 18 almost certainly debar identification of the same man in **19** and these two papyri. If 538 is the correct date, and it is likely to be¹⁹, the Theodorus of CPR V 18 had achieved a

¹⁹ The date of CPR V 18 is not entirely unassailable because it lacks a regnal dating clause, although it has an indictional date, and the Theodorus is *dux augustalis*. It is a matter of dispute when the office was established because the date of the promulgation of Justinian’s thirteenth Edict has not been settled. But, in spite of the lack of a regnal dating clause, the chief point in favour of dating CPR V 18 to 538 is the address. Theodorus is φρονιτικῆς πραγμάτων τῆς θειοτάτης καὶ εὐσεβ(εστάτης) ἡμῶν δεσποίνης καὶ αἰων(ίαν) Ἀγού[τ]της Βασιλ(ίαν) Θεοδώρας. Theodora died in 548. The alternative year which would be compatible with the indictional date is 553, which would require a

higher rank in 538 than that which the Theodorus of 19 held in 543. The Theodorus of CPR V 18 is addressed (2–4) as Φλ(άουϊος) Θεόδωρος ὁ ἐνδοξ(ότατος) κόμης τῶν καθοσιωμένων δομε(στικῶν) | ἀπὸ δουκ(ῶν) καὶ Ἀγουσταλίων, φροντιστῆς πραγμάτ(ων) τῆς θειοτά(της) καὶ | εὐσεβ(εστάτης) ἡμῶν δεσπο(ίνης) καὶ αἰων(ίας) Ἀγούρ[τ(ης)] Βασιλ(ίςσης) Θεοδώρας. Besides the other dignities, the *comes devotissimorum domesticorum* is much higher rank in the imperial hierarchy than the *comes sacrii consistorii*. It is inconceivable that the man would have been addressed by a lower title later.

5 τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτῳ. On the epithet, see 18 2 n. para. 2.

6 κόμης τοῦ θεοῦ κομιστωρ(ίου). See 18 2 n. para. 3.

7 [c.8] .ω υἱῷ. A further dignity might be expected here, e.g. πολιτευομένῳ as in LVIII 4696 5 (484) or αἰδεσίμοις πολιτευομένοις LXVIII 4701 5 (505), but neither of these will be accommodated in the space. Possibly some adjective to distinguish Theodorus from the other son or sons of Samuelius might have stood in the lacuna.

τοῦ τῆς ἐνδόξου μνήμης Σαμουηλίου. Samuelius' epithet means that he will have been ἐνδοξότατος in life. On the possible connection of Samuelius with the Samuelius of 18, see 18 3–4 n. para. 2 ff.

9 Παμουθίου. This is a variant on Παμούθης. (Coptic ΠΑΜΟΥΤΕ; instances of its attestation are enumerated in full at http://www.onb.ac.at/files/kopt_namen.pdf). The name is of commonest occurrence in Oxyrhynchite texts, but it is not limited to them.

10–11 ἀπὸ ἐποικί[ο]υ Νήσου | [Ca]ραπίου. It is unclear whether this is simply a new designation of a known hamlet or the name of a new hamlet. A number of instances of a village called Sarapion occur in the papyri. The closest to what 19

mistake in the receipt because it would make Theodora alive five years after her death. This is most unlikely. See the discussion in CPR V 18 introd. para. 4 ff., and L.E. Tacoma, 'Replacement Parts for an Irrigation Machine of the Divine House at Oxyrhynchus. P.Columbia inv. 83, October 12, AD 549(?)' *ZPE* 120 (1998) 123–130, at 127.

offers is P.Merton I 27.15 (after 191/2), an agricultural account. It attests oil εἰς λυχναμίσκων *Καραπείου Νήσου*. Three other papyri mention hamlet called Sarapion, viz. XLIV 3184 30 (297) and LV 3787 30 (fourth cent.), the ἐποικίου *Καραπίου*, and SB XIV 12130 (fifth/sixth cent.) a list of festal contributions, attests τῶν ἀπὸ *Καραπίου*[υ]. The editor of 3787 30 n. remarks ‘presumably the place takes its name from a shrine of Sarapis, i.e. *Καραπίου* = *Καραπιείου*’. The word νῆσος literally means ‘island’. It will have been made by the build up of silt deposited by the Nile; for further references on this, see *RSON*^{2.0} s.v. Limeniou, Nesos.

11 κτήματος τῆς ὑμῶν ἐνδοξότητος. Theodorus was only a *vir spectabilis*, not a *vir gloriossimus*. He will not, therefore, have been entitled to be addressed as ἐνδοξότης. Perhaps the scribe was influenced by the mention of his father Samuelius, who was a *vir gloriossimus*. The *variatio* in the terms of address ἐνδοξότητος (11) ... λαμπρότης (13) ... μεγαλοπρεπείας (19) looks suspicious, even if it is common: it is highly unlikely that he would have been addressed as ἡ ὑμῶν μεγαλοπρέπεια when he ought in fact to have been called ἡ ὑμῶν ἐνδοξότης. In this period, consciousness of rank was acutely felt.

15–16 ὀκταξεστι(αίων) | [c.11] γεουχικοῦ *κηκώ*[ματος *κ*]ηκωμάτων. One might consider supplementing e.g. [ἐκ τοῦ μεγάλου] γεουχικοῦ *κηκώ*[ματος from the next line. It would be a tight fit but could be accommodated.

On the *sekoma*, which was a measurement of wine, see P. Mayerson ‘*Κηκώματα* – “Standard Measures” for decanting wine’ *BASP* 35 (1998) 153–8, 155, and again ‘*Κηκώματα*: measures of wine, not jars’ *BASP* 38 (2001) 197–101. Commonly the *κήκωμα* is measured in multiples of *sextarii*, one of which is estimated to be approximately 550 ml. On their appearance in Oxyrhynchite papyri, see T.M. Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus* (Michigan 2012) Appendix C ‘Wine Containers Used in Byzantine Oxyrhynchite’ 195–6.

17 γί(νονται) οἶν(ου) (ὀκτα)ξ(ετιαῖα) ἐκ τοῦ μεγάλ(ου) κηκ(ώματα) ρι. The eight-*sextarii sekoma* was commonly in use in the Apionic estates, and perhaps this is meant by the description of ‘large *sekoma*’ as opposed e.g. to four- five- or six-*sextarii sekomata*. The *sekoma* is nowhere else qualified by so a general and unspecific adjective denoting its volume as μέγα, but other particular descriptions of the *sekoma* also appear, e.g. ἐκ τοῦ κηκώματος τοῦ υἰοῦ Ἑλλᾶ SB XXII 15725.6–7 (sixth cent.). The term γεουχικὸν κήκωμα occurs in a number of papyri, viz. XVI 1896 19 (577), XLIX 3512 12 (492) and LXXVII 5123 20 (555). R. Hübner, ‘Four Oxyrhynchos Papyri’ *ZPE* 30 (1978) 195–207, at 207, observes that it is only the ὀκτάξεστον κήκωμα which is called γεουχικόν. However, neither γεουχικὸν κήκωμα nor e.g. κήκωμα τοῦ υἰοῦ Ἑλλᾶ itself denotes volume. The γεουχικὸν κήκωμα was the estate measuring vessel, which was used to decant wine from the jars (πίθοι) in which the pressed or trodden grape juice was collected to pour into the jars in which it would be stored.

18 παρὰ {λ}ληνόν. The scribe may well have confused παρὰ ληνόν with παρ’ ἀλλήλων. The phonetic error is probably corroborated by χωρίον (l. χωρίων) in l. 21. This is the only instance of this mistake.

The meaning of the word ληνός is discussed in depth by P. Mayerson, ‘The meaning and function of ληνός and related features in the production of wine’ *ZPE* 131 (2000) 161–7, who demonstrates convincingly that the word means a ‘treading/pressing floor or platform’, which may be taken by synecdoche to mean the entire equipment used in the process of making wine rather than ‘fermentation vat’ as held by N. Kruit, ‘The Meaning of Various Words Related to Wine: Some New Interpretations’ *ZPE* 90 (1992) 265–76, at 268–9. It is also discussed by J.–P. Brun, *Archéologie du vin et de l’huile dans l’ Empire romain* (Paris 2006) 146–7, who believes that when ληνός is accompanied by a number it means ‘cuvée’.

18–19 ἀπὸ γλα[ύ]κους | [ἀδόλου]. γλαῦκος is a common error for γλεῦκος, e.g. XLIX 3512 14 (492), LXXVII 5123 14 (555), P.Flor. I 65.8 (570), P.Mich XI

608.10 (sixth cent.). Confusion of its etymology may have been its origin: it might have been falsely connected with γλαυκός, ‘bluish green or grey’, which will have been the colour of the grape on the vines, cf. Sophocles *Tr.* 703 γλαυκῆς ὀπώρας. On the meaning of this expression, see P. Mayerson, ‘Transactions involving γλεῦκος/μοῦστος: Must or Wine? or Must Wine?’ *BASP* 36 (1999) 123–8. Mayerson concludes that γλεῦκος was must. Further corroboration of this may be adduced from the preceding expression, παρὰ ληνόν: the grape juice will not have had time to ferment so as to become wine before it was delivered.

20–21 ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ | [μέρ]ους τοῦ γεωργοῦ. The expression does not occur in other texts.

22–25 [ἐν τῇ τ]ρύγη τοῦ Μεσορη μηνός τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους | [ε̄κ ρ]πθ̄ τῆς παρούσης ἐβδόμης ἰνδικτίονος οἴνου | [ρύσει]ως τῆς σὺν θεῷ ὀγδόης ἐπινεμήσεως ἀνυπερ[θέτω]. The seventh indiction is the chronological reckoning: the crop of grapes, from which the must would be made, would be harvested between 25 July–23 August 544. This would be counted in the eighth ‘fiscal’ indiction, which would begin on 1 May 544. This was the date when the *praedelegatio* or preliminary taxation schedule would be issued; see Bagnall–Worp, *CSBE*² 30–4.

25 καλονήν (l. καλλονήν). On the simplification see Gignac, *Grammar* i 155.

25–26 ἀναδέχομαι δὲ τὴν καλονήν καὶ παραμονήν | [μέχ]ρι τοῦ Τυβι μηνός. Kruit, ‘Meaning of Various Words’ 271–2, maintains that ‘[i]n accordance with the sense of μόνιμος “stored, laid-up” [which he does not demonstrate convincingly] παραμονή in my opinion has to be translated as “keeping”, “storage”. The storage of the wine is also stipulated in P.Strasb. VII 696.7–9: καὶ ἐτοίμως ἔχω φυλάξαι τὸν προκειμέν[ον] | οἶνον ἐν τῷ ἡλιακτηρίῳ μέχρι τῆς τούτων | μεταφορᾶς.’ It may, however, be questioned why the vintner must guarantee the wine to be of good quality as well as its alleged storage. The agreement here is simply to deliver one hundred and ten eight-*sextarii* *sekomata* of wine without delay for a price that the purchaser has paid. There is no conceivable reason why the purchaser might wish to have his

wine stored till Tybi by the vintner. The meaning of the παραμονή is clear both from its derivation (see LSJ⁹ s.v. παραμένω II.4) and usage outside that of the papyri: e.g. Ath. 1.55 (Kaibel) οἶνος πρὸς παραμονὴν ἐπιτήδειος or Str. 11.10.1 εὐοινεῖ δὲ σφόδρα ἡ γῆ· καὶ γὰρ εἰς τριγωνίαν παραμένει ἐν ἀπιττώτοις ἄγγεσι. It is the clear implication of the clause, which occurs in nearly all similar documents, that the wine was considered to last at least four to five months before it might be spoiled. However, some contracts do guarantee the durability of the wine right up till Pharmuthi e.g. SB XVI 12639 (541, Heracleopolites) or P.Coll. Youtie II 93 (sixth cent., from Heracleopolites).

26 [μέχ]ρι τοῦ Tybi μηνός. The clause guaranteeing durability of the wine almost invariably runs μέχρι ὅλου τοῦ Tybi μηνός so that it is odd that ὅλου is lacking here. It may very well have been a mere omission but cf. e.g. LXI 4132 28–30 (619) which runs ἀναδεχόμενος | τὴν καλλονὴν τοῦ οἴνου μέχρι τοῦ Tybi μηνός. The omission will not have signified a shorter period of guarantee on the keeping of the wine.

28 ἐν πρωτίῳ οἴνῳ. It is stipulated in only a handful of contracts that the wine given in exchange for spoiled wine must be of first quality, viz. P.Flor. I 65.15 (570/1?, Oxyrhynchus), P.Mich. XI 608.17 (sixth cent.?, Oxyrhynchites), P.Lond. V 1764.7 (sixth cent.?, Oxyrhynchus), SB XXVI 16830.27–8 (sixth cent., Heracleopolites or Oxyrhynchites).

28–29 κινδύνῳ τῶν ἐμοὶ ὑπαρχόντων ὑποκειμ(ένων) εἰς τοῦτο. For instances of clauses similar to this bearing on the possessions of ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί, see LXX 4794 19–21 n.

32 ἀποδώσω αὐτὰ ἐν οἴνῳ] ἐπιτηδίῳ. Such detailed subscriptions as that of 19 are not terribly common, but when they do occur, they run more usually e.g. XXXIX 3512 24–5 (492) καὶ ἀποδώσω ἐν τῇ προθεσμί[α] καὶ συμφωνεῖ μοι πάντα ὡς πρόκειται. Wine is described as ἐπιτήδειος at in a number of ‘sale on delivery’ contracts, viz SB XVI 12639.16–17 (541), P.Coll. Youtie II 93.8 (sixth cent.),

P.Select 2.6–7 (sixth cent.) (all three from Heracleopolites), and T.Varie 8.8 (699) (Oxyrhynchus). A similar expression occurs in P.David. 10.19 (523, from Oxyrhynchus), a pledge to replace wine which has spoiled, [ἀπ]οδώσω ἐν τῇ τρύγῃ καὶ συμφ(ωνεῖ) μοι πάντα ὡς πρόκ(εῖται).

35 I have been unable to identify the notary who signed the document in J.M. Diethart–K.A. Worp, *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten* (Wien 1986) 77–90.

20. APPLICATION FOR TRANSFERENCE OF TAXATION

56 1B.25/74(a)

16.4 x 15.9 cm11

March 571

Flavia Cyranymphe addresses a request to the tax office of the division and *domus* of Theon in Oxyrhynchus to have her name removed from the register of taxes for the *embole*, the *naula*, the charges on the freighting of the wheat to Alexandria, and other taxes for which she is liable on account of her ownership of some land. Presumably she will also have applied to have the name of the person, on whom the liabilities would henceforth have fallen, entered in her stead. These applications, usually called ἐπιτάγματα τοῦ σωματισμοῦ or τοῦ κουφισμοῦ, are made when ownership of the land changes e.g. through sale of the land, mortgaging the land, marriage or inheritance. The reason why Cyranymphe applies to be relieved of these liabilities is unknown.

Documents of this kind are not very numerous, and this is a particularly badly preserved example. The published Oxyrhynchite applications are: P.Michael 33 (367–8), L 3583 (444), P.Warr. 3 (before 504?), XVI 1887 (538), SB XXIV 15955 (540), and I 126 (572). Elsewhere in Egypt, applications for alteration of the taxation lists are commoner. Hermopolite are: SB XIV 12133 (VI); P.Laur. III 78 (VI); P.Laur. III 77 (603) P.Würzb. 19 (622?) P.Laur. II 26 (VII); Arsinoite is P.Würzb. 18 (IV); from Aphrodito are: P.Cairo Masp. I 67048 (IV AD), 67117 (527), 67118 (547?) 67119 + 67048 (VI); and from Palestine are P.Petra I 3, 4, 5 (all 538), III 19 (539–40), 23 (544), 24 (544), 25 (559).

Two further applications from Oxyrhynchus are also in the process of publication (ed. A. Syrkou). They are P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a (572), which is the counterpart to I 126 (572), and P.Oxy. inv. 54 1B.26(E)/A(7)a (575). They provide useful information on a number of points. The case of P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a and I 126 might suggest that both parties who were involved in the change in the ownership will have been required to apply separately to make the

application valid: P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a is the application made by the father, Ioannes, and I 126 that made by the daughter, Stephanous. But since no other counterparts to the other applications have been published this claim cannot be pressed far on the current basis of the evidence.

The publication of **20**²⁰ brings to four the number of applications which are addressed to the same *μερίκι καὶ οἶκος τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μνήμης Θεῶνος*: the others are P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 4, I 126, and SB XXIV 15955, and, interestingly, all of them involve women.

Unfortunately the papyrus has sustained such serious damage that it is only possible to reconstruct the date, the name of the addressee and the applicant, and the nature of the application: much of the left-hand side and lower portion of the document has fallen away, and what remains of the lower portion has also largely been obliterated. The text runs with the fibres. The back is blank, but one would expect a description of the contents of the papyrus, e.g. *ἐπίταγμα τοῦ σωματιμοῦ*, to have been written somewhere on the back, as e.g. I 126 has, viz. *ἐπίτα[λ]μ(α) σωματιμ(οῦ) γενόμε(νον) π(αρά) Στεφαν[οῦ]δος τῆς εὐγε[ν]ε(στάτης) μετ[ὰ] σ[υνα]ινέ(εως) Μάρκ[ου] | [. . . .] ω [. . .] [.] . . μ[.] λ [. ᾶ] πὸ τῆ[ς] νέα[ς] Ἰουστίνου πόλεως.*

There are two small loose pieces, which are entangled in the fibres. It is unclear where they will have stood in relation to the rest of the text. They are very scrappy and I do not transcribe them.

²⁰ As their inventory numbers show, both **20** (56 1B.25/74(a)) and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a were excavated in Grenfell and Hunt's first season at Oxyrhynchus (1896–7), perhaps part of the large find of Byzantine documents of 18th and 19th March of which Grenfell speaks in his reports to the EES: see N. Gonis 'Excavations at Oxyrhynchus (1896–1907)' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 345–68, at 350. I 126 was never assigned an inventory number but, as an almost identical copy of P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a, one might presume that it will have lain near these other two papyri in the rubbish dumps.

- † βασιλείας τοῦ θει]οτάτου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου ἡμῶν δεσπότης μεγίστου
 εὐεργέτου Φλ(αουίου) Ἰο]υρτίνου τοῦ αἰωνίου Αὐγούστου καὶ Ἀυτοκράτορος ἔτους
 ς, ὑπατείας τῆς αὐτῶν γ]αληνότητος τὸ β//, Φαμενωθ ιε, ἰνδ(ικτίονος) δ, (ἔτους) $\overline{c\mu\zeta}$ καὶ $\overline{c\iota\varsigma}$.
 τῇ ἑξακτορικῇ τάξει] μερίδος καὶ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μηνῆς Θεωνος
- 5 διὰ Ν.Ν. c.6 τοῦ θαυμ]ασιωτάτου ἐπιμελητοῦ Φλαουί]α Κυρανύμφη θυγάτηρ
 Ν.Ν. c.15 ὄρωμ]μέ[ν]η ἀπὸ τ]α[ύτ]η[ς] τῆς νέας Ἰου]ρτίν]ου π[ρό]λεως
 ἐκ τῶν παρὰ σοὶ δ]ημοσίων χαρτῶν [έ]κ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ Φιλοξένου
- c.15]ερου μου συμβίου θελήσατε κουφίσει τὸ ἐμὸν
 ὄνομα c.19]η συντελεῖα ὑπὲρ μὲν ἐμβολῆς πίτου καγόν-
- 10 ος ἀρτάβας *n* c.14]ς τρίτον μετὰ τῶν τούτων ναύλων
 Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ μεταφορ]ῆς καὶ παντοίων ἀναλωμάτων, ὑπὲρ δὲ
 κανονικῶν κεράτια *n* c.18]ου Θεωνος χρυσοῦ
 κεράτια *n* c.25]α τῷ κατὰ καιρὸν
 c.35 ἰπ]ποβ[ο]υρδῶνος ἦτοι
 15 c.35]τέσσερα δημοσίω
 ζυγῶ c.30]ε[.]ε[.] τῆς θυγατρὸς

c.40

]υμένην θυγ[ατ]έρα

c.40

]ιακτηευ .[

.

3 ἴε ινδ L 5 φλαουῖα

‘In the reign of our most godly and most pious master, greatest benefactor Flavius Justinus, the eternal Augustus and Imperator, year 6, in the consulship of his Serenity for the second time, Phamenoth 15, indiction 4, year 247 and 216.’

‘To the office of collection of the taxes of the *divisio* and *domus* of Theon, of *spectabilis* memory ... through N.N., most admirable *epimeletes*. Flavia Cyranymphe, daughter of N.N. ... originating from this New City of Justinus. From the public lists kept by you ... please remove my name and (that of) Philoxenus ... my ? husband ... *n* artabas of grain for the *embole* ... one third with the *naula* and the shipping costs to Alexandria and transport dues and expenses of all other kinds ... *n* carats for the public *canon* ? of Theon carats ? of gold ... to the then ? ... of a mule ... four by the private standard ... of a daughter ... the ... daughter ...’

1–3 For the regnal and consular clauses combined and conversion of the date, see Bagnall–Worp, *CSBE*² 47–9, 94–5, and 210 (where it is formula 4). The clause is attested solely in Oxyrhynchus.

3 (ἔτους) $\overline{\text{c}\mu\zeta}$ $\overline{\text{καὶ}}$ $\overline{\text{c}\iota\varsigma}$. This is the peculiarly Oxyrhynchite era. The two counts refer to the regnal years of Constantius II and Julian respectively. The first true era year was that after the death of Julian, in 363/4. See *CSBE*² 55–62. The addition of *καί* between the two regnal counts seems to have been somewhat arbitrary and a matter of vogue: without making a systematic search on the matter, *καί* between the two regnal counts seems to appear from the middle of the sixth century onwards, e.g. I 146 4 and I 147 3 (555), I 149 5 (572/3), XX 2283 4 (586), LXVIII 4704 4 (626).

4 τῆ ἑξακτορικῆ τάξει] μερίδος καὶ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μηνίμης Θεῶνος. The usual address of the Oxyrhynchite applications is τῆ ἑξακτορικῆ τάξει μερίδος καὶ οἴκου N.N.: thus e.g. P.Warr. I 3.1–2 (before 504?), XVI 1887 2 (538), I 126 4 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a (572), SB XXIV 15955.3 (540). But L 3583 2 (444) is addressed only to the μερί]δι τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μηνίμης

Τιμαγένου. A more significant difference appears in P.Oxy. inv. 54 1B.26(e)/A(7)a 3–4 which is addressed to τῇ ἑξακτορικῇ τάξει τη (l. τοῖς) τε βοηθοῖς | λογιστηρίου ταύτης τῆς νέας Ἰουκτίνου πόλεως. This demonstrates that the long defunct *domi* of Theon and Timagenes functioned in an identical manner with the δημόσιον λογιστήριον of Oxyrhynchus for the purposes of collecting fiscal dues. This system was in operation from at least 564 (cf. BL VI p.61), as P.Got. 9 demonstrates. It is perhaps worth noting that the applications from elsewhere in Egypt reveal marked regional differences, which will reflect the different practices for the collection of fiscal dues.

] μερίδος καὶ οἴκου τοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μνήμης Θεωνος. The exact nature of the μερίς in late antique Egypt is not entirely clear. However, J. Gascou, ‘Les grands domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine’ *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 40–47 = *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* (Paris 2008) 162–70, has proposed a view which has largely commanded the *communis opinio*. Gascou’s view holds that the μερίς is an abstract ‘share’ of the total annual fiscal revenues for which a landholder would once have been liable. The *domi* are fossilised conceptions: when the original landholder died his name remained attached to the ‘share’ of the liability for the dues which had subsequently fallen to whoever owned the land at the time. See also T.M. Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus* (Michigan 2012) 44–8.

The *domus* of Theon is well attested in papyri: see Gascou, loc. cit. 41–4 = 163–6. On Theon himself and his career, see N. Gonis, ‘Prosopographica II’ *APF* 55 (2009) 90–95, at 91–92. G. Azzarello, ‘P.Oxy. XVI 2039 e la nascita della *domus gloriosa* degli Apioni’ *ZPE* 155 (2006) 208–28, at 210, suggests that ‘l’oikos di Theon sarebbe scomparso al più tardi intorno al 459/60’ based on the information offered by XVI 2039 (562/3), a statement of provision of ῥηπάριοι for the *domus* of Theon by other estates.

As a kind of fiscal entity, it is unsurprising that the *domus* of Theon is almost exclusively known from documents dealing with matters of taxation. Its instances of attestation are, besides **20**: applications for remission of taxation I **126** and 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a (572), and SB XXIV 15955 (540/1); receipts for the *embole* XVI **1999** (sixth/seventh cent.) XVI **2009** (sixth cent.); a receipt for the *canon* XVI **2016** (sixth cent.), and ‘Un documento dell’*oikos* di Theon (PL/III 331)’ (436 or 437) ed. R. Pintaudi, *BASP* 45 (2008) 185–8, which mentions the *annona* for an unknown military unit. Apparently the only papyrus which mentions the *domus* of Theon but does not deal with matters of taxation is XVI **2039**.

5 διὰ Ν.Ν. c.6 τοῦ θαυμ[α]σιωτάτου ἐπιμελητοῦ. I **126** 4–5 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 5, which are dated only one year later than **20**, suggest that an almost certain restoration of the name in the lacuna will be διὰ Κύρου τοῦ θαυμ[α]σιωτάτου ἐπιμελητοῦ. The supplement would be almost exactly commensurate with what can be accommodated in the lacuna.

Cyrus’ *epitheton ornans* in I **126** 5 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 5 is αἰδέσιμος. This is similar in rank to θαυμασιώτατος: see O. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (Giessen 1930), s.vv. θαυμασιώτατος, 15–16, and αἰδέσιμος, 1–2. Two other Oxyrhynchite papyri refer to him, viz. XVI **1999** 1 (sixth/seventh cent.) records a Κῦρος ὁ θαυμα(σιώτατος) ἐπιμε(λητῆς) οἴκου Θεῶνος, and P.Got. 9.3–4 (564) is addressed to τῷ θαυμασιωτάτῳ Κύρῳ ἐπιμελ[ητῆ τ]οῦ δημοσίου λογιστηρίου ταύτης τῆς Ὀξυρυγγ(ιτῶν) πόλεως.

Cyrus’ career as superintendant of the public record office in Oxyrhynchus lasted at least twelve years from 560 (I **125**) till 572 (I **126**). Cyrus held office as a public agent which is demonstrated by the fact that he is addressed indifferently as both ἐπιμε(λητῆς) οἴκου Θεῶνος in XVI **1999** 1 and ἐπιμελητῆ τοῦ δημοσίου λογιστηρίου ταύτης τῆς Ὀξυρυγγ(ιτῶν) πόλεως in I **125** 3. On this see Gascou, loc. cit. 43 and esp. n. 253 = 165 and n. 251.

Κυρανύμφη seems not to have been printed before, although it probably ought to have been read at SB XVIII 13762.30 (sixth/seventh cent., a private letter of unknown provenance) where the editor suggests Κύρα νύμφη πολλὰ ὑμᾶς προσκυνεῖ. But Κυρανύμφη is the likelier interpretation than the name Κύρα with νύμφη in apposition, as the want of the article shows. Νύμφη (Coptic NEMΦE ; the instances of its attestations are enumerated at http://www.onb.ac.at/files/kopt_namen.pdf) is rare as a name in late antiquity: there seems to be only a single attestation in Greek texts from the period, viz SB VIII 9876.6 (534, a lease contract from Heracleopolis)

Κυρανύμφη belongs to the class of women's names established by J.–L. Fournet–J. Gascou, 'À propos de PSI IX 1061 descr.: Le nom du saunier et une formation méconnue d'anthroponymes féminins' *ZPE* 135 (2001) 139–149. The class 'comport[e] en premier élément le titre, devenu en l'occurrence un nom propre, Κύρα soit à l'état libre (et donc déclinable) soit à l'état construit. Cette onomastique peut être rapprochée de formations contemporaines contenant en premier élément un titre, ainsi Ἄπα Ἄμα' (149).

6 ἀπὸ .τα[ύτ]η[ς] τῆς νέας Ἰου[κτίν]ου π[ό]λεως. The city of Oxyrhynchus affected this name in honour of Justin II for a brief period during the latter part of his reign. The instances of its occurrence in the papyri are listed in LXII 4350 5 n. with references updated in LXXI 4836 8 n. It is not known when the city resolved to change its name, but its earliest attestation is P.Flor. I 65.1–2 (570/71) and its latest is LXX 4791 6 (578). Consequently, for the same period the nome was renamed ὁ Ἰουκτινουπολίτης νομός.

7 ἐκ τῶν παρὰ τοὺς δημοσίων χαρτῶν. These public records, also called δημόσιοι πτυκτοί in I 126 8 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 7, will have been kept in the δημόσιον λογιστήριον.

7–8 [ἐ]κ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ Φιλοξέγου | [c.15]ερου μου συμβίου. In fiscal documents, ὄνομα means 'entry on a fiscal register for personal liability'. On this see P.Apoll. 74 introd.

8–9 θελήσατε κουφίσαι τὸ ἐμὸν | [ὄνομα]. This is the formal request to remit taxes due from a person's ὄνομα. Usually it is followed by the request to transfer them to that of another. Depending on the construction, this can be expressed by the aorist infinitive βαρέσαι e.g. I 126 7–8 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 7–8 θελήσῃ ἢ σὴ [α]ἰδεσιμότης [ἐ]κ τῶν ἀποκεμμένων παρ' αὐτῆ δημοσίων πτυκτῶν | κουφίσαι τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα καὶ βαρέσαι τὸ ὄνομα Στεφανοῦδος. Other constructions also occur e.g. L 3583 6 ἀποκουφίσατε ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος ... σωματίσατε τῷ ὀνόματι, or XVI 1887 11–13 θέλησον ἀποκουφίσαι | [καὶ σύμπαντα] τ[αὐ]τὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα δημόσια τελέσματα ἐνέγκατε καὶ σωματίσατε | [εἰς τὰς προσ]ηγούσας.

9]η συντελεῖα. The articulation of this is uncertain. The verb συντελεῖν occurs in P.Oxy. inv. 54 1B.26(e)/A(7)a 10–11, which runs θελήσατε δεχόμενοι τὸ παρὸν ἐπίσταλμα κουφίσαι μὲν τὸ ἡμῶν ὄνομα ἐπὶ τῇ εἰρημένῃ ἐμβ[ολ]ῆ, ἥτις συντελεῖ εἰς εἰσὶ κανόνος ἀρτάβας ... Further, L 3583 10–11 has σωματίσατε τῷ ὀνόματι Παύλου διασημοτάτου υἱοῦ | [. . . .]ρου αὐτοῦ τελούντος τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν παντοῖα δημόσια τελέσματα. τελούντος is identical in meaning with συντελεῖ in P.Oxy. inv. 54 1B.26(e)/A(7)a. Alternatively, one might consider the noun συντέλεια in the nominative] ἢ συντέλεια or dative]η συντελείᾳ. Of the two the dative would possibly be the more easily accommodated by the syntax: it is perhaps conceivable that the request ran e.g. καὶ βαρέσαι N.N. τ]ῆ συντελείᾳ ... The verb συντελεῖν and its cognates συντελεστής and συντελής are the regular words for payment of fiscal dues. On this see Gascou, loc. cit. 13–16 = 134–8 and A. Laniado, 'Συντελεστής: notes sur un terme fiscal surinterprété', *JJP* 26 (1996) 23–51, esp. 31–36 and, concerning taxation in Oxyrhynchus, 48–51.

9–10 ὑπὲρ μὲν ἐμβολῆς εἰσὶ καγόν[ος ἀρτάβας n]. *Canon* is a general term for the total annual fiscal dues arising from ownership and exploitation of the land; see L. Wenger, *Canon in den römischen Rechtsquellen und in den Papyri* (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsbericht 220,

1942) 24–47 and C. Zuckerman, *Du village à l'Empire. Autour du registre fiscal d'Aphrodito (525/526)* (Paris 2004) 179–80.

10–11 μετὰ τῶν τούτων ναύλων | [Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ μεταφορ]ᾶς καὶ παντοίων ἀναλωμάτων. The restorations are based on I 126 11–12 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 11–12 which reads εἰς μὲν ἐμ[β]ο[λ]ῆν πίτου κανόνος ἀρτάβας ἐξήκοντα τρεῖς μετὰ τῶν τούτων ναύλων | Ἀλεξανδ[ρ]είας καὶ μεταφορᾶς καὶ παντοίων ἀναλωμάτων.

The *naula* were transport surtaxes on the grain paid for the *embole* (Lat. *canon frumentarius urbis Constantinopolitanae*, which was the tax paid in grain levied to be sent to Constantinople to be distributed to certain sections of the population), and the μεταφορά was the costs of freightage of the grain to Alexandria. It is unclear what other kind of charges might have been levied on the grain or its freightage. On the transportation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople, see A.J.B. Sirks, *Food for Rome* (Amsterdam 1991) 193–239, and Zuckerman, *op. cit.* 194–206.

11–12 ὑπὲρ δὲ | [κανονικῶν κερᾶτια *n*]. This is restored on the basis of I 126 12–13, P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 12–13 and SB XXIV 15955.12. The *canonica* were taxes which were included in the *canon*, that is the unspecified annual fiscal dues. They will have included both the *embole* and the *largitionalia* (which were the various personal taxes levied in money for the *sacrae largitiones*). See A.C. Johnson–L.C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies*² (Amsterdam 1967) 309–10.

13]α τῷ κατὰ καιρόν. I 126 13–5 and P.Oxy. inv. 53 1B.26(F)/C(5)a 13–14 both offer καὶ ὑπὲρ κανονικῶν | καὶ τὰ καταβαλλ[ό]μενα τῷ κατὰ καιρὸν ἔθνικῷ χρυσῶνῃ χρυσοῦ κερᾶτια εἴκοσι δύο δημοσίῳ | ζυγῷ. This suggests that τὰ καταβαλλόμεν]α ought to be restored here.

14 [ἰπ]ποβ[ο]υρδῶνος ἦτοι. This is the second attestation of the word; its other occurrence is in XVI 1919 14 (VII). The word is rather puzzling in both this

context and that of its other occurrence: they both deal with fiscal matters, and one would scarcely expect a mule to have anything to do with them. Mules were rare in Roman and Byzantine Egypt because environmental conditions were not particularly favourable to breeding them: see C. Adams, *Land transport in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2007) 60–62.

The mule must have some relevance to taxation, and it may be worth speculating that it will have been a further charge for transportation of the wheat from which the applicant wishes to be relieved. It may be the tax levied for the land transportation of the wheat by mule, the *χρυσὸς βουρδώνων*, which is known from Hermopolite, Heracleopolite and Oxyrhynchite nomes. This is, however, a strictly military tax, which had nothing to do with the *annona civica*. The connection would again be obscure. On the *χρυσὸς βουρδώνων* see CPR XXIV 4.36–7 n., and F. Mitthof, *Annona militaris: Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten* (Pap. Flor. XXXII; Firenze 2001) i 196.

That [ἰπ]ποβ[ο]υρδώνων refers to a further surcharge might be further indicated by XVI 1919, a schedule of several fiscal charges to be paid, which include some of the same taxes and charges mentioned in 20. A tax for transportation would be most consistent with the rest of the contents of the document. If this is correct, it is tempting to supplement ὑπὲρ to precede ἰπ]ποβ[ο]υρδώνων so that 13–14 would then run καὶ τὰ καταβαλλόμενα τῷ κατὰ καιρὸν | [ἔθνικῷ χρυσώνῃ χρυσοῦ κεράτια *n* καὶ ὑπὲρ ἰπ]ποβ[ο]υρδώνων ἦτοι.

15–16 δημοσίῳ | [ζυγῷ]. Sums paid in Gold were reckoned by the the ‘public standard’ (δημόσιος ζυγός), the ‘private standard’ (ιδιωτικὸς ζυγός) or the ‘Alexandrian standard’ (ζυγὸς Ἀεξανδρείας). These weight standards differed from one another: on this see K. Maresch, *Nomisma und Nomismatia* (Pap. Col. XXI; Köln 1994) 33–4 and 38–9 and Zuckerman, *op. cit.* 78.

18–19] .ιατῆσευ. [. Possibly τῆς εὐτ[υχοῦς | [*n*th ἰνδικτίωνος/ἐπινεμήσεως] might have stood after the break. Alternatively,] .ιατῆς εὐγ[εν][εστάτης] might be

restored. On the epithet, which is applied almost exclusively to women who were of middling to higher social standing, see K.A. Worp, 'Εὐγενέτατος' *ZPE* 109 (1995) 181–6. If that were the case,] . ιαc would be the end of a name, which has not been mentioned before.

21. PRIVATE LETTER FROM BYZANTIUM

1B. 13/B

29.6 x 30.7 cm

Late sixth century

A large and nearly complete letter of greater than usual interest, chiefly because it is written by a man either residing or having recently spent an extended period of time at Constantinople who writes in moderately reverential terms to a man in Oxyrhynchus.

The letter seems to have been provoked by a reproach addressed to the writer by the addressee for his failure to correspond with the addressee. This draws an indignant response from the writer who counters the accusation and himself reproves the addressee for his own lack of correspondence. Once the writer has recounted that he has been ill and that he is in danger of falling into gravest destitution, he apprises the addressee of several rather complex business affairs which involve payments, grain and various individuals in Constantinople and Oxyrhynchus. They require the addressee's action. The sender asks him to instruct a *symmachus* to collect a payment. He mentions agents, further payments and the purchase of oil and linen. The sender then exhorts the addressee to pray for him so that he may recover from his illness. Next he writes of one of his household slaves having been 'dragged away' from him by one Isidorus who demands of him to sell the slave. The writer then urges the addressee to take care of his house and perhaps his chattels in Oxyrhynchus. Then he writes of another complex affair. It involves letters concerning grain which have failed to reach him. He then bids the addressee to convey some letters to the wife of an *agens in rebus*, and recounts that the wife of a former *praeses* is harassing him about grain in Constantinople. He mentions that she said that she had sent her slave to Oxyrhynchus with a payment and wants him to write a response so that he may be freed from scandal. Finally the writer bids the addressee to send letters to an estate banker in Heracleopolis.

The identities of the correspondents will arouse some interest, but the prevailing epistolary conventions of the period led to the suppression of the identities of both the sender and the addressee in the body of the letter. On the back, the address is too badly faded for the addressee's name to be revealed, although the customary flourish of titlature remains. One may surmise from the terms of address that the addressee may have been a moderately notable figure in Oxyrhynchus. The sender is in Constantinople at the time of writing; his business there is connected with interests in Oxyrhynchus and Heracleopolis. He may have been on a business trip to the imperial capital from Oxyrhynchus or Heracleopolis.

21 demonstrates many of the conventions which characterised the correspondence of the upper strata of society in Egypt of late antiquity. The evolution of correspondence in later Roman and Byzantine Egypt, with particular attention to its conventions and its literary and rhetorical characteristics, has been documented and discussed in detail by J.-L. Fournet, 'Esquisse d'une anatomie de la lettre antique tardive d'après les papyrus' in R. Delmaire-J. Desmulliez-P.-L. Galtier (eds.), *Correspondances. Documents pour l'histoire de l'Antiquité tardive*. (Lyon 2009) 23–66 = *Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux* 40, *série litt. et phil.* 13.

The writing runs across the fibres, '*transversa charta*', a practice which began to predominate in the fifth century and prevailed almost to the complete exclusion of that of writing along the fibres in the sixth and seventh centuries, as Fournet establishes, loc. cit. 29. The letter may be further evidence, since it may have been written at Byzantium, that this practice was not restricted to Oxyrhynchus, as Fournet observes, loc. cit. 29, or even Egypt.

Furthermore, on account of its likely origin, it might be important from a palaeographical point of view because it might provide a further example of handwriting from Constantinople: these are rare. But it must be stated that the letter may have been written by the sender himself, or one of his retinue, who may have

been from Oxyrhynchus, rather than a local scribe in Constantinople. Hitherto only six documents have been identified, of which the origin is certain to have been Constantinople. They are collected and their characteristics are analysed by E. Crisci, *Scrivere greco fuori d’Egitto* (Pap. Flor. XXVII; Firenze 1996) 101–9. Four of the six belong to the ‘Dioscurus Archive’, named after Dioscurus, a poet and notary of the village of Aphrodito. They are SB VI 9102 (c.Sept. 548), a letter from the *curator* of the *domus divina* at Constantinople addressed to the *dux* of the Thebaid; SB IV 7438 (527–65), a letter of introduction for Dioscurus; P.Cair. Masp. I 67032 (551), a contract; P.Cair. Masp. II 67126 (Jan. 541); possibly P.Cair.Masp. III 67352, a draft (?) of a petition (see J.–L. Fournet, ‘Les tribulations d’un pétitionnaire égyptien à Constantinople’ in T. Gagos (ed.), *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology* (Ann Arbor 2010) 243–52. Another is SPP XX 146 (mid 5th cent.), a loan which is unconnected with the ‘Dioscurus Archive’.

As far as the documentary hands from Constantinople are concerned, Crisci finds that they do not exhibit any peculiar traits which set them apart from the hands of the rest of the Byzantine world. He observes, *op. cit.* 103, that ‘la scrittura documentaria usuale costantinopolitana non sembrerebbe caratterizzarsi per una sua particolare fisionomia rispetto ad altre aree del mondo bizantino’. The observation would be borne out by this document: it displays strong similarities in script, format and size with other letters that emanate from Oxyrhynchus from the same period, e.g. LVI 3867 (sixth cent.), a letter from a similar social milieu to that from which **21** comes. The similarities include the hand and the format of the letter: the size of the papyrus is 28.7 x 24.9 cm, its margins are 2 cm at top and bottom, and it is likewise written *transverta charta*.

21 also has many coincidences with PSI III 237 (sixth cent.), which is from Oxyrhynchus. An image of it is available at ww.psi-online.callatech.it. It is also a business letter. While the hand may have some strong similarities, it is not the same. But its content is almost identical: the addressee is referred to as ἡ ὑμετέρη

λαμπρότης, the writer refers to an ἀποδόσιμον (3 etc.), γράμματα (6 etc.), πραγματευταί (3 etc.), and τὸν κύριον Μηγᾶν τὸν ἐν . . . νιον (10). A.S. Hunt, in his own edition of PSI III in the Sackler Library in Oxford, corrects ἐν . . . νιον to κύμμαχον. The online image does not confirm this, although it does not definitely exclude it either. Moreover, the writer refers to making someone come to Alexandria. While all of these points of coincidence singly are wholly commonplace in correspondence in Egypt of late antiquity, together they are difficult to dismiss as coincidence, and if Hunt's correction is right, the possibility of a connection between PSI III 237 and **21** would be strong.

21 may be dated wit to the late sixth century. LVI **3867** is dated to the sixth century on comparison with BGU IV 1094 which is securely dated to 29 September 525, and **21** shares a number of affinities the in letters with the Berlin text, e.g. η, κ, λ, ρ, and τ.

The letter provides some new prosopographical information. An Antiochus, a former *praeses*, and a Comitas, an *agens in rebus*, appear. Neither of them has been attested to date; see 21 and 22 nn. Besides this however, the letter offers a fascinating *aperçu* into the affairs of an Egyptian in Constantinople. One may surmise that he will almost certainly have been connected with a prominent family which will have had interests, very possibly significant in size and diversity, both in Oxyrhynchus and further afield in Heracleopolis. He appears to be attempting to administer them from Constantinople.

In spite of these evident means, the sender has allowed himself to be overwhelmed by the vicissitudes of life in the great city, or that is at least what he claims (10). The anguish occasioned by the almost certainly fictitious precariousness of his existence and the exigencies of his affairs give the impression that, while he will probably not have been directly dependent on the addressee, he certainly needed the addressee's help to sort out his affairs back in Egypt. It is fairly safe to assume that the writer's predicament will not have been nearly as bad as he

has made out: only one of his slaves has been ‘dragged off’. His misery is simply a *captatio benevolentiae* designed to make the addressee comply with the injunctions which the writer makes on him. Nonetheless, it might have been the case that, were the addressee to die or be otherwise somehow incapacitated, the writer’s business interests would have been adversely affected.

Both writer and addressee will have been to some extent prominent individuals in Oxyrhynchus. In the absence of any positive evidence as to their identities, one may only speculate on possibilities.

The addressee has attained the *clarissimate*. At this date it did not signify that he was a member of the Roman Senate. The *clarissimate* was now common and had long been devalued: it was held, for instance, by all members of the civil administration. Membership of the Senate had become restricted to the more highly ranked members of the imperial administration such as the *viri illustres* etc.; see 1 n. Nonetheless, the addressee can employ a *symmachus* and he moves in fairly elevated social circles in that he can communicate a letter with the wife of an *agens in rebus* (21).

The sender is involved in business both in Oxyrhynchus and Heracleopolis, but he has been in Constantinople long enough to have sent several letters to Oxyrhynchus which have gone unanswered by the addressee. It is ambiguous whether *διάγοντος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ* (3) implies that he resided permanently at Constantinople or that he was visiting simply for the purpose of transacting his affairs. The mention of payments and the complex affairs which deal with grain would seem to be significant in his occupation there. He may have been involved in the state importation of grain from Egypt to Constantinople or in the distribution of the *annona*, or perhaps he was acting as the agent of the addressee who might have owned one of the great estates that had come to predominate over the landscape of Egypt from the later fifth century onwards.

If one were to hazard a guess about the identity of the addressee, it would be tempting to draw a candidate from someone connected with the administration of the estate of the Flavii Apiones, simply because they are the most prominent family at the time in Oxyrhynchus, had possessions in the Heracleopolites, and are abundantly attested in the papyrological documentation. The family itself lived at Constantinople, where they occupied the highest echelons of the imperial administration, but their estate controlled significant proportion of the Oxyrhynchite nome. The information offered by the papyrus would be well compatible with what is known about the interests and circumstances of the Apiones. On the family in general, see e.g. R. Mazza, *L'archivio degli Apioni* (Bari 2001), and T.M. Hickey, *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus* (Michigan 2012). However, the total lack of evidence to prove a link prohibits outright even tentative connection of the writer or addressee with the Apiones.

The letter has sustained some damage on the left-hand side, where the papyrus has been sheared off in two large sections, and at approximately one quarter down and half way down, where the letter will have been folded on the horizontal axis. Here, the fibres have been abraded away in the middle so as to make reading very difficult and, at times, impossible. The damage combined with the nice elaboration of language leaves much of the sense of the letter obscure: one can make out a general impression from it, but the details are in many cases beyond recovery.

†

- ἡ ὑμ]ετέρα ἀδελφικὴ λαμπρότης ἐν ἅπασιν πρ[ο]ῶτερεύειν ἐθέλουσα
 ἐγκαλ]εῖ προλαβοῦσα ἐγκαλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ὀφειλομένη. ἐμοῦ γάρ, καί-
 περ] διάγοντος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ, γράψαντος αὐτῇ διαφόρους ἐπιτολὰς
 παρ' ὑμ]ῶν γράμμα οὐκ ἔδεξάμην. ἐπεὶ οὖν καθὼς ἔγραψα ἀρρωστία
 5 μ[.] περιέπεσα καὶ μέχρι τοῦ [π]αρόντος ἀρρωστῶ, ζῆ κύριος, ἐνδεὴς ὢν
 ωσει[.]ρτου· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει του . . . τελεσαντ καταξιώσ[α]τε ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ
 ὥρᾳ πέμψαι Μηνᾶν τὸν σύμμαχον ποιῶντες γενέσθαι τὸ μικρὸν ἀποδόσιμον.
 γράψουσιν δὲ ο[ἱ] πραγματευταὶ οἱ ποιῶντες ὅτι καὶ πλείο[ν]ος ἔληθῶ λάβουσι(ν)
 παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐνταῦθα ἰδιόχειρον καὶ πιστεύουσίν μοι. ἵνα δὲ μηδὲν τῇ ὑμετέρα
 10 ἀδελφότη(ητι) δυσχερὲς ἀπαντήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἀποθάνω ἐνταῦθα τῇ λιμῷ,
] [. . .] συνειδήσ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐργάτ[η]ν [. . .] το . . . ἔλαβες ἢ ὑπόθου ἢ ἔχε παρὰ σε[α]ντ[ῶ]
 c.6]ειαν καὶ ἐρχόμενος συν . . [.] αι [.]ση δύο ἡμερῶν πληρῶ ἐμαυτὸν ἐξ
 c.9]ε . . α ν καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπ[ο]φε[ί]λομαι μικρὰς συνηθεί[α]ς καὶ οἰογδήποτε
 c.6] οὐκ ἀνέχομ λείσθαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. τὸ δὲ ἔλαιον καθὼς ἐκελεύσατε
 15 καὶ τὸ] λινάριν ἀγοράζω. εὔξασθαι δὲ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ παρακαλῶ ἵνα δυνηθῶ ὀλίγο(ν)

ἀνας]φῶλ[υ]`αί´ ἐκ τῆς νόσου · προσετέθη γάρ μοι καὶ ψυχικὴ ὀλιγορία Ἰσιδώρου

c.6] του ἀποσπᾶσαντος ἕνα τῶν οἰκετῶν ὧν ἠγόρασα καὶ ἀπαιτοῦντός με

αὐτὸν μετ]απωλῆσαι. πολλὰ ὑμᾶς προσκυνῶ παρακαλῶν φροντίσαι τοῦ οἴκου μου

τε καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας. γράμματα δὲ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ὀσπριγίτου γραφέντα

20 c.4 πρὸς Θεοδόσιον ἕνεκεν πίτου οὔτε ἀπέδωκέν μοι ὁ σύμμαχος οὔτε εἶδο(ν).

κ[αὶ τὰ γράμ]ματα ἀπόδος τῇ γυναικὶ Κομιτᾶ τοῦ κα{`θ}θο(σιωμένου) μαγιστρι(ανοῦ). ἡ δὲ ἐλευθέρᾳ τοῦ

ἀπὸ ἀρχόντ(ων) τοῦ κυρίου Ἀγτιόχου CIAίνει με ἐνταῦθα ἕνεκεν πίτου λέγουσα ὅτι ‘καὶ τὸν

παῖδά μου ἔπεμψα μετὰ τῆς τιμῆς εἰς Ὁξύρυγχον καὶ ταύτην οὖν τὴν ἀπόκρισιν γράψον μοι

ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῶ τῆς λέσχης’. τὰ δὲ γράμματα εἰς τὴν Ἡρακλέους πέμψον τῷ κυρίῳ

25 Ἀπολλῶ τῷ τραπεζίτη.

Back, along the fibres,

† δεσπό(τη) ἐμῶ τ(ὰ) πά(ντα) λαμπρο(τάτω) (καὶ) πά(σης) προσκ[υνη]c(έως) ἀξ(ίω) ἀδελφ(ῶ)

.....

1 I. προτερεύειν 5 ὧν 8 λαβουCI 9 ἴδιοχειρον ἵνα 9 ὑμετερα 10 ἀδελφοτς 1. τῷ λιμῶ, an τῷ λοιμῶ, an τῇ λοίμη? 14

ὑπερ 15 ὑπερ ἵνα ολιγῶ 16 I. ἀνασφῆλαι ἴσιδωρου 18 ὑμας 19 ἰωαννου 20 εἶδο 21 κα{`θ}θος μαγιστρ- 1. καθω(σιωμένου)

24 ἵνα

Back δεσπο^τ τ^α π^α λ^αμπρ^ος π^ας^ς προσ[κυνη]^ς αζ αδελφς

‘Your brotherly splendour, wishing to be first in all matters, brings accusations in anticipation [of them] whereas it is rather yourself who is due them: while I wrote several letters to yourself in spite of my residing in Constantinople, I have received none from you. Since, therefore, as I wrote to you, I have succumbed to a ... illness and up till the present I have been ill, as the Lord lives, being in need of the things which ... for he [or she] does not have ... grant that in this very moment you send Menas the *symmachus* since you are having the small payment made for him (?). And the agents who are active will write (and let me find greater pity here!) that they may obtain from me an *idiocheiron* and may trust me. In order that nothing disagreeable may happen to your brotherliness, and lest I die here of hunger [or the plague ?] ... you know the workman himself ... you took ... either mortgage it or hold it by yourself ... and coming with ... two days I pay in full myself ... and I am owed in addition small perquisites and whatever else ... cannot tolerate ... to be ... on my behalf. And I am buying the oil and the linen yarn, just as you bade. I call on you to pray for me so that I may recover a little from the illness: for in addition to [the illness] I am suffering from despondency of the soul because Isidorus the ... dragged away one of the slaves which I bought and demanded of me to sell him again. I greet you many times and bid you to take care of my house and my chattels. The *symmachus* neither gave me Ioannes the *osprigites*’ letters to Theodosius concerning the grain nor did I see them. And give over the letters to the wife of Comitas, the *devotissimus magistrianus*. The wife of the lord Antiochus, *expraesidibus*, is troubling me here about the grain saying that ‘I sent my slave to Oxyrhynchus with the payment, and, therefore, write this reply for me so that I may be freed from this scandal’. Send these letters to Herakleopolis to the lord Apollos the banker.’

Back, ‘To my master in all respects most splendid and worthy of worship, my brother ...’

1 ἀδελφική. The writer was a Christian, as ζῆ κύριος (5) attests, and the use of ἀδελφικός implies that the addressee will likewise have been a Christian; see P.Köln III 165.3 n.

[ἡ ὑμ]ετέρα ἀδελφική λαμπρότης. λαμπρότης and its adjective (conventionally in the superlative when it refers to individuals) λαμπρότατος (Lat. *clarissimus*) will originally have denoted that the addressee was a member of the Roman Senate. But from the mid-second century, the title began to be applied to officials who did not belong to the Senate as a matter of courtesy. For instance, the *praefectus Aegypti* was only an eques, not a senator, since Augustus made Egypt a province of the Empire. The correct *Rangprädikat* for the equestrian class was διασημότατος (Lat. *perfectissimus*), but the prefect was regularly called ὁ λαμπρότατος ἡγεμών as early 145 as e.g. P Mich. XI 617.14 (145), P.Lond. III 11589.4–5 = W. Chr. 415 (145–7) attest. On this see A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* i (Oxford 1964) i 528ff, P. Koch, *Die byzantinischen Beamtentiteln* (Jena 1903) 10–22, and more recently, A. Arjava, ‘Zum Gebrauch der griechischen Rangprädikate des Senatorenstandes’ *Tyche* 6 (1991) 17–35, esp. 17–23. As Arjava observes, 23, more and more offices began to attain the clarissimate and the former holders of these offices, which had not carried the clarissimate when they were in office, were also advanced to the rank: ‘als Folge davon verlor das Wort seine einstige Wertigkeit, nicht mehr alle *clarissimi* waren Mitglieder des Senates und im späten 5. Jh. War der Zugang zum Senat dann überhaupt einer neuer Reichsaristokratie, den *illustres*, vorbehalten. Zweitens aber verlor λαμπρότατος in Ägypten auch diese erweiterte Bedeutung, so daß man fast jeden Beliebigen so anreden könnte.’

πρ[ο]ῶτερεύειν. The scribe seems to have confused προτερεύειν ‘to anticipate’ with πρωτεύειν ‘head’ or ‘take the lead’, since he strikes out the correct omicron: πρωτεύειν cannot, however, be meant. προτερεύειν is never attested in the papyri, and elsewhere it is restricted to grammarians such as Herodianus or

Choeroboscus, Patristic authors such as Gregory Nyssenus, Athanasius, commentators on Aristotle such as Simplicius, and Neoplatonists such as David. In spite of its being the first appearance in the papyri, it seems to have been of moderately common currency in literature of the period when the letter was written. The word will probably not have struck the addressee as being especially recondite, but it does undoubtedly have a literary colouring, which the writer may have intended to be appreciated by the addressee.

2 [ἐγκαλ]εῖ προλαβοῦσα ἐγκαλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ὀφειλομένη. The construction προλαμβάνειν as a participle with the indicative seems to be modelled on the classical construction of φθάνειν, which seems to grow increasingly rare towards the end of the fourth century.

ὀφείλειν with the infinitive in the sense ‘ought to do something’ is a common construction from Homer onwards. The construction ὀφείλειν with μᾶλλον qualifying the infinitive is not very common. It can be paralleled from a letter from a similar period VII 1165 6–8 (sixth cent.) εἰ λέγει ἡ ὑμετέρα ἀδελφικὴ σοφία ὡς ἡ παραφυλακὴ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, καὶ κύριοι ἐστὲ τῆς παραφυλακῆς, καὶ ἀντιπ[οι]ηθῆναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπεξελεῖν ὀφείλετε καὶ τὸ ὅλον καταλείψαι τῇ εὐτελείᾳ μου.

This first sentence, in particular, is highly elaborate and may certainly be seen as the product of the rhetorical education which was prevalent throughout antiquity. This is particularly evident in letters. As Fournet, ‘Esquisse’ 46–7, observes, ‘on ne peut échapper au constat global que ce genre [that of the letter] est l’objet d’une mutation qui, quoique déjà amorcée au iii^e s., devient surtout visible au iv^e s.: il subit l’emprise de la rhétorique qui va jusqu’à en phagocyter totalement le contenu pour en faire un morceau d’éloquence écrite aux dépens de sa fonction utilitaire; parallèlement, il est de plus en plus marqué, dans son vocabulaire, par les canons littéraires de l’époque, à savoir la poésie classique et la littérature testamentaire.’ The letter is not so wholly devoid of content as those of which Fournet speaks, in that its

purpose really is business, but, in different circumstances, the content might easily have given place to a display of rhetorical and literary flourish.

2–3 καί[[περ] διάγοντος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ. The intransitive usage of *διάγειν*, very much like that of *διατρίβειν*, is a very common classical usage,²¹ which is also fairly widespread in late antiquity. It becomes increasingly frequently attested from the second century onwards. It is less common than *καταγίνεσθαι*, which itself seems to occur more frequently before Diocletian, although *καταγίνεσθαι* is still attested as late as the eighth century.

Βυζαντίῳ. Constantinople was the capital of the eastern Empire, and it is occasionally referred to in the papyri, usually in petitions and other kinds of official correspondence. The city was known as Byzantium till Constantine I refounded it as Nova Roma in 330 to be the new capital of the Empire. Only after his death in 337 did it become known as Constantinople. But it is extremely rare to find the city called Βυζάντιον in the papyri. There are only two instances, and both of them antedate Constantine I's refoundation of it. They are PSI IV 413.24 (third cent. BC) and XVII 2113.13–14 (316). The word occurs as an ethnic designation more frequently: P.Cair. Zen. I 59089.21 (257 BC), II 59177.5 (255 BC), II 59292.366, 454 (250 BC), P.Col. IV 69.14, 16, 21 (257–49 BC), P.Mich. XVIII 781.19 (186/185 BC), PSI VI 620.11 (third cent.). The ethnic is also attested in late antiquity, viz. CPR VIII 53.10 (fifth cent.), and CPR XXV 17.7 (sixth/seventh cent.?, but see note ad loc.)

Although the city was renamed in 337, the change is not heavily documented in the papyri: Κωνσταντίνου πόλις or Κωνσταντινούπολις occurs only in P.Ammon II 40.4, 41.24, 45.7 (all the same petition, 348); P.Oslo III 88.11 (fourth cent.); P.Princ. III 191.8 (fifth cent.); SPP XX 146.3 (fifth/sixth cent.); P.Cair.Masp. I 67032.5–6 (551); I 67069.8 (sixth cent.); PSI VIII 953.72 (sixth cent.); XXXIV 2732 15 (sixth cent.); VI 922 15 (sixth/seventh cent.).

²¹ Curiously, *διάγειν* does not appear in Lampe, *Lexicon*.

Alternatively it was also called ἡ βασιλική πόλις: SB IV 7438.4 (527–65); P.Cair. Masp. I 67126.6 (541), SB VI 9102.3 (547–9); P.Cair. Masp. I 67032.19, 116 (551); PSI I 76.5 (572/3); P.Eirene III 15.3 (second half of sixth cent.?), and or as a *variatio* on this, it was also called ἡ βασιλεύουσα πόλις²² in LXIII 4397 17, 20, 29, 40, 68, 113 (545) and P.Cair. Masp. I 67032.21 (551), ἡ πανευδαίμων πόλις e.g. P.Cair. Masp. I 67032.93 (551).

It will appear that the usage of Βυζάντιον here is anachronistic. But some of the Fathers of the Church, e.g. Gregory Nazianzenus (who was Archbishop of Constantinople in the fourth century), and other theologians as well as writers such as Ioannes Malalas (who died in Constantinople) continued to refer to it both as Βυζάντιον and Κωνσταντινούπολις. This might suggest that within the city itself the new name did not prevail as completely as it evidently did elsewhere. The sender, who is well connected with Egypt where the conventional names for the city are always used at this period, has chosen to refer to the imperial capital in an unusual way. It might be a deliberate archaism to give the reference a literary colouring which would have been intended to be appreciated by the recipient.

4–5 ἀρρωστία μ[. . . .] περιέπεξα. Along with its cognates ἀρρωστῆν and ἀρρωστος, ἀρρωστία is well attested in the best classical Attic (e.g. Thucydides, Isocrates and Aristotle), as well as the predictable medical writers of the Classical and Imperial ages and the New Testament. In the papyri, it is heavily documented in the Ptolemaic period, then only sporadically in the Roman period and then again in the sixth century. It occurs in work contracts in the *Wohlverhaltensklauseln* in the form δίχα ἀρρωστίας καὶ πόνου τινός, e.g. I 140 17 (550), LI 3641 12 (544), LXXIII 4967 11 (sixth/seventh cent.), where it is one of the few possible ways of being released from a contract. On these clauses see A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten* (Heidelberg

²² Both Rome and Jerusalem were called this in Patristic writers: see Lampe, *Lexicon* s.v. βασιλεύω II A. Rome was also so called in the papyri.

1990) 155–6. One may surmise from the *Wohlverhaltensklauseln* that ἀρρωτία must have been a serious condition, which fundamentally disabled the sufferer. This will not have been the case here.

It is tempting to restore ἀρρωτία | μ[εγάλη]. The space might be very slightly too short to accommodate the word, but the hand is not very regular. It is a rather colourless expression which occurs in a papyrus from the Ptolemaic period P.Col. III 10.2–3 (257 BC), ἐ]γὼ εἰς μεγάλην δὲ ἀρρωτίαν ἐνέπεσον καὶ εἰς ἀπο[[ρίαν, and literary sources from e.g. Plut. *Pyhrr.* 12.6.3 ἐξ ἀρρωτίας μεγάλης ἀναλαμβάνουσιν onwards.

5 ζῆ κύριος. This expression is of somewhat seldom occurrence in correspondence of the sixth and seventh centuries: P.Cair. Masp. I 67076.14 (sixth cent.), VI 943 7 (sixth cent.), XVI 1839 2 (sixth cent.), XVI 1854 4 (sixth/seventh cent.) and P.Wash. Univ. I 42.4 (sixth cent.). All of these instances are letters which emanate from Oxyrhynchus, save P.Cair. Masp. I 67076 which comes from Aphrodito.

7 Μηνῶν τὸν κύμαχον. The *symmachus* was an armed but strictly a civilian messenger. Originally he did a liturgical duty, which had been established by the end of the third century, as e.g. P.Cair. Isid. 80 (296) attests. *Symmachi* were principally messengers who took instruction on a wide variety of duties from public officials. By this period, however, liturgical duties in the old sense had long been obsolete. Although the *symmachi* remained in the service of government, they now also served private landholders as well as the Church. See the thorough examination of them, by A. Jördens ‘Die ägyptischen Symmachoi’ *ZPE* 66 (1986) 105–18.

Since the identities of both parties in the correspondence are unknown, it cannot be established whether the *symmachus* here was acting in the employ of a private person or that of a public official. The *symmachus* may have been assigned to the addressee by the state, as seems to have been the case in e.g. LVIII 3932 11 (sixth cent.), where an *exceptor* speaks of τοῦ ἐμοῦ συμμάχου. The editor notes that

‘[i]n this case ἐμοῦ could indicate that he was privately employed by Paul, or perhaps more probably, that he was employed by the state but assigned to serve as messenger to this particular *exceptor*.’

Menas was an extremely common name in Egypt in late antiquity, and a number of *symmachi* have the name. Jördens, loc. cit. 114, could list six *symmachi* called Menas to which the following further attestations of *symmachi* called Menas are to be added: CPR XIV 17.10 (652?, from the Arsinoites), O.Abu Mina 793.1 and 936.1 (first half of seventh cent., Abu Mina), SB XX 14076.9–10 (sixth/seventh cent., *archisymmachus*, from Oxyrhynchus), and SB XX 14077.3, 4 (sixth/seventh cent., two *archisymmachi*, from Oxyrhynchus). The *symmachus* of **21** will most probably not admit of identification with any of these attestations.

τὸ μικρὸν ἀποδόκιμον. It is uncertain what exactly the ἀποδόκιμον was and how it functioned. The instances of its attestation are seldom: CPR V 18.12, 15, 16 (538?), P.Mich. XV 742.2 (sixth cent.?), PSI III 237.3, 6 (fifth/sixth cent.), SB VI 9139.3 (sixth cent.?), XXVI 16795 1 (553). It also occurs at SB VIII 9699.348 (78/9) but this is unlikely to have been the same payment device as the others later instances. LSJ⁹ s.v. 2 states that it means a ‘receipt’. But that is wrong. H. Gerstinger, ‘Prodromus corporis epistularum privatarum inter papyros Graecas Vindobonenses (PER) asservatarum edendi’ *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 363–81, at 378 2–3 n., translates it as ‘Ausgabenweisung’, and this prevails as the *communis opinio*. The editor of P.Mich. XV 742.2 n. observes that an ἀποδόκιμον is ‘an order to hand over money or things’, and the editor of CPR V 18.12 n. concurs with that interpretation. **21** would appear to offer further corroboration of this interpretation.

The purpose and, indeed, the nature of the payments remain entirely obscure. The editor of CPR V 18.12 n. suggests that ἀποδόκιμα may have been made out to ‘collectors of revenues due to the *domus divina*, who then passed them onto the *curator*.’ The ἀποδόκιμον will probably have been part of a highly sophisticated system of effecting payments, which was used in the management of the large estates

in Egypt of late antiquity. Furthermore, it may well have been the case that agents of some kind, *πραγματευταί*, were employed especially to deal with them. Besides **21**, two of the five occurrences of the *ἀποδόκιμον* are sent to *πραγματευταί*: P.Mich. XV 742.2–3, addressed to a *πραγματευτή*, refers to τὸ ἀποδόκιμον | τοῦ ἐνδοξ(οτάτου) στρατη(λάτου) and PSI III 237. 5–7 runs καταξιώση τοίνυν ἢ ὑμῶν λαμπρότης ἀποδόκιμον πέμψαι ἢ γράμματα χαράξαι προσόδων βουλῇ πραγματευτη (l. –τοῦ) καὶ ταῦτα συντόμως ἀποτέλλω. Exactly what these agents did is again obscure, but one might perhaps speculate that they were clerks of some kind who were employed by the estate and were involved in settling accounts.

8–9 γράψουσιν δὲ οἱ[ί] πραγματευταὶ οἱ ποιοῦντες ὅτι καὶ πλείο[ν]ος ἐλεθῶ λάβουσι(ν) | παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐνταῦθα ἰδιόχειρον καὶ πιτεύουσίν μοι. The first person singular aorist subjunctive passive ἐλεθῶ clearly does not fit in the larger syntactical structure of the sentence. It seems to be a *captatio benevolentiae*, for it is most conveniently to be classed as a jussive subjunctive which functions with καὶ πλείο[ν]ος as an urgent rhetorical flourish, ‘and let me be pitied all the greater!’. This would be similar in function to the other pressing appeal made to the addressee in 15–16, εὔξασθαι δὲ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ παρακαλῶ ἵνα δυνηθῶ ὀλίγον | [ἀνασ]φῶλ[υ]αί (l. ἀνασφῆλαι) ἐκ τῆς νόσου.

The main verb is γράψουσιν, which is the third person plural future indicative active; γράψουσιν and ὅτι imply an indirect statement, but λάβουσι is slightly odd in its morphological form: it is clearly meant to be a third person plural future or subjunctive. On the confusion of these forms see B. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri* (Athens 1973) §543 p.247.

οἱ[ί] *πραγματευταί*. The exact function of the *πραγματευτής* in late antiquity is unclear: it has been suggested that he was a ‘trader’ e.g. XVI **1880** 5 n. (427), and the other papyri noted there to corroborate that view, but it seems more likely that he was an agent. ‘Trader’ would not be suitable in this case: see LV **3805** 121 n. (566 or later).

9–10 ἵνα δὲ μηδὲν τῆ ὑμετέρῃ | ἀδελφότητι) δυσχερὲς ἀπαντήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἀποθάνω ἐνταῦθα τῆ λιμῶ. It is not clear what τῆ λιμῶ means: if it is ‘famine’, ὁ λιμός, the gender of the article needs correction; if, however, it is ‘plague’, ἡ λοίμη or ὁ λοιμός, the termination of the former needs correction, the gender of the article of the latter. The plague was recurrent and lethal in Constantinople from 541–3, ‘The Plague of Justinian’ which according to Procopius, *Pers.* 2.22–3, claimed up to 10,000 lives a day in the city. The sender speaks twice of his being ill, 4–5 and 15, and so this would be compatible with a reference to the a plague. But the sender seems to imply that the peril to his own life would be the corollary of anything δυσχερὲς occurring to the addressee. It would make sense if he feared lest anything unpleasant should happen to the addressee (e.g. incapacitation or death) because this might occasion him to be stranded without means of survival, whereas it would be difficult to see how anything disagreeable happening to the addressee might cause the recipient to contract the plague.

12 πληρῶ. J. Gascou, ‘Les domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine’ *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 1–89, at 15 n. 71 = *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine*, 137 n. 71, observes that ‘πληροῦν apporte la nuance de complétude du paiement ou du remboursement’. How it fits in the sentence is unclear.

13 ἐπ[ο]φεί[ι]λομαι. This verb only occurs in papyri of the period of Diocletian and later, with the earliest attestation dating from 292, X 1255 15–16.

μικρὰς συνηθεί[α]ς. συνήθειαι were gratuities which were paid to officials. They are defined by C. Zuckerman, *Du village à l’Empire. Autour du registre fiscal d’Aphrodito (525/526)* (Paris 2004) 133 as a ‘gratification coutumière annuelle qui accroît le salaire régulier d’un fonctionnaire, indépendamment des charges qu’il peut réclamer pour des services rendus’. Furthermore, A. Benaissa, ‘Receipt for a Gratuity to a Cancellarius’ *APF* 56 (2009) 56–62, remarks that ‘a great variety of officials, many with no connections to the fiscal process, are known as recipients of such fees’ (56).

14 οὐκ ἀνέχομ λείψαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. One might consider reading e.g. οὐκ ἀνέχομεν τελεῖσθαι or πωλεῖσθαι, but the object of the verb would remain obscure. ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ might suggest that some financial transaction is involved here.

14–15 τὸ δὲ ἔλαιον καθὼς ἐκελεύσατε | [καὶ τὸ] λινάριον ἀγοράζω. On the various morphological forms of λινάριον (l. λινάριον), see R. Pintaudi, ‘PSI V 481 verso: Conto di spese’ *Aegyptus* 61 (1981) 93–102 at 100–1 and E. Wipszycka, *L’industrie textile dans l’Egypte romaine* (Warsaw 1965) 17 4 n.

15–16 ἵνα δυνηθῶ ὀλίγον | [ἀνασ]φύλα[υ]αί (l. ἀνασφῆλαι) ἐκ τῆς νόσου. ἀνασφάλλειν is seems to be a technical term for ‘recover’. It is first used in the ps.-Platonic *Axioxus* (364c) and then in the Imperial period in both medical and theological or ecclesiastical writers. Elsewhere the expression occurs in VI 939 5–6 (fourth cent.) and XXXIV 2713 18 (c.297).

16 ψυχική. The word occurs only twice in papyri: P.Berl. Sarisch 18.2 (sixth/seventh cent.?) runs οὔτε γάρ ἐστιν ἀντάλλαγμα ψυχι[κόν]. This letter is clearly heavily Christian in tenor and ψυχι[κόν] does not refer to an emotional state but the soul. The other attestation of the word is in a Manichaean letter P.Kell. I 63, in which the emotional sense of the word is apparent. It runs, 20–24, καὶ | νῦν ἀπολαύομεν πνευματικῶν | ὀλίγων καρπῶν, ἀπολαύ[ο]μεν δ[ὲ] πάλιν καὶ τῶν ψυχικῶν τῆς εὐσεβοῦς | ψυχικός occurs in inscriptions occasionally e.g. SEG 33.736 (second cent. BC), I. Aeg. Thrace 5 (166–160 BC), and I. Eph. 6 (?).

προσετέθη γάρ μοι καὶ ψυχικὴ ὀλιγοψυχία. The expression ψυχικὴ ὀλιγοψυχία probably means ‘despondency of the soul’, similar to e.g. ὀλιγοψυχία (Lampe, *Lexicon* s.v. 2) meaning ‘desolation of the soul’ or ‘temptation to despondency’.

18–19 πολλὰ ὑμᾶς προσκυνῶ παρακαλῶν φροντίσαι τοῦ οἴκου μου | [τε καὶ τῆς] ἐμῆς παρουσίας. φροντίσαι could have a legal meaning, related to φροντιστής which, as the editor of P.Köln III 165.9 n. observes, is ‘ein von einer (vollkommen geschäftsfähigen) Person durch Rechtsgeschäft bestellter Vertreter’; that is ‘act as a *procurator*’ (on this see L. Mitteis, *Grundzüge* ii 249). Since the sender is abroad, he

might well need someone who is legally empowered to act on his behalf. But φροντίσαι need not specify legal competencies over the writer's affairs. It might have the more informal meaning of 'look after'. It is not clear what [τῆς] ἐμῆς παρουσίας means. The most frequent sense of the word is 'presence' or 'arrival' (LSJ⁹ s.v. παρουσία 1 and 2 respectively); and in the Patristic writers it usually means 'the advent' of Christ or the Holy Spirit (Lampe, *Lexicon* s.v. παρουσία). 'Presence' is also the usual sense of the word in the papyri. But φροντίζειν would be an odd choice of word to use if he is asking the addressee to organise a visit on his behalf. A more appropriate sense of παρουσία to this case might be e.g. 'chattels' or 'property' more broadly, which the writer possesses in Oxyrhynchus.

19 γράμματα δὲ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ὀσπριγίτου. Little is known of the functions of the ὀσπριγίτης, who is attested eleven times in the papyri from the sixth century onwards, viz. P.Köln VII 317.14 (sixth cent.), XVI **2000** 14 (sixth/seventh cent.), XVI **2021** 7, 8 (sixth/seventh cent.), XVIII **2195** 130 (576/7), LV **3805** 100 (566), LVI **3873** 8 (sixth/seventh cent.), SB XIV 12048.2 (fifth/sixth cent.?), SPP III 473.3 (sixth cent.), SPP VIII 1111.3 (633), SPP III².1 66.2 (seventh cent.) In XVIII **2195** 130 (576–77?), an *osprigites* by the name of Ioannes appears, who may be identical with the Ioannes of **21**. It runs, Ἀναστασίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ ὀσπριγίταις ὑ(πὲρ) ἐμβολ(ῆς) ἀπὸ γενήμ(ατος) ι ἰνδ(ικτίονος) δί(του) κ(αγκέλλῳ). The date would be compatible with **21**, but Ioannes is such an extremely common name at this time that it is only a possibility that the same man is here attested for a second time.

The *osprigites* dealt with the transportation of ὄσπριον or ὄσπρεον. In the earlier Roman period, this included all kinds of pulses. But the editor of P.Col. VII 169 (318) (= N. Lewis, 'Two Petitions for Recovery' *JJP* 2 (1948) 51–66), observes, 8 n., that '[ὄσπρεον] had by the fourth century come to be used for any mixed produce, including grains'. The *osprigites* is chiefly involved in the collection and transport of grain as fiscal dues, the *embole*; on this see esp. SPP III² 473.3 n. and P.Köln VII 317.14 n.

21 Κομιτᾶ τοῦ κα{`θ'}θο(σιωμένου) μαγιστρι(ανοῦ). *Comitas* is one of the *agentes in rebus*, who are colloquially called the μαγιστριανοὶ τῶν θείων ὀφφικίων in the papyri, or simply, as here, μαγιστριανοί (Lat. *magistriani*). These *magistriani* were in the service of the *magister officiorum* in Constantinople. On the office and its duties, see R. Delmaire, *Les institutions du bas-empire romain de Constantin à Justinien (I Les institutions civiles palatines)* (Paris 1995) 97–118, M. Clauss, *Der magister officiorum in der Spätantike* (München 1980) 23–40, CPR XXIV 22 introd. p.129, and B. Palme, ‘Flavius Sarapodorus, *ein agens in rebus* aus Hermupolis’ *APF* 40 (1994) 43–68.

Magistriani were relatively few in number. C.Th. VI 29.27.23 states that their number is to be restricted to 1174, but a subsequent edict of Emperor Leo in C.J. XII 20.3 raises the limit to 1248, with express instructions that the number was not to be exceeded, for the entire eastern Empire. The number of *magistriani* assigned to each province is difficult to establish with certainty. C.Th. VI 29.2.1 (357) states that two *magistriani* were to be assigned to act in each province, ‘nec vero multos [sc. *agentes in rebus*] esse per singulas provincias iussimus, quippe sufficit duos tantummodo curas gerere et cursum publicum curare, ut, licet in canalibus publicis haec necessitas explicetur, numerus tamen amplior esse non debeat’. Slightly later, this is contradicted by a statement in C.J. XII 22.4 (395) which ordains that, ‘*agentes in rebus singulos per singulas provincias mittendos esse censemus*’. Since no later statements are to be found on the number of *magistriani* assigned to each province, it should follow that only one *magistranus* was assigned to each province. CPR XXV 8 (fifth/sixth cent.), however, attests two *magistriani*, which would seem to contradict the later edict (C.J. XII 22.4). It may be the case that in later periods more than one *magistranus* was active in each province, as the editor of LXXII 4909 3–4 n. (444) suggests, but this is only one possibility.

No *Comitas* attested as an *agens in rebus* in *PLRE* is compatible with the *Comitas* of 21. It is not a rare name. Clauss, op. cit. 197–213, enumerates the known

agentes in rebus, and a list of those attested in Egypt is given by P. Sijpesteijn in the appendix to ‘Miete eines Hofes und einer Scheune mit Zubehör’ *CE* 68 (1993) 160–67, updated in CPR XXIV 22, introd. 1 n. This itself may be updated with three new *magistriani*: Colluthus and Heron, CPR XXV 8.3, 4 (fifth/sixth cent.), and Fl. Phoebammon LXXII 4909 3 (444).

κα{θ'}θo(σιωμένου). The scribe appears to have added θ' above the θ for some reason which is difficult to see. This is the common *Ehrenprädikat* of the military; see F. Mitthof, *Annona Militaris Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten* (Pap. Flor. XXXII; Firenze 2001) ii 542, note on P.Herm. 79.6.

21–2 τοῦ | ἀπὸ ἀρχόντων τοῦ κυρίου Ἀγτιόχου. The ἀπὸ ἀρχόντων were former *praesides*, i.e. civilian governors of provinces. The sender clearly moves in international circles; he may be referring to a governor of any province, but most probably it will have been a *praeses Arcadiae*, the province in which Oxyrhynchus was situated. No Antiochus attested in *PLRE* is compatible with the Antiochus of 21.

22 CIAÍNEI. This is a moderately uncommon verb, attested in CPR V 25.5 (seventh/eighth cent.), P.Apoll. 19.3 (661 or 676), P.Apoll. 37 verso 1 (second half of the seventh cent.), XVI 1837 2 (sixth cent.) and XVI 1849 2 (sixth/seventh cent.). LSJ⁹ s.v. CIAÍNOW suggests that it means ‘cause loathing or disgust to a person’ in the active, and ‘feel loathing’ in the passive. It does also appear to be used of physical nausea: see XVI 1849 2 (where the nausea is caused by rotten vegetables) and CPR V 25.5 n., but this sense does not suit the context here. Lampe, *Lexicon* s.v. CIAÍNOW suggests that it chiefly means ‘annoy’ ‘provoke’ ‘trouble’ or ‘bother’, which is the sense wanted here.

23 ἡ δὲ ἐλευθέρα. This is an expression for a ‘wife’; see XVI 1872 8 n.

CIAÍNEI ME ENTAŪΘA ÉNEKEN CÍTOY. Since the sender has to do with an ὀσπριγίτης, he might have been concerned with the *embole*.

λέγουσα ὄτι. For ὄτι introducing direct speech see Kühner–Gerth, *Grammatik* ii 366–7, and F. Blass,–A. Debrunner,–F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik der neutestamentlichen Griechisch*¹⁵ (Göttingen 1979) § 470 pp.398–9.

23 εἰς Ὀξύρυγχον. One might interpret this collocation as εἰς Ὀξυρύγχων (sc. πόλιν) so as to normalise the expression, but there are a handful of cases from the sixth century and later in which the city would seem simply to be called Ὀξύρυγχος. As the editor of LVI 3860 8–9 n. remarks, this usage is very rare. The instances are P.Lond. V 1791.7 (seventh cent.) ἐπὶ Ὀξύρυγχον, PSI III 220.10 εἰς Ὀξύρυγχον, PSI VII 808.4, 20 (third cent.) εἰς Ὀξύ(ρυγχον), P.Ant. II 95.9 (sixth cent.) ἐν Ὀξυρύγχῳ, P.Iand. II 17.3 ἐν Ὀξυρύνχῳ (l. Ὀξυρύγχῳ), and a handful of other admittedly somewhat doubtful others. While the attestations may be few, it is difficult to deny outright the existence of this alternative designation. It may be that, in some social circles, the city was known as simply Ὀξύρυγχος, just as Constantinople appears to have been known as Βυζάντιον. It might have been a colloquial designation, for most of these examples emanate from private correspondence. Against this interpretation it must be admitted that in the following line the sender uses εἰς τὴν Ἡρακλέουζ tout court in l. 24, and probably one must understand πόλιν there, unless that too was a colloquial designation. Possible parallels for this might be found in LXIII 4386 10 (393) which offers ἐν Ἡρακλέουζ and LVI 3871 6 (sixth/seventh cent.) which has ἐν τῇ Ἡρακλέουζ (l.-λέουζ). One ecclesiastical source does use εἰς Ὀξύρυγχον: Theodoretus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 238, has ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔγνω μυρία παντόθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν συρρέοντα πλήθη ... εἰς Ὀξύρυγχον αὐτὸν τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν ἐξέπεμψε πόλιν. Other literary sources e.g. Strabo 17.1.40 refer to Oxyrhynchus as Ὀξύρυγχος πόλις.

On the meaning of τιμή, see F. Morelli, ‘Τιμή e μισθός: vendita e prestazione di lavoro’ *Istituto Papirologico ‘G. Vitelli’ Firenze, Comunicazioni* 2 (1997) 7–29.

24 ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῶ τῆς λέεχης. The word λέεχη is of extremely rare occurrence in the papyri. It has only two instances of attestation, and they are both in a private

letters: SB XII 11237.5 (second cent.?) and X 1298 8 (c.330). The word usually means ‘talk’ but it can, in a bad sense, mean ‘gossip’ or ‘scandal’ (LSJ⁹ s.v. λέεχη II). This is probably the best example of the sender’s pretension to an elevated style.

24–5 τῶ κυρίῳ Ἀπολλῶ τῶ τραπεζίτη. The meaning of the word τραπεζίτη in late antiquity changed radically from that of the earlier times, as the editor of CPR XXIV 29 (616) observes, pp.172–3, ‘im spätbyzantischen und früh-arabischen Ägypten bezeichnet der Titel nicht mehr den Bankier wie in der ptolemäischen und römischen Epoche, sondern den Kassenführer eines Großgrundbesitzes. Vor allem die Texte aus der Verwaltung der *domus gloriosa* der Apionen haben gezeigt, daß der Trapezites als Vertrauensmann des Grundherrn eine Spitzposition in der hierarchischen Gliederung der Verwaltung einer *domus* einnahm.’ On banking in late antique Egypt in general, see R. Bogaert, ‘La banque en Égypte byzantine’ *ZPE* 116 (1997) 85–140, esp. 95 on estate bankers (τραπεζίται), 100–101 on estate banks in the Heracleopolites, and 128–40 on the functioning of the estate banks.

The mention of a τραπεζίτη in the Heracleopolites suggests that the addressee will have had to do with the owner of a great estate, which will likely have spread over large areas of Egypt.

Index of works cited in Sections I, II, and III

- Angiò, F., 'Sofocle, Tereo, Fr. 583 R.' *Sileno* 17 (1991) 207–13
- Arnott, W.G., 'Some Orthographical Variants in the papyri of Later Greek Comedy' in A. Willi (ed.), *The Language of Greek Comedy* (Oxford 2002) 191–217
- Barrett, W.S., *Euripides Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964)
- Bolling, G.M., *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925)
- Brunck, R.F.P., *Sophoclis tragoediae septem ad optimorum exemplarium fidem emendatae cum versione et notis* (4 vols. Argentorati 1789)
- Burkert, W., *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985)
- Burnet, J., *Platonis Opera* (5 vols. Oxonii 1900–7)
- Bury, R.G., *The Philebus of Plato* (London 1897)
- Canfora, L., *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene* (Padua 1968)
- Cavallo, G., 'Osservazioni paleografiche sul canone e la cronologia della cosiddetta "Onciale Romana"' *ANSP* II.36 (1967) 209–20
- Cavallo, G., *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica* (Firenze 1967)
- Cavallo, G., 'Lo stile di scrittura 'epsilon-theta' nei papiri letterari: dall'Egitto ad Ercolano' *CErc* 4 (1974) 33–6
- Cavallo, G., *Il calamo e il papiro: la scrittura greca dall'età ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio* (Pap. Flor. XXXVI; Firenze 2005)
- Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968)
- Cribiore, R., *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Georgia 1996)
- Coulon, V., and van Daele, H., *Aristophane* (5 vols. Paris 1923–30).
- Del Corso, L., 'Lo "stile severo" nei P.Oxy.: una lista' *Aegyptus* 86 (2006) 81–106
- Dickey, E., *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford 1996)
- Diès, A. et al., *Platon Oeuvres Complètes* (14 vols. Paris 1920–64)
- Diggle, J., *Euripidis Fabulae* (3 vols. Oxonii 1984–94)
- Dilts, M.R., *Demosthenis Orationes* (4 vols. Oxford 2002–9)

- Dindorf, G., *Aristophanis Fabulae Superstites et Perditarum Fragmenta* (Lipsiae 1869)
- Dobrov, G., ‘The Tragic and the Comic Tereus’ *AJP* 114 (1993) 189–234
- Edwards, M.W., *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge 1991)
- Erbse, H., ‘Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur’ in H. Hunger et al. (eds.), *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* (2 vols. Zürich 1961) i 262–4
- Erbse, H., review of Fränkel’s OCT, *Gnomon* 35 (1963) 18–27
- Finglass, P.J., *Sophocles Electra* (Cambridge 2007)
- Finglass, P.J., ‘Orthographica Sophoclea’ *Philologus* 153 (2009) 206–28
- Finglass, P.J., *Sophocles Ajax* (Cambridge 2011)
- Fitzpatrick, D., ‘Sophocles’ “Tereus”’ *CQ* 51 (2001) 90–101
- Fränkel, H., *Apolloni Rhodi Argonautica* (Oxonii 1961)
- Fränkel, H., *Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Argonautika des Apollonios* (Göttingen 1964)
- Fränkel, H., *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (München 1968).
- Gagos, T.,–Litinas, N.,–Priest, N., *Homeric Varia Michiganensia BASP* 41 (2004) 46–50
- Hall, F.W.,–Geldart, W.M., *Aristophanis Fabulae* (Oxonii 1922)
- Haslam, M.W., ‘Apollonius and the Papyri’ *ICS* 3 (1978) 47–73
- Henderson, J., *Aristophanes Lysistrata* (Oxford 1987)
- Henrichs, A., ‘Scholia Minora zu Homer I’ *ZPE* 7 (1971) 97–149
- Hermann, C.F., *Platonis Dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi* (6 vols. Lipsiae 1890–6)
- Hourmouziades, N.C., ‘Sophocles *Tereus*’ in J. H. Betts et al. (eds.), *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* (2 vols. Bristol 1986) i 134–42
- Hunter, R., *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge 1993)

- Irmer, D., 'Beobachtungen zur Demosthenesüberlieferung' *Philologus* 112 (1968) 43–62
- Janko, R., *The Iliad: A Commentary* (Cambridge 1992)
- Kannicht, R., *Euripides Helena* (2 vols. Heidelberg 1969)
- Kassel, R.,–Austin C., *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols. Berolini 1983–2001)
- Kaczko, S., 'ἡμῖν, ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν da Omero a Sofocle: problemi linguistici' *RFIC* 130 (2002) 257–98
- Leaf, W., *The Iliad* (2 vols. London 1900)
- Livrea, E., *Apolloni Rhodii Argonauticon Liber IV* (Firenze 1973)
- Lobeck, C.A., *Phrynichi Eclogae nominum et verborum atticorum* (Leipzig 1820)
- Lundon, J., *The Scholia Minora in Homerum: An Alphabetical List*^{1.0}, Trismegistos Online Publications 7 (Köln–Leuven 2012)
- MacDowell, D.M., *Aristophanes Wasps* (Oxford 1971)
- MacDowell, D.M., *Demosthenes Against Meidias* (Oxford 1990)
- McCabe, D.F., *The Prose-rhythm of Demosthenes* (New York 1981)
- McNamee, K., *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri* (Diss. Duke University 1977)
- McNamee, K., *Sigla and select marginalia in Greek literary papyri* (Bruxelles 1992)
- McNamee, K., *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt* (2007)
- Mazzuchi, C.M., 'Sul sistema di accentazione dei testi greci in età romana e bizantina', *Aegyptus* 59 (1979) 145–67
- Montserrat, D., 'News Reports' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus and City and its Texts* (London 2007) 28–39
- Mooney, G.W., *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (London 1912)
- Moore, J.M., *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius* (Cambridge 1965)
- Moore-Blunt, J., 'Problems of Accentuation in Greek Papyri' *QUCC* 29 (1978) 137–63
- Parsons, P.J., review of *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*, *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 375–80

- Parsons, P.J., 'P.Köln XI 431: A Further Note' *ZPE* 171 (2009) 15
- Pasquali, G., *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*² (Firenze 1962)
- Passweg, R., *The Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Oration 24, In Timocratem* (Diss. New York 1975)
- Pédech P. et al., *Polybe Histoires* (12 vols. Paris 1961–95)
- Pearson, A.C. *Fragments of Sophocles* (3 vols. Cambridge 1917)
- Probert, P., *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (Bristol 2003)
- Schade, G.,–Eleuteri P., 'The textual tradition of the *Argonautica*' in T.D. Papanghelis–A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden–Boston 2001) 37–9.
- Puglia, E., *La cura del libro nel mondo antico* (Napoli 1997)
- Schmidt, F.W., *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern* (3 vols. Berlin 1886–7)
- Sommerstein, A.H., *Lysistrata* (Warminster 1990).
- Sykutris, I. post C. Fuhr, *Demosthenis Orationes*² (Leipzig 1944)
- Threatte, L., *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* (2 vols. Berlin–New York 1980–96)
- Turner, E.G., 'The Graeco–Roman Branch' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 17–27
- Uebel, F., 'Die Jenaer Papyrussammlung' *Proceedings of XIIth International Congress of Papyrology* (1970) 491–5
- Vian, F., *Révue d'Histore des Textes* 2 (1972) 171–95
- Vian, F., *Apollonius de Rhodes Argonautiques* (3 vols. Paris 1974–81)
- van Leeuwen, J., *Aristophanis Lysistrata*, (Lugduni Batavorum 1903)
- von Wilamowitz–Moellendorff, U., *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin 1924)
- von Wilamowitz–Moellendorff, U., *Aristophanes Lysistrate* (Berlin 1927)
- Wankel, H., *Demosthenes Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz* (2 vols. Heidelberg 1976)

Welcker, F.G., *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* (3 vols. Bonn 1839–41)

West, M.L., *Hesiod Theogony* (Oxford 1966)

West, M.L., *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982)

West, M.L., *Homeri Ilias* (2 vols. Munich–Leipzig 1998–2000)

West, M.L., *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Munich–Leipzig 2001)

Wilson, N.G., *Aristophanis Fabulae* (2 vols. Oxonii 2007).

Ziegler, K. et al., *Plutarchus Vitae Parallelae* (4 vols. Lipsiae 1957–2000)

Index of works cited in Sections IV and V

- Adams, C., *Land transport in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2007)
- Anagnostou–Cañas, B., ‘La documentation judiciaire pénale dans l’Égypte romaine’ *MEFRA* 112 (2000) 753–79
- Arjava, A., ‘Zum Gebrauch der griechischen Rangprädikate des Senatorenstandes’ *Tyche* 6 (1991) 17–35
- Arjava, A., *Women and the Law in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 1996)
- Avogadro, S., ‘Le Ἀπογραφὰὶ di proprietà nell’Egitto greco-romano’ *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 131–206
- Azzarello, G., ‘P.Oxy. XVI 2039 e la nascita della *domus gloriosa* degli Apioni’ *ZPE* 155 (2006) 208–28
- Bagnall, R.S., et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta 1987)
- Bagnall R.S.,–Frier, B.W., *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge 1994)
- Balconi, C., ‘Ἀπογραφὰὶ προβάτων καὶ αἰγῶν dell’età di Tiberio e Caligola’ *Aegyptus* 64 (1984) 35–60
- Balconi, C., ‘Le dichiarazioni di bestiame ed il controllo del patrimonio zootecnico nell’Egitto romano’ *Aegyptus* 70 (1990) 113–22
- Banaji, J., ‘Agrarian History and the Labour Organisation of Byzantine Large Estates’ in A.K. Bowman–E. Rogan (eds.), *Agriculture in Egypt from Pharaonic to Modern Times* (PBA 96 1999) 193–216
- Bastianini G., ‘Lista dei prefetti d’Egitto’ *ZPE* 17 (1975) 263–328
- Bastianini G., ‘Lista dei prefetti d’Egitto dal 30^a al 299^p: Aggiunte e correzioni’ *ZPE* 38 (1980) 75–89
- Bell, H.I., ‘The Constitutio Antoniniana and the Egyptian Poll Tax’ *JRS* 37 (1947) 17–23
- Benaissa, A., ‘Receipt for a Gratuity to a Cancellarius’ *APF* 56 (2009) 56–62
- Bickermann, E., ‘Testificatio Actorum. Eine Untersuchung über antike Niederschriften’ *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 333–55

- Bingen, J., 'Akoris: épigraphie et onomastique' *CE* 63 (1988) 165–72
- Bingen, J., 'Notables hermopolitains et onomastique féminine' *CE* 66 (1991) 324–9
- Blass, F.,–Debrunner, A.,–Rehkopf, F., *Grammatik der neutestamentlichen Griechisch*¹⁵ (Göttingen 1979)
- Bogaert, R., 'Liste géographique des banques et des banquiers de l'Égypte romaine, 30–284' *ZPE* 109 (1995) 133–73
- Bogaert, R., 'La Banque en Égypte Byzantine' *ZPE* 116 (1997) 85–140
- Bonneau, D., *Le régime administratif de l'eau du nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine et byzantine* (Leiden 1993) 105–15
- Bowman, A.K.,–Rathbone D., 'Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt' *JHS* 82 (1992) 107–27
- Braunert, H., *Die Binnenwanderung Studien zur Sozialgeschichte Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer- und Kaiserzeit* (Bonn 1964)
- Brun, J.–P., *Archéologie du vin et de l'huile dans l' Empire romain* (Paris 2006)
- Brunt, P.A., 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt' *JRS* 65 (1975) 124–47
- Clauss, M., *Der magister officiorum in der Spätantike* (München 1980)
- Crisci, E., *Scrivere greco fuori d' Egitto* (Pap. Flor. XXVII; Firenze 1996)
- Daris, S., *Supplemento 3° to the Dizionario dei nomi* (Pisa 2003)
- Daris, S.,–Calderini A., *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell'Egitto greco-romano* (4 vols. Madrid and Milan 1935–1987)
- Delmaire, R., 'Les dignitaires laïcs au concile de Chalcédoine' *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 141–75
- Delmaire, R., *Les institutions du bas-empire romain de Constantin à Justinien (I: Les institutions civiles palatines)* (Paris 1995)
- Diethart J.M.,–Worp K.A., *Notarsunterschriften im byzantinischen Ägypten* (Wien 1986)

- Drecoll, C., *Die Liturgien im römischen Kaiserreich des 3. und 4. Jh. n. Ch.* (Stuttgart 1997)
- Drexhage, H.–J., *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians* (St. Katharinen 1991)
- Fikhman, I.F., ‘Coloni adscripticii – ἐναπόγραφοι γεωργοί in den Papyri’ in A. Jördens (ed.), *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im spätantiken Ägypten: kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart 2006)
- Fikhman, I.F., ‘Esclaves et colons en Égypte byzantine’ *APapyrol* 3 (1991) 7–17
- Foti Talamanca, G., *Ricerche sul processo nell’Egitto greco-romano i: l’organizzazione del ‘conventus’ del prefectus aegypti* (Milano 1974)
- Foti Talamanca, G., *Ricerche sul processo nell’Egitto greco-romano ii: l’introduzione del guidizio* (Milano 1979)
- Fournet J.–L.,–Gascou, J., ‘À propos de PSI IX 1061 descr.: Le nom du saunier et une formation méconnue d’anthroponymes féminins’ *ZPE* 135 (2001) 139–149
- Fournet, J.–L., ‘Esquisse d’une anatomie de la lettre antique tardive d’après les papyrus’ in R. Delmaire–J. Desmulliez–P.–L. Galtier (eds.), *Correspondances. Documents pour l’histoire de l’Antiquité tardive.* (Lyon 2009) 23–66 = *Collection de la Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux* 40, série litt. et phil. 13.
- Fournet, J.–L., ‘Les tribulations d’un pétitionnaire égyptien à Constantinople’ *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology* (Ann Arbor 2010) 243–52
- Frisch, P., *Zehn agonistische Papyri* (Pap. Col. XIII; Köln 1986)
- Gascou, J., ‘Les grands domaines, la cité et l’état en Égypte byzantine’ *T&MByz* 9 (1985) 1–89
- Gascou, J., *Fiscalité et société en Égypte byzantine* (Paris 2008)
- Gerstinger, H., ‘Prodromus corporis epistularum privatarum inter papyros Graecas Vindobonenses (PER) asservatarum edendi’ *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 363–81
- Gonis, N., ‘Korr. Tyche 330’ *Tyche* 14 (1999) 330

- Gonis, N., 'A Late Byzantine Land Lease from Oxyrhynchus: P. Oxy 1968 Revisited' *Tyche* 15 (2000) 93–102
- Gonis, N., 'Excavations at Oxyrhynchus (1896–1907)' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 345–68
- Gonis, N., 'Prosopographica II' *APF* 55 (2009) 90–95
- Habermann, W., 'Die Deklarationen von Kleinvieh (Schafe und Ziegen) in römischen Ägypten. Quantitative Aspekte' in P. Herz–G. Waldherr (eds.), *Landwirtschaft im Imperium Romanum* (St. Katharinen 2001) 77–100
- Haensch, R., 'Das Statthalterarchiv' *ZRG* 109 (1992) 209–317
- Haensch, R., 'Die Bearbeitungsweisen von Petitionen in der Provinz Aegyptus' *ZPE* 100 (1994) 487–546
- Hagedorn, D., 'Ὁξυρύνχων πόλις und ἡ Ὁξυρυγιτιῶν πόλις' *ZPE* 12 (1973) 277–92
- Hagedorn, D., 'The Emergence of Municipal Offices in the Nome Capitals' in A.K. Bowman et al. (eds.), *Oxyrhynchus: a City and its Texts* (London 2007) 194–204
- Hickey, T.M., *Wine, Wealth and the State in Late Antique Egypt: The House of Apion at Oxyrhynchus* (Michigan 2012)
- Hodecek, S.,–Mitthof, F., 'Ein Weinlieferungskauf aus dem Herakleopolites' *APF* 51 (2005) 76–86
- Hornickel, O., *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (Giessen 1930)
- Hübner, R., 'Four Oxyrhynchus Papyri' *ZPE* 30 (1978) 195–207
- Johnson A.C.,–West, L.C., *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies²* (Amsterdam 1967)
- Jones, A.H.M., *The Later Roman Empire* (2 vols. Oxford 1964)
- Jones A.H.M. et al. (eds.), *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge 3 vols. 1971–92)
- Jones, B.W.,–Whitehorne, J.E.G., *Register of Oxyrhynchites 30 BC–AD 96* (Chico 1983)
- Jördens, A., 'Die ägyptischen Symmachoi' *ZPE* 66 (1986) 105–18

- Jördens, A., *Vertragliche Regelungen im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten* (Heidelberg 1990)
- Jördens, A., 'Die Agrarverhältnisse im spätantiken Ägypten' *Laverna* 10 (1999)
- July, H.H., *Die Klauseln hinter den Massangaben der Papyrusurkunden, (Insbesondere die Klausel ἡ ὄσαι ἐὰν ὤσῃ und ihre Synonyme)* (Diss. Köln 1966)
- Jouguet, P., *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine* (Paris 1911)
- Kaser, M., *Das römische Zivilprozessrecht* (München 1966)
- Kelly, B., *Petitions, Litigation and Social Control in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 2011)
- Koch, P., *Die byzantinischen Beamtentitel* (Jena 1903)
- Koenen, L., *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste* (Meisenheim 1976)
- Kreller, H., *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen auf Grund der graeco-ägyptischen Papyrusurkunden* (Leipzig 1919)
- Kruit, N., 'Local Customs in the Formulas of Sales of Wine for Future Delivery (A Supplement to P. Heid. V)' *ZPE* 94 (1992) 167–184
- Kruit, N., 'The Meaning of Various Words Related to Wine: Some New Interpretations' *ZPE* 90 (1992) 265–76
- Kupiszewski, H.–Modrzejewski, J., 'Υπηρέται' *JJP* 11–12 (1958) 141–66
- Langellotti, M., *L'allevamento di pecore e capre nell'Egitto romano: aspetti economici e sociali* (Bari 2012)
- Laniado, A., 'Covτελεκτής: notes sur un terme fiscal surinterprété', *JJP* 26 (1996) 23–51
- Lewis, N., 'The meaning of cὺν ἡμιολία and kindred expressions in loan contracts' *TAPhA* 76 (1945) 126–39
- Lewis, N., 'Two Petitions for Recovery' *JJP* 2 (1948) 51–66
- Lewis, N., 'The Prefect's Conventus: Proceedings and Procedures' *BASP* 18 (1981) 119–29.
- Lewis, N., *On Government and Law in Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1995)

- Lo Cascio E. (ed.), *Terre, proprietari e contadini dell'impero romano: dall'affitto agrario al colonato tardoantico* (Roma 1997)
- Mandilaras, B., *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri* (Athens 1973)
- Maresch, K., *Nomisma und Nomismatia* (Pap. Col. XXI; Köln 1994)
- Mayerson, P., 'Cηκώματα – "Standard Measures" for decanting wine' *BASP* 35 (1998) 153–8
- Mayerson, P., 'Transactions involving γλεῦκος/μοῦστος: Must or Wine? or Must Wine?' *BASP* 36 (1999) 123–8
- Mayerson, P., 'The meaning and function of ληνός and related features in the production of wine' *ZPE* 131 (2000) 161–7
- Mayerson, P., 'Cηκώματα: measures of wine, not jars' *BASP* 38 (2001) 197–101
- Mazza, R., 'P.Oxy. XVI 1911 e i conti annuali dei pronoetai' *ZPE* 122 (1998) 161–72
- Mazza, R., *L'archivio degli Apioni* (Bari 2001)
- Mazza, R., 'Gli affitti fondiari dell'Ossirinchite nell'età tardoantica' in B. Palme (ed.) *Akten des 23. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses* (Wien 2007) 439–46
- Mitthof, F., *Annona militaris: Die Heeresversorgung im spätantiken Ägypten* (2 vols. Pap. Flor. XXXII; Firenze 2001)
- Morelli, F., 'Τιμή e μισθός: vendita e prestazione di lavoro' *Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli' Firenze, Comunicazioni* 2 (1997) 7–29
- Oertel, W.R.M.F., *Die Liturgie, Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Ägyptens* (Leipzig 1917)
- Palme, B., 'Flavius Sarapodorus, ein agens in rebus aus Hermupolis' *APF* 40 (1994) 43–68
- Pintaudi, R., 'PSI V 481 verso: Conto di spese' *Aegyptus* 61 (1981) 93–102
- Pintaudi, R., 'Un documento dell'oikos di Theon (PL/III 331)' *BASP* 45 (2008) 185–8
- Presigke, F., *Girowesen im griechischen Ägypten* (Strassburg 1910)

- Primavesi, O., ‘P. Cair. Inv. 10554 r: Mahnverfahren mit Demosiosis’ *ZPE* 64 (1986) 99–114
- Quaegebeur, J., ‘Tithoes, dieu oraculaire?’ *Enchoria* 8 (1977) 103–13
- Ranke, H., *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* (2 vols. Glückstadt 1935)
- Rathbone, D., *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third Century A.D. Egypt* (Cambridge 1991)
- Rathbone, D.W., ‘Egypt, Augustus and Roman taxation’ *Cahiers G. Glotz* 4 (1993) 81–112
- Rea, J.R., ‘On κηρυκίνη: P. Heid. IV 334, P. Köln VI 279, and CPR I 232’ *ZPE* 79 (1989) 201–6
- Rowlandson, J. *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt* (Oxford 1996)
- Rupprecht, H.–A., *Studien zur Quittungen im Recht der graeco-ägyptischen Papyri* (München 1971)
- Rupprecht, H.–A., ‘Zum Ehegattenerbrecht nach den Papyri’ *BASP* 22 (1985) 291–5
- Sänger, P., *Veteranen unter den Severern und früheren Soldatenkaisern: Die Dokumentensammlung der Veteranen Aelius Sarapammon und Aelius Syrion* (Stuttgart 2011)
- Sijpesteijn, P.J., ‘Sammelbuch VI 9049 – A Sworn Declaration to be a Guardian of a Minor – Reconsidered’ *RHD* 50 (1982) 197–200.
- Sijpesteijn, P.J., ‘Bemerkungen zu einigen Papyri’ *ZPE* 70 (1987) 133–8
- Sijpesteijn, P., ‘Miete eines Hofes und einer Scheune mit Zubehör’ *CE* 68 (1993) 160–7
- Sirks, A.J.B., *Food for Rome* (Amsterdam 1991)
- Sirks, A.J.B., ‘The colonate in Justinian’s reign’ *JRS* 98 (2008) 120–43
- Strassi, S., *Le funzioni degli ὑπηρέται nell’Egitto greco e romano* (Heidelberg 1997)
- Straus, J.A., ‘Le statut fiscal des esclaves dans l’Égypte romaine’ *CE* 48 (1973) 364–

- Tacoma, L.E., 'Replacement Parts for an Irrigation Machine of the Divine House at Oxyrhynchus. P. Columbia inv. 83, October 12, AD 549(?)' *ZPE* 120 (1998) 123–130
- Taubenschlag, R., *Das Strafrecht im Rechte der Papyri* (Leipzig–Berlin 1916)
- Taubenschlag, R., 'Ἐννομος ἡλικία nel diritto dei papiri' *Aegyptus* 12 (1932) 141–4
- Taubenschlag, R., 'Die Alimentationspflicht im Rechte der Papyri' in G. Baviera (ed.), *Studi in onore di Salvatore Riccobono* (4 vols. Palermo 1936) 505–18
- Taubenschlag, R., *Opera Minora* (2 vols. Warsaw 1959)
- Tenger, B., *Die Verschuldung im römischen Ägypten* (St. Katharinen 1993)
- Turner, E.G., *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Pennsylvania 1977)
- Wallace, S.L., *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton 1938)
- Wenger, L., *Canon in den römischen Rechtsquellen und in den Papyri* (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsbericht 220, 1942)
- Whitehorne, J., 'The Pagan Cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus' *ANRW* II 18.5 (Berlin–New York 1995) 3050–91
- Whitehorne, J., *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt²* (Pap. Flor. XXXVII; Firenze 2006)
- Wilcken, U., 'Ὑπομνηματισμοί' *Philologus* 53 (1894) 80–126
- Wilcken, U., and Mitteis, L. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (2 vols. Leipzig 1912)
- Wipszycka, E., *L'industrie textile dans l'Égypte romaine* (Warsaw 1965)
- Wolff, H.–J., *Das Recht der griechischen papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats* (München 1978)
- Worp, K.A., 'Deliveries for συνήθεια in Byzantine papyri' in T. Gagos–R.S. Bagnall (eds.), *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas* (Exeter 2001) 51–68
- Worp, K.A., 'Εὐγενέτατος' *ZPE* 109 (1995) 181–6.
- Yoyotte, J., 'Notes de Toponymie Egyptienne' *MDAI(K)* 16 (1958) 423–30

Zucker, F., 'Beeidete Übernahme der Vormundschaft über eine Minderjährige (P. Jen. 32)' *Festschrift für Leopold Wenger* (München 1944–5) 34–5.

Zuckerman, C., *Du village à l'Empire. Autour du registre fiscal d'Aphrodito (525/526)* (Paris 2004)