

X.—Critical Notes on Papyri and Ostraca

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

This article consists of five notes which examine hitherto unresolved difficulties in four papyri and one ostrakon. The results obtained may be summarized as follows: (1) *PFuad* 37, παραξημι = παράξημι = παρέξημι; (2) *CPR* 40, ἐνουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι a blunder for ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι; (3) *PStrassb.* 73, οὔπω ὡμῶς ἔσχον a blunder for οὔπω κομῶς (= κομψῶς) ἔσχον; (4) *PWarren* 4, πλ. . η an incomplete reading of πλωτή; (5) *Ostr. Strassb.* 654, λόγ(ος) ἀργ(υρικῶν) an error for λόγ(ος) ἀργ(ας).

1. *PFuad* 37

This text is a contract of apprenticeship drawn up in 48 A.D., in which a master weaver acknowledges his own obligations, at the same time fixing the obligations that rest on the father of the apprentice.¹ The statement of these begins in line 4 of the text and includes two verbs which are without parallel.

. . . σοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς τρέφοντος αὐτὸν καὶ ἱ[ματί]ζοντος, ὃν καὶ παράξημι παραμένοντα πρὸς [τῇ μ]αθήσει αὐτὰς τὰς ἡμέρας ὑπήκοον ὄντα ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν τέχνην. ἀργήσῃ τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὃν (= ὧν) καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ μισθοῦ ὑπολογήσω, τῶν δὲ πλεόνων τοῦ μὲν μισθοῦ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ὑπολογήσω, ἀντιπαράξημι δὲ αὐτὸν τὰς [ῖσ]ας² μετὰ τὸν χρόνον. . .

Scherer finds παράξημι and ἀντιπαράξημι “disconcerting.” If he accepts them as “strange” futures of παρέχω and ἀντιπαρέχω, that is because παρέχω is frequently used in the same context in deeds of apprenticeship.³ Taken in this way, they can represent only the first person singular, and the weaver declares, according to Scherer: “I will keep him with me.” We are thus asked to believe that new MI-verbs were being coined at a time when the few remaining

¹ Edited by J. Scherer in *Les Papyrus Fouad I (Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents* 3, Cairo, 1939) 93–97. A bibliography of the standard works on the apprentice contracts of Graeco-Roman Egypt is given on p. 94.

² τὰς ῖσ]ας Scherer. The papyrus is reproduced on Plate II at the end of the volume.

³ A. Zambon, *Διδασκαλικά*, *Aegyptus* 15 (1935) 51. *BGU* 4.1125.8 presents the sole example of ἀντιπαρέχω recorded by F. Preisigke and E. Kiessling, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin, 1925–31), but significant is the fact that the context is the same as in *PFuad* 37. Kiessling's continuation of the *Wörterbuch* (Berlin, 1944) has no example of the verb.

verbs of this type were struggling against extinction.⁴ Equally arresting is the hitherto unattested meaning assigned to *παρέχω*; it may fairly be called the converse of its usual meaning.⁵ This verb is regularly used of the person — parent, guardian, or slave owner — who undertakes to “produce” the apprentice for daily instruction and work with a master craftsman. The editor of *PFuad 37* was aware of the difficulties, and his note on the passage can be read with profit.⁶

In a comprehensive treatment of the institution known as *paramone*, Westermann has also had occasion to study *PFuad 37*.⁷ While rightly retaining Scherer’s text, he refers *παράξημι* to *παράγω*, not to *παρέχω*, and the weaver now promises to “direct” his apprentice in the duties of the craft.⁸ On either view, the startling emergence of new MI-verbs, and moreover in the future tense, remains unexplained, but Scherer has the advantage of assimilating these embarrassing forms to *παρέχω*, which appears repeatedly in other agreements of the same kind. Up to the present moment, at any rate, *παράγω* has found no place in these documents.

So far as I can see, there is only one way of investigating further the supposed MI-verbs in *PFuad 37*. A selection of pertinent parallel passages must be assembled from apprentice contracts and *paramone* agreements. Their syntactical structure may tell us something that we need to know for understanding *παράξημι* and *ἀντιπαράξημι*.

⁴ L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1, Tübingen, 1925) 96–101; “Koine” (*SAWW* 224 [1947] 5) 36.

⁵ Cf. my remarks in *CW* 37 (1943–44) 8.

⁶ Scherer, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 97: “Cette forme de futur est déconcertante. Il faut sans doute la rattacher à *παρέχειν*. Ce verbe est d’usage fréquent dans les contrats d’apprentissage; mais, d’après tous les exemples connus jusqu’ici, il apparaissait seulement dans les actes établis au nom du père ou du tuteur de l’apprenti: il a alors son sens ordinaire de *présenter*, tenir à la disposition, *donner*. Ce sens est impossible ici, où le contrat est établi au nom du patron. Sans pénétrer les causes qui ont pu déterminer le scribe à choisir, ou à imaginer, cet étrange futur, nous verrions volontiers dans *παράξημι* un composé de *παρά* et de *ἔχειν*, mais où les deux éléments seraient moins combinés que juxtaposés, chacun d’eux gardant sa valeur propre: *ἔχειν* son sens — très classique — de *garder*, *retenir*, et *παρά* la valeur technique et quasi-juridique qu’il a, par exemple, dans *παράμενειν* ou *παράμνη*.”

⁷ W. L. Westermann, “The Paramone as General Service Contract” (*Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 2, 1948) 30.

⁸ *Ibid.*; cf. note 69: “Scherer, the editor, found the futures *παράξημι* and *ἀντιπαράξημι* in line 6, ‘disconcerting’: but certainly these futures derive from *παράγειν*, not from *παρέχειν*. The meaning, then, is: ‘I will lead him along (that is, guide him), he performing services, etc.’”

- (1) *BGU* 4.1125: a slave is apprenticed to a musician; document badly damaged.

8. ἀντιπαρέ[ξω σο]ι αὐτὸν παρα[μένον]τα

- (2) *POxy.* 4.725 (= Hunt and Edgar, *Select Papyri* 1.14): a boy is apprenticed to a weaver.

9 f. κ]αὶ παρέξει αὐτὸν προσεδρεύοντα τῷ διδασκάλῳ

42 ff. παρέξει αὐτὸν . . . τῷ διδασκάλ[λ]ῳ . . . παραμένοντα

- (3) *PTeb.* 2.384: a boy is placed in service by his brothers.

20 ff. παρ]εξόμεθα τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑμῶν (= ἡμῶν) . . . π[αραμέ]νοντα αὐτῷ

- (4) *PFlor.* 1.44: a boy is placed in service by his parents.

17 ff. παρέξον[σι τὸ]ν ἑαυτῶν υἱὸν . . . [παρ]αμένοντα τῷ [Δ]ημητρ[ί]ῳ

- (5) *PMich.* 5.241: a young man accepts service in a pottery.

31 f. παρέξεσθ[α]μι τὸν Διόνη *ἐα* <ν> τὸν παραμένοντα τῷ Πάτρωνι

- (6) *POxy.* 14.1647: a slave is apprenticed to a weaver.

18 f. καὶ παρέξεσθαι αὐτὴν τῷ διδασκάλῳ

- (7) *BGU* 4.1021: a slave is apprenticed to a hairdresser.

11 f. παρέξεται αὐτὸν . . . τῷ διδασκάλῳ

The use of *παρέχω* might be further illustrated, but the examples cited above will suffice for our purpose. Nos. 1–5 follow an identical syntactical pattern. Its elements are variously placed, but they are always present:

- (a) the verb *παρέχω* or *ἀντιπαρέχω*, active or middle,
- (b) an accusative object of the verb (*ἀδελφόν*, *αὐτόν*, *ἑαυτόν*, *υἱόν*),
- (c) an accusative participle (*παραμένοντα*, *προσεδρεύοντα*),
- (d) a dative object of the verb or a dative complement of the participle.⁹

Nos. 6 and 7 omit the participle, and the dative in consequence depends necessarily from the verb.

The corresponding clauses as now read in *PFuad* 37 are *ὃν καὶ παράξῃμι παραμένοντα* and *ἀντιπαράξῃμι δὲ αὐτόν*. These would conform to the patterns analyzed in the preceding paragraph if each included a noun or pronoun in the dative case. The absence of a dative and the presence of new verbs ending in *-μι* strongly suggest that *μι* is in reality *μοι*.¹⁰ With this hypothesis the verbs are trans-

⁹ The examples cited show that the dative may be felt at times to be in an *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* construction with the verb and the participle.

¹⁰ The complete surrender of *οι* to itacism was not achieved before the 5th–10th cent. A.D. (N. Bachtin, *Introd. to the Study of Modern Greek* [Cambridge, 1935] 26–28),

formed into παράξη μι and ἀντιπαράξη μι, and in the conventional orthography the clauses then read as follows: ὃν καὶ παρέξη¹¹ μοι παραμένοντα and ἀντιπαρέξη μοι δέ¹² αὐτόν.

Since the Fuad papyrus is an apprentice contract addressed by a master weaver to the father of the apprentice, verbs in the second person singular middle are entirely appropriate. It is naturally the father who is obliged to "produce" the boy for daily attendance on the master.

2. CPR 40

In 1895 Carl Wessely published CPR 40 and 41, which are chirographs of the years 301 and 305 A.D. from Heracleopolis.¹³ Beginning with an epistolary prescript, they continue with μεμίσθωμα παρὰ σοῦ (παρ' ὑμῶν) κτλ. in the ordinary manner of land-leases.¹⁴ The terms that follow are quite unremarkable, except for a clause introduced into the statements of the rental. There are minor lacunae at this point in both documents, but the passages supplement each other throughout. No. 40 has φόρο[υ οὗ] ἐνουσίως ἐπεδεξά[μην], and No. 41 ἐκφορίου οὗ ἐ[νο]υσίως ἐπεδεξάμην.¹⁵ Relying on the obvious derivation of ἐνουσίως from οὐσία, "property," Wessely saw here an undertaking to pay a rental secured by a pledge of such property as the lessee possessed in his own right.¹⁶ With this

but sporadic examples are found much earlier. See E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 1 (Leipzig, 1906) 111 f.; cf., e.g., POslo 2.18.3; 3.71.225 f. (with note *ad loc.*), 133.11 (app. crit.).

¹¹ Assimilation of ε to α in the vicinity of ρ is well known. See Mayser, *op. cit.* 60; K. Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache* (Byzant. Archiv 1, Leipzig, 1898) 4 ff. This substitution, however, is usually effected in unaccented syllables. The grammars exhibit examples of α assimilated to ε in accented syllables, but not ε assimilated to α. See Dieterich, *op. cit.* 10 f.; S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristl. Zeit* (Münch. Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung 28, 1938) 34 f. Mayser, *op. cit.* 60, 151, explains παραθήσεται = παρῆθεται and παρανοχλεῖ <σ>θω = παρενοχλείσθω as due to a scribe's consciousness of the preposition; παράξη and ἀντιπαράξη could also be brought under this head. Especially pertinent to our problem is PPrinceton 2.70.9, ἀνάθη = ἀνέθη.

¹² On the position of δέ consult Mayser, *op. cit.* 2.3.125; J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1934) 185 ff. Most pertinent is PTeb. 1.34.13: γράφω σοι δέ κτλ.

¹³ For a brief description of the chirograph see L. Mitteis and U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912) 2.1.55 f.

¹⁴ H. Comfort, "Notes on 'Requests' and ΧΕΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΑ among late Byzantine Land-Leases," *Aegyptus* 14 (1934) 286, note 2.

¹⁵ ἐ[νο]υσίως = ἐνουσίως. Interchange of omicron and omega is a standard feature of vulgar Greek.

¹⁶ Wessely translates No. 40: "Der Grundzins, dessen Zahlung ich bei Haftung mit meiner Habe übernommen"; No. 41: "Der Grundzins, für den ich mit meiner Habe hafte."

understanding of *ἐνοῦσις* Wessely then drew the inference that failure to pay the stipulated sum would entail consequences not for the person of the lessee but solely for his property.¹⁷

Wessely's reading has never been questioned and his interpretation has been utilized by a number of distinguished legal scholars. Brassloff reprinted Wessely's text and translation, but he did not discuss *ἐνοῦσις*.¹⁸ Waszynski's use of *CPR* 40 and 41 assumed that Wessely's point of view lay beyond doubt.¹⁹ Gentilli's approach was more critical. He believed for a time that *ἐνοῦσις* was a scribal blunder for *ἐνιαῦσις*. When Vitelli convinced him that the latter was not suitable, he accepted *ἐνοῦσις* as genuine, but even then he was not sure what was meant by the word.²⁰ For Manigk, however, *ἐνοῦσις* was "das entscheidende Wort" and "das für die Annahme einer dinglichen Haftung entscheidende."²¹ Partsch, in his turn, had a difference of opinion with Manigk on the exact bearing of *ἐπιδέχομαι*, but this did not exclude agreement on the significance of *ἐνοῦσις*.²²

We may safely say that the word is part of our papyrological tradition, especially now that it has found a place in lexicon and grammar. *LSJ* cites it from *CPR* 40 as meaning "on the security of one's property." Preisigke enters *CPR* 40 and 41 under *ἐνούσιος*, to which he gives a novel and startling definition: "was seinem Umfange nach bekannt ist."²³ Preisigke does not explain his departure from the generally accepted view, but it is clear that he applies the adverb to the rental and not to property offered as security for the rental. From Preisigke the word has been borrowed

¹⁷ Wessely's note to 40.15: "Die Personalexecution erscheint hier nicht mehr."

¹⁸ S. Brassloff, "Zur Geschichte des römischen Compensationsrechtes," *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung*, rom. Abt., 21 (1900) 364 f., 368 (note 1).

¹⁹ S. Waszynski, *Die Bodenpacht* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1905) 148.

²⁰ G. Gentilli, "Dagli antichi contratti d'affitto," *Stud. Ital.* 13 (1905) 346, 376: "Avevo fatto *ἐνοῦσις* = *ἐνιαῦσις*; ma giustamente mi fece notare il prof. Vitelli la poca verisimiglianza di questa interpretazione; nè d'altronde è più verosimile quella data dal Wessely. . . . Che la frase possa significare: al qual canone mi obbligo io stesso, io in persona (in sostanza)?" The ground of Vitelli's objection is not stated, but one may suppose that it rested on the fact that *CPR* 40 and 41 are leases for one year only. In papyri *ἐνιαῦσις*, like *κατ' ἔτος*, means "annually," not "for the year." Cf. *POslo* 2.35.14-15, note.

²¹ A. Manigk, "Gräko-ägyptisches Pfandrecht," *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung* 30 (1909) 273; "Pfandrechtlisches," *APF* 6 (1920) 118. M. Modica, *Introduzione allo studio della Papirologia Giuridica* (Milan, 1914) 277, follows Manigk without discussion.

²² J. Partsch, "Juristische Literaturübersicht," *APF* 5 (1913) 504, note 3; "Erwiderung," *APF* 6 (1920) 123.

²³ Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 3) s.v.

by Palmer for his grammar, where it is listed among new adjectives in -ως.²⁴

This is surely an impressive tradition. Wessely's reading has survived a good deal of handling, and his interpretation was doubted only by Gentilli in 1905 and rejected only by Preisigke some twenty years later. And yet, the massed authority of great names cannot conceal the interesting fact that more than fifty years have passed since the publication of *CPR* 40 and thousands of new texts have become known without disclosing a second example of ἐνουσίως. The number of leases has increased considerably,²⁵ and still only *CPR* 40 has ἐνουσίως. Where materials are plentiful and the texts are in large measure formulaic, the unique word is disturbing.²⁶ Neither the adjective nor the adverb plays any part in classical or Hellenistic Greek. *LSJ* cites the adjective only from Hesychius, who defined it as synonymous with συμφυής on the one hand and with πολυκτήμων on the other, and neither of these suits the passage in *CPR* 40. Otherwise it is a theological word which Christian writers from the fourth century onward found useful in trying to express the nature of the Persons in the Trinity.²⁷ When Wessely, Gentilli, and Preisigke fell back on definitions formulated *ad hoc*, the simple truth is that they had no alternative if they were to define at all.

The persistence of Wessely's interpretation, which now has the sanction of *LSJ*, is the more surprising when we consider that the same idea is elsewhere in papyri, both in leases and in other contracts, repeatedly rendered by the simple and completely intelligible phrase ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, which is regularly part of the executory clause and not of the statement of rental. A good example is *POxy.* 3.499.29 ff.: ἡ πράξις ἔστω τῷ με[μισθω]κότῃ [ἐκ τε] τοῦ [αὐτοῦ] Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ πάντων καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης. In *CPR* 40 and 41 this clause is reduced to the participial clause

²⁴ L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* 1 (*Publications of the Philological Society* 13, London, 1946) 33. It is a weakness of Palmer's method that he has too often taken his words from Preisigke without criticism. How fallible Preisigke could be on occasion, is now shown by Kiessling's revision and continuation of the *Wörterbuch*.

²⁵ H. Comfort, "Prolegomena to a Study of Late Byzantine Land-Leases," *Aegyptus* 13 (1933) 589.

²⁶ See my remarks in *TAPhA* 76 (1945) 148, note 52.

²⁷ J. C. Suicer, *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* (Amsterdam, 1728) s.v.; *TLG* s.v.; E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Cambridge, U.S.A., 1914) s.v.

πράσσοντι καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης, but the legal implications are the same.²⁸

The difficulties so far enumerated can be quickly summarized. The word ἐνουσίως is suspect because it is unique in papyri; its meaning has been determined *ad hoc*; and it is wrongly placed if it has this meaning. Each of these obstacles taken by itself could be overcome, but taken together they offer a formidable resistance. And the way to an explanation will remain blocked so long as attention is concentrated on ἐνουσίως to the exclusion of ἐπιδέχομαι. In order to see what is wrong, one need only fix his eye on ἐνουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι as a unit. A reasonable familiarity with leases, from the third to the sixth centuries, will soon bring up the closely similar expression ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι, which is used over and over again to introduce the main body of such agreements.²⁹ A difference of only one letter — *nu* for *kappa* — distinguishes the exceptional ἐνουσίως from the very common ἐκουσίως. I suggest that either the scribe erred in writing the one for the other, a sheer blunder, or the editor mistook a broadly written *kappa* for *nu*.³⁰ Whether the error is ancient or modern, is not important; whether the papyrus has *nu* or *kappa*, is not significant. What counts is that the numerous occurrences of ἐκουσίως ἐπιδέχομαι, a conventional phrase in leases, provide the clue for correcting CPR 40 to φόρο[ν οὐ] ἐ<κ>ουσίως³¹ ἐπεδεξά[μην]ν and 41 to ἐκφορίου οὐ ἐ[κο]υσίος³² ἐπεδεξάμην, i.e. "at a rental which I have accepted of my own free will."³³

²⁸ Waszynski, *op. cit.* (above, note 19) 146 f.; *PHal.* 81; Modica, *op. cit.* (above, note 21) 110 ff.; R. Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt* 1 (New York, 1944) 406 ff.

²⁹ Comfort, *op. cit.* (above, note 14) 286 ff. Some notion of the frequent use of the phrase in leases may be obtained by scanning the following references, which I gathered in a rapid and incomplete survey: *POxy.* 7.1037.7, 1038.16; 8.1129.6; 14.1632.7, 1695.10; 16.1889.10, 1957.6, 1958.7, 1959.7, 1961.10, 1965.9, 1966.6; 17.2109.27, 2137.12; *PSI* 1.75.6, 77.8, 90.6; 3.175.7, 187.5; 4.316.3; 5.466.7, 467.5, 469.6; 6.708.5, 709.10; 9.1070.5, 1078.7; *PFior.* 3.325.5; *POslo* 2.35.8; *Sammelbuch* 4.7445.6.

³⁰ At first sight *PTeb.* 2.591 appears to provide a parallel in εἰδόνηκα, which the editors corrected to ηἰδόνηκα and Preisigke entered in his *Wörterbuch* under εἰδοκῶ. In fact, however, it is a spelling of εἰρόνηκα. Nevertheless, an editor might easily confuse a broadly written cursive *kappa* with cursive *nu*. Cf. E. M. Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford, 1912) 191 ff. My own notes show editorial confusion of *kappa* in its cursive forms with a number of other letters: *alpha*, *eta*, *mu*, *sigma*, *omega*.

³¹ The angular brackets mark my correction of *nu* to *kappa*.

³² I.e. ἐκουσίως, as in No. 40. With the spelling cf. *POxy.* 8.1126.2.

³³ Gentili (above, note 20) was clearly reaching out for ἐκουσίως when he ventured the translation "stesso, in persona" for ἐνουσίως; he failed to find it because the materials available for comparison were much less abundant in 1905. For ἐκουσίως in a

3. PStrassb. 73

The text of this papyrus is a private letter of the third century A.D. The papyrus is torn away both at the top and at the bottom, and in consequence the letter lacks an undetermined number of lines at the beginning and at the end. Lines 1–10, which are approximately the upper half of the remaining text, are devoted largely to a matter of business. Then, after a broad space in the middle of line 10, the writer undertakes a brief account of a violent illness which attacked him and, seemingly, his entire family.³⁴ There are a few misspellings, one or two quite extraordinary, but the meaning is clear through line 16. Lines 17 and 18, which gave the editor some trouble, remain obscure even after Kapsomenakis' effort to clarify them.³⁵ Numerous attempts of my own to make sense of these lines have failed, but they have convinced me that a collation of Preisigke's edition with the papyrus would not be wasted.³⁶ Kapsomenakis, however, did put the remainder of the letter on a sound basis by revising Preisigke's punctuation.

Describing the aftermath of his illness, the writer of the letter reveals a good command of idiomatic Greek in spite of lapses from conventional orthography. In Preisigke's text the passage runs thus:

καὶ ἀγῶ³⁷ αὐτὸς μετὰ τὴν νόσον γίνω-
 15 μαι³⁸ κατὰ τοῦ ποδὸς μου ἐρυσίπολιν³⁹
 καὶ μέχρι δεῦρο οὕτω ὡμὸς ἔσχον
 ἀλλὰ⁴⁰ κτλ.

different context, but in a phrase of the same grammatical structure, see PSI 10.1104.3 f.: μετὰ κυρίου οὐ ἐκουσίως αἰρούμαι.

³⁴ PSI 4.299, another letter of the 3rd cent., concerns a similar situation; cf. *Stud. Pal.* 22.33. In reading such letters, one is forcibly reminded of the recurrent epidemics that afflicted the Empire in the late 2nd and 3rd centuries. See U. Wilcken, "Ein dunkles Blatt aus der inneren Geschichte Ägyptens," *Festschrift Hirschfeld* (Berlin, 1903) 128 f.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im römischen Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1931) 2.361, note 15.

³⁵ Kapsomenakis, *op. cit.* (above, note 11) 43 f.

³⁶ I have tried to obtain a photograph of this papyrus, but without success.

³⁷ Read ἀγῶ.

³⁸ Read γίνομαι.

³⁹ Read ἐρυσίπelas. The spelling on the papyrus shows that the syllables after the accent were slurred as in English.

⁴⁰ Read ἀλλά.

If we follow Preisigke in his rejection of $\omega\mu$ ⁴¹ and his acceptance of $\sigma\omega\varsigma$ $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$, these lines say simply that the writer, after surviving the illness that ravaged his household, has come down with erysipelas, and he is not yet really well.⁴² Kapsomenakis, in his study of the papyrus, preferred to keep the text intact and thus not to eliminate $\omega\mu$ as meaningless. Preserving also the word-division adopted by Preisigke, he proposed $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$ $\acute{\omega}\mu$ ⁴³ $\sigma\omega\varsigma$ $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$,⁴⁴ and he understood these words to mean that the writer suffered from other complications even before he was free of erysipelas.⁴⁵

Either interpretation leaves room for objection. By disregarding $\omega\mu$ Preisigke makes a syntactical unit of $\sigma\omega\varsigma$ $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$, but this idiom requires an adverb and $\sigma\omega\varsigma$ is not known as an adverb.^{45a} By retaining $\omega\mu$ and correcting it to $\acute{\omega}\nu$, Kapsomenakis preserves grammatical continuity, but he cannot account for the change of $\nu\iota$ to $\mu\iota$ before $\sigma\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, these scholars are in substantial agreement on the meaning of line 16: the writer is reporting that up to the present moment he is not yet completely well.

Since $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$ and $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$ are thoroughly sound Greek, the trouble must lie somehow in $\omega\mu$ $\sigma\omega\varsigma$. Since $-\omega\varsigma$ does suggest an adverb, we shall make a fresh start by abandoning the word-division, on which the previous attempts at explanation are based. We shall write $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$ $\omega\mu\sigma\omega\varsigma$ $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$, treat the verb as an epistolary aorist, and say that these words mean "I am not yet fully recovered." Our adverb is then $\omega\mu\sigma\omega\varsigma$, and it is a barbarous and meaningless thing, although it ought to mean "well, in good health." Neither lexicons nor reverse indexes offer any help. In the entire range of the Greek language there is not one word ending with $-\mu\sigma\omicron\varsigma$, and that is another way of saying that no adverb ending

⁴¹ Preisigke's note: " $\omega\mu$ weiss ich nicht zu deuten." In his *Wörterbuch* (above, note 3) s.v. $\sigma\omega\varsigma$, Preisigke omits these letters: " $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$ $\sigma\omega\varsigma$ $\xi\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$, ich fühlte mich noch nicht wohl."

⁴² Preisigke translates thus in his edition: ". . . war ich noch nicht recht wieder munter." See note 41.

⁴³ Read $\acute{\omega}\nu$.

⁴⁴ Read $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$.

⁴⁵ Kapsomenakis, *op. cit.* (above, note 11) 44: "ich selbst bekomme nach der Krankheit am Fusse Hautentzündung und bisher bevor ich gesund war, hat mir anderes gefehlt. . . ."

^{45a} Hesychius gives $\sigma\acute{\omega}\omega\varsigma$ as a synonym of $\iota\gamma\upsilon\omega\varsigma$.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 43, note 1: "Schluss- ν vor σ wird in den Papp., soweit ich sehe, nie zu μ ."

with *-μως* exists.⁴⁷ But, at the same time, it is also a way of saying that *ωμως* is a misspelling of an adverb which would give the required sense with *ἔσχον*. Fortunately for our purpose a like combination of letters is found in *POslo* 3.155.2, where the syntax and the meaning are exactly those needed in the Strasbourg papyrus. One man writes to another: ἐξῆλθα ἀπὸ σοῦ κομσῶς ἔσχηκώς, χάρις θεοῖς. No doubt arises here. The adverb is a vulgar spelling of κομψῶς,⁴⁸ and the idiom employed is κομψῶς ἔχειν, "to be in good health, to be well." Although papyrus examples are relatively few,⁴⁹ the expression was common enough in daily use, as may be inferred from an admonition of Epictetus (3.10.13) on the conduct suitable to a man in time of illness: δταν ὁ ἱατρὸς εἰσέρχεται, μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τί εἴπῃ, μηδ' ἂν εἴπῃ "κομψῶς ἔχεις," ὑπερχαίρειν.⁵⁰

Following the lead of the Oslo text, we may now write <κ>ωμσῶς = κομσῶς = κομψῶς in line 16 of the Strasbourg letter, but there is some indication that a new inspection of the papyrus, when that becomes possible, will justify a radical change in the reading. Preisigke has provided a tracing of lines 7–10, and although κο does not appear in these lines, καὶ occurs three times. Very instructive is the example in line 8, where the cursive quality of the script has produced a particularly striking resemblance to *omega*.⁵¹ There is then every chance that the papyrus itself has κομσῶς. For the present, however, accuracy in detail may be postponed. Whether the papyrus is better represented by <κ>ωμσῶς or κομσῶς, one sure result has been obtained: Preisigke's text of line 16 leads ultimately to καὶ μέχρι δεῦρο οὕτω κομψῶς ἔσχον, "and to this moment I am not yet fully recovered."⁵²

⁴⁷ C. D. Buck and W. Peterson, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago, 1945) 735 ff.

⁴⁸ So rightly the editors of *POslo* 3.155 in note *ad loc.* The reduction of *psi* to *sigma* in the Oslo text is not unique. *PFay.* 113.11, 13; 116.6, 20 and *PWarren* 18.17 have πέμσωι and πέμσις for πέμψω and πέμψεις; Wilcken, *Chrest.* 480.17 f. has προκόσαι for προκόψαι.

⁴⁹ *PPar.* 18.3; *PAthen.* 60.10; *PTeb.* 2.414.10; with κομψότερον *PBad.* 2.34.4. It is also found with the comparative in *NT Ev.Jo.* 4.52. Cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 3) s.v. κομψός; *LSJ* s.v. II.

⁵⁰ Cf. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London, 1915–29) s.v.

⁵¹ Also instructive is the *ductus* of *μοι* in line 7, where the pronoun could easily be mistaken for *ωι*. For examples of editorial confusion of *kappa* and *omega* see *TAPhA* 72 (1941) 441; *CPh* 39 (1944) 38, note 100.

⁵² It will not be amiss to enter here another, if somewhat obvious, suggestion for improving the text of *PStrassb.* 73. In Preisigke's text and with Kapsomenakis'

4. *PWarren 4*

This papyrus bears a receipt issued to a certain Dionysius for his completion of the *πενθήμερος*, a *munus sordidum* characteristic of the Fayûm and having for its purpose the maintenance of canals and embankments.⁵³ Dionysius, who resided at Dionysias, a village located at the western end of Lake Moeris,⁵⁴ had labored from the second to the sixth of September, 139 A.D., ἐν Σν. Ἰ. πλ. . η. In receipts of this kind ἐν regularly introduces the name of a canal or an embankment, and so doubtless it does here.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, in the present instance, the name cannot be recovered from the papyrus.⁵⁶ Since conjecture is therefore in place, C. H. Roberts has offered, with due reserve, ἐν Σύρ(ων) λ(εγομένη) πλάτη, and proposes to take the last word as a topographical nickname.⁵⁷

There is also another approach to be made to this problem by sifting out from the large number of similar receipts the few that have phrases comparable to the one in *PWarren 4*. In *PAberd.* 36b, which certifies the performance of the required labor by a resident of Socnopaei Nesus,⁵⁸ probably in July or August, 146 A.D., the locale is given as ἐν πλωτῇ. Turner, who edited this document, rightly supplied διώρυγι; the man was assigned to repairs on a "navigable canal." Turner further calls attention to a canal of the same name in *PPrinceton 2.40*, a *corvée* receipt issued in 49 A.D.

punctuation, lines 19–21 have ἐὰν μέλλῃς τι πέμψῃς (=πέμψαι) εἰς πλοῖον καὶ ἧς οὖν κομίσας κρῶήν, πέμψον μοι διατροφήν. The particle οὖν serves no clear purpose here, and I suggest ἧς οὖν κομίσας be corrected to ἧς συνκομίσας, since the latter is the verb regularly used in papyri for "harvest." A like blunder in *POxy.* 1.63.5, οὖν πάση σπουδῇ is corrected to σὺν πάση σπουδῇ in *LSJ* s.v. σπουδή.

⁵³ The only extensive account of the compulsory labor on the dikes and canals is by F. Oertel, *Die Liturgie* (Leipzig, 1917) 63–78. Briefer treatments may be found in Wilcken, *op. cit.* (above, note 13) 1.1.330 ff.; A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian (Economic Survey of Ancient Rome)*, ed. by T. Frank, 2, Baltimore, 1936) 12 f.; *PAthen.* 49, introd. For other useful references see *TAPhA* 71 (1940) 634, notes 42–45; 73 (1942) 79, note 59.

⁵⁴ Probably the modern Qasr Qurûn; the Lake is now called Birket el Qurûn. See *PTeb.* 2, p. 375; Baedeker's *Egypt* (1929) 209.

⁵⁵ The Fayûm receipts show an impressive uniformity in this respect. See the list given by Oertel, *op. cit.* 64 ff.

⁵⁶ Editorial note in *PWarren 4*: "Although the letters printed above are perfectly clear, no complete reading can be given."

⁵⁷ *JEA* 32 (1946) 107. Since it is difficult to communicate the full measure of Roberts' hesitancy in making a suggestion at all, it is only fair to quote his own words: "... for the first word (Σύρ(ων) seems barely possible) I have nothing to offer, but the last two may well be λ(εγομένη) πλάτη (the nickname of the particular part of the dike)." I judge that this reconstruction rests on the use of πλάτη in *POxy.* 14.1674.

⁵⁸ Modern Dimê, north of the Lake (cf. note 54).

to a resident of Theadelphia⁵⁹ for work executed ἐν τ(ῇ) Πλωτ(). In publishing this text, Kase entered Πλωτ() in his index of geographical names and suggested, with a query, that it might be the name of a canal. Turner's own statement implies that πλωτή, "navigable canal," is the correct designation in the Princeton as well as in the Aberdeen receipt.⁶⁰

Kase, who edited the Princeton papyrus some three years before Turner published the Aberdeen text, referred to another Theadelphia receipt of the same type which had given Vitelli and Norsa considerable trouble. As printed for the first time in 1912, *PSI* 1.51 certifies that the recipient, in this case a woman, is credited with five days' work, to the account of the tenth year of Nero, 63–64 A.D., ἐν Συριω() πλω(). In the geographical index this place is described as an embankment in the territory of Theadelphia, but an editorial note on the passage warns that the writing is most crabbed and might be read in various ways.⁶¹ The text was revised and republished in 1929, and the original reading was replaced by ὑπ(ἐρ) Ἰσαρίω(νος) Πλω(), with the unresolved abbreviation now taken to be a personal name.⁶² While the new reading has behind it the very great authority of Vitelli and Norsa, the parallels in *PAberd.* and *PPrinceton* strongly favor a certain reserve in giving it preference over their earlier reading. Whatever the truth may be about the rest of the phrase,⁶³ the view that πλω() might be other than πλω(τή) is no longer tenable since the appearance of the Aberdeen receipt in 1939 brought the needed clarification.⁶⁴ The preposition ἐν, which is usual elsewhere in the Fayûm receipts, was eliminated from the revised text, but this omission does not alter the meaning.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Modern Harît, on the western edge of the Fayûm, southeast of Dionysias (cf. note 54).

⁶⁰ See his note to line 5 of the Aberdeen papyrus.

⁶¹ *PSI* 1.51.2, note: " . . . sarà probabilmente il nome della località: ma la scrittura è intricatissima e non escludo che si possa leggere diversamente."

⁶² *PSI* 9.1044, introd.

⁶³ The phrase ὑπ(ἐρ) Ἰσαρίω(νος) is not topographical; it marks the use of a substitute working in place of Isarion. For other examples see Oertel, *op. cit.* (above, note 53) 64 ff., Col. 6; cf. *PCairBoak* 15, introd. (= *Etudes de Papyrologie* 3, 1936, 32 f.).

⁶⁴ Oertel, *op. cit.* (above, note 53) 66.31a, using the old reading, wondered whether πλω() might not be διώ(ρυγι). This, of course, proves nothing about the reading of the papyrus, but Oertel's feeling for the meaning of the phrase has been justified by more recent publications.

⁶⁵ The preposition is also omitted in *PGrenf.* 2.53e, f, as corrected in *Berichtigungs.* 2.2.72. Cf. its omission in the *corvée* lists, *PMich.* 6.380, 381.

The significance of these remarks for *PWarren 4* becomes evident when the phrases as now interpreted are exhibited together.

<i>PPrinceton</i> 2.40	Theadelphia	ἐν τ(ῆ) πλωτ(ῆ)
<i>PSI</i> 1.51	Theadelphia	ἐν Συρίω(νος) πλω(τῆ)
1st edition		<ἐν> πλω(τῆ)
2nd edition		ἐν] πλωτῆ
<i>PAberd.</i> 36b	Socnopaei Nesu	

This list provides reasonable assurance that *PWarren 4* has ἐν Συ. ἅ πλωτῆ. If we again introduce Roberts' suggestion, somewhat modified to meet the conditions of the problem as it now presents itself, the resultant text is ἐν Συρ(ίω)νος λ(ε)γομένη πλωτῆ. Since Dionysias is not far from Theadelphia, the Warren papyrus might thus be said to lend its support to the first edition of the Italian papyrus. But the rejection by Vitelli and Norsa of their older reading leaves no ground for any conjecture that would take it seriously. What remains sure, nevertheless, is the mention of a πλωτή, a "navigable canal," in four *corvée* receipts from the northern and western limits of the Fayûm.⁶⁶

5. *Ostr. Strassb. 654*

Ostrakon texts necessarily follow a rule of brevity imposed by the material on which they are written, and in the principal categories, tax receipts and lists of various kinds, they are likely to make dull reading.⁶⁷ An editor who prepares any considerable number of them for publication soon finds himself engaged in a trying ordeal

⁶⁶ This does not mean necessarily that the western settlements enjoyed harbor facilities. It is not clear from the work certificates that the canals mentioned in them always served the villages from which the workers were drawn. In *PYale* 349 (= *YCIS* 10 [1947] 250 ff.) the priests of Bacchias allege as a privilege that it is customary for them ἀγεσθαι εἰς χωματικά ἔργα οὐκ ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις. Their complaint is that now, contrary to custom, they are being compelled to labor "in other places far from the village." See Oertel, *op. cit.* (above, note 53) 72, note 5; *PMich.* 6.380, introd.; but cf. Hohlwein (*Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3 [1949] 79), who assumes the proximity of canals and villages when they are mentioned together: "L'eau ne devait certes pas manquer à Evhéméria [not far from Theadelphia] tant pour les transports que pour l'irrigation des terres."

⁶⁷ Tax receipts, for example, follow shorter forms on ostraca than on papyri; cf. Youtie and Pearl, "O. Mich. I, 154," *AJPh* 62 (1941) 82. It is a matter of some interest that even papyrologists of rank find ostraca monotonous, if not repugnant. H. I. Bell, reviewing my edition of Karanis ostraca in *JRS* 35 (1945) 139, reflects an aversion which I share but should have hesitated to put into words: "Ostraca, important as they have been in so many ways, are rarely exciting, and those contained in this volume are no exception to the rule."

of monotony. There is then the danger that the exceptional text, which is neither a tax receipt nor a routine list, will slip by unrecognized. Something of the sort seems to have happened in the case of *Ostr. Strassb.* 654, a fragmentary text to which its editor, Paul Viereck, assigned a modest place in a long series of miscellaneous accounts from Upper Egypt, probably Thebes or its environs.⁶⁸ Viereck published the ostrakon without commentary, but in resolving the abbreviations that constitute the first line of the text, he introduced a definite interpretation. The account is entitled $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma(ος) \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma(υ\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu)$.

Although it is thus presented as a money account, and specifically an account of money taxes,⁶⁹ it proves on examination to contain no reference to money. It is in fact something very different from a money account, and its true character is revealed unmistakably almost from line to line in Viereck's excellent transcription. Naturally, then, his text is indispensable to any discussion of its meaning and for that reason is repeated here.

$\lambda\acute{o}\gamma(ος) \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma(υ\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu)$ [
 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\eta\eta\ \omicron\iota\kappa(\iota\alpha\nu)$ [⁷⁰
 $(\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma) \epsilon\gamma'$ καὶ $(\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma) \iota\beta'$
 $\Theta\acute{\omega}\theta \eta\rho\gamma(\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu) \eta\mu(\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma) \eta$]

5. $\pi\omicron \text{'}\Lambda\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho \tau\epsilon \xi\omega\varsigma$ [
 $\mu\omicron\upsilon \eta\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \delta\mu\omicron\iota[\omega\varsigma$
 $\sigma\mu\omega \eta\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \delta\lambda\omicron\nu$ [⁷¹
 $\text{Μεσορ}\eta \delta\mu\omicron\iota(\omega\varsigma) \eta\rho\gamma(\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu) \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}[\rho\alpha\varsigma$
 $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \acute{\omega}\nu \acute{o}\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ ⁷² $\alpha\rho.$]

10. $\nu\alpha \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho(\alpha\varsigma) \delta\acute{\upsilon}\omicron$ [

Viereck reinforces his interpretation of line 1 by suggesting $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma[υ\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ at the end of line 9. But between 1 and 9 the verb $\eta\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ occurs in four out of seven lines, and in two instances the word $\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ is still preserved after the verb. The purpose of the text is therefore not left in doubt. It counts up the number of days on which someone was idle from Thoth (line 4) to Mesore

⁶⁸ *Ostr. Strassb.*, pp. viii, 186.

⁶⁹ Strictly speaking, $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ is "money account" and $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ is "account of money taxes." See Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 3) 2, s.v. $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ 16; 3, Absch. 11, s.v. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$.

⁷⁰ Also possible is $\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}[\alpha\nu$, according to Viereck.

⁷¹ Viereck: $\delta\lambda\omicron\nu$ $\{\tau\acute{o}\nu \mu\eta\nu\alpha?$

⁷² Read $\acute{o}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$.

(line 8), the first to the last month of an Egyptian year. The year is fixed precisely by line 3, the 13th year of Diocletian = the 12th year of Maximian, i.e. August 29, 296 to August 28, 297 A.D.

Since the account was not compiled in terms of money, but in terms of days lost from work, its title was not λόγ(ος) ἀργ(υρικῶν), but rather λόγ(ος) ἀργ(ίας), or ἀργ(ήσαντος) followed by a substantive, which goes well with the writer's insistence on ἡργήσεν.⁷³ In a long account which is part of the Heroninus archive, ἀργία is used a number of times to mark days on which work was suspended, and one section of the account is entitled λόγος ἐργατῶν ἀργησάντων.⁷⁴

Only the first entry of the account on the ostrakon, which occupies lines 2-4, is sufficiently preserved to show the structure of the text. It falls into three parts: the reason for the absence, in this instance a visit at home; a comprehensive date; the number of days consumed by the absence. Of these items only a date remains in the second entry (lines 5-6), but a reason for the absence may be inferred from the date. A vacation starting on Hathyr 15 might well include one or more days of the Isia, the great annual festival of Isis, which occupied Hathyr 17-20 (Nov. 13-16).⁷⁵ Since μου stands at the beginning of line 6, it may not be excessively rash to imagine that it is the remnant of ἡμέρας ἑορτασίμου.⁷⁶ At the same time, it is not a supplement on which one would wish to insist; a number of other reconstructions are equally possible. Of the third entry (line 7) very little remains except ἡργήσεν and a reasonably good indication that the absence lasted a full month.⁷⁷ The syllable σμω might well be the conclusion of a phrase giving the cause of the absence. An idle period extending to a month is more likely to imply an illness than a visit or a festival, but the possibilities for supplementing σμω are numerous to the point of embarrassment. A reasonable conjecture is that the ostrakon, when it was still

⁷³ See note 82. In *PHaid.* 1818.8-20 (= F. Bilabel, "Die gräko-ägyptischen Feste" [*Neue Heid. Jahrb.* 1929] 5 f.), of which a full discussion will appear elsewhere in the near future, Bilabel likewise mistook ἀργ(ίας) ἡμ(ἐραι) for ἀργ(υρικαί) ἡμ(ἐραι). See S. Eitrem, *Symb. Osl.* 17 (1937) 46, note 1. The abbreviation ἀργ is extremely frequent in papyri and ostraca for ἀργύριον and ἀργυρικός, but in *Ostr. Strassb.* 654 and *PHaid.* 1818 these resolutions are rejected by the context. For ἀργ = ἀργία see *PIand.* 8.148.14.

⁷⁴ *PLond.* 3.1170 (pp. 193 ff.) 45, 129, 134, 137, 384, 399, 402. Cf. *PIand.* 8.147.10, 13; 148.14, and see also Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch* (above, note 3) s.v.

⁷⁵ *Plut. de Iside* 39; *UPZ* 1.401 f.; Bilabel (above, note 73) 39-41.

⁷⁶ This phrase is used for festal days in an edict of Caracalla (*PGiss.* 40.2.20 f.). See also *LSJ* s.v. ἑορτάσιμος.

⁷⁷ See note 71.

intact, had a noun in the dative case preceded by a preposition.⁷⁸ With the fourth entry (line 8), which is indented, the principal part of the account comes to a close. The first and last words of the entry are lost in the lacunae of lines 7 and 8, and what remains is not especially informative. In lines 9–10 the structure of the account changes. No date is preserved, but the syllable *να*, which alone represents the reason that was given for the absence, calls to mind the festivals known as Charmosyna and Erana.⁷⁹ Although these are mere guesses, the lacunae do not obscure the bearing of the entry. The mutilated word *αρ.* suggests a form of *ἀργέω*, and the lines record the loss of two days' work, which the person concerned "owes."

In the light of the foregoing analysis we may now venture a partial reconstruction of the Strasbourg ostrakon. The restorations are purely illustrative and are intended only to elicit the meaning of that portion of the text which is preserved. It is fortunate that the first four lines are intelligible without the supplements. Whenever restoration would require a knowledge of facts which we do not have, I have simply indicated the pertinence of the lost text.⁸⁰ Since ostraca come in varied shapes and sizes, the length of the lacunae cannot be established with anything approaching certainty.⁸¹

λόγ(ος) ἀργ(ίας) [⁸²

εἰς τὴν οἰκ(ίαν) [αὐτοῦ ἐλθῶν]

(ἔτους) ιγ' καὶ (ἔτους) ιβ' ἀπὸ τ' ἕως τ']⁸³

Θῶθ ἡργ(ησεν) ἡμ(έρας) η, [καὶ ἄλλας ἀ-]

5. πὸ 'Αθὺρ τε ἕως [τ' *occasion of absence*]

μου ἡργησεν ὁμοί[ως ἡμ(έρας) ., καὶ ἐν]

σμφ ἡργησεν ὅλον [τὸν *month*, καὶ ἀπὸ τ' ἕως τ']

Μεσορῇ ὁμοί(ως) ἡργ(ησεν) ἡμέ[ρας . *occasion*]

χωρὶς ὧν ὀφίλει ἀργ[ήσας *occasion*]

10. να ἡμερ(ῶν) δύο [⁸⁴

⁷⁸ Cf. *ἐν ἀσθένει*, "in illness," which I substitute in *PHeid.* Inv. 1818 (above, note 73) for Bilabel's mysterious 'Εναθήδια.

⁷⁹ Bilabel (above, note 73) 34 f., 37.

⁸⁰ For a reasoned justification of this procedure in epigraphy see B. D. Meritt, *Epigraphica Attica* (Martin Classical Lectures 9, 1940) 109 ff., esp. 129–131.

⁸¹ Cf. *TAPhA* 72 (1941) 458 f.

⁸² This line may be complete as it stands, or a personal name may be lost in the lacuna. If the latter alternative happens to be true, *ἀργ(ήσαντος)* is also possible. For titles using the participle, see the references to *PLond.* in note 74.

⁸³ J. G. Tait (*Berichtungs.* 2.2.154) suggests that the year-date be extended to include also the 5th year of Constantius and Galerius, but it is not indispensable and it would make a rather long line.

⁸⁴ This may be the end of the text.

As the title of the account now indicates, the text is a list of absences. Within the list a distinction appears to be made between lines 2-8 and 9-10. The indention of line 8 is perhaps a way of effecting a visible separation. More telling is the change of construction by which lines 9-10 are deliberately presented as an addition to lines 2-8. Prepositional *χωρίς*, it is true, does no more than mark the two days' absence recorded in the final entry as either accidentally or purposely excluded from the preceding section; but the verbs used in both sections of the account lend verisimilitude to the notion that the indention and the syntactical variation were intentional. The aorist *ἤργησεν* occurs in each of the four entries which occupy lines 2-8, and in the text as we have it there is no suggestion that these absences constitute a "debt." In lines 9-10, however, the emphasis is clearly on *ὀφίλει*, whereas the fact of absence, if my reconstruction is correct, is subordinated through the use of a participle.

Since the ostrakon is broken and as much as half of it may be lost, the distinction that has been proposed between the two parts of the list is, of course, hypothetical, but it is probable nevertheless. Absences of both kinds — those that are free of penalty and others for which compensation is due — are familiar from apprentice agreements on papyrus.⁸⁵ Not all of these make provision for leisure, but three of them are of considerable interest. *POxy.* 14.1647 stipulates that a slave girl apprenticed to a weaver shall have annually eighteen free days for the celebration of festivals. In *POxy.* 4.725 a boy bound as an apprentice is to have twenty days each year, also for festivals. In these contracts illness is not counted as a legitimate excuse, and this is true generally of such agreements.⁸⁶ But a much different concept of leisure comes into play in *PFuad* 37, which states that a boy placed in apprenticeship shall have three days of free time in each month, or thirty-six days during the year, and this concession is in no way restricted.⁸⁷ In any case, unauthorized absences are always subject to penalty: the apprentice works an equal number of days after the contractual period, or his guardian makes a fixed payment for each day.

⁸⁵ For bibliography on apprenticeship in Graeco-Roman Egypt see *PFuad*, p. 94.

⁸⁶ Cf. A. Zambon (above, note 3) 61 f. In a single contract of *paramone*, not therefore an apprentice agreement, seven days are allowed for illness (M. I. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles, "A Parchment Contract of Loan from Dura-Europus on the Euphrates," *YCIS* 2 [1931] 6 [lines 10 f.], 16, 66).

⁸⁷ For the pertinent portion of *PFuad* 37 see above, p. 212.

It is clear that lines 9–10 of the Strasbourg text are devoted to an absence for which compensation was obligatory. If lines 2–8 could be said, in spite of the lacunae, to embrace only absences not subject to compensation, the ostrakon would suit perfectly the kind of situation described above. It would be a record kept by a master craftsman who has responsibility for an apprentice. But the lacunae are possibly of considerable extent, and nothing will be gained by pushing this hypothesis too hard.⁸⁸ Indeed, even if no real distinction between lines 2–8 and 9–10 was intended, the reckoning may still be one between master and apprentice, for most apprentice agreements make no allowance for absences without penalty.⁸⁹

In this respect they do not differ from the service contract known as *παραμονή*.⁹⁰ This usually takes the form of a loan, and the service to be rendered is stated to be in place of interest. All absences are penalized, and the penalties are similar to those imposed on apprentices. The only exception to the rule is a contract from Dura, in which seven days are allowed for illness, but all other absences carry a penalty of one drachma for each day.⁹¹

This all too brief summary of the conditions of apprenticeship and antichretic service makes at least one thing obvious. It is just such an account as *Ostr. Strassb.* 654 that a master would compile in order to safeguard his contractual claim to the labor of an apprentice or of an antichretic servant.⁹²

⁸⁸ For this reason I have refrained from using an alternative reconstruction of line 2: *ἐς τὴν οἰκ(οδομικὴν) [τέχνην]*.

⁸⁹ See note 86.

⁹⁰ For literature on this type of agreement see *POslo* 3, p. 212. The most recent study of *paramone* is by W. L. Westermann, "The Paramone as General Service Contract," *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 2 (1948) 9–50.

⁹¹ See note 86.

⁹² It would not be profitable to carry the discussion further. If no distinction is made between lines 2–8 and 9–10, it is not possible to fix exactly the class of worker to which the account applies. Absences of workers who are neither apprentices nor servants are most carefully recorded in *PLond.* 3.1170 (pp. 193 ff.) 45–52, 129–141.