

Notes on Papyri

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1. *POxy.* 1.104

The text of this papyrus is a will executed by Soëris, daughter of Harpocras, at Oxyrhynchus toward the end of December, A.D. 96. The property of which she disposes is a house and courtyard with their appurtenances. The principal beneficiary is her son Hareotes, who is in turn charged with making provisions of money and lodging for Soëris' husband Hatres and her daughter Tnepheros.

Soëris describes Hareotes quite simply as "my son" but immediately thereafter gives his official description as "son of Thomis, daughter of Soëris" (10–11):

τοῦ υ[ι]οῦ μου Ἀρεώτου χρηματίζοντος μητρὸς Θωμι[ς]¹ τῆς Σοήριος

i.e. "my son Hareotes, who is officially styled as having for mother Thomis, daughter of Soëris." The language is disconcerting, and Grenfell and Hunt noted that Hareotes "was apparently only the adopted son of Soëris" because their text seems to guarantee that he is the natural son of Thomis, who is perhaps to be regarded as the daughter of the same Soëris. If this were the meaning conveyed by the text, the situation would be normal enough. We should have a grandmother providing by will for a grandson whom she had adopted, probably after

N.B. I again have the pleasure of expressing my gratitude to Mr. H. R. Creswick, Librarian of Cambridge University, for permission granted in June 1963 to examine the Oxyrhynchus papyri that are now in his care, and to the staff of the Anderson Room, whose courtesy never faltered through two weeks of daily demands on their time; to my wife, Louise C. Youtie, who prepared palaeographic descriptions and drawings of broken or otherwise difficult passages which have proved indispensable in the composition of these notes; to Prof. Isaac Rabinowitz, who tested my suggestion for *PCornell* 19 and sent me both a photograph of the papyrus and his own drawing of line 11; and to Professor Herbert Hunger, who verified my conjecture for Vienna papyrus, No. 2002.

¹ Grenfell and Hunt, taking account of the conventional equivalence of -ις and -ιος (cf. D. J. Georgacas, *CP* 43 [1948] 243–60), correct to Θάμιος. Their text of this passage is retained by F. Kraus, *Formeln d. griech. Testaments* (Borna–Leipzig 1915) 65.

the death of his mother. The editors cite for comparison *POxy.* 1.46.5–7, but here as elsewhere, when natural and adoptive parents are distinguished, the dative *θέσει* is inserted to mark adoption.² When a child's name is followed by the genitive of his father's or mother's name without further definition, the persons concerned are regularly bound to each other by a natural tie, not merely by the legal obligations voluntarily assumed in adoption.³ Hence, the words "my son Hareotes," unqualified as they are, ought to mean that Hareotes is the actual son of Soëris, not her adoptive son.⁴

If we make this assumption, the description given of Hareotes in the Greek text cannot go unchallenged. The two parts of which it consists are contradictory. In the first half of the phrase Hareotes is the son of Soëris, in the second half the son of Thomis, daughter of Soëris. In these circumstances, the intrusion of Soëris as mother of Thomis and grandmother of Hareotes sets up a remarkable coincidence. It is only necessary to drop *Thomis* from the text in order to reach consistency in both halves of the statement: Soëris would be identified as Hareotes' mother throughout. There is accordingly some possible significance in the fact that *Thomis* is the only reading in lines 10–11 for which the editors have indicated doubtful elements. Furthermore, the name *Thomis* is one that we do not expect. Between 1898, when the text was published, and 1922, when Preisigke published his *Namenbuch*, the name did not recur. Preisigke listed it from the Oxyrhynchus papyrus alone, and refused any responsibility for it by retaining the editors' dots and brackets. From 1922 to the present it has remained without further attestation although numerous editions of papyri have appeared.⁵

² Preisigke-Kießling, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin–Marburg 1925–1958) s.v. (4); for *κατὰ θέσιν LSJ* s.v. III. The natural filiation as opposed to the legal relationship established by adoption is sometimes indicated by *φύσει* (*Wörterbuch* s.v.; for *φύσιν, κατὰ φύσιν LSJ* s.v. I).

³ Where *θέσει* is omitted, the situation has previously been clarified, e.g. *POxy.* 3.504 (cf. lines 4–5, 33, 36, 40, 53, 54).

⁴ Cf. my discussion of a similar problem in *PCol. Inv.* 551 verso = *Sammelbuch* 5.7533 (*TAPA* 91 [1960] 244–46). The problem presented by the Oxy. text has no legal significance; it is purely textual. There is no question that adopted children, apart from *κοιπράριοι*, were in normal course entitled to inherit (R. Taubenschlag, *Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*² [Warsaw 1955] 133–36).

⁵ The only other occurrence of *Thomis* is in Hesychius, s.v., where it replaces *Thonis* as the name of the legendary figure who received Paris and Helen in his city of the same name at the Canopic mouth of the Nile (Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, 2te Reihe,

With these considerations in mind, I undertook in the summer of 1963 to restudy the papyrus in the University of Cambridge Library.⁶ There was no real difficulty in establishing *εμ.υτης* as the basic reading, so that the only possibilities are seen to be *ἐμαντῆς* and *ἐμοῦ τῆς*.⁷ The doubtful letter has faded to almost nothing, but what one seems to see favors *alpha* over *omicron*. Hence, without totally excluding the alternative⁸ even though it appears to be less desirable on palaeographic grounds, I propose that Grenfell and Hunt's text be changed to read as follows:

τοῦ υ[ι]οῦ μου Ἀρεώτου χρηματίζοντος μητρὸς ἐμαντῆς Σοήριος

i.e. "my son Hareotes, who is officially styled as having for mother myself, Soëris." And in fact, with either reading the information conveyed by the phrase is the same. Hareotes is the son of Soëris as well as her heir. That he passes as his mother's son only, marks him as *ἀπάτωρ*.⁹ There is no hint in the text that he might also be the natural although not the legal son of Soëris' husband Hatres. His sister, however, is specifically said to be the child of both.¹⁰

6.i [1936] 329 [Pieper], 330 [Kees]. *Thonis* was very much used as a man's name at Oxyrhynchus (*PRyl.* 2.95.2 note; cf. *POslo.* 3.143.8 note), but as such it is not pertinent to our text. As a woman's name, *Thonis* occurs only in Plut. *Demetr.* 27, where it is used for an Egyptian courtesan of the time of Bocchoris (718–12 B.C.). There is no trace of feminine *Thonis* in papyri. The phonetically similar *Tōmis*, although feminine (*PLond.* 1.131 [pp. 174 f.] 162, 198 [cf. *Berichtigungsl.* 1.230]; *POxy.* 10.1259.12, 22.2341.4 note) also lacks pertinence; it is the name of a canal (perhaps from Egyptian *thon*, "the canal"; Pape, *Griech. Eigennamen* s.v. *Θών*, so explains *Θώνης* and its variants) now known as the Bahr Youssef. *Tomis* occurs as a personal name, but masculine, in *PCairIsidor.* 76.4, 11, 14.

⁶ Its label is Camb. Add. 4042. Cf. *POxy.* 4, p. 267.

⁷ For editorial confusion of *θ* and *ε*; *ω* and *μ*; *μ*, *α* and *ο*; *ι* and *υ*, see Youtie, *Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri* (Inst. Class. Stud., London, Bull. Suppl. 6, 1958) 69.

⁸ Cf. e.g. *PMich.* 3.185.23 *ἐμὲ τὸν Ὠρον*; *PCairIsidor.* 81.6 *ἐ[μοῦ] τοῦ Ἰσιδώρου*, 13 *σου τοῦ Παλλίωνος παρ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ Ἰσιδώρου*.

⁹ A. Calderini, *Aegyptus* 33 (1953) 362, n. 3. Soëris' husband Hatres was also *ἀπάτωρ* (line 6).

¹⁰ Supplements suggested for lines 25–26 are recorded in *Berichtigungsl.* 1.315 f. I add a few minor corrections. Line 3. *ἀγαθῆι*: *ἀγαθῇ* ed. 5. *Τνεφερῶτος*: *Πνεφερῶτος* ed. Soëris' daughter (23) was named after the mother of her grandfather's patron. 14. *Ἀτρῆς*: *Ἀτρεύς* ed. The writer of this testament uses *Ἀτρεύς* as gen. (6, 23, cf. 7 *Φατρ[ε]ύς*) and *Ἀτρῆ* as dat. (21). 18–19. *ἐκκληρωθῶσι* (cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v.): *ἐκκληρώσσωσι* ed. The left side of the papyrus is torn away. Only the bottom of *theta* remains. The hand is of a square type, even though very irregular, and the bottoms of *epsilon*, *sigma*, and *theta* have a close resemblance. 24–25. *δια[τάσσ]ω* superior to *δια[τέταχ]α* (cf. *Berichtigungsl.* 1.315) and almost sure; *δια[...]* ed. Both suggestions were made by H. Kreller, *Erbrechtliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig–Berlin

2. *PCornell* 19

This text is a declaration filed by a resident of Theadelphia in the Fayum in the month Choiak (Nov. 27–Dec. 26) 298 A.D. for the land census instituted by Diocletian in 297. It is addressed, as are the other declarations submitted in the Fayum between 298 and 300, to the *censitor* Julius Septimius Sabinus.¹¹ Almost a third of the text is lost on the left side, but what remains is entirely legible. A suggestion for improving the supplement in line 3 was made by U. Wilcken soon after the publication of the Cornell volume.¹² Subsequently, A. E. R. Boak made available the text of a closely similar declaration filed at approximately the same time from Karanis.¹³ This was used by A. Déléage as his guide for a new edition of *PCornell* 19. His comparison of these declarations yielded much profit for the text preserved on the Cornell papyrus as well as for the supplements.¹⁴ Only one major defect was allowed to remain, and this is found in the statement of the boundaries. I repeat Déléage's text of lines 9–11, where the boundaries are given:

[ἀρούρας δύο], ἀρ(ουραι) β.
 [ὧν γείτονες ἀπὸ μὲ]ν ἀνατολῶν διῶρυξ, μεθ' ἣν συνορία Πολυδευκείας,
 [ἀπὸ δὲ δυσμῶν μετὰ κλ]ῆρον ἡμῶν 'Ρούφου κτῆσ(ις).

According to this description, a plot of two arouras is the object of the declaration. Its eastern limit is a canal, beyond which lies the village boundary, where Polydeucia adjoins Theadelphia; and to the west, "beyond our plot," is the estate of Rufus. Déléage has substituted μετὰ κλ]ῆρον ἡμῶν for a like phrase in the *editio princeps*: παρὰ κλ]ῆρον ἡμῶν, "along the limit of our plot." The reason for the substitution is not clear since the effect of these phrases is substantially the same. What is strange about both of them is that neither is essential to the meaning. The adjoining properties or facilities are obviously situated "beyond"

1919) 363, n. 8; he adds the following comment: "Am Original nicht zu erkennen, Burkitt nach Hunts brieflicher Mitteilung." 27. [ἐὰν καθά]πράξ: [.....]..ξ ed. 31–32. ἄλλω δὲ οὐδενὶ [ἀπλῶς] τῶν ἐμῶν καταλείπω [οὐδέν: ἄ. δὲ οὐ. [οὐδέν] τ. ε. κ. [..... ed. 33. 'Ατρῆ]ς: 'Ατρεῦ]ς ed. See my note to line 14, above.

¹¹ *PCairIsidor.* 2, introd.

¹² *Archiv f. Papyrusf.* 8 (1927) 296; also recorded in *Berichtigungsl.* 2.ii (1933) 49.

¹³ *Études de Papyrologie* 2 (1934) 8–11; republished in 1960 as *PCairIsidor.* 2.

¹⁴ *La Capitation du Bas-empire* (Macon 1945) 56. For his contributions to the text see *Berichtigungsl.* 3 (1958) 46.

or “along the limit” of the plot. Since this is so, if either phrase were the true text, it might be expected to occur after ἀνατολῶν in line 10 rather than in the second half of the description.

These considerations raise a serious doubt about the basic reading:]ηρονήμων. And a quick search through papyri uncovers a word much used in designating property and showing a close resemblance to the reading in the Cornell papyrus. Another declaration for the same census has the following, also in a statement of boundaries (*PCairIsidor.* 5.10):

ἀπὸ μὲν] ἀνατολῶν κλη[ρονό]μων Χαίρημον[ος . . .] . . . εἰς κτῆσις

i.e. “on the east the estate of the heirs of Chaeremon, son of . . .” An even more striking text is *POxy.* 4.719.16–17:

βορρᾶ [κλ]ηρονόμων Διογᾶτος, ἀπηλιώτου κληρονόμων Ὁρου

i.e. “on the north (the property) of the heirs of Diogas; on the east, of the heirs of Horus.” Many other instances might be cited from papyri of inherited ownership marked in this way. As good an example as any is *POxy.* 24.2421, where payments in kind, or in money equivalents, are made by numerous owners, among them thirteen groups of heirs. One entry will suffice to illustrate all of them, e.g. line 40: κλη(ρονόμοι) Σώτου Φιλοσόφου.

With these notions in mind I consulted Prof. Isaac Rabinowitz, who thereupon inspected the papyrus in the Library of Cornell University. With great kindness, he sent me both a photograph of the papyrus and a most skilful handdrawing of the passage in question. Both of these confirm his observation that the space between *nu* and *mu* is altogether inadequate for *eta*,¹⁵ but it is not at all too narrow for *omicron*. The letter, as we see it now, is badly abraded but very easily reconstructed to *omicron*. I suggest therefore that the line be remade to read as follows:

[ἀπὸ δὲ δυσμῶν κλ]ηρονόμων Ρούφου κτῆσις).

Since Déléage departed needlessly in two places from the text of the *editio princeps*, was the victim in another place of a careless typesetter, and was not in every case able to estimate accurately the length of the lacunae because he could not then know what we now know about the characteristic arrangement of the left

¹⁵ Letter of 10 Oct. 1963.

margin in declarations of this type,¹⁶ I have thought it wise to reprint the entire text with a minimum of comment and a translation.

- [Ἰουλίῳ Σεπτί]μίῳ Σαβείνῳ κηνσίτορι
[παρὰ Αὐρηλίου . . .]τος Νειλάμμωνος ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφίας τοῦ
Ἀρσινοίτου).
- [ἀκολουθῶς θείῳ προσ]τάγματι τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν αὐτοκρατόρων
[Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ Μ]αξιμιανοῦ Σεβαστῶν καὶ Κωνσταντίου καὶ
Μαξιμιανοῦ
- 5 [τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτ]ων Kaisάρων φανερόν σοι ποιῶ κεκτηῆσθαι με
[περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν κ]ώμην Θεαδελφίαν ἔκτης ὁγδόης τοπαρχείας
[Θεμίστου μερίδος] ἐπὶ τῆς
[σφραγίδος ἐν τόπ]ῳ Διαρούρου λεγομένῳ γῆς ἰδιωτικῆς σπορίμης
[ἀρούρας δύο] ἄρ(ούρας) β
- 10 [ὧν γείτονες ἀπὸ μὲ]ν ἀνατολῶν διῶρυξ μεθ' ἧν συνορία Πολυ-
δευκειάς
[ἀπὸ δὲ δυσμῶν κλ]ηρονόμων Ῥούφου κτῆσ(ις),
[καὶ ὄμνυμι τὸν σεβ]άσμιον ὄρκον ἀληθῆ με τὴν ἀπογραφὴν πεποιῆσθαι.
[ἔτους ιε' καὶ ιδ' καὶ] ζS' τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανοῦ καὶ
[Μαξιμιανοῦ Σεβαστ]ῶν καὶ Κωνσταντίου καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ τῶν
15 [ἐπιφανεστάτων] Kaisάρων, ὑπατείας Φαύστου καὶ Γάλλου, Χοιᾶκ
[]
- (2nd hd.) [Αὐρ(ήλιος)s] καὶ ὥμοσα τὸν σεβάσμιον ὄρκον ἀληθῆ με
τὴν ἀπογραφὴν
[πεποιῆσθαι] καὶ ἐπέδωκα. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἀθανάσις ἔγραψα ὑπ(έρ)
αὐτ(οῦ) ἀγραμ(μάτου).
- (1st hd.) [γείν]ονται ἰδιωτικῆς γῆς σπορίμης ἄρ(ουραι) β.

COMMENTARY

2. . . .] . τος: . . .]τος *ed. pr.*, Déléage. A small remnant of the letter that preceded *tau* is still visible on the edge of the papyrus. It has some resemblance to the right side of *omega* when this letter is written immediately before *tau*.

3. [ἀκολουθῶς θείῳ Déléage, [ἄ. τῷ θ. Wilcken. The expression is used elsewhere with and without the article; cf. *PCairIsidor.* 2.6, 4.5, 5.4. Considerations of space favor its omission here.

4. Κωνσταντίου *ed. pr.*, Κονσταντίου Déléage.

¹⁶ See e.g. *PCairIsidor.* 2, 4, and 5.

6. [περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν: [π. τ. προκιμένην *ed. pr.*, Déléage. The phrase occurs in both forms; cf. *PCairIsidor.* 2.11, 4.6. If the losses along the left side of the papyrus have been correctly estimated, the space at the beginning of line 6 does not suffice for the participle.

τοπαρχείας = τοπαρχίας. On numbered toparchies see *PCair. Isidor.* 2.12 note.

8. A numeral is lost at the beginning of the line; cf. *PCairIsidor.* 2.14 and note *ad loc.*

ἐν τόπ]ω Διαρούρου Déléage; so also N. Lewis, *ChronÉg.* 58 (1954) 294, n.2 and *Berichtigungs.* 3 (1958) 46. With the "Double Aroura" cf. *PBas.* 17.3. The name may have been taken directly from the plot that is here declared for the census.

11. κλ]ηρονόμων: see introd., above.

12. [καὶ *ed. pr.*, om. Déléage. For the usage of the declarations see *PCairIsidor.* 2.20, 4.12, 8.12.

15.]Καισάρων: *K]αισάρων ed. pr.*, Déléage.

16. The day of the month is lost at the beginning of the line.

17–18. The 2nd hd. is exceptionally rapid, and some disagreement on detail is to be expected. The form of the subscription may be compared to *PCairIsid.* 2.26–28. This text was not available to the editors of *PCornell* 19, who are followed by Déléage. A point by point collation of their text with mine would serve no useful purpose. I note only the slight differences in readings where there is basic agreement: ἀληθῇ *ed. pr.*; [ἄ. Déléage, but doubtless a typographical misunderstanding due to the necessity of breaking the line in print. ᾽Αθανάσις (= ᾽Αθανάσιος, cf. footnote 1); ᾽Αθανάσιο(ς) *ed. pr.*, Déléage. αὐτ(οῦ), possibly α<ὐ>τ(οῦ); αὐ(τοῦ) *ed. pr.*, Déléage. ἀγραμ(μάτου): ἀγραμμάτ(ου) *ed. pr.*, Déléage.

19. [γείν]ονται: [ἀπογράφ]ονται *ed. pr.*, Déléage. *PCairIsidor.* 2.29, 4.14 use εἶσιν, ἔστιν; 3.28, 5.33, 8.15 γείνονται.

TRANSLATION

"To Julius Septimius Sabinus *censitor* from Aurelius . . . s, son of Nilammon, of the village of Theadelphia in the Arsinoite

nome. In conformity with the imperial edict of our masters the emperors Diocletian and Maximian, Augusti, and Constantius and Maximian, the most noble Caesars, I declare to you that I possess in the vicinity of the said village of Theadelphia in the sixth and eighth toparchy of the Themistes division, in the . . . section, in the hamlet called the Double Aroura two arouras, 2 ar., of private seed land, of which the adjacent areas are: on the east a canal, beyond which is the boundary of Polydeucia, and on the west the estate of the heirs of Rufus; and I swear the oath by the Augusti that I have made the declaration in accordance with the truth. Year 15, 14 and 7 of our lords Diocletian and Maximian, Augusti, and Constantius and Maximian, the most noble Caesars, in the consulship of Faustus and Gallus, Choiak . . . (2nd hd.) I, Aurelius . . . s, have both sworn the oath by the Augusti that I have made the declaration in accordance with the truth, and submitted it. I, Aurelius Athanasius, have written for him since he is illiterate. (1st hd.) Total: 2 ar. of private seed land."

3. *PLugdBat.* 6.21 = *PBerl.* Inv. 13990

This text is a copy of a receipt given by Didymarion, daughter of Heraclides, to her brothers Heraclides and Lysimachus.¹⁷ She acknowledges that she has received from them the sum of 600 drachmas, which were due to her from her father, now deceased, as part of her dowry. Didymarion's marriage dates from 105/106 A.D. On that occasion her father gave her 500 drachmas with the promise of 600 more to come, and the undertaking was renewed in the following year. He died subsequently without completing the payment. Now, on 25 July 122, the brothers at last discharge their father's obligation.¹⁸

The scribe's spelling is somewhat uncertain, but it does not depart from popular norms. His language is in general idiomatic and intelligible. A few apparent exceptions therefore deserve fresh consideration. Most striking of these is a statement which specifies the origin of the present transaction. It occurs first in the acknowledgment at lines 8–10, then is repeated in a shorter form in Didymarion's subscription at lines 26–27. I reproduce

¹⁷ Didymarion is mentioned only here in the archive; her brothers are better known. In van Groningen's list (pp. 5–8) they are entered under Nos. 29 and 58.

¹⁸ For further details see the editor's comment (p. 77).

both passages here in order to provide a visible basis of discussion. To lines 8–10 I add the editor's translation, and although he has left lines 26–27 untranslated, I do not hesitate to give a rendering of them so as to make his point of view explicit.¹⁹

8–10. [Didymarion acknowledges receipt of] ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς ἑξακοσίας ὑπεσχημένας ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντων [π]ατρὸς Ἡρακλείδου Μάρωνος, ὡς τετελεύτηκεν, πρὸς οἷσι τῇ Διδυμαρίῳ κατὰ συγγραφὴν γ[ά]μου τελειωθείσαν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γραφείου τῷ ἐνάτῳ ἔτι θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ, i.e. "600 silver drachmae promised by our common father Herakleides son of Maron, who is dead, beside those (valuables) which he (gave) her through the marriage-contract drawn up by the same registrar's office in the 9th year of the deified Trajan."

26–27. [Didymarion acknowledges receipt of] ἀργυρ[ίου] δραχμὰς ἑξακοσίας δηλωθέντας²⁰ διὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς πρὸς οἷσιν μοι τὸν πατέρα, i.e. "600 silver drachmae as stated in the contract, beside those (valuables) which our father (gave) me."

Of this Greek the editor has written in his note to lines 7 ff.: "The construction is intricate and clumsy; moreover the copy is imperfect: the verb is missing in the relative clause . . ." And again, in his note to line 26: "The words πρὸς οἷσί μοι τὸν πατέρα are scant relics of the clause which is not even well preserved in 9 ff." But not only do these clauses lack verbs; they have a possibly grosser fault in the form of the relative pronoun. The dative plural in -οισι(ν) is unknown to the *koiné* and ought not to occur in either place.²¹ The supposed pronouns need to be remodeled in some way, and a beginning can be made, I think, with lines 26–27. A clue to a proper arrangement of the words is supplied by the editor's insertion of "gave" in his translation of 8–10. This should indeed be the sense of the missing verb, and if we eliminate the pronoun by writing

προσοίσιν²² μοι τὸν πατέρα,

¹⁹ For convenience in printing, I omit all dots under letters where they seem to me to express only a formal doubt and accordingly mark broken or abraded but not essentially doubtful letters. The following adjustments to standard spelling are taken from the editor's *aph. crit.*: ὡς=ὄς, συγγραφὴν (-φής)=συγγραφήν (-φής), ἔτι=ἔτει.

²⁰ Corrected by editor to δηλωθείσας.

²¹ Cf. Hoffmann-Debrunner, *Geschichte d. griech. Sprache* 1 (Sammlung Göschen 111, Berlin 1953) 58 f.

²² Read προσοίσειν.

we recover a most suitable Greek equivalent.²³ The infinitive with its subject accusative yields an adequate meaning: "that our father would give to me." But even though this suggestion abolishes an embarrassingly defective relative clause, the dependence of the infinitive clause on *δηλωθείσας*, which the editor has substituted for *δηλωθέντας* in order to bring it into agreement with *δραχμάς*,²⁴ is excessively harsh. A simpler correction is *δηλωθέντος*, i.e. "it having been stated in the contract that our father would give them to me."²⁵

If we now use this acquisition to approach the longer statement in lines 8–10, we shall correct *ὑπεσχημένας* to *ὑπεσχημένου*²⁶ and *πρὸς οἷσι* to *προσοίσι<ν>*,²⁷ and so obtain a simplicity of expression which closely parallels the revised text of 26–27: "it having been promised by their common father Heraclides, son of Maron, who has died, that he would give them to Didymarion." By way of consolidating the gains already made, I repeat the passages in their new form with translations, which I have tried to keep sufficiently *mot à mot* to illustrate the impersonal construction of the participles.²⁸

8–10. ἀργυρίου δραχμάς ἑξακοσίας ὑπεσχημένας (for -νου) ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντων [π]ατρὸς Ἡρακλείδου Μάρωνος, ὡς τετελεύτηκεν, προσοίσι<ν> τῇ Διδυμαρίῳ κατὰ συγγραφὴν γ[ά]μου τελειωθείσαν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γραφείου τῷ ἐνάτῳ ἔτι θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ, i.e. "600 silver drachmas, a promise having been made by their common father Heraclides,

²³ The verb *προσφέρω* is frequently used with respect to dowries. See line 11, and cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v. (1.c.).

²⁴ Cf. text of lines 26–27, above.

²⁵ Cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführl. Grammatik* 2.ii (Hannover–Leipzig 1904) 81 f.; E. Mayser, *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri* 2.i (Berlin–Leipzig 1926) 308 f. The papyrus may of course have *-τας*, as given in the edition, but it would be wise to have another look in order to be quite sure that it does not have *-τος*, which in any case was intended. [I observe with regret that I have not succeeded in procuring photographs from the Berlin collection since it was repatriated. I therefore content myself on this occasion with reasonable conjecture.]

²⁶ Cf. preceding footnote. In some hands not only *-ας* and *-ος* but also *-ας* and *-ου*, show a deceptive resemblance. If the edition is right nevertheless, the writer was misled by the proximity of *δραχμάς ἑξακοσίας*. The passive use of the verb is late, and there is no mention of it in our lexicons. Mayser, *Grammatik* 2.i.93, lists it among *media tantum*. Veitch, *Greek Verbs* (Oxford 1887) s.v., records Appian's use of the perfect participle in a passive sense (*BC* 2.102, 4.99, 5.129; cf. 3.74, which is also listed by *LSJ* s.v. *προῦπισχύνεμαι* together with another passive from *Sammelbuch* 1.5673.7 [2nd cent.]).

²⁷ See footnote 22.

²⁸ For details of spelling see footnotes 19 and 22.

son of Maron, who has died, in a marriage agreement drawn up by the same registry office in the 9th year of the deified Trajan, that he would give them to Didymarion.”

26–27. ἀργυρ[ίου] δραχμὰς ἑξακοσίας δηλωθέντας (for -τος) διὰ τῆς συγγραφῆς προσοίουν μοι τὸν πατέρα,, i.e. “600 silver drachmas, it having been stated in the agreement that our father would give them to me.”

The text of the receipt is susceptible of improvement also in line 17. In the course of the usual statement that she will not initiate any legal action against her brothers or their heirs in respect to this or any other agreement into which she has entered up to the present day, Didymarion uses a puzzling phrase:

ἀπὸ μηδενὸς ὀρμ[.]υ μέχρι δικαίου.

The editor sees that the obvious completion of the broken word is ὄρμον, but he also sees that it “gives no sense.” We are not nevertheless without resources for a fresh attack on the composition and meaning of the phrase. In the same context *PTebt.* 2.397.17 has the following:

ἀπὸ μηδενὸς ὀρμωμένη δικαίου.

This is rendered by Preisigke quite straightforwardly: “ohne sich auf irgend ein Anrecht zu berufen.” For interpreting the participle he starts from the basic definition: “von einem Stützpunkte ausgehen,” with an easy progression to “einen Anspruch herleiten” and “sich worauf stützen.”²⁹ The phrase is also found without the participle but in the same sense in *PFlor.* 1.47a.15–16 (*Berichtigungsl.* 1.139):

ἀπὸ μηδενὸς δικαίου.

This again is correctly rendered by Preisigke as “[nicht] unter Berufung auf irgend welchen Rechtsanspruch.”³⁰

Since the Leyden papyrus requires an accusative in line 17 to agree with τῇν Διδυμάριον in line 14, it is clear that a cursively

²⁹ *Wörterbuch* s.v. ὀρμάω (4).

³⁰ *Fachwörter* s.v. δίκαιος (2.a).

written or badly preserved ὀρρωμένην has got itself read as ὀρμ[.]υμεχρi.³¹ I suggest therefore that line 17 be emended to conform to the Tebtunis papyrus:

ἀπὸ μηδενὸς ὀρρωμένην δικαίου.

4. *PLugdBat.* 11.24

In the year 1888 Carl Wessely published a short excerpt from a Vienna papyrus of 134 A.D. It consists of little more than the names of a woman and her *kyrios*:

Τετανούπισ . . . μετὰ κυρίου Ἱερακίωνος τοῦ μετοίκου.

To the word *metoikos* Wessely assigned a meaning otherwise unattested: "Inwohner ihres Hauses."³² Preisigke reprinted the excerpt in 1915 in *Sammelbuch* 1.5837,³³ and in 1927 he recorded *metoikos* in his *Wörterbuch* from this text only and followed Wessely in defining it as "Hausgenosse."³⁴ Wessely's definition was again preserved in 1940 by *LSJ* s.v. (2), who still had no other example of the word in this sense. They turned the German explanation given by Wessely and Preisigke into English as "occupant of the same house with another."

More recently, the editor of another Vienna papyrus, which is a return for the census of 131/132 A.D., has been astute enough to recognize there the same woman and her *kyrios*. *PLugdBat.* 11.24 is addressed to the strategus of the Memphite nome by Tetanoupis (3-7):

παρὰ Τετανούπιος τῆς Ἀρείου Νεμεσάτος μητρὸς Ἀρείας τῆς Ζώθου
τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως μετὰ κυρί(ου) Ἱερακίωνος τοῦ Πετοβάστ(εως).

Here Hierakion is described as son of Petobastis but not as *metoikos*. From this fact the editor, who adopts the now traditional view of *metoikos* as used in Wessely's papyrus (2002), infers

³¹ Nevertheless, the scribe shows signs of carelessness elsewhere and so may have written a nominative here. [See my remarks in footnote 25 *ad fin.*]

³² *MPER* 4.60, No. 2002. The three dots in the Greek text mark in the usual way an omission by Wessely of whatever terms are used in the papyrus as further description of Tetanoupis.

³³ Preisigke, seemingly by inadvertence, replaced Wessely's dots with square brackets.

³⁴ Preisigke assigned the text in *Wörterbuch* to the 3rd cent., but this is certainly nothing more than a typographical error.

that Hierakion was not yet a "Mitbewohner des Hauses" in 131/132 but had entered into that relation with Tetanoupis by 134.³⁵

There is thus complete agreement on the reading and interpretation of *metoikos* in No. 2002. If I have had a doubt of my own, my reasons have been the ordinary ones: the word has not recurred in papyri and the meaning accepted for it is without parallel. But it is possible to shift the doubt from these general and familiar but not always probative considerations to specific palaeographic ground by comparing the words in a suitable visual frame:

Πετοβάστ(εως)
μετοίκου

Both of them are seen to consist of eight letters, and they share in *ετο* a group of three letters. Of the other letters, editorial confusion of *α* and *κ*, *σ* and *ο*, *τ* and *υ* has been noted elsewhere.³⁶ Those who are familiar with cursive script of the second century will not be surprised if an editor mistakes *βα* for *ικ*. For *π* and *μ* it may at least be said that the impression of two verticals is strong in both, and if *π* were damaged at the top an editor might well be betrayed into reading *μ*.

These observations have seemed to me sufficient to justify suspicion of *μετοίκου*. And thanks to the generous coöperation of Prof. Hunger, I am able to say that the suspicion is fully justified. He has examined the papyrus in Vienna and has determined that Wessely should have read *Πετοβάστ(εως)*.³⁷ In consequence, both papyri have the same text:

Ἱερακίωνος τοῦ Πετοβάστ(εως).

³⁵ Editor's note to lines 6-7.

³⁶ Youtie, *Textual Criticism* (above, note 7) 69.

³⁷ Letter of 10 Oct. 1963. To him I also owe the assurance that Ζώθου in *PLugdBat.* 11.24.5 is a misreading of Ζώλου. Line 13 *ἐμαντὸν* is the scribe's mistake for *ἐμαντήν* (cf. 17). The editor has placed a full stop in line 17 where it is not appropriate; the maximum possible pause is a high point since *ἐμαντήν* is resumed from line 13. Tetanoupis declares herself and her husband *Βυχανοῦπις*. The papyrus was found at Memphis, the seat of the bull god Apis, but Buchanoupis takes his name from Buchis, the bull god of Hermonthis in Upper Egypt. Cf. S. A. B. Mercer, *Religion of Ancient Egypt* (London 1949) 232-35. Two other occurrences of this name in variant spellings (Boke-, Bocha-) are recorded by Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, from papyri recovered in Upper Egypt.

5. *POxy.* 1.118³⁸

This is a letter written in the late third century by Saras and Eudaemon to Diogenes, whom they call "son."³⁹ They expect a visit from an important personage, probably "the most notable Ammonion,"⁴⁰ for whom careful preparations must be made, and to this end they instruct Diogenes to do a number of things. Diogenes is at Oxyrhynchus, where the papyrus was found, while Saras and Eudaemon are somewhere to the north, between Oxyrhynchus and Heracleopolis, perhaps at Ankyronpolis (Hibeh).⁴¹ They have been advised by Ammonion to obtain a ferryboat because of "the uncertainty of the journey by road."⁴² They accordingly are sending an order (*epistalma*) to Diogenes in the hope that the local people will comply and provide the boat.⁴³ If they refuse, Diogenes is to send the *epistalma*, doubtless copies of it, to the strategus and the irenarchs⁴⁴ to be put on file so that

³⁸ Now in the Cambridge University Library, where it has the label Add. 4043. Cf. *POxy.* 4, p. 267. The brief introduction and translation given by G.-H. show that they did not fully grasp its meaning when they published it in 1898. Cf. Wilamowitz, recording his own failure to understand the text (*GGA* 1898, p. 684): "Teils die Zerstörung, teils die ungelenke Rede erschwert das Verständnis." I therefore submit a new account of its contents with the aid of new readings.

³⁹ Διογέει τῷ υἱῷ ed., Διογέει τῷ υἱῷ pap. Oxyrhynchus papyri and others have proved that *Saras*, like *Eudaemon*, is a man's name. Diogenes may be the son of one or the other of them, or "son" may be only a term of affectionate regard. G.-H. substitute "the younger" for "son," perhaps avoiding the literal translation because they also take *Saras* as masculine. Wilamowitz (preceding footnote) says that *Saras* is Diogenes' mother and relates the name to *Saraeus*, which is known to be a woman's name, but the papyrus evidence that has accumulated since he wrote does not sustain his view. Many editors have commented on the Egyptian predilection for using loosely the words that mark family relationships. Cf. *PMich.* 8.468.46-47 note.

⁴⁰ Lines 3-7 mention only advice received from A., but 32 refers to "his visit." If the visitor is not A., the pronoun has no antecedent. Cf. *POxy.* 14.1764.9 ff.: τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ ἀξιολογωτάτου Καλπου[ρ]νίου. Although this proves nothing about *POxy.* 1.118, the words are undeniably suggestive.

⁴¹ The verb ἀνεληλύθασιν (34) indicates that they live somewhere below Oxyrhynchus. As I shall show in due course, their visitor is spending a few days in the Heracleopolite nome (25) before coming to them.

⁴² So *LSJ* s.v. ὁδοπορία, with direct reference to this papyrus. Their words suggest that the letter was written in the summer when the rising river made travel uncertain. If this inference is correct, we can at least say that their visitor, although a person of considerable importance, was not the prefect of Egypt. See D. Bonneau, *ChronÉg.* 72 (1961) 377-85. On the non-official character of *axiologótatos* see *PStrassb.* 20.5 note.

⁴³ The use of an *epistalma* marks their visitor as a person for whom officialdom must feel responsibility. Cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v. (2); *Fachwörter* s.v.

⁴⁴ Nome officials with police functions. F. Oertel (*Liturgie* [Leipzig 1917] 283 f.) cites *POxy.* 1.118 for their association with the strategus.

Saras and Eudaemon may be cleared of responsibility in case of a mishap.

At line 17 they turn to another need arising from the approaching visit. Because this portion of the letter requires critical discussion, I repeat Grenfell and Hunt's text of lines 17–23.

εἰδὼς δὲ ὁποία
ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ ξενία, λαβὼν
παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων ὀλίγον
20 χ[.].ιν⁴⁵ καὶ λιβανωτόν
[τινα σ]υναγοράσας ἀγα-
[θ...]χομένος
[....]ε.

For the broken lines 21–23 Wilamowitz made a proposal which was approved by Grenfell and Hunt:

ἀγα[θὰ εὖ]χομένος [ἐπίθῃ]ε.⁴⁶

There is no difficulty about the meaning of the text as reconstituted by Wilamowitz, but even so it can be shown to be false. Wilamowitz may be forgiven for supposing that the incense was to be purchased to be used as a burnt offering while prayers for a good issue were recited to unnamed gods.⁴⁷ What Wilamowitz could not have known in 1898 is evident today to any reader of papyrus letters. The remains so accurately recorded by Grenfell and Hunt are the debris of a much used piece of epistolary language. A few examples may be found illuminating.

PMich. 3.214.20–21: ἔνεγκον ἐρχομένη ποκάρια ἐριδιῶν δέκα.

30–32: ἔνεγκον ἡμῶν πάντα τὰ ἡμάτια⁴⁸ ἐρχομένη.
ἐνεγκον ἐρχομένη σου τὰ χρυσία.

⁴⁵ A reasonable interpretation of the slight remains, but it would be all the better for dots under the letters. Only the tops of *chi* and *iota* are visible, the extreme tip of the letter before *iota*, and the right side of *nu*. G.–H. had no word to suggest. Wilamowitz (above, note 38): "Vergeblich suche ich, was er nur bei den Priestern bekommen konnte." I have had equally little success. Either the word is new or the reading is false.

⁴⁶ *POxy.* 2, p. 320; reprinted in *Berichtigungs.* 1, p. 316.

⁴⁷ ἐπιθύω is standard late Greek for "burn incense." In Diod. Sic. 18.61 it is combined with λιβανωτόν. Cf. *LSJ* s.v. (II). Wilamowitz's supplements were also adopted by Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.vv.

⁴⁸ For ἡμάτια.

PGiss. 103.9-11: ἐ]νεγκον δέ μοι ἐρχόμ[ε]νος τὰς τρεῖς⁴⁹ λίτρας
τῶν σιππίων.⁵⁰

Sammelbuch 5.7635.13-15: καὶ φέρε τοῦτο ἐρχόμενος. ἐρχόμενος δέ,
δέσποτα, ἐν σιδλιν⁵¹ καὶ ἐν σαντάλλιν⁵² φέρε
μοι.

The linguistic pattern illustrated in these samples is of the simplest: the imperative present or aorist of φέρω, usually the latter, combined with the present participle of ἔρχομαι. Sometimes the new future ἐνέγκω, formed from the aorist subjunctive, is used in place of the imperative.⁵³ In the Oxyrhynchus papyrus only a final *epsilon* remains to represent the imperative. The present φέρε is used, as we have seen, in *Sammelbuch* 5.7635, and the aorist imperatives ἐνεγκε and ἔνεικε are of course available.⁵⁴ Making full allowance for these possibilities, I suggest that the passage be reconstructed as follows:

εἰδὼς δὲ ὁποία
ἐστὶν καὶ ἡ ξενία, λαβὼν
παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων ὀλίγον
20 χ[.]ιν καὶ λιβανωτόν
[τινα σ]υναγοράσας ἀγα-
[θόν, ἐρ]χόμενος
[ἐνεγκ]ε.

Translation: "Since you know what the guest-house⁵⁵ is like, having got from the priests a little . . . and bought some incense of good quality, bring them when you come." The incense was not to be used, as Wilamowitz thought, to accompany a religious act, but for the very practical purpose of enhancing the comfort of the guest-house.

In line 23 Saras and Eudaemon take up another subject very much on their minds. They urge on Diogenes the need for

⁴⁹ For τρεῖς.

⁵⁰ Vulgar writing of στυππίων. For the numerous spellings of this word see *LSJ* s.vv. σίππιον, στυππίειον, στύπ(π)η, στύπος.

⁵¹ For σιδλίον.

⁵² For σανδάλιον. With the singular used to designate a "pair of sandals," cf. *PMich.* 8.477.27 note; 508.5-6 note.

⁵³ L. R. Palmer, *JThS* 35 (1934) 172; S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuch. z. ein. Grammatik d. Papyri* (Münch. Beitr. z. Papyrusf. 28, 1938) 32. Cf. *PMich.* 8.476.28, 477.42, 494.12; *Sammelbuch* 5.7992.13 (ἐνέκω).

⁵⁴ Cf. Veitch (above, note 26) 670 f.; cf. *BGU* 2.597.6.

⁵⁵ Cf. *PBrem.* 15.4 note; *PSI* 1.50.16 note.

haste. The passage as printed by Grenfell and Hunt is defective, and it is perhaps in consequence of the loss of writing at the beginning of line 26 that their translation is not helpful. I repeat their text.

- ἀκούομεν
[ὅτι δ]ύο ἡμέρας ἐν
25 [τῇ Ὶ]ρακλεοπόλει
...χοι, ὅθεν κατὰ τὴν
προσοῦσάν σοι ἐπιμέ-
λειαν σπεῦσον, ἔχων
ὦν χάριν καὶ ὥρμισας.⁵⁶
30 οὐδὲν γὰρ ὄφελος ὅστε-
ρησάντων τῶν χρειω-
δῶν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Very little ink remains at the beginning of line 26. What has been read as doubtful *omicron* looks like a gigantic dot, but to accept it as *omicron* is to overlook a horizontal line which begins just above it and joins the top of *iota*. The heavy dot is more likely to be an ink blot, and because of the horizontal stroke *epsilon* is at least as good a reading as *omicron*. I recommend *εχει* as a more reasonable reconstruction than *εχοι*. I am guided in this preference not only by palaeographical considerations but also by another piece of epistolary language which has become familiar from papyri.

PFay. 123.9–10: ἔχαι⁵⁷ ὧδε ἡμέρας ὀλίγας.

POxy. 16.1855.9–10: ἔχω δύο ἡμέρας ἀγερχό[μ]ενος πρὸς αὐτούς.

PMerton 1.46.4: δύο ἔχει μόν[ας] ἡμέρας ἀπαιτῶν ὁ Φιλόξενος.

In view of these examples,⁵⁸ and because *τηεχει* fits very well the remnants in line 26, I propose that Grenfell and Hunt's text of lines 23–26 be changed to read as follows:

- ἀκούομεν
[ὅτι] δύο⁵⁹ ἡμέρας ἐν
25 [τῷ Ὶ]ρακλεοπολεί-
τῇ⁶⁰ ἔχει.

⁵⁶ For ὥρμισας.

⁵⁷ For ἔχω.

⁵⁸ Both ἔχω and ποιῶ are used in this way. See Kapsomenakis (above, note 53) 62; Preisigke, *Wörterbuch* s.v. ποιέω (1.d); *LSJ*, *Add. Corr.* s.v. ἔχω.

⁵⁹ A tiny remnant of the lower right corner of *delta* can still be seen on the papyrus.

⁶⁰ For -πολίτη, sc. νομῶ.

The entire passage (23–32) is now simplified and presents no obstacle to translation: “We hear that he has two days in the Heracleopolite nome, and so, with your characteristic devotion to duty,⁶¹ hurry back once you have what you set out to get. For it is no help if the things that are needed for his visit come too late.”

The rest of the letter (33–39) runs smoothly. The cooks Ammonas and Dioscorus, whose services may soon be needed, have gone to the Oxyrhynchite nome, presumably with the intention of returning shortly. We may suppose that they were commissioned to obtain a store of provisions in preparation for Ammonion’s visit. Since they are slow in getting back, Diogenes is asked to send them on their way immediately. The letter concludes with a greeting in line 40 and another by a second hand in line 41. These, then, are the “signatures” of Saras and Eudaemon.

⁶¹ Wilamowitz (above, note 38): “eifrig wie du bist.”