VI. DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

4953. PETITION TO STRATEGUS REGARDING EXTORTION

A petition to the strategus Tiberius Claudius Pasion from Dius son of Peteuris, a weaver, complaining about the extortion by Ammonius, a former tax collector, of 40 drachmas in each of two consecutive years, Year 6 = 45/6 and Year 7 = 46/7. **4953** must have been submitted after September/October 48, when Dor[ion?], Pasion’s predecessor as strategus, was still in office: see J. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt* 2 (2006) 91. It is one of a small group of texts of this type (II 284, 393 descr. = SB XIV 11902; sim. 285, 394 = 4954 below), but it is difficult to tell which is the earliest since they are all undated.

That four of these texts are addressed to the same strategus is likely to be an accident of preservation. There is no reason to suppose that this type of extortion was confined to a few years in the Oxyrhynchite nome or that Pasion was successful in stamping it out. Indeed the fact that each of the weavers lived in a different part of the city and they complained about different tax collectors (Apollophanes in 284 and 285; Damis in SB 11902) shows how pervasive this type of extortion must have been. **4953** differs from the parallels in that the amount involved is much larger, and only here does the petitioner offer the extortion as an excuse for being in arrears in the payment of his weaver’s tax for Year 7 (10–11).

There is no *kollesis*. The back is blank.

Τιβερίωι Κλαυδίω[ι Πα]ϲ̣̣̄ῑ̣̣ω̣̣̄νι ϲτρα(τηγῷ) παρὰ Δίου̣ τοῦ̣ Πετεύριοϲ τῶν ἀπ’ Ὀ̣̣̄ξῡ̣̣ρ̣̣̄χων πόλε̣̣̄ων λαύ̣̣̄ραϲ Ποιμενικῆϲ. διαϲείϲθηι 5 ὑπὸ Ἀμμωνίου γ̣[εν]ομένου πράκτοροϲ τῶι σ̣̣̄ (ἐτεί) Τιβερίου Κλαυδ(ίου) Καίϲαρος Σεβαϲτοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Ἀυτοκράτοροϲ ἀργ(υρίου) (δραχμάϲ) μ καὶ τῶι ζ̣̣̄ (ἐτεί) κατὰ μέροϲ ἄλλαϲ ἀρ[γ]ου̣(ιον)] (δραχμάϲ) μ, 10 ἕ̣̣̄ς οὐ ἐφέλκομαι διὰ τὸ διάϲιϲ- μα τὸ τοῦ ζ̣̣̄ (ἐτουϲ) χειρονάξιν. διὸ ἀξιῶ̣ι διαλαβ̣[ε]ῖ̣̣̄ν ὁϲ ἐάν ϲοι δό- __________ ξηι. (vac.) εὐτύχ(ει).
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

To Tiberius Claudius Pasion, strategus, from Dius son of Peteuris, of those from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, of the weavers of the quarter of Poimenike. Ammonius, the ex-fraktor, extorted from me in Year 6 of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator 40 drachmas of silver, and in Year 7, another 40 drachmas of silver, bit by bit. As a consequence, because of the extortion, I am in arrears for the trade tax for Year 7. I therefore request that you deal with (this) as you may see fit. Farewell.'

Although it cannot be dated precisely, this is perhaps the earliest attestation of Tiberius Claudius Pasion as strategus, since the text is likely to have been written after the end of Year 7 = 46/7 (line 9); cf. SB XIV 11902. His predecessor as strategus, Dor[jon?], is attested in office in September/October 48 (II 255 = W. Chr. 201) while the earliest secure date for Pasion himself remains 29 March 49 (I 37 i); see Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes' 91. The other texts, being undated, are of little help: 284 complains of extortion in Year 8, and so is Year 9 = 48/9 at the earliest; 285 refers to Years 1 (sic) and 9, and so is Year 10 = 49/50 at the earliest; SB XIV 11902 refers to the past Year 9, and so is also Year 10 at the earliest.

διαϲείϲθηι, l. διαϲείϲθην. Cf. 10–11 διάϲειϲμα. διαϲείϲον/διάϲειϲμα are the standard terms for extortion by officials; cf. Subatianus Aquila’s edict, VIII 1100 (206) passim.

8–9 (δραχμὰϲ) μ. 80 drachmas over two years is a considerable amount, given that the weaver’s tax was typically c.36 drachmas a year; see II 288 introd. The amounts in the parallels are much less: 16 drachmas over a year in II 284, a linen tunic worth 8 drachmas plus 16 drachmas over a six-month period in II 285, and 16 drachmas in Year 8 followed by 24 drachmas in Year 9 in II 393 descr. = SB XIV 11902.

9 κατὰ μέροϲ. Translated erroneously at 284 10 as ‘among other people’. In the context of a private account, J. R. Rea at LXIV 4436 i 3 n. suggests ‘by instalments’, which implies regular payments of a fixed amount. This is what happened in 285, where 12 drachmas were extorted at 2 drachmas ‘month by month’, κατὰ μῆνα, over the six-month period. But this may not have been the case here. On analogy with κατ’ ἄνδρα, ‘man by man, person by person’, κατὰ μέροϲ is rather ‘bit by bit, part by part, severally’.

J. WHITEHORNE

4954. Petition regarding Extortion

Camb. UL Add. Ms. 4069 3.2 × 21 cm c.49

This papyrus was first published in the form of a short description as II 394: ‘Conclusion of a similar petition [to 393 = SB XIV 11902] complaining of the extortion of 24 drachmae and a ἵματιον worth 16 drachmae’ (P. Oxy. II p. 314). A full edition is given here since the text belongs to the same dossier as 4953. We find a similar combination of extorted money and clothing (a linen tunic) in II 285.

The back is presumed to be blank. The text was transcribed from a photograph, and is published courtesy of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
4954. PETITION REGARDING EXTORTION

Germanicus Imperator twenty-four drachmas of silver, bit by bit (?), having seized from me a cloak worth 16 drachmas, so that it is (in total) 40 drachmas of silver. I therefore request that you proceed against him as you may see fit.'

2–3 (δραχμὰϲ) εἴκοϲι τέϲϲαρεϲ was no doubt governed by a verb such as διέϲειϲε in the lost part of the line; cf. II 285 12–13.

N. GONIS

4955. Military Roster

One large and one smaller fragment that can be joined together. The left half of the smaller fragment, as well as some other bits, are lost. The papyrus preserves a left margin of c.2.3 cm and a bottom margin of 3.5 cm; top and right margins lost. A sheet-joint is visible 1.8 cm away from the left edge of the papyrus; the back is blank. The text is written along the fibres, in a so-called rustic capital. Such scripts are attested in several other Latin papyri dating from the first and second centuries AD (see below). In the left margin, there are remains of a few letters written in a cursive script, presumably by a different hand, which are clearly the ends of Roman cognomina. This suggests that we have a tomos synkollesimos of military reports or similar documents. There are no lectional signs or punctuation. The symbol used for centuria is attested, in various shapes, in other Latin papyri; see e.g. ChLA X 411.42 (156), IV 275.12 = 735 12 (205), IV 270.12 (iii), XLII 1213 fr. b.10, and fr. c.5 (225–250). On Latin texts found in Oxyrhynchus, see J. D. Thomas in Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts 231–43.

Column ii is a list, in Latin, of the names of seventeen soldiers preceded by the centuries to which they belong (the names of five of these are preserved). The names are preceded by assignments to duty, which correspond to topographical
locations, all but one probably civic or urban facilities: castello, portico, amphi-theatro (presumably amphitheatro was intended; see ii 20 n.), fistulis (water-pipes), alabastrona (quarry). In the smaller, upper fragment, the irregular line spacing suggests that some more topographical entries stood in the missing left part of the sheet. The names add up to seventeen, corresponding to the total given at the bottom of the sheet. Thus no names are missing at the top, although presumably there was originally some sort of heading, now lost. All nomina and cognomina appearing in this papyrus are found either in H. Solin, O. Salomies, Reper-torium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum (1994), or in I. Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina (1965). The presence of several Gaii Iulii (ii 10, 12, 27, and perhaps 15), as well as a Marcus Antonius (ii 2), points to the earlier first century. The four Titi Flauii (ii 6, 22, 24, 25), however, can hardly predate 69, when Vespasian became emperor. The names do not show any influence from later dynasties; notably there are no Ulpii or Aelii, which would point to the period 98–138. In P. Gen. lat. 1 (= CPL 106 = ChLA I 7 = S. Daris, Documenti per la storia dell’esercito romano in Egitto no. 10 = RMR nos. 9, 10, 37, 58, 68), a military register of 81–90, one finds names also attested here, such as Titus Flauius Valens (?) and Gaius Iulius Longus. In VII 1022 (= RMR 87), a Latin enrolment list of recruits dating from 103, Gaii Iulii appear twice (but no Flauii). A date in the late first or early second century therefore seems probable. It would suit the dating of the script, which is a less formal example of ChLA XXV 785 (= PSI XI 1183; 45–54). Other possible parallels are P. Herc. 817 (= Seider, Pal. lat. Pap. II.1 4; 31 BC – AD 79), ChLA I 7 (= P. Gen. lat. 1; 81/90), X 456 + XI 468 (95), XLI 1191 (i/i), P. Mich. VII 430a (= Seider, Pal. lat. Pap. II.1 10; before 115), ChLA X 422 (= BGU VII 1689 = Seider, Pal. lat. Pap. II.1 9; 122–145). The names do not give any clue as to whether this was an auxiliary cohort or a legion.

This looks like a guard roster, parallels of which can be found in R. O. Fink, Roman Military Records on Papyrus nos. 12–19; see esp. 15 introd. The soldiers have been placed at strategic locations, either in pairs or singly. It is impossible to be certain of the town or region in question. The mention of an amphitheatre and of alabaster quarries makes it unlikely that we are dealing with Oxyrhynchus; on the theatre of Oxyrhynchus, see W. M. F. Petrie, Tombs of the Courtiers and Oxyrhynchos (1925) 14–16 (reprint in Oxyrhynchus: A City and its Texts 52–4); A. Lukaszewicz, Les Édi-fices publics dans les villes de l’Égypte romaine (1986) 60, 170–71; D. M. Bailey in Oxyrhyn-chus: A City and its Texts 70–90. Antinoopolis might provide a better fit with some of the topographical features mentioned; A. Bernand, Les Portes du désert (1984) 29–46, quotes the description of the site of Antinoopolis made by E. Jomard in La Description de l’Égypte; Bailey, loc. cit. 70–71, listing a colonnade (33), an amphitheatre (34), baths (41) that could justify the presence of water-pipes, and quarries (44). However, the onomastics and the palaeography militate against a date after 130 (see above) and the ‘amphitheatre’ at Antinoopolis is in fact a theatre (Descr. de l’Égypte iv pl. 53). The only place in Egypt at which an amphitheatre is reasonably securely attested
is Alexandria, close to Nicopolis; see J. McKenzie, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt* (2007) 400 n. 49; D. M. Bailey, ‘Classical Architecture in Roman Egypt’, in M. Henig (ed.), *Architecture and Architectural Sculpture in the Roman Empire* (1990) 121–37, at 123. In that case, these soldiers would probably be legionaries. This, however, does not fit very well with the mention of an alabaster quarry; the nearest to Alexandria appear to be in the Fayum and south-east of Cairo (see ii 26 n.). Whatever the case, the papyrus could have found its way to Oxyrhynchus among the papers carried there by a veteran after his discharge; or it could have simply been discarded by a soldier who happened to be passing through Oxyrhynchus.

Col. i

\[\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\dot{\do
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

(c(entruria) Faiani Crispī) P Vettius D[
(c(entruria) Septim[i]) M Acilius T[

amphothia[tur]]

(c(entruria) Iuli Saturnini) L Antonius[s]
(c(entruria) Septimi) T Flavius Va[

fistulis]

(c(entruria) Faiani) T Flavius Maio[r]
(c(entruria) Clodi Capitoni) T Flavius Scena[Ia
alabastrona]

(c(entruria) Ti Iuli) C Iulius Long[g–

sum(ma) XVII ededit P Ac .[

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ]

14 castell"

(. . .) Quintus Voconius Saturninus
(. . .) Marcus Antonius Cl(. . .)
(Topographical entry) Marcus Tullius (. . .)
(Century) Titus Flavius (. . .)
(Topographical entry) Marcus Dellius Quint(. . .)
(Century) Gaius Iulius Firmus
(Topographical entry) Gaius Iulius Crisp(us?)
(Century) Quintus Vettius Pude(ns?)

At the reservoir:
Century of Faianus Crispus C(. . .)us Sc(. . .)
Century of Clodius Capito Gaius Annaeus B(. . .)
At the colonnade:
Century of Faianus Crispus Publius Vettius D(. . .)
Century of Septimius Marcus Acilius T(. . .)
At the amphitheatre (?):
Century of Iulius Saturninus Lucius Antonius (. . .)
Century of Septimius Titus Flavius Va(. . .)
At the water-pipes:
Century of Faianus Titus Flavius Maior
Century of Clodius Capito Titus Flavius Scaeuola
At the quarry:
Century of Tiberius Iulius Gaius Iulius Long(. . .)

Total of 17 (men). Publius Ac(. . .) presented (the list)
Col. i

1 ... ens. Perhaps Valens, Pudens (see ii 13) or Valens (ii 2).

2 ... anus. Perhaps Ger[manus or Fur]manus.

Col. ii

1 Presumably the genitive ending of the name of the century at the left.

2 M Dellius Quint[.] The rather unusual gentilicum Dellius is listed in W. Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen (1904, repr. 1991) 423.

3 Crisp[us. Presumably Crisp[us or Crisp]inus.

4 The occurrence of fistuliṣ in 23 suggests that castello here refers to a reservoir (a common meaning; cf. Frontinus, Aq. 106), rather than a fort or military installation, which would in any case be less likely to need a detail of a pair of soldiers on guard.

5 Š[ ... icus Sc[ius. C[Iul]ius seems too short to fill the gap. Š[ is possible, though less likely.

6 and 25 Clodi [ ... ius. One would expect Capitonis. Final -s is more stable than final -m; see J. N. Adams, CQ 53 (2003) 538. This genitive was apparently attracted by the 2nd decl. genitive Clodi.

7 Portico. For the shift to the (locatival) ablative singular, see J. N. Adams, JRS 85 (1995) 110, with parallels from Vindolanda. The word porticus usually belongs to the 2nd declension. For parallels to the shift to the 2nd declension, see PSI IX 1026 B 1 (= CPL 117 = ChLA XXV 784; Caesarea Pal., 150) in po[r]tico. CIL VI 15348.6 portico suo. On colonnades in cities of Roman Egypt, see Lukaszewicz, Les Édifices publics 180–81, and LXIV 4441 passim.

8 Amphithia[ tur]. This looks like a clumsy rendering of amphitheatrum, although the Greek word ἀμφιθέατρον is not attested in papyri. The vowel change amphi-/ampho- is hard to explain, and there are no parallels either in Gignac, Grammar or in Mayser, Grammatik; there may be an analogy with e.g. ἀμφότεροι. For -thia- instead of -thea-, see Audollent, Defix. tab. 250b.16 desub ampitiatri corona. The scribe may have realized that his ending in -tur was improper, and crossed it out; apparently, he did not write tro for tur.

9 e(enturia) Iuli Saturnini. A recruit named Gaius Iulius Saturninus is attested in VII 1022 19 (103), probably not the same person. The different elements of the name are all too common to allow an identification.

10 Tit[us] Flavius Vale[.] A Titus Flavius Valente is attested in P. Gen. lat. 1 = RMR 10.17 and 9.34.

11 fistuli. The water-pipes could control the supply either of the baths or of a public fountain.

12 e(enturia) Faiani. For the unusual gentilicum Faianius, see Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen 185.

13 Alabastra. This must derive from the Greek accusative of ἀλαβαστρόν, as in SB I 4693.3–4 (209) καταδικαϲθέντα εἰς ἀλαβαϲτρῷ|να. The word is not attested in any papyrus from Oxyrhynchus, nor is the Latin form found in ThIl or in OCD. In Plin. Nat. 5.61, Alabastron transcribes Greek gen. pl., whereas in 37.109, Alabastrum is acc. n. sing. For a parallel to the use of the Greek accusative without preposition in a similar context, see J. N. Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language (2003) 723–4; id., CQ 53 (2003) 551–2. The precise location of this quarry is uncertain. PSI VII 822.4–5 (ib), a document of unknown provenance, mentions Antinoopolis as well as quarry-workers: εδρων | ταρ[ισ]τα ἀλαβαϲτρωνειταϲ. Alabaster quarries in Het-nub, close to Antinoopolis, are mentioned by K. Fitzler, Steinbrüche und Bergwerke im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten (1910) 108, although there is no ancient record for them; he also registers some in the neighbouring Hermopolite nome (121), where Alabaston polis was located. See also R. Klemm and D. D. Klemm, Stein und Steinbrüche im alten Ägypten (1993). The known alabaster quarries closest to Alexandria appear to be those at Wadi Gerrawi near Cairo (Klemm–Klemm 53, fig. 1, 200) and in the Fayum (Fitzler 110, and the quarry mentioned in SB

27 C Iulius Longus—Presumably Longus, although Longinus is also possible. There are two occurrences of the name Gaius Iulius Longus in P. Gen. lat. 1 = RMR 9.11–12.

28 sum(ma) XVII ededit P Ac [.The total number of men listed in the document is indeed seventeen. See also P. Brook. 24.25 (Thebais, c.215) summa qui decesserunt, milites) XXX, T. Vindol. II 154-25 summa ear[um] XXXI. For a parallel to ededit (instead of the regular edidit), see CIL VI 31850.8. Rather than resolving sum(mam) and regarding it as the direct object of ededit, we should understand a break in the sense after the numeral; the name of the person submitting the report is paralleled e.g. in T. Vindol. III 574. The verb edo does not seem to occur in Latin military documents, but see OLD s.v. 10.

P. Schubert

4956–4957. Two Census Declarations

These two declarations are sufficiently similar, both extremely narrow like SB XXII 154/65 and 154/66 (11 and 7 cm wide, respectively), to raise the question whether they might have been part of a tomos synkollesimos together. But they concern different villages, Peenno and Sesphtha, in different toparchies; it is perhaps just chance that they also have in common that neither declarant has a legal father; the more complete (4957) lacks an address to any official, and it is altogether not obvious why they would have been filed together. Moreover, the second seems to preserve part of the original edges. Together, however, they add substantially to the small group of three Oxyrhynchite declarations previously known from the census of 145/6, for which see R. S. Bagnall, B. W. Frier, The Demography of Roman Egypt (1994) 232–3; no additional Oxyrhynchite declarations for that census have been published in the interim (see the addenda in the digital reprint, 2006). They follow, as far as preserved, the normal Oxyrhynchite formulary of the period for the κατ’ οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή, for which see M. Hombert, C. Préaux, Recherches sur le recensement dans l’Égypte Romaine (P. L.-Bat. 5: 1952) 79, 91, 111, and 119–21.

4956. Census Declaration

75/22(a) 4.8 × 17.8 cm 146/7 Plate XI

The three fragments do not connect, but no more than a line or two is missing between the second and third fragments, depending on the degree of abbreviation. The amount lost between the first and second depends on how many (if any) persons were declared.

The hand is largely bilinear and detached, with some serifs, resembling a bookhand (cf. Roberts, Greek Literary Hands nos. 11, 13–14).
CENSUS DECLARATION

Fr. 1

παρὰ Τνεφερ[ώτος
χρηματίζουσα [μητ(ρὸς) Κεν-
παπῶτος Αυτ[ c.5
μετὰ κυρίο[ν τοῦ αὐτῆς
5 ἀνδρὸς Πανεξ[ώτου
Αρμύσιος ἀμφ[στέρων
ἀπὸ Πεε[ννω). ἀπο[γράφομαι
κατὰ τὰ κελ[ευθέν-
tὰ ὑπὸ Οὐαλερ[ον
Πρόκλου το[ν ή̣γ̣έ̣μ(ον)κωντος]
πρὸς τήν τοῦ δ[ιαθόντος
θ (ἔτους) Αντων[ην]
Καίσαρος τοῦ [κυρίου
κατ’ οἰκ[ίαν] ἀπογρ[αφή]
tὸ ὑπάρχ[ον (πρότερον) Ψ[ενα-
μούνιος Τ[ c.5
τοῦ Ψεναμο[ύνιος
μητρὸς Τ[ c.5
ἐν τῇ Α[υτῇ Πεε[ννω) [. . . με-
20 ρος οἰκ[ίας] καὶ κ[α]μάρας
καὶ ἁ[ρ]ής καὶ έτ[έρων
χρηστηρίων [κοι-
νωνικ[ῶν] πρὸς [ c.5
λω[. . .].[. . .

Fr. 2–3

[ c.8 καὶ δμύω]
[Αὐτοκράτορα Καί-
5 σα] Τ[ίτον Αὐλιον
Ἀδριανὸν Α[ντωνών]
Σεβαστὸν Ε[ς]εβή
ἐξ ὑγι[οῦς καὶ ἐπ’ ἀληθείας
ἐπιδεδωκέναι]
[τὴν προκειμέ-]
νὴν ἀπ[ογράφην

4956. CENSUS DECLARATION 147
καὶ μήτε ἐπί[ζενον
μήτε Ρωμα[ῖον
μήτε Ἀλε̣ξ̣[ανδρέα
μηδ' ἄλ(λον) μηδένα
ο[ἰκ[είν μηδὲ
.
.
.  

Fr. 1
2 l. χρηματιζούϲηϲ 7 Πε' 12 θ$ 14 oi" 15 νπαρ$α 19 α Πε'
20 ni" 22 au$ 23 νωνι" 

Frr. 2+3
6 νγ' 13 α$ 

‘From Tnepheros officially described as daughter of mother [Sen]papos daughter of Ant—, with as guardian her husband Panechotes son of Harmiysis, both from Peeno. I register according to the orders of the former prefect Valerius Proculus, for the house-by-house registration of the past 9th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, the —th part belonging to me, formerly of Psenamounis son of T—, grandson of Psenamounis, mother Tn—, in the same Peeno, of a house and storeroom and courtyard and other appurtenances, owned jointly with . . . [break] and I swear by Imperator Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius that I have submitted the aforesaid declaration properly and truthfully and that neither foreigner nor Roman nor Alexandrian nor anyone else is living (in it) nor . . .’

Fr. 1
2–3 [Ϲεν]παπῶϲοϲ. The name had previously occurred in SB XXII 15441, a Theban mummy label of the third/fourth century: Σενταπωϲ(ϲ). (It is of course possible that Και-, common in the Oxyrhynchite nome, appeared instead of Κεν). Παπῶϲ is better attested (see the few instances in Preisigke, Namenbuch, and Foraboschi, Onomatikon, where the reference to P. Erl. 109.32 is to be deleted), but not apparently from the Oxyrhynchite. No Demotic version seems to be listed in Lüddeckens, Demotisches Namenbuch.

2 χρηματιζούϲηϲ. It is of course possible that Και-, common in the Oxyrhynchite nome, appeared instead of Κεν). Παπῶϲ is better attested (see the few instances in Preisigke, Namenbuch, and Foraboschi, Onomatikon, where the reference to P. Erl. 109.32 is to be deleted), but not apparently from the Oxyrhynchite. No Demotic version seems to be listed in Lüddeckens, Demotisches Namenbuch.

2–3 [Ϲεν]παπῶϲοϲ. The name had previously occurred in SB XXII 15441, a Theban mummy label of the third/fourth century: Σενταπωϲ(ϲ). (It is of course possible that Και-, common in the Oxyrhynchite nome, appeared instead of Κεν). Παπῶϲ is better attested (see the few instances in Preisigke, Namenbuch, and Foraboschi, Onomatikon, where the reference to P. Erl. 109.32 is to be deleted), but not apparently from the Oxyrhynchite. No Demotic version seems to be listed in Lüddeckens, Demotisches Namenbuch.

3 Perhaps Αυτ[ων]ιοϲ or Αυτ[ατοϲ].
4 Perhaps abbreviated au$.
7 Peeno was in the Middle toparchy; its attestations belong to the first three centuries of our era (Pruneti, I centri abitati dell’Ossirinchite 141). The last word in the line was perhaps abbreviated απογρ$β.

9–10 On L. Valerius Proculus, see G. Bastianini, ΖΠΕ 17 (1975) 289–90 and 38 (1980) 82; W. Habermann, ΖΠΕ 117 (1997) 180–82. He is clearly described as former prefect in SB XXII 15446 and in 4957, dated to 20 and 22 February 147, respectively; these are the earliest secure evidence for his having left office. One may thus safely resolve the abbreviations as ἀγεμον(εὐκαντοϲ) in P. Corn. 17 = SB XX 14304.6 and P. Bad. IV 75b.9, of 10 and 11 March, as Habermann has shown. It is likely that the aorist participle is to be restored here also, though cf. I 171 desc. = SB XXII 15333.5, also of Year 10 (146/7), which refers to him as τοῦ ἀγεμονοϲ. The later date in BGU II 378 does not refer
to Proculus, as Habermann has demonstrated. Proculus’ successor, M. Petronius Honoratus, is not attested until summer.

15 μοι seems to have been omitted.

18 Probably Τη[εφερῶτοϲ] [perhaps abbreviated], as in the name of the declarant; the former owner of the part of a house was thus probably a relative.

19 It is possible that no portion was specified, given the limited space available.

20 κα[μάραϲ. κα[ταγείου is another, though statistically less likely, possibility. καμάρα is properly a vaulted room; see Husson, OIKIA 123–8. Whether it is distinguished from the house here because it was a basement and thought of separately (Husson 124 cites P. Lips. I 3, οίκια . . . ὑφ’ ἄφ’ ἄν καμάρα) or because it was a separate storeroom, the meaning it commonly takes on, is hard to say.

23–4 Ἀπολλω[ν][]?

4957. Census Declaration

The hand of the body of the declaration is an irregular cursive, followed by a signature by a slow writer in an ungainly hand.

παρὰ Λεοντᾶτοϲ χρηματίϲαντ(οϲ)

τῆϲ κάτω τοπαρχείαϲ. ἀπογ(ρά)fμαι

υπὸ Οὐαλερίου Πρόκλου τοῦ ἡγεμονεύϲαντοϲ πρὸϲ τὴν τοῦ διελθόντοϲ ὦτοϲ Αντωνίου Καίϲαροϲ τοῦ κυρίου κατ’ οἰκείϲ[...]πογ(ραφή)ν

εἰς τοῦ διελθόντοϲ θ (ἔτουϲ)

Ἀντωνίνου Καίϲαροϲ τοῦ κυρίου κατ’ οἰκείϲ[...]πογ(ραφή)ν

πρ(οϲγίνεται) Πμυϲθᾶϲ υἱὸϲ μηρ(όϲ)

πρ(οϲγίνεται) Πανετβεῦϲ ἀδελϐόϲ γονέων
ἀντίκροτος μητρὸς Σινπμυστ( ) γυνὴ μον ἀτεχνος ἄνημος ἐτῶν λβ,

Αρτέμιδος Πανετβεῦτος αὐτῶν Σινπμυστ( )

και ὀμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Τίτου Ἁδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου

Ἀντωνίνον Κεβαστὸν Ἑὔσεβῆν ἄλθη εἴναι τα προγεγραμμένα. (ἐτῶν) ια.

καὶ ὀμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Τίτου Ἁδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου 

Ϲέϲθα 3 l. τοπαρχίαϲ 3, 9 ἐμαυτόν

κατὰ τὰ κελευϲθέντα 7 θ 9 l. οἰκίαν 10 μαι

-λαμβανομένοιϲ 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 27 L 16, 18 ῶ 16 μη

Ἀρτέμιδοϲ 20 l. Πανετβεῦτοϲ μητρὸϲ ἀγναϲ 20 l. Ἀρτέμιδοϲ 3 l. τοπαρχίαϲ 3, 9 ἐμαυτόν

οἰκίαν ετῶν λβ,

πατρὸϲ Καίσαροϲ ῶτῶν αὐτῶν ὀμνύϲ ἂτεχνοϲ ἄϲημοϲ (ἐτῶν) ια.

Ὑμῷ Θεῷ ἡμῖν Ἄρτεμιϲ Πανετβεῦϲ μητ(ρὸϲ) Ϲινπμυϲτ( )

γυνῆ μο̣υ ἄτεχνοϲ ἄϲημοϲ (ἐτῶν) λβ,

τοπαρχίαϲ 3 l. τοπαρχίαϲ 3, 9 ἐμαυτόν

κατὰ τὰ κελευϲθέντα 7 θ 9 l. οἰκίαν 10 μαι

-λαμβανομένοιϲ 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 27 L 16, 18 ῶ 16 μη

Ἀρτέμιδοϲ 20 l. Πανετβεῦτοϲ μητρὸϲ ἀγναϲ 20 l. Ἀρτέμιδοϲ 3 l. τοπαρχίαϲ 3, 9 ἐμαυτόν

οἰκίαν ετῶν λβ,
CENSUS DECLARATION

5 For Valerius Proculus, see 4956 Fr. 1.9–20 n.

12–13 I do not know of a parallel for this phrase in the census declarations, but Hombert–Préaux, Recherches 111, note that Oxyrhynchite declarations give more information about the origin of ownership of property than those from other nomes. For ἀναλαμβάνω in the sense of ‘porter dans les rôles’, see P. Thmouis I 69.20 n., citing Preisigke, WBI 94 s.v. (12).

16 At the start (also in 18), a rho surmounted with a curve concave downward, suggesting πρ( ).

The name Πυθᾶϲ, otherwise unattested, is simply the well-known name Μυθᾶϲ prefixed with the masculine definite article. It is characteristic of the Arsinoite rather than the Oxyrhynchite, but as Dr Gonis points out, Sesphtha was not very far from the Arsinoite. The grandmother’s name in line 20 is evidently formed by prefixing ‘the daughter of’ in its characteristic Oxyrhynchite form to this name, although with tau instead of theta at the end.

18 The younger son has been named after his maternal grandfather.

19 The indication of the age of the younger son has been corrected, but how is not clear. There is a clear alpha written above the horizontal of the year sign. This is followed by a mass of downward strokes, some apparently sinusoidal but one vertical. The ages otherwise never have markings after them, and it is possible that the scribe at first mistook an original eta, or age 8, for an alpha followed by a sinusoidal curve. That would not, however, explain why he did not (upon realising his error) alter the first part of the letter to look more like an eta.

19–20 The paragraphos is written just on top of γυναῖϲεϲ and barely distinguishable from its horizontal abbreviation stroke.

30–32 The verbs of oath and submission are given in reverse order in SB XXII 15466.42–3. The deformation of the second verb is striking, but it is paralleled in a number of texts; see Gignac, Grammar ii 304, with examples of ὀμώμεχα and ὀμόμεχα. The papyrus is broken off at the bottom, but it is possible that nothing is lost.

R. S. BAGNALL

APPLICATION TO ACTING STRATEGUS

4958. APPLICATION TO ACTING STRATEGUS

An application to Ischyron, royal scribe and acting strategus, from Onnophris son of Sambas, a tenant farmer seeking to continue cultivating a holding of royal land.

The lease of the land had originally been granted to Sambas, Onnophris’s deceased father, and Onnophris had apparently expected to take over the lease on the same terms on his demise; in fact he had already sown the land (19–20). But an
overbid for the right to cultivate the land had been put in by Sarapion, freedman of Petosorapis (9), by offering an additional payment (18, 22, 25: for the possible resolution of the abbreviation, see 18 n.).

Onnophris, as ‘the former tenant who has already sown the land’ (18–20), now claims the right to continue as lessee for the present Year 11 = 147/8. He undertakes, ‘according to the customary usage of the nome’ (21), to match Sarapion’s additional payment, on condition that it is removed from him after that year (23–5), that the right of farming the land in future will remain with him on the original terms which he had paid for the preceding Year 10, and that an appropriate deduction will be made for any land left unflooded or artificially irrigated in the following Year 12.

The inclusion of these standard clauses in lines 26–32 shows that Onnophris intended to continue farming the land himself. This may not have been the case with Sarapion. Initial applications to lease public lands, e.g. P. Sarapion 45 = P. Strasb. I 78 (Herm., 127) and P. Flor. III 383 (Ant., 232), appear to show that the payment of the additional amount might entitle the successful overbidder to sublet to a third party rather than work the land himself. So this may have been what attracted Sarapion’s opportunistic overbid in the present case.

For some discussion of related texts, see Th. Kruse, Der Königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung (2002) 578–81, but the only parallel to 4958, and then not a close one, appears to be SB I 5672 (Herm., 156/7; not discussed by Kruse). This too is a petition to the strategus concerning a lease of public land; there is reference to the offer of an additional payment, and the complainants also describe themselves as προγεωργοί, but the text is too broken to be of much help.

There is no kollesis. The back is blank.

\[\text{Ἰϲχυρίωνι β(αϲιλικῷ) γρ(αμματεῖ) διαδεχ(ομένῳ) καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν ετρα(τηγίαν) παρὰ Ὀννώφριοϲ Σαμβάτοϲ τοῦ Ὀννώφριοϲ μητρὸϲ Μοήριοϲ ἀπὸ κ[(ω]μήϲ Ταν̣[ά̣]ε̣ωϲ. προϲπέπτωκέ μοι Ϲαραπίων ἀπελεύθεροϲ Πετοσοραπιοϲ ἀπ’ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεωϲ ύπερβαλὼν τῷ ἑνεκτῶτι ἀ(τεπ)ε ἀναγραφόμενον εἰς τὸν μετηλλαχότα μον τατέρα Σαμβάν Ὀννώφριοϲ τοῦ Ὀννώφριοϲ περὶ Σεϕω ἐκ τοῦ Ἐπιμέ-}\]
APPLICATION TO ACTING STRATEGUS

To Ischyrion, royal scribe acting also in the post of the strategia, from Onnophris son of Sambas the son of Onnophris, whose mother is Soeris, from the village of Tanais. It has come to my notice that Sarapion, freedman of Petosorapis from the city of the Oxyrhynchi, has made an overbid for the present Year 11 for the landholding registered to my deceased father Sambas son of Onnophris the son of Onnophris in the vicinity of Sepho, from the kleros of Epimenes, a ¼ aroura(s) of royal land, having offered a single . . . for the present Year 11 only. So as I am the former tenant farmer and have sown the land beforehand, according to the customary usage of the nome I undertake (sc. to pay) the aforementioned single . . . , on the terms that the aforementioned single . . . will be removed from me after the present Year 11, and the right of farming will remain with me on the terms of only the payments paid for the past Year 10, and if from the coming Year 12 any land should become either unflooded or artificially irrigated a deduction will be made for me.

Year 11 of Imperator Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Mecheir 26.

I, Onnophris son of Sambas, have submitted (this).

1–2 This is the first attestation of Ischyrion as acting strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome. He
is otherwise known as royal scribe only from I 171 descr. = II p. 208 = SB XXII 15353: J. Whitehorne, Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt 162.

5–6 κ[ῶ]μηϲ Ταν̣[ά]ε̣ωϲ. Tanais was located in the Middle Toparchy, Sepho in the adjacent Thmoisepho Toparchy: P. Pruneti, I centri abitati dell'Ossirinchite s. vv. and map.

14–15 Ἐψιμένονοϲ κλήροϲ. The kleros of Epimenes is otherwise known from PSI X 1118.7; see Pruneti, Aegyptus 55 (1975) 176.

16 (ἀρου)̣ ¼. The unread figure might be ε̣ or ι̣. One might even consider reading Λ (½), which would correspond to τὸ ἀναγραφόμενον in 10–11. However, it would make no commercial sense for Sarapion to offer such a large additional payment as 5 artabas (see below, 18 n.) for the right to lease only ¾ aroura.

18, 22, 25 ε̣( ) ἕν. The initial epsilon is definite, with its tip continuing upwards into a vertical stroke cut through by a horizontal dash above, similar to that which marks the numeral in 16. Its resolution remains uncertain.

J. L. Rowlandson, who had not seen the papyrus, pointed out that the standard term for an additional sum offered as an overbid to offer to lease or purchase public lands or property is ἐπίθεμα; see P. Ryl. II 97.5 n. for discussion of the term, and cf. III 500 (130, lease of public land), IV 721 and 835 (13/14, sale of crown land), P. Flor. III 368 (Herm., 96). P. Amh. II 85 (Herm., 78), which is an application to the exegetes to lease land held in trust for orphans, stipulates a period of 10 days allowed for the offer of an ἐπίθεμα. The word would give the required sense for the context and fit with the preceding neuter singular τὸ προκείμενον in 22 and 25. But it is questionable whether one could refer to ‘a single additional payment’ without specifying an amount. Nor does it seem possible to take the abbreviation mark as ἐ(πίθεμα) or ἐπ(ίθεμα).

K. A. Worp has suggested that the abbreviation may be the name of a dry measure, the amount of which constituted the overbid. If this is the case, the only likely candidate worthy of consideration here seems to be (πεντ)αρτάβιον; the word is not attested, but cf. XIV 1760 8–9 (ii), where we find the adjective πενταρταβιαῖον, used of a sack of this size. Compare also the common term πενταρτάβια, ‘5 art. percentage’, is written as ε followed by the symbol for artaba. An argument in favour may be that 5 artabas are also offered as the ἐπίθεμα in III 500. The public land applied for there was 20 ¼ arouras, suggesting that 5 artabas as a lump sum may have been a standard amount for such an overbid. ε( ) ἕν might accordingly be understood as ‘one (or ‘a single’) 5 art. measure full.’ We should not therefore be looking here for a one-to-one correspondence with the land area of 5 (or 10) ¼ arouras in 16.

19 προεξιδαμηκώϲ. *προεξιδαμᾶν is an addendum lexicis.


J. WHITEHORNE

4959. LETTER OF AMMONIUS TO HIS PARENTS

43 5B.66/F(1–2)a 13.5 × 20.5 cm Second century

Ammonius, who is or has been a gymnasiarch, wrote this letter to Demetria and Dius, whom he calls his mother and father (very probably but not certainly his parents), concerning his brother Theon. Theon had written to them that he had caught a chill but had recovered. Demetria and Dius, however, were apparently still
worried about Theon’s health, and Ammonius tries to reassure them. He swears to
the gods that Theon has fully recovered, and no residue of his illness has remained.

The letter shows a very good command of Greek. There are no errors, save
for a common phonetic spelling (4, 14). Iota adscript is used whenever required.
The sophisticated language borders on the literary and has some prominent atti-
cistic elements. On atticism in Greek private letters and letters written by educated
individuals, see S. Witkowski, *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 529–41, and W. Döllstädt, *Griechische
Papyrusprivatbriefe in gebildeter Sprache aus den ersten vier Jahrhunderten nach Christus* (1934).
The two opening lines are spaced out more generously than the rest of
the text. The scribe sometimes leaves a space between sentences as if to signify
a change in context. In his effort to make the layout as regular as possible, the
scribe uses angular filler signs at the ends of some lines (4, 14, 17, 19). In this he is
fairly consistent, though there are a couple of lines that are shorter than others and
have no filler signs (especially 12). The filler sign is of standard format, found often
in literary papyri, similar, for example, to those in *GMAW* 67, but with the lower
stroke more elongated. The size of some letters is occasionally exaggerated (even
in the middle of words).

The main text is written in a distinctive script that can be paralleled in early
examples of the ‘chancery’ style; for the main discussion of this style, see G. Ca-
vallo, *Aegyptus* 45 (1965) 216–49. Cf. in particular P. Brem. 5–6, two formal letters of
recommendation addressed to Apollonius, strategus of the Heptanomia in 117–19
(P. Brem. 5, pl. in *ed. pr.*; P. Brem. 6 is pl. 1 in Cavallo’s article); P. Giss. Univ. Bibl.
III 20, an official letter of c.113–17 (see J. D. Thomas, *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and
Roman Egypt: The Roman Epistrategos* (1982) 187; pl. 1 in *ed. pr.*). P. Raim. Cent. 70,
assigned to the late second third or early third century (J. Chapa, *Letters of Condolence
in Greek Papyri* (1998) 87, pl. 5), is also somewhat similar. These parallels are different
translations of the same principle. They are all influenced by the chancery script,
but are less pretentious versions of the flamboyant official documents (see, for
example, plates iii–iv in Cavallo’s article). A date for our letter in the early second
century seems acceptable.

The document seems to have been thoroughly revised and corrected by
a second hand, which is cursive and of variable size. Extensive parts of the text
have been crossed out, and an alternative version has been added over each of the
crossed-out lines. At the end of the main text, four additional lines were penned
by the second hand. On the back, below the address, which was written by the first
hand, the second hand added a docket stating the name and capacity of the sender.
A big X, starting from all four corners of the sheet, cancels the whole of the
text. This is not an unusual feature in documents that have to do with loans, but it
is very rare among letters (cf. XLII 3057, where such a letter is possibly mentioned,
but the editor thinks that it is more likely that the word κεχιασμένην refers to some
kind of sign rather than that the letter was crossed out). It is not easy to tell who
made the corrections, or even why, but it is even more difficult to speculate on who
drew the X, for, though it is possible, it does not necessarily follow that it was the
same person who did both.

To return to the corrections, a possible scenario would be that Ammonius,
being or having been a gymnasiarch, was a man of above-average literacy, but not
necessarily skilled in calligraphy. He hired a scribe, and dictated to him the letter,
which the scribe finished and added the address. After that, Ammonius must have
looked through the letter and perhaps thought that it was not convincing enough.
Thus he took it upon himself to make the corrections in his own hand. It would
be plausible to assume that, after he had made the corrections, he gave it back to
the scribe to rewrite it, and either of them could have crossed it out. However, the
letter seems to have been folded as if about to be sent (there are regular vertical fold marks), and also contains a docket under the address, stating the name of the
sender. Maybe Ammonius wrote the docket, giving back the letter to the scribe,
for filing purposes. It is not impossible that the letter was sent, despite its state, as
Ammonius seemed to think it was urgent. Besides, the main text in 3057 starts
with ἐκομιϲάμην τὴν κεχιαϲμένην ἐπιϲτολήν, which, if it means ‘I received the
crossed-out letter’, and not ‘the one bearing the sign of the cross’ (see P. J. Parsons
50ff.), suggests that, even if not a usual practice, it was conceivable that such letters
were sent.

Ἀμμώνιοϲ Δη̣μητρίαι τῆι μητρὶ καὶ Δίωι τῶι πατρὶ χαί̣ρειν.
καὶ Δίωι τού πατρὶ χαίρεαι.
εξήρκει μὲν καὶ τὰ Θέωνοϲ τοῦ ἄδελφοϲ γράμματα
δὲ ἄν ύμειν ἐθόδου ὅτι ψυγμῶι ληφθεὶϲ ἐκ
βάθουϲ καὶ ἐκλύ̣ϲει τοῦ ϲώματοϲ 〚καὶ̣〛 ἐν ἀγωνίαι ποι̣
ήϲαϲ πάνταϲ ἡμᾶϲ οὐ τῆι τυχούϲηι, διὰ τοὺϲ θε̣
οὐϲ αὐτῆϲ ἄρας ἀνέλαβεν καὶ τέλευν ἀνεκτήϲα-
το, ἀντε καὶ λούϲαϲθαι αὐτῆϲ ἐκείνηϲ ἡτῆϲ ἡμέ̣
ραϲ καὶ μηδὲν ἐτι αὐτῶι τοῦ εὔκατα-
利润率 εἰναι. ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀληθέϲτατα ταῦτα
γρ̣άμμαϲιν ὅϲ ψυγμῶι ψυγμῶι [ЛИ]πέτετεῖϲ κάγῳ γέγραϝα
〚ὑμεῖν ἐπιϲτέλλομεν〛 τοὺϲ ἄνθρωοϲ πάνταϲ ἐπ̣
.ordinal δ' ἄν
μυσται. [Ἰνα] δ' [, ]παρ' ἄλλου ὅ[ι]ντσ τοὺϲ θε̣
>iωβότων μη τὰ ἀληθῆ λέγειν ἀν[αι]γκαίον ὑγηςά-
.Γ
.α μεθα φθάϲαιτε αὐτὸ τοῦτο δῆλον ύμειν ποι̣
‘From Ammonius to Demetria, his mother, and Dius, his father, greetings. The letter of my brother Theon should have been enough, in which he informed you that, having got a chill deep within and a general weakness of the body, which made us all worry greatly, he immediately recovered, thanks to the gods, and was in perfect form again, so that he even bathed on that very same day, and no residue of his illness still remains. I swear to all the gods that these things that I am sending you are very true.

In order that . . . you would . . . that he sent his letter to you just to please you, I have also written. However, in order that you (do not) hear about this from one of those people who have the habit of not telling the truth, I thought it necessary to let you know of this before they did . . . Therefore, do not be upset, since Theon, my brother, is in perfect condition and carries out all his usual activities.

Your daughter and my brother Sotas send you their greetings. Give my best to Ptolemaeus and Antiochus, my brothers. I wish you good health, my most honoured (parents), and good fortune to the entire household . . . I swear that my brother Theon is very well and doing his usual activities.’

Back: (illegible remains of the address followed by) ‘From Ammonius, (ex-)gymnasiarch.’

1 Ἀμμώνιοϲ. Ammonius is called a (former?) gymnasiarch in the docket. There are numerous gymnasiarchs of this name, in Oxyrhynchus and elsewhere, but it is hard to propose an identification.

3 ἔξηρκεϲ. The use of this verb is one of the examples of accurate choice of wording and fine grammar in this letter. The σχῆμα Αττικόν is not always used already in the Ptolemaic papyri, and subsequently it is used less and less until it disappears completely (Mayser, Grammatik ii.3 28, §151). The plural is used mostly with neuters indicating persons, while the singular is found with non-personal subjects, as well as abstracts and pronouns (Blass–Debrunner–Rehkopf, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch 110, §133).

The imperfect here is potential and expresses something unreal, which is common in Attic Greek; see Kühner–Gerth, Grammatik ii.1 204, §391.5, but they only refer to impersonal verbs or the like. A close parallel is Basil. Epist. 325.1 ἔξηρκεϲ καὶ τὸ γράμμα τῆϲ εἰμῶν ἡϲ εὑρέται ἐν φροσύνῃ.
4 ψυγμώι. This word in the papyri usually refers to a special place in a pottery, where pots are left to cool off after they have been fired (see e.g. L 3595–7). Here, however, it has the meaning of a 'cold' or 'ague'. There seems to be only one example of this meaning in the papyrus, P. Oxy. Hels. 46 (2 iii), a private letter ending οὐ γὰρ ἱδονήθην ἐπὶ τοῦ | παρόντος γράφαι οὖθει διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ νόσου ἀναλαμβάνειν καὶ ψυγμώι | μεγάλου καὶ μόνιμη ἱδονήθην καὶ ταῦτα γράφαθα βαςαγίζομεν (its inventory number, 43 5B71/42–43b, indicates that the papyrus was found during the same season of excavations as 4959, and arranged in the same box, but that the two papyri were not found together).

In the medical writers, the term ψυγμώι implies a medical condition, but it is not altogether clear what exactly that is; it can refer to a symptom of a disease, a cause of a disease, or the disease itself. Gal. 11.510 seems to use this term for a condition opposite to fever: τινὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ θερμότερον ἑκτετράβασθαι σώματα . . . , τινὰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ψυχρότερον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς καλομένοις ἁγίῳ συνήθως ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων άρθρωσών ψυγμῶι. On the other hand, Orib. ἰσ. 1.19.8, takes it as a cause of fever and refers to τοῖς ἀπὸ ψυγμῶι ποιέτουσι. The word also appears in Sch. Nic. Ther. 433a, where it seems to refer to a cold in the head, or the sniffles: ἐκτετράβασθαι καὶ γὰρ οὖθει ψυγμῶι ἀπελάσασα, εἰ τις τρίφας τριὶς προκεκεχρήκη τῇ βάλτι . . . .

Aect. 2.2, as well as others, connects ψυγμῶι with hip diseases (πρὸς ἱσχυρᾶ καὶ πάντας τοῖς περὶ τὰ νευρώδη μόρια ψυγμῶι, and Dsc. 5.11.2, uses the word in the sense of 'shiver': τὰ τῶν θηρίων δημιοῦν, δοκεῖ τόρμους καὶ ψυγμῶιν ἐπιφέρει. Paul. Aegin. Epit. 1.100.3, associates ψυγμῶι with diseases of the chest: ὅταν δὲ τι περὶ τῶν βύμων καὶ μέλη γίγνεθαι . . . καὶ ἀγωνίωι γίγνεθαι . . . . ψυγμῶι στήθους καὶ βραχίων.

4–5 ἐκ βάθους. In medical writings ἐκ βάθους often has the sense of 'within the body' or 'from deep within': ἀετ. 5.77, defines fever as θερμώτερα παρὰ φόνω καρδίας καὶ ἄρτηρων . . . ἀναλαμβάνειν τε ἐκ βάθους καὶ δρμεία. Sever. Περὶ τῶν κωλικῶν φαρμάκων p. 24.34. Dietz., in explaining the causes of dysentery, writes: ἡ δὲ αἰτία αὕτη οὐκ ἐξωθεῖ τὴν βλάβην κινεῖ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐκ βάθους ἀνακύπτει.

5 ἐκλύς. Durling, Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen (1993), explains ἐκλύς as 'feebleness, faintness'. In Galen, the word refers either to a general condition (4.437, καὶ γὰρ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ τὰ ῥυτικῶν κατακείσθαι εἰς ἑκλύσουσα, or to specific parts of the body (7.502, ἐν ἑκλύσει καρδιακαί τοι καὶ στομαχικαί). In the Corpus Hippocraticum the word often occurs with σώμα, as it does in 4959. The word is used in Hesychius and the Suda in the context of mental feebleness.

[καὶ]. Palaeography, sense, and style suggest that this may be the only correction made by the first hand, whereas all the others (10a, 11, 12, 15–17) are due to the second hand.

5–6 ἐν ἀγωνίαν ποιήσας πάντας ἡμᾶς οὐ τῇ τυχοῦσῃ. This postponement of the negative expression / litotes is common enough, but here it has been displaced even more than would be expected. In J. D. Denniston, Greek Prose Style (1952) 50ff., in the discussion of hyperbaton, this case would fall in the category of 'deliberate separation of logically cohering words'. In this way, ἀγωνίαν features as the main point of the sentence, while τῇ τυχοῦσῃ is emphasized by the postponement of its attributive position. For a similar construction, cf. P. Ryl. II 136.11–12 (34) ὃ ὅ μοι εὐν |=έκλύσως (l.-ατο) οὐ τῷ τυχοῦσαν.

6–7 διὰ τοῦ νόσου. Not found elsewhere. According to Mayser, Grammatik ii.2 426, διὰ with the accusative, apart from its instrumental and causal uses, can also have the sense 'in the name of'; as an example, he cites UPZ I 62.6 διὰ τε τα[ι]νιάν Κάραπος.

7 ἀνάλαβεν. Although this verb is often attested in the papyri, there are not many passages in which it has a medical sense, 'to recover', as it does here: P. Zen. Postm. 51.3 (257 BC), PSI IV 333.3 (256 BC), P. Bad. II 17.12 (i BC), P. Oxy. Hels. 46.17 (2 ii), XI. VI 3313 7 (ii). In classical Greek it can have a medical meaning, but always in the construction ἀνάλαβαντες ἡμῶν. What distinguishes later examples is the omission of the accusative. Examples illustrating this meaning are usually followed by an adverbial modifier: in Philo De congressu 39, Legum allegoriarum 11 60, De praeemis et poenis 21, and Dsc. 5.6.16, ἀνάλαβαντες is followed by the expression ἐκ νόσου, and in Plu. Pyth. 12.6, by ἔξ ἀρρωστίας.
τέλεον. τέλειοϲ and τέλεοϲ are both attested in the papyri, and the adverbial use of the neuter appears in either form. See Kühner–Gerth, Grammatik i.1 137–8.

7–8 ἀνεκτήϲατο. This verb usually means ‘to re-acquire, ‘to take back’, or ‘to restore’. In this use it is mostly transitive. In the papyri it occurs rather rarely, and refers to land or the working of land, or sums of money changing hands. There are however two cases that are similar to the present one, denoting recovery from some sort of evil, though neither refers specifically to an illness: UPZ I 110.127 (164 BC) τοῖϲ ἀνθρώποϲ ἐκ . . . καταφθοράϲ . . . ἀνακτωμένοϲ; and P. Fay. 106 = W. Chr. 395.18–19 (c.140) ἐμαυτὸϲ ἀνακτήϲαϲθαι ἀπὸ τῶν καμάτων. In the latter passage, which comes from a letter written by a doctor, καμάτων refers to debts rather than physical exertion. The text also contains the word ἐξηϲθένηϲα, which works in the same motif.

In literature, the closer parallels to the present one come from theological writers, who tend to use the verb transitively. A good example is offered by Jo. Chrys. In Epist. ad Rom. 13.6 (PG 60.516), who uses the two verbs we have here in the same context: πῶϲ ὁ Δαυιδ πεϲών, ἑαυτὸϲ ἀνεκτήϲατο; πῶϲ ὁ Πέτροϲ ἀρνηϲάμενοϲ, ἑαυτὸϲ ἀνέλαβε; The Suda (α2243) explains the one from the other: ἀνεκτήϲάμην· ἀνωρθωϲάμην, ἀνελαβόμην.

8 λούϲαϲθαι. It is doubtful whether this was part of the curing process (some medical writers suggest bathing and then anointing oneself with oil or wine as a cure for ψυγμόϲ; e.g. Hippiatrica Parisina I 1082). It is more probable that it is mentioned to show that Theon’s state of health was so good that he was capable of taking a bath (or simply that he would do so: when a doctor’s advice can have the form ‘in November, μὴ λούεϲθαι τὸ ϲύνολον’ (Aët. 12.69), it would be a brave thing to do just after recovering from an illness). This is supported by the fact that, after the assurance that Theon has fully recovered (16), he is reported to be carrying out all his usual activities. Presumably bathing was one of them.

9–10 ἐγκατάλειμμα. The primary meaning of this word is ‘remnant’, ‘residue’ or ‘trace’ (LSJ s.v. 1). It has previously occurred only once in papyri, P. Petr. II 4 (11).2 (255 or 254 BC [HGV]), where it seems to refer to a ‘sediment’ or ‘sitting up’ (LSJ s.v. 4; W. Schubart, Ein Jahrtausend am Nil (1912) 18, renders ἐγκατάλειμμα γέγονεν as ‘ist ein Rest unvollendet geblieben’). In a medical context the word usually refers to residual traces of a disease (e.g. Aët. 6.8 εἰ δ’ ἐγκατάλειμμα εἴη τῆϲ διαθέϲεωϲ ἐπὶ τὸν λευκὸν ἐλέβορον ἐλθέ; Paul. Aegin. Epit. 6.36 στηρτικοῖϲ φαρμάκοϲ ἐκδαπανᾶν τὸ ἐγκατάλειμμα). The example that best illustrates the particular use of the word in a medical context is in Paul. Aegin. Epit. 3.77.4 ἐγκαταλείμματοϲ τῆϲ νόϲου μείναντοϲ.

10 ἀληθέϲτατα. The superlative has not occurred in any other papyrus.

10a ἵνα 〚̣̣ι̣λ̣〛λ̣ο̣π̣αι̣τε̣. The text written by the original scribe is ‘Anyway, what we are writing to you is the absolute truth; I swear by all the gods’. Of this, only ὑμεῖν ἐπιϲτέλ̣λ̣ο̣μεν is deleted, but it would seem more likely that the inserted text is meant to replace the whole of the original text from ὅτι to ἐπόμνυμαι, since this makes better sense. However, since only two words were deleted it is conceivable that the corrector meant to leave in the phrase ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀληθέϲτατα ταῦτα (sc. ἐϲτί) τοὺϲ θε̣ο̣ὺϲ πάνταϲ ἐπόμνυμαι.

The readings of the superscript material must follow the same pattern of absolute assertion of truthfulness: after ἵνα we expect a verb in the subjunctive, or indeed the optative, in accordance with the letter’s attistic attributes (Mandilaras, The Verb 272). That may be the word ending in -τε. If the following words αὐτοῦ τοῖϲ γρά̣μμαϲιν̣ belong to this clause, and they refer to the brother’s letter, then the -τε verb should (i) refer to the parents, (ii) govern a dative, and (iii) describe their reaction to the letter. Since Ammonius thought it necessary to write again, that reaction must have been incredulity. Therefore the missing word should mean ‘believe’ or ‘(not) disbelieve’. If the former, then the obvious verb would be πιϲτεύϲητε/-αιτε; if the latter, there must have been a μή after ἵνα, and the traces belong to a form of either υποπτεύω or υπονοέω. But none of these verbs can be read in the traces. In any case ἵνα must be followed by a conjunction.
10–11a τοῖς γραμμασίων could be the object of the (unread) verb. Otherwise it may be taken as an instrumental dative, i.e., 'so that you may believe / not disbelieve him by his letters . . .'.

11a ὡς ἄρα γραμμασίων. The assumption is that this is the beginning of a clause dependent on a verb of suspecting or believing in the inserted line above. An alternative would be to take ὡς to mean 'since' (causal), but then γραμμασίων would have to be understood differently: 'so that you should believe/not disbelieve his letter, since he sent you a letter out of kindness, I too have written . . .'.

12 ἵνα. The word is cancelled by the second hand, who wrote ὡς over the line. In Classical Greek the two particles express different nuances, which in later Greek are more or less ignored. ἵνα introduces an abstract final expression, whereas ὡς expresses a psychological preoccupation. Classical authors often use a combination of the two, in the form οὐχ ἵνα . . . ἰἀλλ' ὡς (ἂν), to exclude a presumed intention and confirm the authenticity of another. In Attic Greek, ὡς replaces ἵνα only when the clause expresses subjectivity, uncertainty, particular circumstances, etc.; see S. Amigues, *Les Subordonnées finales par ὡς en attique classique* (1977) 103.

The correction appears even more impressive if one considers that in later Greek ἵνα is used increasingly at the expense of ὡς, since it is overall more straightforward and easy to use (Amigues, *Subordonnées finales* 105–6). Nevertheless, the writer of the letter knew about it and how to use it, unless he only made the correction in view of the fact that he had just inserted a ἵνα clause a few lines above and did not want to repeat the word.

Such corrections are found in two other texts: P. Petr. ii 13 (18a), where the correction was made, as in 4959, as part of a general revision of the text; and in P. Got. 12.4 (iii/iv). The opposite occurs in P. Cair. Zen. II 59256 = SB III 6993 (252/251 BC). The putative omicron is written above the line by the first hand, is an addition rather than a correction, since πυθομένοι τοῖς γράμμασιν, whereas the construction following verbs based on the present stem is almost always παρά τινος, whereas the construction following verbs based on the present stem is almost always the genitive.

15 ἔσταρσι [χθες]. This compound has occurred only in one other papyrus, P. Gen. I 1.12 (213), a letter of a senior Roman functionary.

17 προσαγωρέει. The use of the singular instead of the plural in verbs followed by more than one subject is not uncommon in the papyri; see Mayser, *Grammatik* ii.3 30–33.

18 'ὢ' Σωτάς. The putative omicron is written above εω. However, the article is not expected, unless Sotas was mentioned in the corrections over line 13, which have not been read. This would explain why the article was added later.

21 παῦσας. This is the Attic equivalent to πανοικία, according to the Atticist Moeris (I. Bekker, *Hsparotion et Moeris* (1833) 207). Döllstädt, *Griechische Papyrusbriefe* 15, describes the latter as belonging to literacy as well as everyday κοινή, and adds a further form, πανοικία (or ἰαγωνία), which he classifies as Ionic and poetic. Indeed πανοικία is only attested in Ptolemaic papyri, unless one includes P. Flor. ii 273.25 (260) πανοικία, whereas παῦσας(ει), though common enough, does not occur before the Roman period (in BGU ii 450.27 [ii/iii], παῦσας[ει] should probably be resolved differently).
πανοικηϲία (or -εϲίᾳ) has fewer attestations than πανοικι, ranging in date from the second to the fourth century. All of them occur in documents that show good command of Greek, but as far as one can see, none of them has obvious atticistic affinities.

πανοικηϲίᾳ εὐτυχοῦνταϲ. The two words often occur together at the close of private letters of the Roman period: see XLII 3084, P. Berl. Zill. 11.23–4, P. Flor. II 273,24–5, P. Giss. Univ. III 32,30, P. Land. II 8.14–15, P. Princ. II 68.15–16, 69.7–8, III 185,15, P. Ryl. II 434,12, PSI XIII 1335,30, SB V 7629,9, etc.

This must be a repetition of the oath in line 11, and the beginning of this line would read something along the lines of καὶ θεοὺϲ ἐπόμνυμαι, which suits the space and the sense.

M. MALOUTA

4960. LETTER TO A STOLISTES

This letter concerns a victory in a law court, which resulted in the cudgelling of a man called Petseis, and which would have been a cause for celebrations. The sender, whose identity is uncertain, reports on those proceedings, and gives the date of the hearing and a summary of the outcome. The recipients are a στολιϲτηϲ and a πλῆθοϲ of uncertain composition; the context points to some priestly guild. The legal procedures referred to in lines 6–8 are difficult to understand and interpret fully.

The text is evenly spaced, apart from the first two lines (2–3), which are closer together, and the closing greeting, which is spaced down after one line left blank. In the one remaining line of the prescript the words are divided by large spaces. There is some spacing between words and sentences in the main text, but not done consistently.

The hand recalls examples of the chancery script, on which see 4959 introd. The letters are formed separately. They are written with a wide-tipped pen and leftward slant. A date in the second century would suit.

It is unclear whether the address on the back is in the same hand as that responsible for the main text; the pen looks different, and the script is generally narrower and slants to the right.

The text is written along the fibres. The sheet exhibits regular vertical as well as horizontal fold-marks, including a deep horizontal fold. This would indicate that the letter must have first been rolled and squashed flat in the expected fashion, from right to left (see LIX 3989 introd.), but at some later point, it must have been opened and then folded again at right angles to the previous folding.

τῷ το[υ] (vac.) π[άντοϲ] εὐχόμεθα ὑμᾶϲ

πρὸ μ[έν] παντόϲ εὐχόμεθα ὑμᾶϲ
ὑγίαν. γεινώϲκειν ὑμᾶϲ θέλων τῇ ἕκτῃ διηκόνωϲκεν καὶ ἐνικήϲαμεν καὶ ἐξουλοκοπήθη Πετϲεἰϲ ἐπικηρυϲϲομένου “μὴ ςταϲια ἀλλ' ἔμμενε τοῖϲ κεκριμένοϲ”.

διὸ γράφομεν υμεῖν ὅπωϲ εὐωχὴϲθε καὶ εὐφραίνεϲθε καὶ ςτεφανηφορίαν ἄξετε σὺν παντὶ τῷ πλήθει καὶ παίδων.

(vac.)

ἐρρῶϲθαι υ(μᾶϲ) εὐχ(όμεθα). Θὼθ 6.

Back, downwards along the fibres:

15 (m. 2?) ἑστολιϲτῆι καὶ τῷ πλήθει [θεὶ]

2 ν μάϲ: ν corr. from c? 3 l. γεινάϲκειν 5 l. ἐνικήϲαμεν 8 l. ἔμμενε

9 l. ὑμῖν 12 παντὶ: ν corr. from a? 14 ὑεϲ

. . . the gathering, greetings. First of all we wish you health. We want you to know, that on the sixth our case was heard through, and we won. Petseis was flogged, while a herald cried “do not cause trouble, but abide by the judgement (of the court)”. Therefore we write to you, so that you can rejoice and be merry and conduct a wreath-wearing (festival), together with the whole gathering, both of . . . and of children. We(?) pray for your health. Thoth 6.'

Back: '. . . the [. . . ?]stolistes and the gathering [. . . ?].'

1 τῷ πλήθει. Cf. 12, 15. In 12–13 the noun is defined by genitives, -ων καὶ παίδων; in the address it is preceded by ἑστολιϲτῆι (or a compound), which shows that the letter was addressed to an individual as well as the group. We should allow for two lines lost at the top; there will have stood a proper name or names in the nominative, a name in the dative, and (—)ϲτολιϲτῆι καὶ.

There does not seem to be any other example of πλήθοϲ as addressee in papyrus letters. The ‘collective address’ is elsewhere expressed in the opening formula in more precise terms, as e.g. in P. Amh. II 40.1–3 (ii BC) Ἡπιόδωϲ τῶι λεϲώνει καὶ τοῖϲ ἱερεύϲι τοῦ Ϲοκνοπαίου χαίρειν, and in the closing formula in terms such as ἐρρῶϲθαί σε εὔχομαι πανοικεί. Otherwise, as in LV 3809 12–13 ἀϲπάζου τοὺϲ ςυμμαθητὰϲ πάνταϲ, the internal coherence of the πλήθοϲ is accurately specified.

The word πλήθοϲ can have several connotations. In a few cases it can mean ‘crowd’, ‘mob’ in general (e.g. BGU VI 1214.24). More often it refers to a group of things or animals: πλήθοϲ προβάτων (P. Cair. Zen. III 59394.3–4), βιβλίων (P. Fam. Tebt. 15.89), ἀικιῶν (P. Hib. II 197 i 4), ἄργυρων (P. Tebt. III 772.6), etc. The cases of human πλήθῳ usually refer to priests: πλήθοϲ ἱερέων (CPR XV 17.9; P. Bacch. 24.8; P. Lond. VII 2188 iii 56; P. Mert. II 73.3; P. Tebt. II 310.4), but also there are πλήθῳ στρατιωτῶν (CPR VII 25.5), γερδίων (P. Mich. II 124 ii 19), ἀνδρῶν ἀτάκτων (L 3581 18), κακούργων (LVIII 3926 5–6), νεανίϲκων (P. Panop. 27.20).

All passages in which a πλήθοϲ ἱερέων occurs suggest that more than a mere crowd is meant.
The expression denotes an organized corporation, which has legal status in itself (cf. esp. P. Tebt. II 310, where Thaubastis surrenders some temple land to the corporation of priests, and P. Lond. VII 2188, where the priests of Pathyris sue for redress as a corporation). It is doubtful whether πλῆθοϲ should be seen as a technical legal term; it would be more convincing to conclude that the word does not have such connotations in itself, but is used to describe a group which has internal coherence. This argument may be supported by P. Bacch. 24.6 διὰ τὸ τοὺϲ ἱερ〈ε〉ῖϲ ἀπὸ πλήθουϲ εἰϲ ὀλίγουϲ κατηντη[κέναι], which uses the same word but in its commoner meaning.

4–5 διηκ̣ού̣ϲ̣̣̣μ̣̣̣[̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣́]̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣. C. B. Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Inscriptions (1934) 235, notes the use of the verb for listening to envoys and judicial hearings, and comments that ‘in both connections, the verb belongs to the ἱοīνε, but the uses are only a slight extension of the Attic meaning “to hear through”’. The same verb is used of a judicial hearing in NT Acts 23.35 (the arraignment of Paul at Caesarea), and commonly in papyri, e.g. P. Yale I 42.31 ὁ γὰρ βαϲιλεὺϲ αὐτὸϲ καθήμενοϲ διακούει.

6 ἔξυλοκοποτη. The verb occurs in several Ptolemaic documents in the sense of ‘to cut wood’, and refers to a particular agricultural activity; see M. Schnebel, Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten (1925) 22. Later on the meaning of the word seems to have changed radically, and κόπτω reverts to the definition ‘to smite, strike’ rather than ‘to cut’. The meaning ‘to cudgel’ or ‘to cudgel to death’ appears in papyri of the Roman period, mostly in reference to illegal use of violence, for which retribution is sought (see the evidence collected by B. Kelly, The Repression of Violence in the Roman Principate (diss. Oxford 2002) 316–29, but note that it excludes military violence). However, in IV 706 = M. Chr. 81.12–13 (73?; see BL IX 181), a report of proceedings before a prefect, we find ἐάν ϲε μέμψηται . . . ἔξυλοκοπίαν . . . κελεύϲω.

The practice of beating people with sticks or rods seems to have been a Roman custom, especially in a military context. Castigatio was performed in the form of flogging, employed with no distinction of rank or position (cf. Frontinus Strategemata 4.1; C. E. Brand, Roman Military Law (1968) 103–5), and took several forms according to the seriousness of the transgression, as well as the official carrying out the punishment. The most brutal form of cudgelling, and one resulting in death, was fustuarium, a punishment for soldiers proven not to have been doing their duty. This is explained in modern literature as the beating of the condemned soldier with clubs, fustes, by his fellow soldiers (for an overview of military punishments see P. Southern, The Roman Army (2007) 146–8). Plb. 6.37, however, describes the procedure of ἔξυλοκοπία as the accused soldier being touched by an official’s club, as a sign of condemnation, and then being stoned to death by his comrades. A similar punishment was whipping with rods, virgae, performed on criminals before their execution, and considered a great disgrace (Brand, Roman Military Law 80). Roman soldiers were also cudgelled by the centurion, who used a vine staff, vitis. It seems that this was a more ‘everyday’ kind of punishment, for less serious crimes and without implications of disgrace (Brand, ibid.).

The principal occurrences of the word in Greek literature, mainly in Polybius (6.37.1, 2, 38.1, 3), identify ἔξυλοκοπία with fustuarium. The word also appears in Epictetus (3.7.32, 4.4.38) applied to the beating of donkeys. Philo In Flaccum 10 gives first an example of official violence and then describes the practice behind it. E. A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, relates ἔξυλοκοπία to ἔξολοϲ παίω, citing D. H. Ant. Rom. 9.50.7 ἔξολοϲ παίομενοϲ διεφθάρηϲαϲ.

There is little evidence for official use of force against private citizens (IV 706; P. Flor. I 61; SB V 7523, on which see below). R. S. Bagnall, BASP 26 (1989) 213, argues that these are cases of threats, and they are recorded but never actually carried out. However, he adds that even though physical abuse of free citizens was forbidden by official edicts, official violence even against free persons did exist and was to be feared. In the present case it is unlikely that Petseis is a slave; there is evidence that
the transgressions of slaves do not become legal cases, since their masters have the right to discipline them themselves (ibid. 207). It is likely that Petseis falls somewhere between the two extremes: if he is not a slave, he is obviously not a Roman citizen either. As an Egyptian, or ‘Greek’, he could be subjected to corporal punishment.

Little is known about penalties inflicted on people by the courts of Roman Egypt. It seems that for slaves and men of low status, the penalty for very serious crimes would be hard labour in an army camp, mine or quarry. Also prisons are mentioned as well as guard duty there (N. Lewis, Life in Egypt under Roman Rule (1985) 194). There are a few references to beatings ordered for the violation of court orders (ibid.), and based on the contents of the ἐπικήρυξες, one can assume that the document in question is such a case. R. Taubenschlag, Opera minora ii (1959) 737–41, gives several examples of court-ordered floggings, and differentiates between corporal sentences as Expressionsmittel or Strafe. One interesting case is SB V 7523 (153), where a Roman citizen is being cudgelled on orders of a strategus (on this papyrus see H. Horstkotte, ἩΡΕ 111 (1996) 256–68).

Πετϲεῖϲ. A Greek transliteration of a Demotic name, likely to mean ‘the one whom the goddess Shay has given’ (suggested by Professor W. J. Tait). This form is unparalleled in the papyri, although one can find variations of it such as Πετϲείϲ, Πετϲεύϲ. The common Πετϲεῖϲ, though similar in Greek, involves Osiris rather than Shay. For such names see E. Lüddeckens, Demotisches Namenbuch (1992) iv 280, 308, 344 (cf. v 298); J. Quaegebeur, Le Dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l’onomastique (1975).

6–7 ἐπικηρύσσομένου. There are several possible ways of articulating the letters within this sentence. In this edition it has been interpreted as an impersonal passive compound in the genitive absolute, of which the subject is the following sentence. Though there is no reason for doubting this construction, two other ways of interpreting it should also be mentioned: ἐπὶ κηρύσσομένου (τινόϲ), i.e., in the presence (of someone) who announced, in which case the next sentence would be the object; ἐπικηρύσσομεν: “οὐ μὴ σταϲια ̣ ̣ ̣ “. The grammar of ἐπὶ κηρύσσομένου is not impossible, and ultimately it does not make much difference concerning the sense. Nevertheless, it is more probable that it was meant to be one word, given that in the surviving documents forms of κηρύσσειν almost always appear as compounds. The second alternative is even less likely. It does not make good sense, and would create unnecessary and clumsy asyndeta, to have a first person subject for any form of ἐπικηρύσσειν, and certainly not in the present tense.

7 σταϲια ̣ ̣ ̣ . The second of the unread letters is a round one. If there is another letter after it (there is some scattered ink), this would disallow the most obvious guess, σταϲίαζε (σταϲίαζειν, σταϲίαζϲ, or σταϲίαζϲαι are all palaeographically impossible). Based on palaeography, one might also suggest σταϲῖαϲων, but μή with the 2nd-person singular aorist imperative would be unexpected. There is only one isolated and uncertain example in the papyri, P. Lond. VI 1915.36 (c.330–40) μὴ ο̣ὖ̣ν̣ ἀ̣μ̣[έ]̣-̣λ̣η̣ϲ̣[ο̣]̣ν̣ (Mandilaras, The Verb 300, questions the reading, but according to the editor the final ν seems secure; see BL VII 93).

8 ἔμενε τοῖϲ κεκριμένοϲ. The easiest conclusion drawn from this phrase is that Petseis has transgressed against a previous court decision; he is being punished now, to learn that he must comply with the ruling of the court the first time round. Similar phrases occur in P. Mert. III 104.18, of the early Roman period, όϲ ἐμενε τοιϲ κεκριμένοϲ; 138 = M. Olt. 58.16 (49/50) μη βουλομένου ἐμέναι τοιϲ κεκριμένοϲ; SB VI 9252.9 (118) ὅπωϲ πείθονται τοιϲ κεκριμένοϲ. It is plausible to assume that in all these cases the process is more or less the same, though none of them contains any indication of physical violence applied or threatened as a means of coercion.

10 εὐωχήσθε καὶ εὐφράινεϲθαι. εὐφράινεϲθαι occurs most often in the phrase ἐρρῶϲθαι σε εὔχομαι καὶ εὐφράινεϲθαι, as for example in P. Mich. VIII 465.46. Here no form of ῥῶνυμοι could match the traces, but a form of εὐωχεῖϲθαι suits both the traces and the sense: this verb is associated with feasting and dining, which is very appropriate to the setting of a στεφανηφορία (εὐφράινομαι does not seem to have this particular sense).
LETTER TO A STOLISTES

10–11 εὐωχήθει ... εὐφραίνεσθε ... ἀξεῖτε. A curious parataxis of three verbs, which seem to be in the present subjunctive, present indicative, and future indicative (or aorist imperative) respectively. The sentence is intended to be a secondary pure final clause introduced by ὅπως. The normal construction of this kind of clause after a verb in the present tense is with a verb in the subjunctive. The problem is the second verb, since ὅπως is not normally construed with the present indicative. F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (1979) 298–9, consider ἡ τήν with present indicative to be a scribal mistake, but do not mention the possibility of a similar construction with ὅπως. Gignac, Grammar ii 385–9, argues that forms of the indicative frequently substitute those of the subjunctive, and partly attributes this phenomenon to the phonological identification of several endings (-ει/-ης, -ει/-η, etc.). He gives many examples in clauses introduced by εἶναι, εἶ, and ἢνα, but he too does not mention ὅπως. One example however can be found in Mayer, Grammatik ii.1 231, from PSI IV 382.17, which has ὅπως followed by a verb in the present indicative, ὅπως µου ὑπάρξει, which possibly is a final clause. In Blass–Debrunner–Rehkopf, Grammatik 298–9, ὅπως with such a construction in pure final clauses is considered normal.

A final consideration is the possibility that the third verb is not part of the same sentence. If the restored καί that connects it with the previous line were not there, one could punctuate after εὐφραίνεσθε and restore τήν; however, this would imply that it was a particular cτεφανηφορία being referred to. It is also risky to take a strong position on whether the ισγυντα created by this hypothesis is possible or not; though there are no ισγυντα elsewhere in the text, the sample is too small to allow judgement on the author’s style. But even if καί were accepted, it would not be impossible that a new sentence started at this point, though admittedly it would be a very inelegant structure.

The overall impression that the document gives about the literacy of its author is a very good one. Therefore, the confusion of tenses and moods in this sentence cannot be simply dismissed as a grammatical mistake.

11 εὐφραίνεσθε. The word or cognates have occurred in VII 1021 15 (54) δίο πάντες ὀφείλομεν εὐφραίνεσθαι καὶ δουλεύονται διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Κωνσταντῖνος (c.115 [HGV]) καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι ἄξω καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ὀφειλομένας ἐπονομάζει ἀποδόει; IV 3781 14 (117) εὐφράνεσθαι εἰς τὸ Θεόν διὰ τὸν Σωτήρα τῆς ζωῆς διασώσων ἡμᾶς καὶ εὐφραίνουσα. The word or cognates have occurred in VII 1021 15 (54) δίο πάντες ὀφείλομεν εὐφραίνεσθαι καὶ δουλεύονται διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Κωνσταντῖνος (c.115 [HGV]) καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι ἄξω καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ὀφειλομένας ἐπονομάζει ἀποδόει; IV 3781 14 (117) εὐφράνεσθαι εἰς τὸ Θεόν διὰ τὸν Σωτήρα τῆς ζωῆς διασώσων ἡμᾶς καὶ εὐφραίνουσα.
by the fact that the word is accompanied by a mention of sacrificing to the gods or something similar. Also in some of these cases the number of days that the ‘wreath-wearing’ will last is specified. In religious festivals wreaths were worn by the people taking part, by the sacrificial animals, and were also used to adorn temples on important occasions (S. Price, Rituals and Power (1984) 108–12).

The fact that a στεφανηφορία usually is part of a major event, should not lead to the conclusion that the flogging of Πετσείς was of such great importance as to be celebrated in a way comparable to the accession or the birthday of an emperor. The most likely interpretation would be that the πλῆθος was preparing a great celebration involving a στεφανηφορία, and Πετσείς was for some reason an obstacle. Now that he has been punished for it, the priests can go on performing their duties. A remote possibility would be that the expression στεφανηφορίαν ἄξετε is meant figuratively; cf. PSI XII 1247.8ff. εάν κοιμίζομαι ὕψω γράμματα, ἐστόρην ἄγω. This argument, however, is weakened by the fact that the particular στεφανηφορία is described further: κόν πάντι τῷ πλῆθει καὶ \[\text{c.6-7} \nu καὶ παιδῶν\]. This would be exaggerated in the case of a metaphorical expression.

\[c.6-7\nu καὶ παιδῶν\]. The context seems to be very much connected with priests and temples (cf. the address on the back), so that [ἱερέων] would seem appropriate. Besides, a πλῆθος ἱερέων is the most usual form of a πλῆθος in the papyri. In any case, the word to restore depends on what one takes those ‘children’ to be. A tracing, however, does not easily confirm the supplement, unless all the letters in this word were horizontally elongated and spaced out (which is not impossible, but does not seem justified, especially since all but \(\omega\) are very narrow letters). [ἀνδρῶν] would seem more likely, albeit still too short for the break. On the other hand, if the idea of some kind of a priestly πλῆθος is still to be assumed, it is difficult to see what the actual word was, since στολιστῶν or any other specific priestly rank is too long.

The ‘children’ are part of the πλῆθος. It is not clear whether they are children or slaves. If the former, they could be sons and daughters of the priests (assuming that the πλῆθος did consist of priests), living in the temples; they could be pupils at the temple school; or they could themselves be priests. D. J. Thompson in M. Beard, J. North, Pagan Priests (1990) 101, notes that the sons who inherited the priesthood from their fathers were often very young.

Such ‘children’ may be mentioned in BGU I 176 = W. Chr. 93.9 ἀποστέλλων τοὺς παιδὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων. The meaning of the word παιδας is disputed: sons of priests (Krebs, Wessely) or slaves (Otto, Wilcken)? Wilcken’s argument is that if they were sons of priests, the expression would be τοὺς παιδὰς ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων or τοὺς νόιοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων. However, even if ultimately Otto and Wilcken could be right, the particular argument does not sound convincing (ἵερων, proposed in place of ἱερέων by K. F. W. Schmidt, BL III 9, should be ignored; Wilcken states that he has re-examined the original). It seems probable that the reference is made to an association of priests. Within those associations, the age of becoming a member is not specified. Some became members together with their sons, and it seems that this was common practice; there are several terms in Demotic which describe those young people or novices who were part of the association (F. de Cenival, Les Associations religieuses en Égypte d’après les documents démotiques (1972) 150). What is more interesting in this case, is that apparently there were formations within the association consisting of some sort of chief and the young members, and there even exists an expression for this, ἱβιοστολιστής, ‘the chief (some sort of chief; the exact meaning of ἱβιοστολιστής is unclear) and the young ones/novices’; see de Cenival, Les Associations 173.

\(\text{Thoth 6 = September 2/3.}\)

\(\text{15} \) ἱβιοστολιστής. In the papyri there are attestations of στολιστής, πρωτοστολιστής, δευτεροστολιστής, ἰβιοστολιστής, ἱεροστολιστής, στ ιερόστολοι. With the exception of the last, each of the other words could be the one in this document. For the rank of στολιστής see W. Otto, Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten (1905) 83–4 and J. A. S. Evans, YCS 17 (1961) 188–9.

M. MALOUTA
Despite the large size of this papyrus, it is certain from the restorations in \( \alpha 2–3 \) (cf. \( \beta 35–7 \)) that even in the best preserved lines rather less than half the width is preserved, and considerably less than this in many of the other lines. What we have is a partially preserved authenticated copy or rather two copies of a petition to the prefect with his subscriptio. It is comparable in format to the text that I published as LXV 4481, with a discussion in the introduction of this type of document and a list of parallels. Since then one further text of this type has appeared: P. Horak 13, published with an important introduction by Guido Bastianini. See also Tor Hauken, *Petition and Response* (1998) 98–105. The ‘outer’ text (\( \beta \)) occupies lines 35 ff.; above this, written in the same hand but in noticeably smaller writing, is the ‘inner’ text (\( \alpha \)). There is a gap of 2.5 cm between \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). The inner text would have been tightly rolled (shown clearly by the formation of the worm-holes), and sealed and signed on the back by the witnesses. Three of the signatures still survive, though none of the seals. These signatures start at the top of the outer document and run downwards at \( 180^\circ \) to the direction of the text on the front. Both sides of the papyrus are written *transversa charta*. There is a kollesis 22.5 cm from the upper edge. On ‘double documents’ in general, see now, in addition to the remarks and bibliography in 4481 introd., the important discussion by Dominic Rathbone in *Essays and Texts in Honor of J. David Thomas* (2001) 102–5.

The general structure of the document is clear. It begins with the statement regarding certification (\( \alpha 2–3, \beta 35–7 \)); the petition itself occupies almost the whole of what follows (\( \alpha 3–33, \beta 37–82 \)); at the end is a copy of the prefect’s subscriptio (\( \alpha 33–4, \beta 83–5 \)). This format is almost the same as that found in BGU II 525 + III 970 = M. Chr. 242 (177) and XVII 2131 (207); and very close to that in LXV 4481 (179) and BGU XI 2061 (207), which differ in that the certification clause comes once only, between the two copies. 4961, however, has three unexpected features. In the first place, above the first line of the document proper, in what would have been close to the centre of the original papyrus, is the numeral \( \iota \theta \); see further 1 n. Secondly, the documents just mentioned all have the prefect’s subscriptio written in the same hand as the petition. In 4961 the hand changes for the subscriptio, as is most clear in \( \beta 84–5 \). In \( \alpha \) the change of hand can be seen earlier than this, in the statement concerning Agathus Daemon (\( \alpha 33 \)), and presumably will have changed at this point in \( \beta \). So little survives of this second hand in both copies, and it is so abraded in \( \beta \), that one hesitates to insist that it is the same in both copies, though this is what we should expect. It is not too surprising that a subscriptio should have been copied later, after the petition and its subscriptio had been publicly displayed. This is almost certainly what happened in XLVII 3364 (see *Tyche* 18 (2003) 204–5).
and no doubt in other cases. We could suppose that two copies of the petition were prepared in advance and that once the subscriptio had been posted, there was added to each of them (by Agathus Daemon?) a copy of this subscriptio.

The third peculiar feature in 4961 is that on the back there appear to be several lines of writing, along the fibres at right angles to the direction of the witnesses’ signatures, one set of lines underneath the signatures, another set several centimetres below them. These are in fact offsets from the ‘inner’ text on the front, which was clearly rolled and sealed while the ink was still wet.

The difficulty of calculating the amount lost in the larger lacunas is complicated. In \( \alpha \, 3 \), where the restoration ought to be certain (i.e., we expect \( \alpha ντίγραφον \) to be followed immediately by the imperial titles), we have 195 letters, but in no other line of \( \alpha \) can we be confident of the restoration. \( B \) is more useful. The restorations should be certain in \( B \, 36 \), giving 123 letters to the line, \( B \, 37 \), giving 124 letters, \( B \, 42 \) (cf. \( A \, 6–7 \)), giving 134 letters, and \( B \, 47 \) (cf. \( A \, 9–10 \)), giving only 110 letters. However, if we count the letters in the part that survives before the break in the papyrus in those lines where the break comes earliest, which amounts to about one-third of the original line, we find that the first ten lines of \( B \) (ignoring \( B \, 35 \); see below) have about 44 letters; this number reduces over the same area to about 36 letters over the next ten lines and to about 34 letters over the remainder. This suggests that at first the scribe was writing about 120–25 letters in each line but by the later part of the text this was no more than about 105. The same thing seems to have happened in \( A \): counting the letters up to the same point as in \( B \) gives an average of 67 letters in the first ten lines (ignoring \( A \, 2 \); see below), only 59 in the next ten, and no more than 55 in the last ten. This would point to a reduction in lines length from about 190 letters at first to no more 170 later. There is a further complication. In lines \( A \, 2 \) and \( B \, 35 \) what would seem to be the standard formula gives 227 and 133 letters respectively, with only 2–3 letters in \( \epsilonκθθ\epsilonσις \), and this is without the alias name for Diogenis. Restorations based on these lines, therefore, would suggest at least 20 letters more in \( A \) and 10 more in \( B \). I do not see how to reconcile this with the length of line suggested by \( B \, 36 \) and \( 37 \) and by \( A \, 3 \) (though cf. \( A \, 2 \) n.). In \( B \, 37 \) nothing is expected between \( \alpha ντίγραφον \) and the imperial titles, though there may have been a \( \nu\epsilonκ\nu α\sigma\tau \) (a small \( \nu\epsilonκ\nu \) does indeed survive), but there is no obvious place for such a \( \nu\epsilonκ\nu \) in \( B \, 36 \) (there is a \( \nu\epsilonκ\nu \) in \( A \, 9 \) and in what seems to be the wrong place in \( B \, 46 \)). From all this it will be clear that the number of letters suggested in the text for the longer lacunas should be treated as no more than a rough guide.

Since so much of the papyrus is missing, there is no hope of producing connected sense. What is clear is that the document contained two copies of a petition by a certain Aurelia Diogenis to the prefect M. Aedinius Iulianus. After the standard formula relating to the copying of the petition, which had been posted publicly in Alexandria (\( A \, 2–3, B \, 35–7 \)), Diogenis prefixes to her petition imperial constitutions that were no doubt intended to support her case (\( A \, 3–9, B \, 37–45 \)). Apparently
these constitutions stated (1) that no praejudicium exists if a petitioner has lied, and (2) that parents and children are in certain circumstances permitted to take action if they believe they have been wronged. On the use of imperial decisions as precedents, see R. Katzoff, SZA 89 (1972) 273–8. The format of 4961 in this respect, with imperial decisions quoted before the petition proper, is found in several other petitions, e.g. SB X 10537; the editor’s comment in the ed. pr. (BASP 6 (1969) 17) that this is ‘a rather unusual procedure’ is incorrect—such a procedure was the norm (cf. Katzoff, loc. cit.). For a petition preceded by a combination of imperial rescripts and an edict (as in 4961) see P. Flor. III 382. For judicial decisions issued by Severus on his visit to Alexandria in 199–200, see LXVII 4593 introd. Cf. also Jean-Pierre Coriat, Le Prince législateur (1997) 123–5.

The petition proper begins with a general introduction (A9–12, B47–51). Diogenis then proceeds to recount her case in great detail, much of which we can no longer comprehend. It is certain that she is or had been in dispute with her father over some property. It seems that this property originally came to her as a gift (A12–14, B51–4), but before something or other took place (ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ χρόνῳ B55), her father had remarried and had children by his new wife (A15, B55–6). Urged on by Diogenis’ stepmother, her father brought a petition against his daughter, no doubt alleging that she had not shown proper filial duty towards him (A16–18, B57–61). He obtained the subscriptio partially preserved in A19, B62. This seems to have led to a court hearing that resulted in her father losing his case; this at any rate seems to be the implication of ἡττήθη in A21. Whereupon her father brought a further petition and obtained another subscriptio, the end of which is preserved (A21–3: τὴν δέους πρόνοιαν ποιήσεται). After this the text becomes even more difficult to interpret, as the papyrus, especially in B, is less well preserved. It seems likely that Diogenis’ father died (A24) and that her stepmother had in some way deprived Diogenis of some property, probably because of the terms of the will that Diogenis’ father had made, which she claims is illegal (A28). We then come to the concluding part of the petition (A30–32, B78–81). In his subscriptio the prefect probably said little more than ‘petition the epistrategus’ (see B84–5 n.).

In view of the large amount of the text that is lost, the legal situation is far from clear. On this I am grateful for advice which I have received from Prof. A. M. Honoré; I have also benefited greatly from discussing the problems with Dr Antti Arjava. There are many things we do not know: for example, whether Diogenis was married or what her age was, or whether she had full brothers or sisters (she certainly had at least one half-brother or sister (15)). If she had a husband, she does not mention him (unless his name occurs in 14 or 30; neither seems very likely). We cannot be certain that it was Roman law which was being applied. By the date of 4961 the parties were of course Roman citizens, and there is explicit mention of ὁ νόμος τῶν Ῥωμαίων (B75). But we are only some ten years after the Constitutio Antoniniana, and Arjava has sought to demonstrate in several places that in Roman
Egypt people only gradually came to use Roman law, which did not become common until towards the middle of the third century. Thus in *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (1996) 49, he remarks, ‘In principle, the papyri should now [i.e., after 212] refer to Roman institutions. Sometimes “the law of the Romans” is explicitly mentioned. In practice the situation was, of course, much more complicated: the documents can present either local law, official Roman law, or any popular interpretations of it.’ Cf. also *JRS* 88 (1998) 156; similarly *Pap. Congr. XXI* 30, and *ZPE* 126 (1999) 202–4. Most recently Arjava has treated the ‘Romanization of the Family Law’ in J. G. Manning, J. G. Keenan, U. Yiftach-Firanko (eds.), *Law and Society in Egypt from Alexander to the Arab Conquest* (forthcoming). However, two of the persons mentioned were citizens of Alexandria or one of the other Greek cities (ἀϲτή, Α13, Β56), who might be thought to have readily adopted Roman law. On the other hand, Diogenis insists that she is not the child of an ‘unwritten marriage’ (Α26), a concept that had no meaning in Roman law. Whether the use of the word προίξ is an indication that Roman law was being applied is uncertain; see 25 n.

If, as seems probable, the papyrus is to be considered as being based on Roman law, or at any rate on what the petitioner or her lawyers thought was Roman law, several consequences follow. Firstly, Diogenis would have been in *patria potestas* (a concept that non-Romans not surprisingly found particularly difficult to understand; cf. Arjava’s article in *Law and Society* cited above), unless she had been emancipated, of which there is no mention in the extant parts of the text. If she were in potestate, in theory no legal case between her and her father could have arisen: Dig. 5.1.4, *lis nulla nobis esse potest cum eo quem in potestate habemus, nisi ex castrensi peculio*. Despite this, there are several passages in the Legal Codes that relate to fathers seeking the assistance of provincial governors to exercise control over recalcitrant children (e.g. Dig. 1.16.9.3, CJ 8.46.3, 5, 9.1.14, CTh 9.13.1); see also BGU VII 1578 and Arjava, *JRS* 88, 153 with n. 37. Secondly, if Diogenis was in potestate, she could not own any property; all her property in law belonged to her father. This applied even to maternal inheritance, on which see *Women and Law* 98–100, *JRS* 88, 151–2. We do not know whether maternal inheritance was involved in the present case, but there is a reasonable argument for thinking that it was; see Α12–14 n. This would make good sense, since conflict between father and children often arose in connection with maternal inheritance; see *Women and Law* 101, *JRS* 88, 152. Thirdly, if Roman law is involved, Diogenis’ father would not have been legally entitled to disinherit her, unless there were exceptional circumstances: see *Women and Law* 46–7, *JRS* 88, 154 (XXXVI 2757, where apparently the right of a father to disinherit any of his children whom he wished is recognized, seems not to be based on Roman law). Possible exceptional circumstances were the failure of a child to show proper respect and affection to the parent, and this may well be precisely what Diogenis’ father alleges against her (cf. especially Α18–19 and note). If a father disinherit offspring, thus depriving them of the one-quarter of their share
on intestacy to which the children were legally entitled as a minimum, the child could raise a querela inofficiosi testamenti (see Dig. 5.2, CJ 3.28), by seeking to prove that he/she had acted properly towards his/her father, cf. CJ 3.28.28: liberi de inofficioso querelam contra testamentum parentum mouentes probationes debent praestare, quod obsequium debuit ingere, prout ipsius naturae religio flagitabant, parentibus adhibuerunt. A court would then need to decide the matter (JRS 88, 154). One may add that the difficulties stepmothers could make were well known to Roman law (cf. Women and Law 172–4), e.g. CJ 9.32.3, 9.33.5, and especially Dig. 5.2.4: non est enim consentiendum parentibus, qui iniuriam adversus liberos suos testamento inducunt: quod plerumque faciunt, maligne circa sanguinem suum inferentes iudicium, noverculis delenimentibus corrupti. This seems to apply closely to the circumstances we can deduce for 4961.

As a parallel for a dispute between a daughter and her father one naturally thinks first and foremost of the celebrated petition of Dionysia (II 237). However, in this case, as well as there being a property dispute, Dionysia’s father is attempting to break up her marriage. More importantly, the petition dates from 186, and it is abundantly clear that it is Egyptian law that is being invoked, not Roman law. A better parallel is BGU VII 1578. There a veteran complains to the acting prefect about τὰ εἰς ἐμὲ κατὰ ἀσέβιαν ὑπὸ τῆς θυγατρός μου . . . τολμηθέντα (8–9). In this instance, however, the father states explicitly of his daughter ὑποχείριας μοι οὔς κατὰ τὸν νόμο (9), a fact that, he says (14–16), may have annoyed her and caused her behaviour towards him. Another partial parallel is P. Turner 34 (216), where a son alleges that his ‘father’s wife’, presumably his stepmother, has obtained property resulting from an illegal will made by his deceased father.

4961 does not enlighten us very far on the much discussed concept of ‘unwritten marriage’, which has recently been studied in detail by Uri Yiftach-Firanko, Marriage and Marital Arrangements (2003) chap. 5. Here again the locus classicus on the subject is the petition of Dionysia, II 237; see also CPR I 18 = M. Chr. 84 = SPP XX 4 = Meyer, Juristische Papyri 89. Both texts concern, in part at least, the power of fathers over their children, power that seems to be less when the child is the offspring of a written marriage. Similarly the implication of line 26 of the present text is that Diogenis has certain rights that she might not have had if she had been the child of an unwritten marriage. See Yiftach-Firanko, Marriage 84–91, who concludes (p. 91), ‘much yet remains mysterious concerning the institution of agraphos and engraphos gamos and their effect on the capacity of the father over the person and property of his children’.

A possible scenario is the following. Diogenis had acquired property, which included slaves (σ 27), probably given to her by her mother. This property in law belonged to her father, since she was still in his potestas, but he had agreed to register it in her name as a gift. However, Diogenis’ mother died (or was divorced), and her father married again and had children by his second wife, Diogenis’ stepmother. The stepmother induced Diogenis’ father to bring an action against her on the
grounds that she had not shown him due filial respect. This led to a court case in which the father’s charges were dismissed as false. But he immediately made a new petition against her, again egged on by the stepmother, and this time obtained a subscriptio that was favourable to him and unfavourable to Diogenis. He then died, leaving a will in which Diogenis was either completely disinherited or at any rate deprived of the property already mentioned, a will that Diogenis claimed was illegal. She claims that she had not behaved badly towards her father and was being plotted against by her stepmother. She therefore petitioned the prefect asking him to ignore the subscriptio that was favourable to her father (and to her stepmother), on the grounds that it had been obtained by misrepresenting the facts (and therefore could not serve as a ‘precedent’ to be used against her), and to take action to enable her to recover her property that had been appropriated by her stepmother. It must be stressed that this is only a hypothetical reconstruction.

In the text that follows, readings that appear solely in B are given in boldface. The superscript figures in lines 2–34 are the line numbers in B. A vertical bar (|) marks the point at which the papyrus breaks off in a.
Ἀλεξανδρεία ἐτύχει η Φαρμοῦθι: τῆ ἐπὶ μέρους οὐτως: πολλη μὲν τοῖς ἠμετέροισ νόμους τῶν καθηκοντ[...]

μου κελεύουσι καὶ τὰ ἐξής (voc) Μάρκῳ Αἰδινίῳ Ἑυφράχῳ Ἀγνυπτοῦ (parch) Ἀφρικής Διογενίδου τῆς καὶ [c. 60–70]

ῥας Ἀρωμάτης ἔμενεν πόλεως: αἱ θεῖαι αὐτοκρατορικαὶ κατέγραψέ μοι κατὰ χαρίν ἀναφαίρετον ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ μου δι' ὧν τὰ ἅπαντα παρελθὰν καὶ ἐπαινεῖτο μὴ ἀπονέμῃ σοι ἐντευχθεὶς πρὸ βήματος τὸ διὲν τῇ μητρυίᾳ πιθῶ ἀγένητα ἐνκλήματα καὶ ἰκὴ ἐν δι' ἐμοῦ παντὸς προσέγειν αὐτῷ ὡς πατρὶ c. 5–10

Ῥωμαϊκὰ: κολλήματος μα c. 35–45 καὶ αἰεθόμενος ἥσαν διὰ παντὸς πρὸ βήματος τῷ ὡς πατρὶ c. 5–10


DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

βίας καὶ εὐνελαννόμενος τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐ[...].]ένα[ c.5 ]... ὁ ἑκ τῇ τῆς μυθρ[...]καὶ τοῦ τοῦ]μήκης κ[...] c.65–80

τ' ἐμοὶ πεισθεὶ καὶ ἠττήθη· καὶ τῆς διαμέ[...]ς ἀφεμ[...] πάλιν δι' ἐπέρων β[βλειδίων ...].]γ[...] c.25–35 ν προτερ[...] c.40–50

παρατεθῆναι τοῖς τῶν ἐνκτῆσεων βιβλιοφύλαξι α[...] καὶ κατ' ἐρήμων κατ.] c.110–120

cεως σοι τῷ δέουσαν προ[...]οιν ποιήσωται· καὶ τούτωι μ[...]ρκεβίθες τῆς μυθρ[...]ια[ c.105–115

δι' ἐκ ταυτήριον διαθήκην θέσατα ἦτε δια[...] τοῦ πατρός μου τῇ θ' τοῦ δ[...]κλο[...]c.35–45]...[ c.12] εὐομ[...]να, πεμ[ c.? 70

τά τε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μοι καταγραφέντα κα[...][,][.....], πα[...][ c.9 ]...[ c.17] προοικει[...] καὶ τα[...] c.72

τῇ μυθρ[...]η(μου) Καραπί[...] τῇ κ[...] c.60–75 71

ἐνδομενίαν ἐν πλείστῳ τῷ βιβλε[...]ν τουῦ βιβλιό[...] οὐ[...] c.5–60

τοῦ βιβλιο[...] οὐ[...] c.5–60

τοῦ βιβλ[...] οὐ[...] c.5–60

καταγραφέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ[...] c.80–95 72

ἀνόμως πραξ[...] κα[...] [ c.65]...[ c.79]...[ c.68]... Καραπί[...] c.5?

νον ἐν τοισούτω δε[e c.8]...[ c.70]...[ c.40]...[ c.80]... c.40?

σα τυχέω τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ βιβλε[...] (...) [ c.81]... c.83, αρ[...] άμων καὶ Δημ[...] c.5–60

Ἀβρά[...] Θέων ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μη[e] c.82 (m.2)

Ἀβρά[...] Θεῶν ἔγραψαν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μη[e] c.82 (m.2)
ἔτους τρίτου Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου ζ[εούρου ἐξιληφέναι καὶ προσαντιβεβ[λήναι ἐκ τεῦχος[c] συνκολλη[ςίμων ἐν τῷ ταμικῷ τῇ ἑνεκτώσῃ ὁμέρᾳ οὗ ἔστων ἀντίγραφον]

Παρθικὸς μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αὐρηλίος

Ἀντ[ωνίως Εὐσέβων ἐψεύσατο ὁ ἀντίδικός σου πρόκριμα ἐκάστε έκ τῇ[c]

doθεῖσις ἀ.]

cαντὶ ὑπὸ Σαραπιάδος τῆς καὶ [Κυρίων] ἐποίησας καὶ [...] ὑπογραφῆς ὁ δοῦν ἔνοχης.[


καίους περὶ τέκνων καὶ γονέων θεὸι[ς ι]ν ἂν ἄδικεύθαι νομίζεις[ι]ν[


θαὶ τὰς διαθήκας ἀπερ πάσι προκεκακὸ[ν, ντα προέταξα ἐρευνάμε[ν]η]

ἡθεῖας τυχεῖν. κατὰ χάρι τούς ἐτο ἀνωθεν χρόνους ἢδ. [...] α[π] τοῦ Ἀκελπιαδᾶν ἀπὸ τῆς αύτης πόλι[ς]ως μητρὸς Διογενίδου

Ἀπολλωνίων


μοῦ δὴ ὅποι τὰ ἀπαντὰ παρεδ[ο]γίσατο καὶ ἐφεύσατο [...] ἐνετάξειν δὲ ὅτι Βιβλειδίων ἑτοιμα ὑπ[ο]γραφῆς τῆ[c]δε [...]

ἐν εὐθείᾳ μὴ ἀπονέμῃ σοι ἐντευχθὲς πρὸ βήματος τὸ δὲ καὶ αἰθήμονος ἐς διὰ παντὸς π[ρο]ξέφερε νοῦ[τ]] [...][...][...] κατ’ ἐμοῦ ἐκ τ[ῆς τῆς] μητρυ[ᾶς τό]λμης κ.[...][...][...][...][...][...][...]
Back, across the fibres:

B 86 (m. 3) Αὐρήλιος Ὀνήσιμος ἐςφρ(άγισα) (vac.)

(m. 4) Αὐρήλιος Τριάδελφος ἐςφράγισσα (vac.)

(m. 5) ]...[...]ς ἐςφρ(άγισα)

... . . . . .
19. In the third year of Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander Pius Felix Augustus, month of [Hathyr 17. Aurelia Diogenis also called . . . bore witness that she] has made an extract and collation from the roll(?) of conjoined [petitions submitted] to the prefect Aedinius Iulianus, [vir clarissimus], and posted in the treasury building on the current day, of which this is a copy.

'Imperator Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus Arabicus Adiabenicus Partlicus Maximus and Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augustus to Euademon son of . . . of Hermopolis the great: If as you say(?) . . . your opponent lied in his petition, there will be no praecidicium from the subscriptio/answer given . . .

' . . . in a petition presented to the former prefect Maecius Laetus by Sarapias also called Cyrilla and she got(? a subscriptio as follows: . . . having hidden the truth in their petitions(?) and thereby having got answers in accordance with what they requested . . . and such persons are subject to the charge of impiety.

'And from an imperial edict of the same gods Severus and Antoninus posted in the most glorious city of Alexandria, year 8 Pharmuthi 18, in part as follows: Much . . . to our laws . . . as the laws have permitted children and parents if they think that they have been wronged . . . to take counsel concerning children and parents and necessarily(?) . . . [as(?)] the laws command and so on.

'To Marcus Aedinius Iulianus prefect of Egypt from Aurelia Diogenis also called . . . [daughter of X, mother —]ra from the city of Oxyrhynchi. The divine imperial constitutions declare that those who have lied in their petitions and [failed to disclose?] the true facts, that no praecidicium arose from the subscriptio given to them . . . to write their wills in a just manner and that it is possible for children and parents, if anyone(?) thinks [that he has been deprived of?] what is due, to [seek to annul?] the wills. Which [constitutions], being respected by everyone(?), I set out above, relying on . . . I approach you, my lord, requesting to get from you the help arising from these (constitutions).

In times now(?) long past . . . the son of Asclepiades of the same city, his/her mother being Diogenis daughter of Apollonius, citizen, by a public deed . . . registered to me through the registry-office as an unrenounceable gift . . . Megistus son of Spoces, his/her mother being Tsenosiris, of the village of Cercethyris, each . . . and my father in the meantime having married in succession to my mother and having imposed upon me as a stepmother Aurelia Sarapias also called Charitis(? daughter of Sarapion the son of Plutarchus, citizen, by whom he had issue . . . through the influence of my stepmother my father went so far as to . . . blamelessly by me(?) . . . [for much(?)] time up to the past year 2, in the month of Pachon . . . the house . . . [presented a petition against] me in the course of which he misrepresented everything and lied . . . under the persuasion of my stepmother he included non-existent accusations and [charges(?)] without grounds against me, as a result of which petition he got this subscriptio: [. . . if your daughter(?)] did not accord you the filial duty [appropriate to parents(?)], if you petition me pro tribunali . . . Latin. From column 41(?).

' . . . and having perceived the filial duty(?) which I continuously offered to him as a father . . . and being constrained by the truth . . . against me arising from the effrontery of my stepmother . . . lies against me and he lost; and desisting from(?) . . . again through another petition . . . to be deposited with the officials of the record-offices . . . shall make the necessary consideration of your request. And my stepmother not being satisfied with this . . . to deposit the will [before (?) the court which . . . my father having died(? on the 30th (?) of the past(?) [month of . . .] in my case(?) . . . the property registered to me by him in accordance with the gift(? . . . in(?) dowry and the property bought(?) for me by my deceased(? mother, not properly . . . [I know not in what(?)] way since I am not the child of an unwritten marriage and . . . my stepmother Sarapias also called . . . household goods to the highest value and those in store, not only that but also all the slaves . . . happened to be . . . the law of
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the Romans . . . we are (Roman) citizens, declares that all the slaves . . . His will, therefore, being illegal and pointless the . . . of the property registered and the slaves from the laws . . . illegally done against me . . . Sarapion also called Deme[tr— . . .

For it is of no small concern to me(?) . . . requesting to get help from you so that I may have been benefited. Farewell.

'For the [handing in] of the petition [I have sent Aurelius Agathus Daemon(?)] . . . I, Aurelius Theon, have written on her behalf since she does not know [letters].'

(2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Agathus Daemon, who am acting on behalf of [Aurelia Diogenis] (?). . . Year 3, Hathyr 17. If nothing is prejudged(?). . . petition the epistrategus, vir egregius. Column 60+, roll . . .'

Back (3rd hand) 'I, Aurelius Onesimus, have sealed it.'

(4th hand) 'I, Aurelius Triadelphus(?), have sealed it.'

(5th hand) 'I, . . ., have sealed it.'

Line numbers are those of a unless otherwise indicated.

1 ιθ̣. ια̣ is a possible, though much less likely, reading. It is not possible to say for certain whether this is in the same hand as the main hand of the text. A numeral at this point is unexpected and difficult to explain. The only texts that might be at all helpful are XVII 2131 5 and PSI XII 1245.14 = SB XIV 11980. 2131 has, immediately after the certification clause and before the start of the copy of the petition, κολλημ(άτων) Μθ; similarly SB 11980 has at the same point, i.e., immediately before the start of the petition proper, [κολ]ήματοϲ νθ . This would seem to suggest that the petition and subscrip- tion as posted up had at their head the κόλλημα number under which they were filed in the archives. Unfortunately the κόλλημα number given in the subscriptio to 4961 in a 34 cannot be made to agree with that in line 1.

2 There is some ink over the line where Εὐϲεβοῦϲ would have been written, no doubt offset. μη̣ν̣ό̣ϲ̣̣. The reading after mu is not easy.

λαμπροτάτῳ. διαϲημοτάτῳ is also possible at this date; see G. Bastianini, Pap. Congr. XVII iii 1339, ANRW ii 10.1, 583 n. 4.

3 The dating of the prefecture of Aedinius Iulianus (and of the prefects who preceded and followed him) given in the lists by Bastianini, ZPE 17 (1975) 908–9, and ANRW ii 10.1, 513, needs some revision. Bastianini accepts the argument of A. Stein, Die Präfekten von Ägypten (1950) 127, that he is to be identified with the man who appears in the Album of Canusium (CIL IX 338 I 4). Stein dates this inscription not later than the autumn of 223 and, since Aedinius Iulianus is there a vir clarissimus, argues that he must have ceased to be prefect of Egypt by this date. 4961 disproves this argument, since it shows him as still prefect on 14 November 223. I am grateful to Rudolf Haensch for bringing to my attention the article on this inscription by B. Salway in Alison Cooley (ed.), The Epigraphic
Landscape of Roman Italy (2000) 115–71, which includes a discussion of the prefects at this period. (This article supersedes the earlier study by J. Modrzejewski in P. L. Bat. XVII pp. 62–3.) Salway accepts the identification and the date of the inscription, but argues that Aedinius Iulianus could still have been serving as prefect of Egypt until the early part of 224 and is therefore likely to have been prefect when this inscription was set up (pp. 155–6). 4961 strongly supports his view. In fact 4961 is the only papyrus mentioning Aedinius Iulianus that has an exact date. P. Flor. III 382.92 is considered to be the equivalent of 3 November 222 by Stein (followed by Bastianini) because he believed that Aedinius Iulianus could not have been prefect a year later. However, the year number is lost, and 4961 proves Salway to be correct in arguing that the year could as well be year 3 as year 2, i.e. that it could date from 3 November 223. I 35 is dated by the consuls to 223, but the month is not preserved. P. Wisc. I 29r and XLVI 3286 are undated. In SB XVIII 19610 = ChLA XXVIII 865 the prefect’s name is wholly restored.

ἐν τῷ ταμικῷ. The ταμικόν is listed as occurring elsewhere in P. Flor. III 382.94 and P. Stras. IV 275–13 only. In the latter, which must be roughly contemporary with 4961, a report of a trial is quoted as follows: ἥγερ ἔπειν ἐν τῷ ταμικῷ ἐτέθη πρὸς τὸν ταμικόν. In the former a subscriptio from Aedinius Iulianus is said to be ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ ταμικῷ. In BL I 460, P. Flor. 382.94 is corrected to προετέθη, a correction that might be supported by 4961 3, but which P. Stras. 275 suggests is unnecessary. To these two examples we must add BGU XI 2061.19, where ταμικὸν occurs of the location of a petition and its subscriptio. The editor read προτεθέντων ἐν τῷ ταμίῳ, but a photograph kindly supplied by Günter Poethke shows the correct reading to be ταμικῷ.

προτεθέντων . . . τῇ ἐνεστώϲῃ ἡμέρᾳ. So I 35 12–13 and SB X 10537.3–4. In SB 10537 this is followed immediately by οὗ ἐστὶν, where we should no doubt restore ἀντίγραφον. For ἀντίγραφον cf. also P. Yadin 33.

4 Presumably Ἐὐδαίμονι is followed by a patronymic (as is usual in rescripts). Ἐὐδαιμονίδι cannot be read.
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a calque from Latin praeidicium, which had no earlier use in Greek. He reports that it is first attested in I. Knidos 1 31. K. V 34 (100 BC), a translation of the Lex de provinciis praetorii. In papyri it usually appears in the phrase χρησις προκρίματος, on which see most recently Fabian Reiter, Die Nomarchen des Arsinötes (2004) 312. In 4961 it is being used in meaning (i) of the three meanings classified in H. G. Heumann, E. Seckel, Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts (1958–1959) s.v.: ‘der durch die vorgreifende Entscheidung entstehende Nachteil’. Cf. the use of προδιεγνωμένων in the rescript of Pius quoted in 3–4 n.

(b39) οὔτε πρόκριμα ἔσται. The same words occur in LIV 3759 36–7, though in a different context: there the presiding official, the λογιστής, postpones a case, saying that since it is now evening πρόκριμα οὔτε ἔσται.

(b39) εἶ Τῷ[ν δὸ]θείς δ. [. Either α[π]τῷ γράφθης, supported by Λ6, or α[π]τῷ ὑπογράφθης, as in b48, could be read, although ν is slightly preferable to υπόσια.

4–5 These lines must give the start of the second legal ruling cited by Diogenis. Although the content seems to be much the same as the first ruling, and although, as indicated in the previous note, we could read α[π]τῷ ὑπογράφθης in line 4, it is inconceivable that we should link the two rulings together, which would mean that the emperors quoted a prefectorial subscriptio. However, Diogenis would hardly include a prefectorial subscriptio in between an imperial rescript and an imperial edict unless the subscriptio included an imperial constitution. I suggest, therefore, that in the large lacuna in line 5 the prefect quoted imperial authority for what follows. At the start of line 5 we could have the ending of ἀντεπέμβαλθη or ἀνεπέμβαλθη, although it is not easy to see how either can have been construed. Other possibilities are to restore ἄνεπειλήμβαλθη for which we may compare BGU I 194 = W. Chr. 84.12–14 βιβλιδίῳ . . . ὑπογράφησα ἐπιστολῶν δύο, and SB XIV 11343.3–4 βιβλιδίῳ . . . ὑπογράφησα τὰ ὑπὸ ἐμα[ῦ] ἐπείλημπται τὰ ὑπὸ ἐμα[ῦ] ἐπείλημπται. Any of these restorations might perhaps have been preceded by ἄλλο τῶν αὐτῶν, ‘another [pronouncement] of the same [emperors]’, cf. LX 4068 12, or a longer form of this; or indeed a statement that this same rescript was to be found in the prefectural subscriptio that follows.

For the prefect Maecius Laetus, see Bastianini, ZPE 17 (1975) 304, ANRW II 10.1, 512. He is attested in office from May 200 to some time in 203.

καὶ . [. . .] ὑπογράφησα[ν ή]. Neither in A5 nor in B40 is the reading clear. Since ὑπογράφησά is genitive, we might think of supplying some part of τιχάνων. The letter before ὑπογράφησα in B can easily be read as nu, which suggests we might read τῇ[ν ἑχουσίᾳ] there (and ἑκουσίᾳ in Α). We have ἑκουσία ὑπογράφησα in 18, and καὶ ἑκουσία ὑπογράφησα can be paralleled exactly in SB XVIII 13747.13; but in the present text it involves an awkward change of subject.

(b40) We expect the ὑπογράφησα to start with a date. The feet of the letters after ἐπιστολής and μαμά οὐδὲν πρόκριμα ἔσται, but the symbol Λ is almost invariable in such contexts; cf., however, SB XXVI 16426.11–13, where what is unquestionably a subscriptio begins ἔτους ὑγδάον καὶ ἐτους [ἐβδόμου (of Diocletian and Maximian). It is also possible that no date was given (cf. e.g. P. Diog. 17.3, P. Panop. 23.12–13 and the subscriptio began with ἔτους, ‘since’ (cf. below).

(b41) εὐτυχίαις. I do not see how this can mean any sense in the context. It seems essential to correct to ἐντυχίαις; cf. ἐν τῇ[ν εὐ]τυχίαις in A 10.

6 τιχάνων. Again, a correction to τιχάνων looks inevitable.

(b42) εὐτυχίαις. One might think of this being preceded by δῆλον or a similar word, and one might reconstruct the whole ὑπογράφησα, very tentatively, along the following lines: ‘Since the emperors / imperial constitutions have ruled that those who concealed the truth in their petitions . . . fail to succeed, it is clear that such persons are also liable to a charge of impiety.’

(b42) δῆλον. The reading is not easy but can hardly be avoided. The restoration δῆλον [ἐγγυματο[ν τῶν] αὐτῶν θεών κτλ. also looks to be beyond question. This would fit with the length of line sug-
gested by η36–37. Is it possible that this διάταγμα is the one referred to in BGU VII 1578.6–7 (with the correction in BL VI 17), which seems to relate to accusations of ingratitude by parents against their offspring (see above, introd.)? This edict is described as καθολικόν, but this need mean no more than ‘of general application’; see R. Katzoff in Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller (1986) 19–26.

7 At the right in λ there is some ink above [. . .ε[ in the line below. This might possibly be the feet of two iotas, i.e. read Φαρμυοι[δ]η[; in BL VI 149 οό εδιεκτεθαι δυ κα[ε]νε]θαι, but in BL II 169 ως οθθειες δαιδωκη[ε]ι is suggested (cf. al-ready BL I 243 n. 3). Ανάδικεθαι is attested once or twice in papyri, with the meaning ‘reopen a case’ or ‘appeal for rehearing of a case’; cf. Preisigke, WB 1 and iv (see the discussion in P. Heid. VIII 412 introd. and 15 n.). Neither meaning would suit the present context at all well, and this articulation would have preceded noμιζου[νως] hard to construe. ην for οτι is rare in papyrological Greek, but a few instances are attested: see Mandilaras, The Verb § 599. This articulation admirably suits the sense required. We may compare P. Kron. 50.8, where one son gets only a tiny legacy δια τό, ως δ τι[ατ]ηρ Κρονίων π[ρο]φέρεται, εν π[ολ]οίς η[δική]θαι υπε αντ[ο]υ εν τοις κατά τόν βίον.

(n45) δεω[. Most probably δεω alone or δεω[τω].

8–9 Certainly ροι[νεο]ι, again, as in 7–8, with or without an adjective. Here it may have been preceded by ροι[περ]. If ροι[νεο]ι κελεύου[ς] followed its object, one would have expected κελεύου[ς] to have preceded ροι[νεο]ι; cf. XXXVI 2757 ii 5–6 and LX 4068 8–9, the latter a rescript of Severus.

9 There is a strange vacat in β between ἐπάρχω and Αἰγύπτου, whereas Αγ γυπτ[ου] vacat more logically before the start of the petition proper. It was normal at this date to address the prefect by his three names plus the title ἐπάρχως Αἰγύπτου: see Bastianini, AnRW II 10.1, 587–90.

4068 correctly includes παρά before Αὐρηλίας.

(n46) τής καί [. The first letter of Diogenis’ alias is most like phi; sigma or omicron are less likely. Possibly the name of Diogenis’ father, either with an alias or the mention of some office, stood in the lacuna before the name of her mother, ending –ρας. If so, there would have been insufficient room for Diogenis to have mentioned her husband, if she had one: see introd.

10 εν τοι[ι]ς ἔτεις ζευς [. Not ετείς ζευς; ἔτεις ζευς καί[ι ἀποκρυψαμέ]νους (cf. 6) is perhaps not impossible.

The construction here is unclear. In the passages quoted from the legal sources in Heumann–Seckel (see 4 n. above), praetextum several times occurs along with fietai, so that μηδὲν πρόκριμα γενέθαυ suits well; but we should have expected τοὺς φευκαμένους and the following participle to be in the dative. In all three places the accusative is a certain reading.

(n48) φογραφής. The upsilon is certain; not ὑ[πογραφής] as in λ 6.

11 νοοὺς δικαίος γράφειν τάς διαθήκας. Possibly supply διατιθεμέ[νους, with the sense being that the imperial constitutions declare (or prescribe) that the testators (τοὺς διατιθεμένους) should write their wills in a just manner. Alternatively the text may have had βουλομέ[νους τελ σιμ].

λ reads πας; β 49 has correctly πας.

γονεύς. β 49 reads γονεύς, but the letter after γονεύς in λ is not nu. It might be epsilon, as might the letter after γονεύς in β (theta and sigma are also possible), which would point to ζ[άν]; but
ardis (cf. 8) does not suit the trace before νομιζειν, and εναν τις ἀδικεῖθαι is too long for the space. The trace also rules out ε[άν τις, αυτῶ]ν. Sigma is possible, but ε[άν τις νομιζειν is too short.

tων καθηκον [1]. Whether καθηκον [1] or καθηκον [ćeω] could be read. No doubt Diogenis is referring to the passage from the edict quoted in 108.

(β50) θεῖος τας διαθήκες. If the infinitive is governed by έξειναι, ἀναφειπταιθαι or ἀνελθειθαι to overturn the will is a possibility, although a verb meaning ‘to challenge’ (the validity of the will) would seem more suitable. After διαθήκες we no doubt have a strong stop.

(β50) ἀπερ. This must refer back not only to the διατάξεως but also to the διάταγμα in 6, hence the neuter plural.

(β50) παῖς προκειν, ντα προεῖτα. The meaning is clear, what was written less so. We may compare SB V 7696.36, θαυματεται[ι μ]εν [αι] νόμοι και προκεινται, SB XVI 12692.27, etc., θεῖοι . . . και προκεινται νόμων, SB X 10537.11–12, where I read (from a photograph) τῆς θείας νομοθεσίας . . . προκειντῆς οὔς (τοι προκειντος as a 3-termination adjective see LSJ). In ChLA III 201.8 we have ἐκ τῶν προ[εκ]κεινταιοιο (l. -τέων) θετε[τι[εκάτω[ν] (cf. lines 25–6). P. Tebt. II 286 = M. Ch. 83.22–3 reads προκειν[ει]ν [οφελοντες τίς γιαν][υ[c]θει[α]ς [ιμπερ]ια]ποδο[φά]ξει[ς]ς, and BGU IV 1073.12–13 = P. Frisch, Ἀθηνα[ς]ισικά[ν]τερις Ρ[α]υς 2.12–13, προκεινήκαντες τά θεία (sc. διατάγματα). προκεινήτας cannot be read nor προκεινήτης. I have considered προκεινης[θ]ήντα: for the passive in a very similar context cf. IGLSyR. VII 4028.42–3, τἶν θείαν αυτοκρατορίαν ὑπὸ πάντων προκεινήμενην προείνειν; but there would be no room for both theta and epsilon, and the past tense is not what we should expect. It is not possible to read προκεινήτα ὡντα, though this may have been what was meant.

ἐξεραζομεν[η]. Of the meanings given in LSJ, ‘relying on’ seems best suited here, with reference to the validity of imperial pronouncements.

11–12 Restore προς[εμα]; cf., e.g., P. Cair. Isid. 79.14, P. Stras. I 57.6.

12 ἐκ τοῦτον[ων μοι] θεοθείαν τουχείων. The usual expression would be simply τῆς (τῆς) βοηθείας τουχείων. I have restored τοῦτον on the assumption that the word refers, like ἀπερ, to the imperial decrees.

With τουχείων we come to the end of the preamble, before Diogenis starts to recount the long history of the case.

(β51) ηδ. . ηδὴ is possible; otherwise read ηδί.

12–14 I should like to believe that the person mentioned in 12–13 was Diogenis’ mother, now deceased or divorced, who was the citizen of a Greek city (ἀστῆ).[1] Maternal inheritance is discussed in Arjava, Women and Law 94–105, JRS 88, 151–2. But if this person was the subject of κατέγραψε μοι and if κατάγραψεμα in 12 refers to the same registration, as it seems to do, then this was done by a man (τὰ τε ὅπ’ αὐτοῦ μοι καταγράψατα). One possibility is that αὐτῆς does not refer to the subject of καταγράψεμα but to his mother. Another approach is to suppose that Diogenis’ mother was indeed the person who gave the property to Diogenis (ἀστῆς being either part of a genitive absolute or governed by ὅπ’, the subject of the verb being Diogenis’); this property was then registered in Diogenis’ name by her father as a gift, since she was still in his potestas (in terms of Roman law the property would presumably have been regarded as her peculium). We might even think of restoring in 12 ἡδηνι (ἐγώ αὐ)[σ]α ἐπ’ [ι] τατρικῆ ἐξουσία (but there are of course many other possibilities). Jane Rowlandson, Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt (1996) 194, remarks on ‘a surprisingly large number of instances of land being purchased on behalf of unmarried daughters by their parents’, no doubt normally to provide them with a dowry, as Rowlandson implies (cf. the mention of a dowry in 12.25). Arjava, JRS 88, 158, comments on ‘the practice of buying or registering certain property in the name of one’s children’, referring to several instances in the papyri, e.g. XII 1470, P. Gen. I 44 = M. Ch. 215, and especially SB X 10728, the sale of a house (3–5) ἀγορασθὲνα [ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ σου] τριβείσαν ἐπ’ ὀνόματος τῆς ἡμετέρας θυγατρὸς Ἀρβρίλιας Αλεξάνδρας οὔς μοι ὑπ’ ὁ[ς] τῇ χειρὶ κατὰ τοῦς Ρωμαίους [νόμους], followed (probably) by a reference to the previous owner (for σου] ταβεῖσαν instead of the editor’s
ἐν ταχθέαϲ, see \( \text{ZPE} \) 160 (2007) 208–10. He also refers to FIRA II 661.viii.2 si domum . . . pater tuus, cum in potestate eius ageres, nomine tuo donandi animo comparauit . . ., which may be particularly relevant to the circumstances in 4961.

13 ] ̣υ̣ν̣[. We may have a reference to a συγχώρηϲιϲ that took place διὰ τοῦ καταλογείου; perhaps cf. P. Berl. Leihg. I 10.17, where ἐνεχυράϲία is registered και τὰ συγχώρηϲιϲ τοῦ καταλογείου. However, omicron or rho are easier readings than omega (πολ̣ὺν χρ̣[όνον cannot be read).

14 Μεγίϲτου. A very rare name. There are several attestations in LGPN, but none from Egypt. However, Μεγίϲτη occurs several times: see D. Foraboschi, \( \text{Onomasticon} \); add P. Harrauer 33.100. There is also a feminine name Μεγιϲτώ in P. Mich. III 190.29, 34. The person referred to here may have been the previous owner of the property; cf. SB 10728 referred to above. Alternatively it could be the name of Diogenis’ husband or intended husband; cf. introd.

I can offer no explanation for ἕκαϲτοϲ/ἑκάϲτηϲ. After μετά this suggests that some time had elapsed since the original gift had been registered. Possibly the arrangement was that Diogenis was to take ownership of the property when she ceased to be in potestate, and before this happened her father had married again. This would fit with the idea that it was Diogenis’ mother who intended the property to come into Diogenis’ possession.

(555) ἐπιγήμαντοϲ. The verb is new to the papyri. On the aorist of γαμέω, see Mandilaras, \( \text{The Verb} \) §§ 306–7).

15 μητρυίαϲ. This is only the third occurrence of the word in documentary papyri. The other instances are SB XX 15096.8 (μητρυίαϲ); see the correction in \( \text{ZPE} \) 90 (1992) 264 and SB X 10537.24, where again the petitioner is in dispute with a stepmother: he says (to the prefect) οὐκ ἀγνοεῖϲ καὶ τὸ τῶν μητρυιῶν ὄνομα. Problems caused by stepmothers were well known to Roman law; see introd. It is noteworthy that the stepmother in 4961 is a citizen of a Greek city , ἀϲτήν Μεγίϲτη, an alias of Sarapion, or simply by θυγατέρα.

16–17 = Β 58 Presumably Diogenis is speaking of her own actions towards her father and claiming that she acted ἀμέμπτωϲ. After this possibly ὑπ’ ὑµὸϲ Μητρυίαϲ τοῦδε τοῦ διαβο{υ}λικῆϲ καὶ σατανικῆϲ ἐνέργειαϲ. After the deletion of δευ, which is marked by dots over the letters, we seem to have no more than a large cursive beta plus a diagonal stroke, i.e., the writer omitted any indication of ἔτουϲ. Β 59 reads ἔτουϲ.

What follows Παχών is uncertain and difficult to reconcile with the reading of Β 59. Possibly one version (Α) had just the figure, whereas the other (Β) had the day in full. Before μου it is not difficult to read ἐτῶϲ Μητρυίαϲ ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ χρόνῳ. After the lacuna may have been filled by Αὐρηλίου, an alias of Sarapion, or simply by θυγατέρα.
preceded. If this is on the right lines, it suggests Diogenis left her father’s house (rather than gave up all claim to a house that had been given to her).

εἰς τὰν τὸν ἀγένητον αἰτίαν. Probably καὶ (?) μου, preceded by a statement that her father filed a petition (against her).

For a petition of this nature, cf. BGU VII 1578, discussed in the introd.

παρελογίσατο. A comparable use of the word occurs in SB XVI 12692-38 and in CPR XVIIA 24-5.

παθῶ. This must be an attempt at the dative of πειθῶ in the meaning ‘persuasion’; cf. Gignac, Grammar ii 87. The word πειθῶ is very rare in documentary papyri, attested elsewhere only in III 474 37 and XLIII 3106 9, in both cases with the meaning ‘obedience’. In P Sakaon 38.10 = P. Flor. I 36 = M. Chr. 64 the editors restore in a similar context [ἐκ πιθανολογίας τῆς ἀκουστῆς ψωφισμᾶς].

ιῶ [c.8]. The only possibility that occurs to me is to suppose that this is for εἰκῶ in the meaning ‘without good cause”, for which see LSJ Rev. Suppl. Papyrological references to this usage are cropped.

19 = B 62 τὸ δ [c.7]. One expects something like τὸ δ [καίποι εξεξε], but there is insufficient room for this. τὸ δ [εῶ] is a possibility, though there is not really room for ποιῆσαι to follow. For τὸ δ ἔνω, cf. ChLA X 407.15, τὸ δ ἔνω δίκης ἐκ τῆς ἐπηνόωναι. (ChLA has δέον[ἐ] but the supposed iota is in fact part of the nu.)


κολλήματος. In E. Van ‘t Dack et al. (eds.), Egypt and the Hellenistic World (1983) 381, I suggested that in such contexts κολ should be expanded κολλημάτων, since this was the only example I had noted of an abbreviated form of the word (P Harr. I 68.14). R. Haensch, ἙRP E 160 (1994) 504 n. 56, has pointed out that the genitive singular is used in PSI XII 1245.14 = SB XIV 11980, and this would seem to be more logical; see LXIII 4364 9 n. After κολ we have the foot of xi from νέωτ [a]ивεν in the line above; then what must be the column number.

19–21 What is happening here is particularly unclear. The whole of this passage, to καὶ ἡττήθη, could be Diogenis’ report of a trial that had taken place. For ποιῆσαι, cf. BGU VII 1578.10–11, where the father says τῆς δηλομένης μου θυγατρὸς τῆς εὖ καὶ καλῶς κατὰ τὴν [ἀρχὴν μου προκεῖται εφεύρετες]. At the start of line 20 εύεστ [ίας] is a probable restoration (cf. 19), with the meaning suggested in the translation. αἰτίας could be used of an official holding a trial, although it is less easy to see how convehlenomoues τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, if it means ‘constrained by the truth’, could be used of an official. For its likely meaning here, cf. P. Lond. V 1711.59–60: a man has made an agreement μὴ ἐνδοῦ μὴ βία καὶ ἀπαθὴ μῆτε ἀνάγκης ευπορεύεσαι. Immediately before καὶ ἡττήθη ταύτη is good in L 20, but the traces do not seem to permit τῷ οὕτως or τῷ αὐτῷ (what survives in B 64 is not helpful). If we read just τὸ καὶ ἡττήθη, the noun to follow could be, e.g., κατάγνωσμα (the traces in B 64 are too slight to confirm or refute this). If this is the right approach, an official must be the subject of the verb following ἀληθείᾳ in L 20 (assuming we have a verb here). We could easily read οὐ[κ ἔδω]εν αἰτηθη, but this is ungrammatical. A possible restoration is οὐ[κ ἔτα]εν, meaning that the official did not prescribe action to be taken against Diogenis because of the accusations, but on the contrary her father was convicted of lying and lost his case.

A quite different approach is to take the father as subject throughout. Then in L 20 οὐ[κ ἔδω]εν is attractive, ‘my father, although he perceived my filial affection for him, did not cease . . .’ (the verb is used in a similar context in II 237 vi 4); but this does not fit well with ευπορεύεσαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ,
if it means ‘constrained by the truth’; ‘not being constrained’ would fit better. Possibly, again with the father as subject, we might have οὐ[κ ἐδείκ[εν ἄ, perhaps with ἐδείκ]ησα] to follow, i.e., he could not demonstrate the truth of his (false) accusations against Diogenis.

However that may be, the occurrence of ἐν κατὶ πρώτῳ in 21 seems explicable only if there had been a trial and the subject of the verb had lost his/her case; see Preisigke, WB s.v.: (passive) ‘unterliegen (im Prozesse)’, a meaning that is found several times in P. Hal. 1 (see Index, s.v.); cf. also XLI VI 3285 14, where ἡ ἡγεσίβας means ‘the defeated party’ (both texts are legal codes). Since the subject is third person, it should mean that Diogenis’ father lost (‘he was convicted of telling lies against me and lost the case’). The petition as a whole would seem to make more sense if she had lost. Presumably it was the response to the second petition, mentioned later in this line, that was unfavourable to Diogenis and that she is seeking to get overturned or ignored.

21 It might seem that β65 should correspond to τ’ ἐμοῦ in this line. κα]τ’ ἐμοῦ is indeed just possible in β65, but what survives later in the line cannot be reconciled with α21. In any case the amount lost in α20 is sufficient to cover all of β65 which survives. At the right in β65 not part of τέκνον; possibly τοῦ (from δείκνυμι?).


23 κατ’ ἐρήμοιον. This would make sense as a reference to Diogenis’ weak position, bereft of parental support; see Preisigke, WB s.v. ἔρημος (i) ‘mittellos, entblößt’ and the reference in IV s.v. (3) to P. Bours. 25,10–12, ὅ[πωρ] o[δ έ]ρ[ήμοιον. . . .] ή[σον] α[π'] τῆς [κατα]δίκης. As such the word would seem to be part of her own description of herself. The alternative is to understand δίκης, a reference to a trial in which one party is absent (see the discussion in P. Heid. VIII 412 introd. and 7 n.). After it, it seems to be κατ’[ again. κατ’ ἐμοῦ could fit with this alternative meaning of ἔρημος; cf. BGU III 1004 ii.21–2, ε[ξ]ν μὴ παραγένηται ἐν ἡμ[ῖ]σι [ἡμέρας ---] γε[νέθ]σα(μ) ἐρήμος κατ’ αὐτοῦ (before γενέθσα the editor restored ἡ δίκη but in P. Heid. 412.7 n. ἡ κρίσις vel sim. is proposed). Thus Diogenis could be saying that a judgement that was unfavourable to her was given in her absence. But the preposition κατά before ἐρήμοιο is a difficulty with this explanation.

23–24 At the start of this line we should restore, almost certainly, ἐξεῖν; see SB X VI 12692.21, τῆς [ἀ]ξιώματος ἀντίων τῶν δέοντων πρόνοιας κατὰ τ’ [ο]ικός νόμοις ποιήσατε; cf. PSI V 449.15 and SB XVIII 13260.14. There is no doubt that the subscriptio to the second petition by the father (or a decision in a court case arising from this petition) occurs in these lines and ends with ποιήσατε. It is likely that this was unfavourable to Diogenis (see introd.), yet even so it did not satisfy her stepmother.

23ff. Much is lost in these lines, and the sense is obscure. It is probable that at this point Diogenis’ father died (see below) and that the dispute was henceforth between Diogenis and her stepmother, the latter having now sought to acquire property which Diogenis believed should have belonged to her.
The use of the middle of τίθημι with διαθήκη is several times attested. It is unclear why a διακάστηρον should be mentioned, although we do hear of a συγγραφή being brought ἐπὶ τὸ διακάστηρον in P. Tor. Chooach. 12 iv 18 (cf. M. Ch. 28.26–7).

ἡτις could refer to the stepmother or to the will (we might perhaps read ἡτις δια[θήκῃς]), or to neither. Could we have a reference to the will being opened after the father’s death? At any rate, what follows seems to be a reference to the death of Diogenis’ father. τελευταῖον[ος] would be a good reading, so it is very tempting to correct to τελευταίον[ος] (an error that occurs three times in III 493 = M. Chr. 307). In B 70 τῇ ἐλεφαντίον τῇ ἁρπαγές τῷ ἀρχά [would not conflict with the exiguous traces.

τῇ χ. Also possible is τῇ δ. τοῦ δι[θενός] τοῦ μη[νός]. The traces are minimal but consistent with this reading.

(β71) ἐφαναι is a possible reading.

ἐπ' ἐμοῦ [ὑπέρ] ἀνακαλεὶϲ [. The combination of these words might suggest that we have an official speaking, referring to someone summoned to appear before him. But it is more likely that ἐμοῦ refers to Diogenis, although its meaning here is unclear (‘in my case’?). It may be relevant to quote the passage from CJ 1.3.55(57).2, referred to in LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v. ανακαλέω, which concerns the nullifying of an illegal act: the Greek version reads εὐθὺϲ ἀνακαλεῖϲθαι τὸ γενόμενον καὶ ἀντίς ἄκουον ἀποφαίνειϲ; in the Latin version reuocare is used for ἀνακαλεῖϲθαι.

]. ελομεν[[]], σεμ[[]]. σεμ[[]] is a good reading, and there is probably no room for much to have been lost between the lines. This suggests as a possible reading and articulation ἐλομεν[ύ]ν ἅ ἐπ'[ε] μ[ϊ]ν ἀνακαλεῖϲθαι τῇ ἐμῇ ἀνάφοινεϲ; in P. Tor. Choach. 12 iv 18 (cf. M. Chr. 26.135, 169–70, Günther Häge, Ehegüterrechtliche Verhältnisse (1968) 209 f. and index s.v. dos.

καὶ τα. νη[[ε. ?]], εντα μοι. It is quite possible that nothing was lost here and that we should read καὶ τα ω[ν]ήθεντα μοι. If there was a small loss, we might have τα ω[ν]ή[τα + participle, e.g. δο]θέντα.

There is no explicit reference to property having been bought for Diogenis in what survives of the earlier part of the petition, but cf. 13 n. We may perhaps compare P. Lond. III 977.13–14 (p. 231), where a father sells property ὑπάρχοντα μοι καὶ ἀ[ν]ῃθέντα ἐπ'[ε]μοῦ [. . . . .] ἐπ'[ε]ξοικεϲ μοι θυγατρόϲ (now deceased); of the editors’ suggestions for the lacuna, the most probable is ὑπὲρ τῆϲ.

(β72) ὑπὸ τῆϲ [. . . . .]. [. . . . .] οῦ μεταρρ. [μεταρρα] λ[αχύσιϲ μ]ου may be considered but is long for the space. Alternatively we might have a reference to a female relative of Diogenis. 26 να τρόπον. One naturally thinks of κατὰ μηδένα/οὐδένα τρόπον, e.g. ‘she could in no way succeed because . . .’. An alternative is οὐκ οἴδα τι[λ]να τρόπον (cf. XIV 13304 13 and perhaps SB XIV 11349.6–7); cf. the suggested translation.
ἐξ ἀϲυνγράφω̣ν γάμων. I have found no other example of this expression nor any papyrological example of the adjective. I do not know whether any legal significance is to be seen in the use of ἀϲυγγραφοϲ γάμοϲ instead of ἄγραφοϲ γάμοϲ; presumably both expressions mean that there was no written contract between the married couple. ἄγραφοϲ γάμοϲ occurs in II 237 viii 5–6 and CPR I 18.26, 30 = SPP XX 4 = M. Chr. 84 = Meyer, Jur. Pop. 93 only; but the same idea, it seems, is conveyed by ἀϲυνγράφω̣ν κυνεῖαι and similar expressions, for which see Yiftach-Firanko, Marriage 90 n. 37.

The construction of the reference to the stepmother that follows is unclear. Perhaps we should take the two instances of καί as 'both . . . and', and suppose that we have another articular infinitive; there is a trace of a horizontal before the lacuna in B 73, which would suit καὶ τ̣[ῷ]. Also possible is καὶ π̣[,] suggesting π̣[αρά] or π̣[ρόϲ]. Whatever the reading, the passage is likely to have referred to the fact that the ενδομενεία belonged (or did not belong) to the stepmother.

After μητρυιᾷ B 73 inserts μου. It is far from obvious why the stepmother's name was given again here.

[Page 178] There is a diagonal stroke starting in the lacuna in B 74 and extending upwards to finish under the gamma in ἀϲυνγράφω̣ν (B 73).

There scarcely appears to be room for αν at the end of ενδομενίαν, but it seems necessary to read this in view of οδεῖn following.

27 κα[,] [. έ7 δουλ]ικά. The letter before the lacuna is unclear; epsilon or alpha are perhaps the easiest readings. With the former we might think of ἄ κε̣[κτημαι, with the latter ἄ κα[τέλ(ε)ψε (μου) or ἄ κα[τέχων.

a [. Possibly απ[.

[Page 179] τίγχανεν ο̣ντα is presumably a reference to the slaves (a compound verb is unlikely).

After it possibly ἄλλα ὡc.

[Page 180] The deletion is indicated by dots over the letters.

ὡς . . . ὁ νόμος τῶν Ῥωμα[ίων. For the construction, cf. P. Michael. 41.40 (539/554?) ὡς ο](ι νόμος τῶν Ῥωμαίων is very rare expression in papyrus documents; I have found it elsewhere only in M. Chr. 328.9, although the plural occurs more often in the phrase κατὰ τοὺς Ῥωμαίων νόμους (IX 1208 6, X 1268 9, XI 2951 20, SB X 10728.4–5).

29 πολειτευόμεθα. I have come across no papyrological example of the verb πολιτεύεϲθαι used in such a connection, although the phrase ἡ Ῥωμαίων πολιτεία is not uncommon. This can refer to the Constitutio Antoniniana: in XII 1458 4–6, for example, a man says of his name before the Constitutio πρὶν δ[ὲ] τυχίν τῆϲ Ῥωμαίων πολιτίαϲ. I suggest Diogenis is trying to convey the idea that, since all are now Roman citizens (i.e., post 212), it is the law of the Romans by which they are now governed. Perhaps cf. I. Louvre 4 = SB V 8852.15 ο[ι] αἱρο[ύμενοι] βέλτιον π[ολιτεύεϲθαι, translated 'd’être mieux gouvernés'.

After ἀπανταϲ we should probably supply τοῦϲ and assume that ἀπανταϲ agrees with δούλωϲ.

The first letter after the lacuna following has a long descender, presumably rho or phi. Perhaps μ͵ ἄφαι[ριϲθαι (passive)?

= B 76. The reference must surely be to Diogenis' father's will. We do not know the grounds on which she claimed it to be illegal, but parents were not normally allowed to disinherit their children in Roman law (see introd.).

It is likely that some action by the stepmother is being described by Diogenis as μάταιοϲ.

29 δούλωϲ ευμάτωϲ. Neither here nor in the previous line does it seem essential to correct to δουλ(ικ)ῶν.

ἐκ τῶν νομ[ῶν. It is hard to read this in B 77. The traces can be made to fit ἔκ τῶν νόμων̣, but kappa is very difficult.

[Page 181] At the start we should probably read κ[α]στ’ ἐμοῦ with something written over the line above ατ.
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

30 = B78 This line is badly damaged in both versions. Worse still, I have not succeeded in reconciling what survives in the two versions. B suggests two participles joined by καὶ and both ending -εντα; but the letter before -εντα is not theta. It is most like mu, and it might be possible to read διὰ μὲν τὰϲ or διὰ μὲν τῆϲ; but neither can be reconciled with the traces visible in A.

It is odd that this Sarapion should suddenly appear. Was he perhaps the son of Diogenis’ father by his second wife (cf. ἐπαιδοποιήϲατο B56) or her husband (if she had one)?

30–31 In view of the uncertainty as to the number of letters lost, it is possible we should read here τὸν καὶ Δημητριον τὸν προτεταγμένον vel sim. (he could have been named in 15 or in B78). Kappa in τὸν καί is oddly made, perhaps a correction.

31 ἐν τοϲούτῳ δέ. The phrase occurs also towards the end of a petition in P . Warren 1.35. After it μετὰ τ[] is possible.

(Π80) . . . οὐ γὰρ περὶ ὀλίγου μοί ἐϲτιν. The sense would be well suited by the reading οὐ γὰρ περὶ ὀλίγου; cf. the phrase περὶ ὀλίγου ποιεῖϲθαι, for which see LSJ s.v. ποιέω a ii v. However, the letter before οὐ is most like phi, i.e. ἀφ' οὖ.

32 ἅγιοϲ Δαίμων. It is hard to find room for two letters in the lacuna, and we should perhaps reckon with the less common form of the name Ἀγαθοδαίμων. The change of hand and the further entry is unexpected (there is nothing comparable in P . Flor. 6). Presumably Agathus Daemon was the man appointed by Diogenis to deliver the petition at the prefect’s court; in which case he is likely to be recording here that he in due course received the prefect’s subscriptio, of which he adds a copy. This should be the hand, therefore, that occurs in B83–5. There, however, the writing is so poorly preserved that I cannot confidently assert that it is the same hand.

ὁ διαδέχ. Presumably a participle from διαδέχομαι, whereby Agathus Daemon is stating that he is acting in loco Diogenis; cf. LSJ s.v. παν. For the meaning ‘represent’, with reference to BGU V 1210.193. In ChLA X 407.9 it is said of a son τὸν οἰκεῖον πατέρα ἐφ' ἅπαϲιν διαδέχαμεϲ, but in this case the father is deceased; there may be a similar explanation for a son διάδοχον τοῦ πατρὸϲ γενέϲθαι in II 237 ix 9 (see p. 151).

34 ω. There may well be no letter between omega and τῷ.

B84–5 A subscriptio beginning with the date in the short form (see Egypt and the Hellenistic World, cited in 19 n., 374–7) followed by μηδενὸϲ ἐπεχομένου is attested in XVII 2313 19, P. Stras. I 57.18 with BL I 406, P. Tebt. II 327.37 (= W. Chr. 394), III 439 and SB VI 9340 = P. Lund. IV 130–9; cf. III 488 43, XI.2 3027 5. SB 9340 reads μηδενὸϲ ἐπεχομένου τῷ κρατίϲτῳ ἐπιϲτρα[τ]. We may therefore restore ἐπεχομένου with some confidence, although here there was something more than ἐπεχομένου between μηδενὸϲ and τῷ κρατίϲτῳ. No wholly satisfactory explanation of the meaning of the phrase has yet been proposed; cf. 3027 5 n.

Back

B86 Ὀνήϲιμοϲ. The reading is probable. Ὀνήϲιμοϲ is not uncommon, but the spelling with omega does not seem to have occurred previously in texts from Egypt. It is found elsewhere: see P. Yadin 11.33. LGPN I records Θάνηϲίμοϲ (Crete), II Θηϲίμη (Athens) and ΠΠΒ Θαϲίμα (Boeotia).

87 Ἐριάδελφοϲ. An uncertain reading.

J. DAVID THOMAS
Ammonius writes to his ‘brother’ Diodorus, whom he calls a ‘friend’ in the docket, informing him that Diodorus’ ‘brother’ has been appointed *komogrammateus*. Whether he had any role in the appointment or he transmits the news as an outsider, we cannot tell. He reminds Diodorus of an earlier service offered to him, states that something of the kind will please his (Diodorus’) ‘brother’ now too, and urges Diodorus to ‘let him know about this’, i.e., whether similar services would be needed. Ammonius clearly saw this appointment as an opportunity for his own gain.

Normally a three-year liturgy would be something one tried to avoid, but as N. Lewis, *CE* 79 (2004) 231, has put it, ‘As custodian of all the village records and the source of all official information supplied to higher officials and to local inhabitants and property owners, a *komogrammateus*, were he so minded, could find all sorts of ways of “cooking” the books so as to help himself and friends, to the detriment of others.’ P. Lips. II 145.23 ff. shows that the *komogrammateus* was in a position to harm other people (and so, presumably, to benefit them as well) and also that it was not a liturgy that could be given just anyone. A certain experience, such as having been a *praktor*, was required.

The hand would suit a date in the earlier part of the third century. The reference to the *komogrammateus* indicates that the text cannot be later than 245, the latest attested date for the office in the third century.

The text is written along the fibres. The papyrus is fairly well preserved except for some damage along what was the outside fold of the letter. The sheet was folded vertically twice from right to left and once from left to right, and finally once horizontally. The address is on the second panel from the left (as reckoned from the front). There is a *kollesis* c.o.5 cm from the right edge.

*Ἀμμῶνιϲ Δι̣οδώρῳ τῶι ἀδελφῷ

πλείϲτα χαίρειν.

ὁ ἀδελφόϲ σου κατ̣εϲτάθη κωμογραμμα-

τεύϲ τῆϲ Ϲ̣[ ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣]

ἐπειδὴ πρώ̣ην

5

σε ἀνόκν̣ω̣ϲ ὑπηρετήϲαι̣, οἶμαι

καὶ νῦν ἀρέϲεν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ὥϲτε

οὖν πρὸ τού[ν] περὶ(<c>)παϲθῶ εἰϲ ἄλλην πρα̣-

γματίαν περὶ τοῦτον [[ουν]] μοι δήλωϲον.

(vac.)

ἐρρῶϲθ(αί) σε εὔχομ(αι). Μεϲορή ἤη.*
DOCUMENTARY TEXTS

Back, downwards, along the fibres:

7–8 l. πραγματείαν 8 τογτου 9 ερρωθε-εευχ 10 απο αμμο

‘Ammonius to his brother Diodorus, very many greetings. Your brother has been made κομογραμματευς of S—o. Since we earlier served you unhesitatingly, I believe that we will also now please your brother. Consequently, before I am put to another activity, let me know about this. I pray you are well. Mesore 18.’

Back: ‘Deliver to Diodorus from Ammonius, friend.’

3 κατεστάθη. See N. Lewis, On Government and Law in Roman Egypt 109: ‘The terms καθίστημι and κατάστασις are not in themselves evidence either of liturgy or of action by the epistrategos.’

κωμογραμματευς was perhaps a three-year liturgy, in all likelihood served away from one’s idia.

See Lewis, The Compulsory Public Services s.v. (p. 35). See above, introd., on possibilities of abuse.

4 Ц[. . .]ου could be a number of villages in the Oxyrhynchite nome, Цεναω and Цεντω being the best suited to the available space, but it is of course not certain that the office was to be held in an Oxyrhynchite village.

5 υπηρετήϲαμεν. Given the semi-official context of the letter, it is not inconceivable that the verb is used in a technical sense, ‘to serve as hyperetes’; cf. the hyperetes of a κομογραμματευς in P Mich. VI 423.20 (197). In that case, one could think that Ammonius asks Diodorus to intercede so that he (Ammonius) can obtain the post of hyperetes to Diodorus’ brother, the κομογραμματευς-designate. But this is a mere possibility.

7 πρὸ τοῦνπεριϲπάϲθω. πρὸ τοῦ should be followed by an infinitive in classical Greek, but from the second century the subjunctive is used occasionally. The following examples are known to me: III 611 (ii), XVI 1854 3 (vi/vii), XXXVI 2781 4 (ii), P Lond. IV 1346.10 (710); in BGU III 814.14 (iii) the verb is in the optative because of indirect speech. In 611 and 2781, as here, τουν is written, and the editors of 611 correct into οὗ ἄν, which is unnecessary. See further R. C. Horn, The Use of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods in the Non-Literary Papyri (1926) 128, and B. G. Mandilaras, The Verb §598(19).

περιϲπάϲω ‘draw away, divert, distract’ (LSJ) here in the same sense as μεταπεριϲπάω ‘engage in another liturgy’, which is not in WB nor in LSJ, but see P Merton III 117.4 n.; further examples in DDBDP. There is a space between περι and παϲθω where the sigma should be. Curiously, but it is surely a coincidence, the sigma is inserted above the line in P Merton 117.

8 τογτου. The first υ has been inserted later and is Y-shaped while all others are V-shaped.

9 Μεϲορη .pag. According to Lewis, Compulsory Services 35, the starting date for the office was 1 Mecheir. The arguments for this are found in his On Government and Law 88, where he argues that complaints about nominations to κομογραμματεία seem to come in Mecheir or Tybi and that it is ‘hardly likely that nominations would be made as far back as Tybi (or even Mecheir) for offices to begin the following 1 Thoth. The normal time for such nominations appears, in fact, to have been in the period Pachon–Mesore.’ As Lewis himself admits, there is no conclusive proof. I can only offer the present text as contrary evidence, which points to a starting date on 1 Thoth, unless Ammonius was informing his correspondent five months in advance.

A. BÜLOW-JACOBSEN
4963. Letter of Heraclas to Diogenes

Beginning of a letter. Presumably the letter was rolled vertically and folded once horizontally and broke along this horizontal fold, so that half of the text is missing.

Written along the fibres in a good, rather elegant, upright hand with some corrections by the same writer. No kollesis is visible. The left margin shows a tendency to creep towards the right, in opposition to Maas’s Law.

Heraclas is ill without specifying from what. On top of this there is a visit from someone clearly known to the addressee who is throwing his weight about and seems to have ordered Heraclas’ arrest. The letter is basically incomprehensible because we know nothing of the context. The unnamed person must have been an important one, giving orders and having an assistant.

Ἡρακλᾶϲ Διογένει τῶι ἀδελφῶι χαίρειν.
γράφω ϲοι, ἄδελφε, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον̣ τ̣ῇ νόϲῳ χει-  
μαζόμενοϲ· δ〚ευτέρα〛ιϲϲὴ´ δέ μοι ἐ̣γ̣έ̣νετο `ἡ νόϲοϲ´ καὶ  
ἡ α̣ὐτοῦ ἐ̣πι̣δημία, διότι ἀ̣πρόϊτοϲ εἴμι.

5 υπαγι̣νε̣μένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐ̣νετ̣είλατο  
see also Hsch. a 6834 ἀνέξοδος, and Suda a 3692 (= Ps.-Zon. a 238.4) ὁ μὴ τῆς οἰκίας ἐξερχόμενος. In view of the mention of the disease, it is possible that Heraclas was bedridden and unable to go out of his house, but the subsequent reference to his having ‘to be kept secure’ (6) suggests that he was (also) under arrest.

5 παραγενομένου αὐτοῦ and 7 ὑπηρέτου ἐλθόντος both ignore the basic rule of genitive absolute in having the same subject as the main verb. Confronted with this, Heraclas would undoubtedly have referred to Thucydides 3.13 and Smyth, Greek Grammar § 2073. The construction is not uncommon in the papyri: see Mandilaras, *The Verb* §§909–10. The second case (7) is less clear, and we could give the writer the benefit of the doubt.

6 ἡγούμενῳ. The term is used to refer to a president of a guild or to a praeses of the province Aegyptus Herculia, to which Oxyrhynchus belonged from 315 to 324. The possibilities are discussed by J. R. Rea, *LV* 3792 25 n. Here we only know that the ἡγούμενος receives orders from ‘him’, so he must have been of lower status than ‘him’, which does not help us much.

A. BÜLOW-JACOBSEN

### 4964. List of Hamlets and Requisitioned Workers

This document lists *epoikia* and numbers of men requisitioned for work at Alexandria. The names of the *epoikia* are not attested elsewhere, but they are very probably Oxyrhynchite (cf. 7–8 n.). A date in the earlier part of the fourth century is suggested by the hand and tallies with the fact that the bulk of our evidence for such workers in government service dates from this time.

There is no exact parallel to this text among papyri of this period; only XIV 1747 (iii/iv), which contains a list of persons arranged by village and toparchy, possibly ‘required by the government for work of some kind’, may but need not (cf. XLVI 3307) be comparable. Several fourth-century papyri refer to provision of workers for the quarries at Alexandria, those near Alabastrine, or at the bakeries of Memphis or Alexandria; in addition to those listed in BGU XII 2134 introd., we now have LIV 3727 (303) and BGU XIII 2252 (330). Other contemporary documents attest contributions to the salaries and maintenance of such workers (CPR VI 5.1–9; P. Sakaon 22–25; SB XX 14297; P. Hib. II 220; P. Horak 12; XLVIII 3397). For requisitioned workers in the fourth century, the old study of K. Fitzler, *Steinbrüche und Bergwerke im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten* (1910) 121–5, remains useful.

5 μεριϲμοῦ ἐργατῶν

Ἀλεξανδρείαϲ

ἐποικίων Πυξίνου ἀνδρ(εϲ) γ
ἐποικ(ίου) Ὀρφανοῦ ἀν(ηρ) α

5 ἐποικ(ίου) Ε. ἄτης ἀν(ηρ) α
ἐποικ(ίου) Φανδαρους ἀν(ηρ) α−
ἐποικ(ίου) Νεοφύτου

Caraπίωνοϲ ἀν(δρεϲ) δ´

ἐποικ(ίου) Στύλου ἀν(δρεϲ) β

(ναϲ.?) γ(νονται) ὁμού ἀν(δρεϲ) υβ ἐργάτ[αι

1 ἀνδρ´ 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 ἐποι " 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 ἀν" 10 γ}".

. . . assessment of workers for Alexandria:

'Of the hamlet of Pyxinus, 3 men.

'Of the hamlet of Orphanus, 1 man.

'Of the hamlet of E–ate, 1 man.

'Of the hamlet of Phanbarous, 1 man.

'Of the hamlet of Neophytou Sarapionos, 4 men.

'Of the hamlet of Stylus, 2 men.

'Total 12 men, workers.'

1 μεριϲμοῦ. One may be tempted to resolve (πρῶτοϲ); cf. P. Cair. Isid. 71.2 (314) πρῶτοϲ μεριϲμοῦ (of tax payments), SPP XX 96.2 (c.338) α´ μεριϲμοῦ. The abbreviation itself, however, with alpha intersected by an oblique stroke, suggests reading ἀ(ντίγραφον), but to this there seems to be no parallel. A similar term is used of workers in P. Hib. II 220.5 (335) ύπερ μερον (μέρον(ϲ)) BL IV 40; μερ(ϲιμ)(ϲ) ed. pr., but cf. P. Sakaon 25.i.7 ἐργατῶν. For the meaning of μεριϲμοϲ, a levy divided among the contributors, see C. Salvaterra, Αἰγύπτιος 66 (1986) 57–62.

1–2 ἐργατῶν Ἀλεξανδρείαϲ. The collocation recurs in P. Sakaon 75.2 (316/17 or 331/2 or 346/7), CPR VI 5.2, 11 (336) and SB XX 14297.2 (iv); in the latter two cases, the reference is to ἑπιμεληταὶ ἐργατῶν Ἀλεξανδρείαϲ. In none of these texts is the nature of the work in Alexandria indicated.

3 Πυξίνου. Perhaps from the adjective πύξινοϲ, 'made of boxwood', which occurs in several papyri.

4 Ὀρφανοῦ. Cf. the (rare) personal name Ὀρφανόϲ in P. Bad. II 26.7, 15, P. Leit. 10.1, P. Panop. 22.3 and P. Lond. IV 1419.707 (Πορφανόϲ).

5 Ἐ. ἄτηϲ. The unread letter is unlike anything else in this text. It reminds one of a minute U-shaped kappa, but Ἔκατηϲ is an implausible place name. Alternatively, read Ἐνατηϲ, though nu is difficult; for place names formed by an ordinal number, cf. the άμφος Δεκάτηϲ in Oxyrhynchus (Daris, Δἰομαῖον Suppl. iii 31), the Oxyrhynchite ἐποικ(ίον) Ἐκκαιδεκάτηϲ (P. Lond. III 775.10), or the κλῆϲιον Πρῶτοϲ (SB VIII 6969 passim) in the Hermopolite nome; cf. also Ἐνατοῦ (?) in SPP XX 1 verso.

7–8 Νεοφύτου Καραπίωνοϲ. Cf. the Oxyrhynchite place names Νεοφύτοϲ, Νεοφύτοϲ Βάνοϲ (P. Select. 20.3), Νεοφύτοϲ Ιοντάχου (IXVIII 4702 γ), Νεοφύτοϲ τοῦ Χάριτοϲ (Τύχε 21 (2006) 3, lines 20 with n., 46). Such toponyms seem peculiar to this region, which strengthens the impression that this and the other ἐποικ(ία) in this document are Oxyrhynchite.

9 Στύλου. Perhaps named after a 'pillar' in the area. For Oxyrhynchite ἐφοικία named after natural features, see IV 3804 48 n.

N. LITINAS
The letter is written along the fibres in a fluent documentary hand (cf. e.g. XXXI 2571 of 338). Of the 33 lines, 21 are lacking line beginnings and the first 8–10 letters; the last two lines seem to have been squeezed more narrowly before the end of the sheet.

Ammonius and his brethren write to Philadelphus asking him to receive their brother Nilus, who delivers alms (?) to them. Greetings are sent to everybody in the community of Philadelphus.

A Manichaean background of this letter is evident from the references to the παρακλητικὸς λόγος in 10, the ἐκλεκτοὶ (electi, the elects) and κατηχούμενοι (auditores, catechumens) in 20–21, and the ἀδελφοὶ ἁγίοι and the κατηχούμενοι respectively in 15–16. A teacher mentioned in 30–31 may be a Manichaean church official of the highest rank.

The letter shows the close relationship between the followers of Mani in different places. Close connections between the ἐκλεκτοὶ and κατηχούμενοι were essential for survival, since the ἐκλεκτοὶ were not allowed to produce or prepare their own food but depended on the support of the catechumens.

This is the second letter from Oxyrhynchus that attests a Manichaean community for the city in the fourth century, the other being XXXI 2603 (Christian Letter of Commendation; ed. pr. J. H. Harrop, JEA 48 (1962) 132–40). Manichaeism was quite widespread in Egypt in the fourth century. We know of larger communities in Kellis and Lycopolis at least (see I. Gardner, S. N. C. Lieu, JRS 86 (1996) 146–69).

τῷ κυρίῳ μου] ἀδελφῷ
Philadelpho[ν] Ἀμμώνιος
καὶ οἴ παρ’ ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοὶ
ἐ.10 ἀδελφοὶ καὶ οἱ παρ’ ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοὶ
ἐ.10 ἔμων Νεῖλον
τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ] ἡμῶν Νεῖλον
ἐ.10 ἔμων Νεῖλον
τα . . . ἀπε]νθε άλλα καὶ)
ἐ.7 τοῦ κυρίῳ μου] ἀδελφῷ
καὶ οἱ παρ’ ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοὶ
ἐ.10] θαὶ βουληθέν-
τα . . . ἀπε]νθε άλλα καὶ)
ἐ.7] του κυρίῳ μου] ἀδελφῷ
καὶ οἱ παρ’ ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοὶ
ἐ.10] τοῦ κυρίῳ μου] ἀδελφῷ
\footnotesize

5 μενοι συνόντες

15 παρ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ο[ν] ἀδελφοὶ ἄγιοι
κ[α]ἰ [οί κατηχοῦ]μενοι πάνω
e[ προ[εισφέρους καὶ]
aὐτός, κ[รก]υριε] μου ἀδελφε, προσαγόρευε ἡμῖν τοὺς

20 παρὰ σοι πάντας ἐκλεκτοὺς
tε καὶ κατηχουμένους
καθ' ἕκαστον καὶ μᾶλιστα τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Θεό-
δορον, εἰ ἔτι ὑπάρχειν παρὰ σοι, καὶ τὸν τόν . . . ο[ν] Θεόγνω-

25 στον καὶ ἐπαφροδιτικὸς τον [. . . . δθ[. . . . Α]θανασίου ως
του [. . . .]. μ. [. . .]. δι' ἕτερος

30 ἡμῖν τὰ περὶ τοῦ διδασκαλοῦ, εἰ ἐτυγχάνει . . .]. ε[τ][ύ]γχανε
κύριε μο[υ ἄδελφ`ε']
Back, downwards, along the fibres:

τῷ ἀδελφῷ X Φιλαδέλφῳ Ἀμ[μώνιοϲ]

5 νειλὸς 31 ετ[υ]γχανε

'To my lord brother Philadelphus, Ammonius and the brethren with me, . . . greetings. I have
sent our brother Nilus . . . who wanted . . . , but also that you may . . . receive together with the am-
bassador . . . , you and the brethren at your place in faith of the Paracletic Mind; for nothing more
holy(?) has he commanded us. All those gathered . . . with me, the holy brethren and the catechumens

greet you fully, and you yourself, my master brother, greet for us all the elects and catechumens, one
by one, and in particular our brother Theodorus, if he is with you, and the . . . Theognostus, and

with a warm heart . . . of Athanasius that . . . through another . . . Tell us about the Teacher, if he
was . . . , my lord brother.'

Back: 'To my brother Philadelphus, Ammonius.'

4 e.5 πλείοντα with spatium at line beginning, or [ἐν θ(ε)ῷ πλεῖον]τα? But the trace on the edge,
the right end of a horizontal, is too high for a, and rather suggests c or e.
6 ἐπανέρχεσθαι or similar.
7 E.g. εὐθὺς ἀπέλυσα or χθῆς ἀπέλυσα.
8 If the general sense of 5–13 is not misunderstood, the object of ἐποίησε (13) should be
something very valuable for the Manichaean brothers. The terminus technicus for the alms is εὐδεξερα or
agape, but neither would be possible as object on palaeographical grounds. epiphō the verb does not agree with the subject, but could also mean the alimentary support of the elects; cf. P. Kell. I Gr. 63:3–4.

8–9 ἀκόν τοῖς κατὰ | τὸ πάνταν οὐ δακρυος. The τόπος is the place where the Manichaeans meet and live together; cf. the τόπος Μανι in Kellis (P. Kell. IV Gr. 96.320 and 513, and discussion ad loc.), and XXXI 2603:35. The word can also designate a monastery:

9–10 παράκλητον τῷ παρακλητικῷ λόγῳ. The παρακλητικός λόγος can hardly be a consolatory speech: 12–13 make it clear that it must be an authority. Mani is the paraclete, usually not the παράκλητον τοῦ παρακλητικοῦ λόγου; cf. P. Harris I 107.6–7, where Mani is called the παράκλητον πνεύμα.

(παρακλητικός is v. l. for παράκλητον in Epiph. Adv. Haer. 74.7, p. 324.3 Holl, in the important MS J; cf. here 26.) Manichaeans might have called Mani the λόγος, for that was also Christ’s name. For a putative use of termi non technici in this letter, see also 8 n.

11 ἀποθέσις τοῦ αἱγάλα: the word may be too legalistic; cf. P. Tor. Choach. 12 ii 7, iii 30.

13 [άγιοτέρον]. [καυματοτέρον] could also be considered here.

14 πάντες οἱ διμυσαγνοι εὐνόμους or some similar locution.

15–16 οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἄγνοι | οἱ κατηχούμενοι. Cf. 19–21 παρὰ οἱ πάντας ἐκλεκτοὶ | τε καὶ κατηχουμένοι. Manicheism was a firmly hierarchical religion in which only the elect were able to receive the last blessings through observation of strict rules and avoidance of ‘hurting’ the light-particles that, as they believed, are included in all organic material; they were therefore not allowed to bake their own bread, to harvest or even to ‘hurt’ the water by washing themselves. The term of ἀδελφοι ἄγνοι for the elects is attested in the Kephalaia of the Teacher 8.16, p. 37 Schmidt.

25 τοῦ . . . εἰνον. After ν negligible traces of two or three letters, of which the second may be τ; after ζa possible. No plausible adjective comes to mind.

26 εἰσαφροδίτως obviously for ἐπαφροδίτως. The additional κικ can also be observed in παρα-, κλήτικω λόγῳ (10); cf. Alciphr. 4.16.4 ὑποδέξομαι δή σε ἐπαφροδίτως; ’’feliciter’’: see P. J. Parsons, JEA 57 (1971) 166 n. 1.

27 τοῦ . . . Α[θανασίου]. με[τά does not fit the traces.

29 At the beginning perhaps ἐπιτολῆς.

30–31 διασκεδάζων. ‘Teacher’ is the title of the second-highest official in the Manichaean church hierarchy; there were 12 ‘Teachers’, and there can be no doubt that one of them would have been stationed in Egypt. Certain private letters in Coptic from Kellis show that such a ‘Teacher’ was busy traveling up and down the Nile (for missionary reasons?) in the middle of the fourth century (P. Kell. V 20.24, 24.17, 25.42, 49, 29.14, 52.4); of course, it cannot be ruled out completely that an ordinary teacher is meant here.

31 Perhaps οἱ παρῶν] ἔχει[, a possible form of κοιμάζεσθαι.

C. E. ROMER

4966. Sale of Irrigation Implements

50 4B.24/K(1–2)a 15.2 × 16.3 cm 16 March 371

The object of the sale is unusual: a half part of the irrigation devices attached to a well. The price, 12 artabas of wheat, seems low, but we do not know what these devices were. Irrigation equipment was occasionally included in sales of land (cf.
the list in Rowlandson, *Landowners and Tenants* 320), but I am not aware of any other instance of its being sold separately.

The buyer is someone described as a senator, probably a member of the new aristocracy recruited in increasing numbers for the Constantinopolitan senate in the 350s and 360s. His name, Isidorus, as well as the fact that he is described as a landowner in Oxyrhynchus, may suggest that he was an Egyptian, which would make him one of the very few Egyptian senators of the fourth century. He would also be the first Egyptian landowner of senatorial standing to be attested in papyri of this period.

The back is blank.

μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Ὀυαλεντι(νανοῦ)
καὶ Οὐαλεντίς ἵμων Ὀυαλεντίς κ.
Ἀφροδίτης ἤπειρος τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ εὐφυκλη-
tικῷ γεομήχανην ἐν τῇ λαμ(πρά) καὶ λαμ(προτάτῃ) Ὁξυρηνχιτῶν πό(λει)
Ἀφροδίτης ἤπειρος τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ εὐφυκλη-
tικῷ γεομήχανην ἐν τῇ λαμ(πρά) καὶ λαμ(προτάτῃ) Ὁξυρηνχιτῶν πό(λει)
Αὐρήλιος Ἠλιος Ὀυλιανοῦ ᾧ τὸ λαμπροτάτῳ
ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ πεπρακέ-
ναι καὶ παρακεχωρηκέναι σοι ἐπετεύθεν
τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐπιβάλλον ἀριστοκράτους συγκλή-
tικοῦ λαμπροτάτης Ὀξυρηνχιτῶν πόλεως
μέρος μηχανικῶν ὀργάνων ἐπικειμένων

After the consulship of our masters Valentinianus and Valens, eternal Augusti, for the 3rd time, Phamenoth 20.

'To Flavius Isidorus, vir clarissimus, senator, landowner in the splendid and most splendid city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius —cholius, son of Iulianus, ex-curator, from the same city, greetings. I acknowledge having sold and ceded to you henceforth my own and falling to me entire half share of irrigation implements installed in the wells of the ground of Lycon near the village of Paemis of the 4th pagus, the price of my same half-share being agreed between us at twelve artabas of wheat, art. 12,
which I received from you on the spot in full hand to hand, concerning which sum I was asked
the formal question and assented, so that from now on you and your descendants and your successors
may have possession and ownership and you may have the power . . .'

1–2 On the third consulship of Valentinianus and Valens, see CLRE 369–70, and CSBE 2 188–
9. This is the latest occurrence of their postconsulate; the consuls of 371 are first attested on 23 July.

1 Οὐαλεντι(νιανοῦ). It is unusual to find a consul’s name abbreviated, though cf. CPR XIX

3–4 Φλαουΐῳ Ἰϲιδώρῳ τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ ϲυγκλη[τικῷ. See above, introd. Isidorus must have
been one of the new Constantinopolitan senators enrolled in increasing numbers since the 350s; see
P. Heather, ‘New Men for New Constantines? Creating an Imperial Elite in the Eastern Mediterr-
a career as a senior imperial functionary, but there is no need to assume that he was the same as the
one who served as praefectus annonae (Africae) some time in 368–75 (Isidorus 1, PLRE I 465).

The term ςυγκλητικόϲ has not occurred in any other papyrus, but is fairly common in inscrip-
tions, especially of the earlier Roman period, and in literary texts. (Ϲυγκλητικῆϲ in LIX 4004 14,
a fifth-century letter, seems to be a personal name.)

4 γεουχοῦντι ἐν τῇ λα(πρῇ) καὶ λα(προτάτῃ) Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πό(λει). This is the earliest
instance of this expression, which becomes common from the fifth century on. The contemporary
BGU XIII 2339.5 (378) has γεουχοῦντι ἐν τῷ Ὀξυρυγχίτῃ.

5 ] χόλιοϲ. The only name that could provide a match is Αχόλιοϲ, but it is generally very rare;
it has occurred only once in papyri, in P. Horak 21.9 (Ant.?; v).

Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀπὸ λογιϲτῶν. On Iulianus’ career, see P. Oxy. LI V pp. 225–6 and LX 4092 introd.
The present document does not specify whether Iulianus was alive; his latest previous attestation is in
4092 of 355 (pace 4092 introd., Fl. Iulianus, who serves on the staff of the praeses of Augustamnica
and appears as the lessor in PSI V 467 of 360, a lease of a room in Oxyrhynchus, is in my view not
the same man). In 4092 Iulianus and his sister appear as owners of land property κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον
ἐκάστῳ ἥμιϲυ μέροϲ (5), which seems to suggest an inheritance divided equally between the two sib-
lings. See further next note.

8–9 τὸ κατ’ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐπιβάλλον ὅλοκληρον ἥμιϲυ μέροϲ. This collocation has not been attested
otherwise, but is equivalent to τὸ ὑπάρχον (or αἱροῦν) καὶ ἐπιβάλλον μοι μέροϲ, which is fairly
common.

Though these are different properties, this half share could conceivably be related to the half
share of Iulianus in 4092 5. If the latter share goes back to a division of the estate of Iulianus’ father,
the division would have involved irrigation devices too. The purchase of the half share by Isidorus
would be sensible if he had acquired or was about to acquire the other half. A potential difficulty is
that the irrigation machinery is not said to lie in a private property (cf. PSI IX 1078.11–12, quoted
below), but in an ἐδάφοϲ, a topographical description with no connotations of ownership.

9 μηχανικῶν ὀργάνων. This is the earliest attestation of this collocation.

9–10 ἐπικειμένων ὑδρεύμαϲι. Cf. LI 3638 8 (220) ὑδρεύματων καὶ τῆϲ ἐπικειμένηϲ αὐτοῦϲ
μηχανῆϲ; sim. SB XX 1429.15 (iii), XXXIV 2723 10–11 (469), and (more remotely) PSI IX 1078.11–12
(336) ἄροιμας δεας εἰς ἐν ὕδρευμαϲ καὶ μηχανῆϲ καὶ ἄρρητα.

10 ἐδάφουϲ Λύκωνοϲ. This locality is apparently new. It is unclear whether it is related to the
settlement of this name attested in XVI 2000 2 and XVIII 2197 27.

11 Πάειμιν δ’ πάγου. Paeimis belonged in the Western toparchy; its pagus location was not
known previously. The reading of the figure as δ is preferable to χ, the only other alternative.

12–13 The addition of τοῦ . . . μέρουϲ is not strictly necessary, though cf. PSI VI 705.10 (iii).

13 εἰτὸν ἀρταβῶν δώδεκα. As far as I can see, there is no information for other such prices at
that time; that 10 artabas of wheat were paid as rent of an ὀργανόν at Hermonthis in 336 (P. Lond. I 125.16–17 (p. 192), with BL X 97) is the closest to comparative evidence we possess. The only prices of irrigation machinery we have come from the sixth century.

15 περὶ τῆς ἄρθρωσεως. On this phrase, see LXIX 4751 10 n.

N. GONIS

4967. WORK CONTRACT OF PUBLIC HERALD

Only the lower part of this document has survived. The back is blank. Six visible vertical creases suggest that the document was rolled and flattened along its vertical axis from the right to the left side. The rather even damage at the top may have been caused by a horizontal fold, in which case half of the original document in now lost (date, parties and the beginning of the agreement). With the exception of a small margin on the right side, there is virtually no free space on the right and the bottom. The entire document appears to be the product of a single hand, which is practised, but does not offer any particular features for dating the document more precisely than the late sixth or early seventh centuries.

The papyrus records a work contract between an unknown party and Peter son of John for the position of (public) herald to start on 1 Pachon of a fifteenth indication. Peter acknowledges receipt of the wand and bells (the official ‘gear’ of the herald) and, as in several other work contracts from this period, agrees to serve for one year. If he withdraws from his position before the end of the year, he will lose his wages; if he is dismissed unreasonably, the hiring party will pay him wages for the entire year.

This is the only contract to provide direct information about town criers, including their gear and the duration of their service in this period. Unfortunately, very little is known about this profession in late antiquity (this is by far the latest reference), but it is unlikely that their duties changed dramatically from the Ptolemaic or Roman times. Town criers were probably the most important means of mass communication on the local level in the ancient world and the Middle Ages, when the rates of literacy were very low. As we might expect, town criers were expected to have the ability to speak well and have a stentorian voice. Ironically, our town crier is illiterate (he cannot sign his own name), so he clearly learned by heart the pronouncements he had to make. Posting announcements in public spaces (especially in the market-place; see P. Mich. XVIII 795.5 n.) was a complementary way of disseminating information, but was intended mostly for those who had at least the ability to read. According to R. Taubenschlag, ‘The Herald in the Law of the Papyri’, Opera minora ii (Warsaw 1959) 151–7, town criers are found in a variety
of religious, administrative and public contexts: they make announcements about taxes, emancipation of slaves, sales by auction, leases of land, and summon people in judicial proceedings. More recent studies have shown that town criers in Roman Oxyrhynchus were organized as corporations or colleges for cultic and business activities and were stationed at the temple of Thoeris; see J. R. Rea, *ZPE* 79 (1989) 202; for the Ἐξαγορεῖον of Oxyrhynchus, see LXIV 4441 v 13 n., and for the ἀμφοδὸν Ἐξαγορίου, see LXVIII 4689 11. For the early Islamic period, see P. M. Sijpesteijn, *Shaping a Muslim State* (Diss. Princeton 2004) 145 n. 103. On heralds and town criers in classical Greece, see Sian Lewis, *News and Society in the Greek Polis* (1996) 52–6.

4967 presents many similarities with several Oxyrhynchite contracts of the same period, in particular the better-preserved LVIII 3933 (588), a goldsmith’s work contract. For a list and discussion of work contracts from Byzantine Egypt, see A. Jördens, *Vertragliche Regelungen von Arbeiten im späten griechischsprachigen Ägypten = P. Heid. V* (1990) 130–84, to which add from Oxyrhynchus LVIII 3933, 3942, 3952, 3958 (perhaps also 3943–6), and LXXII 4910.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{̣ ̣ ̣}[ & \text{c.12} & \text{τὴν χώραν τοῦ κηρυκτοῦ ἐπὶ ἐνιαυτὸν} & \text{λογιζόμενον ἀπὸ νεομηνίας τοῦ παρόντος} & \text{μηνὸς Παχὼν τῆς παρούσης ἐνδικτίων ἀόκνω[ε]}}
\end{align*}
\]

5 καὶ ἀμέμπτων καὶ ἀκαταγνώστως δεχόμενος

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τὸ ἐμὸν ὀψώνιον ἄτοι μισθὸν παντὸς τοῦ ἐνός} & \text{ἐνιαυτοῦ κατὰ μήμην τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἑταίρου. ὁμολογῶ δὲ} \\
\text{ἐξχειρίζεται παρ’ ὑμῶν τὴν ράβδον τοῦ κηρυκτοῦ} & \text{μετὰ τῶν} \\
\text{αὐτοῦ κωδωνίων καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι με ἐπαναχωρήσαι} & \text{τῆς αὐτῆς λειτουργίας πρὸ τέλους τοῦ ἐνός ἐνιαυτοῦ} \\
\text{δίχα ἀρφοστείας καὶ πόνου τινός. εἰ δὲ τοῦτο πούῆςω} & \text{ὁμολογῶ δὲ} \\
\text{κάγω ἐκβλήθη παρ’ ὑμῶν πρὸ τέλους τοῦ ἐνός} & \text{τῆς αὐτῆς δίχα εὐλόγου αἰτίας, ἐπὶ τὸ καὶ ὑμᾶς} \\
\text{πληρώσαι τὸν ἐμὸν μισθόν. κύρ(ιον) τὸ κυνάλλαγ(α)} & \text{ἀπλ[οῦν] γραφ[ὲν] καὶ ἐπερ[ωτηθεὶϲ] ὡμολ(όγηϲα).} \\
\text{Ἰωάννηϲ ἀξ[ιωθεὶϲ] ἔγραψ[α] (ὑπὲρ) αὐτοῦ ἀγραμ[άτου] ὄντοϲ.} & \text{† Πέτροϲ κηρυκτὴϲ υἱὸϲ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{...[.][.][..][.][..][..][.]} & \text{[c.12]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{4 νῦδ} & \text{5 ἀμέμπτως} & \text{8 ὑμῶν} & \text{9 κωδωνίων} \\
\text{crossed out?} & \text{11 ἀρφοστείας} & \text{14 τῶ ὑμῶς} & \text{15 κυρ} & \text{15, 17 κυνάλλαγ(α)}
\end{align*}
\]
‘... the position of herald for one year reckoned from the first of the present month Pachon of the present 15th indiction, without hesitation and blame and condemnation, receiving my salary, that is, wages, for the entire one year similarly to my partner. I also acknowledge that I have received from you the herald with his bells and I shall not be able to withdraw from this service before the end of the year, except in cases of illness or pain. And if I do this, I agree to suffer loss of my wages, but also if I am ejected by you before the end of the year without any reasonable cause, you will pay my wage. The contract, written in a single copy, is binding and in answer to the formal question I gave my consent.

‘I, Peter, herald, son of John, the aforesaid—the present contract satisfies me as aforesaid. I, John, having been requested, signed on his behalf since he is illiterate.’

(2nd hand) ‘Through me (name) it was concluded.’
9 ἐπαναχωρήσαι. The last three letters are literally squeezed on the right edge of the papyrus. The verb ἐπαναχωρέω, ‘to withdraw’, is rare in the papyri and appears only in late documents (I 128 2, P. Ehl. 74.5, P. Lond. V 1727.16).

11 δίχα ἄριστείας καὶ πόνου τινός. Normally this expression appears as part of the ‘behaviour’ clause (see above, 4–5 n.), but in this case it was probably split because of the reference to the ‘gear’ of the herald. The two words juxtaposed in work contracts appear to be an Oxyrhynchite feature (I 140 17, LI 3641 12).

11–15 The work-related penalty involving the salary is standard; see P. Heid. V pp. 161–2. For similar stipulations in Oxyrhynchite examples, see e.g. 3933 21–7. In 140 25–9 (550), a horse-trainer promises to return double the amount of earnest-money in case he withdraws from his duties before the year ends, but he will keep it if he is dismissed without justification.

14–15 ἐπὶ τὸ (l. τῷ) καὶ ὑμᾶς πληρῶς. This construction instead of a regular main clause in the apodosis is found in several late documents; see e.g. 3933 23, 26, and especially 140 28. For another similar construction, see my comments in BASP 45 (2008) 67 (18–23 n.).

18 The signatory John and Peter’s father must be a case of synonymy, since the name was very common.

19 The name of the scribe is very hard to decipher. Either it must have been short or it was abbreviated. Of the verb only et is clearly visible. The rest was written in Verschleifung.

T. GAGOS