

P.J. SIJPESTEIJN & K.A. WÖRP

P.LOND. INV. 2175: A FULL EDITION

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 175–182

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## P.LOND. INV. 2175: A FULL EDITION

Below we publish for the first time the full text of papyrus inv. 2175 from the British Museum (now: British Library) papyrus collection.<sup>1</sup> Parts of this papyrus were published already more than 70 years ago by Sir Harold Idriss Bell (cf. *Archiv* 7 [1924] 223-24), but the publication of a full text remained a desideratum to date. The writing of the papyrus (H. 26.3 x B. 11.3 cm.) runs along the fibres. The papyrus is cut off rather regularly at the top (margin: 5.1 cm.) and at the bottom (margin 8.5 cm.). Three vertical folds are still visible. The verso is blank.

P.Lond. inv. 2175  
After 3.xii.217

Oxyrhynchite Nome  
Tafel VII

- 1 [ ± 15 ]φ στρ(ατηγῶ) Ὁξυρυγγείτου  
2 [παρὰ Τίτου Φλαυίου Εὐδαίμονος καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει βουλευ[τοῦ τῆς λαμπροτάτης  
πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων δι' Αὐρηλίου]  
3 [Ἀμμωνίου ± 7 ]ονος καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει βουλευτοῦ τῆς Ὁξ[υρυγγιτῶν πόλεως. ἦς  
ἐπόρισα παρὰ Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Μενελάου ἀνταρχιδι-]  
4 [καστοῦ ἐπιστολῆς μ]ετὰ καὶ τοῦ ὑποκολληθέντος βιβλειδίου τ[ὸ ἀντίγραφον ὑπό-  
κειται ]  
5 [ ± 5 καὶ ἀξιῶ σε ἐ]πιστεῖ[λ]αι τοῖς τῶν ἐν κτήσεων βιβ[λιοφύλαξι τοῦ Ὁξυρυγγίτου  
νομοῦ, ἴνα ]  
6 [τὴν παράθεσιν τοῖς] ὑπάρχουσι ποιήσονται πρὸς τὸ μη[δ]ὲν [ἐπὶ περιγραφῇ γίνεσθαι.  
]  
7 [ ± 13 Μάρ]κος Αὐρήλιος Μενέλαο[ς] βουλευτῆς ἀντ[αρχιδικαστῆς  
στρατηγῶ Ὁξυρυγγίτου χαίρειν. Τίτος]  
8 [Φλάυιος Εὐδαίμων βο]υλευτῆς τῆς λαμπροτάτης ἡμῶν πατ[ρίδος ἐνέτυχέ μοι διὰ  
βιβλιδίου ]  
9 [ ± 18 .] ἐπεὶ τοίνυν φάσκει περὶ τῶν μετα [ ]  
10 [ἐν τετυχηκέναι τῶ λ]αμπροτάτῳ ἡμῶν ἡγεμόνι καὶ τε[τυχηκέναι ὑπογραφήσ οὕτως  
ἐχούσης· -]  
11 [ἦθην μέλλειν αὐτὴν] πιπράσκειν ὑπάρχοντα ἃ προκρατεῖ [ ]  
12 [ ± 12 ἐν τῷ] συνβιώσεως χρόνῳ, φρόντισον [ , ἴνα μη-]  
13 [δὲν περὶ τῶν κτήσεων] Πτολεμαΐδος νεωτερίζηται ἄχρι κρ[ίσεως ἔρρωσο.  
(ἔτους) β Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος]  
14 [Μάρκου Ὁπελλίου Σεουήρου Μακρείνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦ[ς, month, day. Μάρκῳ  
Αὐρη-]  
15 [λίῳ Μενελάῳ ἀνταρχιδ]ι[κ]α[σ]τῆ παρὰ Τίτου Φλαυίου Εὐδαίμο[νος καὶ ὡς χρημα-  
τίζει ]  
16 [ ± 15 τῆς συνούσ]ῃς μοι γυναικὸς Αὐρηλίας Πτολεμ[αΐδος ]  
17 [ ± 9 ἐνέτυχον τῶ λ]αμπροτάτῳ ἡγεμόνι διὰ βιβλειδ[ίου οὐ μόνον ]  
18 [ ± 23 ]υ τιμήματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἐ[μοὶ μέρος ]

<sup>1</sup> We are grateful to Dr. T.S. Pattie, *Curator Papyrorum* of the British Library, for his kind permission to publish this interesting papyrus.

- 19 [ ± 7 καὶ ὁ ἡγεμ]ῶν ὑπέγραψέ μοι· (ἔτους) β Χοιάκ ζ· νομ[ ]  
 20 [ ± 15 ]ήθην μέλλειν αὐτὴν πιπράσκειν ἂ κ[αὶ προκρατεῖ ]  
 21 [ ± 11 ἐν τῷ] τῆς συνβιώσεως χρόνῳ εἰς ἃ καὶ ουκολ[ ]  
 22 [ ± 11 · διὸ ἀξι]ῶ προνοῆσαι μηδὲν ἐπὶ περιγραφῇ γί[νεσθαι, ]  
 23 [ἵνα τῶν δικαίων τυχ]εῖν δυνηθῆ. διευτύχει. (m. 2) Τίτος Φλάυιος Εὐδ[αίμων βουλευ-  
 τῆς τῆς λαμπροτάτης]  
 24 [πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρ]έων καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει δι' ἐμοῦ Αὐρηλίου Ἀμμωνίου  
 [. . . . .] ονος βουλευτοῦ τῆς Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως ἐπιδέδωκα.]  
 4, 17 βιβλιδίου 13 κρ[ίσεως: κ corr. from γ 23 δυνηθῶ? (cf. below, footnote 8)

“To (Aurelius Zenobios ?), strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, from Titus Flavius Eudaimon and however he is styled, town councillor of the most illustrious city of the Alexandrines, through Aurelius Ammonios son of (?) -on and however he is styled, town councillor of the city of the Oxyrhynchites. Below follows a copy of the letter which I procured from Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, deputy-*archidikastes*, together with the petition pasted underneath it --- and I ask you to instruct the *bibliophylakes enkteseon* of the Oxyrhynchite nome to make an entry in order that no fraud takes place. ---

Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, town councillor and deputy-*archidikastes*, to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite (nome), greetings. Titus Flavius Eudaimon, town councillor of our most illustrious father town, appealed to us through a petition ---. Since he now says that regarding the --- he has petitioned the most illustrious prefect and obtained a *subscriptio* with the following contents: ‘-- I -- that she will sell the goods she possessed before -- during the period of her marriage’, take care that no measures will be taken concerning the possessions of Ptolemais until the decision [has been finally made?]. Farewell. Year 2 (?) of Imperator Caesar Marcus Opellius Severus Macrinus Pius Felix Augustus [Month, day].

To Marcus Aurelius Menelaos, deputy-*archidikastes*, from Titus Flavius Eudaimon and however he is styled. --- of Aurelia Ptolemais, the woman with whom I live together -- I appealed to the most illustrious prefect through a petition -- not only -- the value but also the part which falls to me -- and the prefect wrote underneath my petition: ‘Year 2, Choiak 7. If you have a legal ground -- I -- that she will sell the goods which she possessed before -- during the period of her marriage and regarding which no --.’ I, therefore, request that no fraud takes place (and that you write to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome?) in order that she (or: I ?) can obtain justice. Farewell. (M. 2) I, Titus Flavius Eudaimon, town councillor of the most illustrious city of the Alexandrines and however he is styled, have submitted (this document) through me, Aurelius Ammonios son of (?) -on, town councillor of the city of the Oxyrhynchites.”

In order to support a theory of Ulrich Wilcken regarding imperial rescripts Bell gave only excerpts of this composite document illustrating the practice of ὑποκόλλησις (l. 4). For understandable reasons these excerpts were never incorporated into the SB. A minor consequence thereof is the fact that Aurelius Ammonios, councillor of Oxyrhynchus (l. 2-3, 24), was not listed by A.K. Bowman in his list of town councillors of Oxyrhynchus in his “*The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*” (Toronto 1971) 138ff.<sup>2</sup> Many more instances of ὑποκόλλησις have become known since; cf., e.g., P.Coll.Youtie I 65 = P.Oxy. XLVII 3365.5.

<sup>2</sup> He may be identical with the Aurelius Ammonios who appears in P.Oxy. X 1278.4, 35; for Oxyrhynchite town councillors named Aurelius Ammonios in the early third century A.D., see Aegyptus 50 (1970) 37.4n.

For the structure of this papyrus, which evidently is an application to a strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (from a man who first approached the *praefectus Aegypti* and a deputy-*archidikastes*) cf. P.Oxy. XII 1472 introd., category (1); cf. also L.C. Youtie in ZPE 46 (1982) 223ff. (= SB XVI 12698); P.Mich. XI 614; H. Kupiszewski in Symbolae Taubenschlag III (= Eos 48 [1956] 89f. See in latest instance S.R. Llewelyn in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 7 (1994) 197ff. An analysis of the complex document yields the following sections:

ll. 1-6: Application to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome from Titus Flavius Eudaimon, a town councillor of Alexandria, who is represented by Aurelius Ammonios, a town councillor of Oxyrhynchus, in which he refers (l. 3-4) to a copy of an earlier letter (*epistole*) from the deputy-*archidikastes* to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome and his previous petition to the deputy-*archidikastes*. Eudaimon now asks the strategus to give an order to the provincial *bibliophylakes enkteseon* to stop the procedure connected with the registration of some property (for παράθεσις having the meaning of 'Sperrvermerk' see H.-J. Wolff, *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens*, II [München 1978] 235ff.; cf. also below, ll.5-6n.).

ll. 7-14: Copy of the referred-to letter from the deputy-*archidikastes* to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome referring to the *subscriptio* (ὑπογραφή) of the *praefectus Aegypti* given in answer to an earlier *libellus* from Eudaimon.

ll. 14-23: Copy of the referred-to previous *libellus* from Eudaimon to the deputy-*archidikastes*, enclosing (l. 19-20/21<sup>3</sup>) a copy of the *subscriptio* (ὑπογραφή) of the *praefectus Aegypti* to an even earlier petition from Eudaimon. Evidently, the prefect instructed in his *hypographe* Eudaimon to bring his case to the attention of the (deputy-)*archidikastes*.

Διευτύχει (l. 23) may belong to either the petition of Eudaimon to the deputy-*archidikastes* (ll. 15-23), or (perhaps slightly more likely) to his petition to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (ll. 1-6).

ll. 23-24: Eudaimon's subscription belonging to the application to the strategus, ll. 1-6.

Obviously Eudaimon himself had lodged an ἀντίρρησις with the *archidikastes* to prevent execution. The *archidikastes* was able to decide the matter (whether he was able to do so by delegation or competence of office remains unclear; cf. S.R. Llewelyn, *op.cit.*, 212). At a κρίσις he decided between a creditor's right to proceed to execution and the validity of the ἀντίρρησις. Pending this κρίσις the *archidikastes* instructs in the present papyrus the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome to stop the procedure of execution in connection with some possessions of Eudaimon. Since the strategus is asked to instruct the *bibliophylakes enkteseon* in Oxyrhynchus (for these cf. P.J. Sijpesteijn - K.A. Worp in a forthcoming publication of P.Lond. inv. 1976 in Stud. Amst. XXXV) to effect a *parathesis* (cf. above ad ll. 1-6) concerning the conveyance of some property of Eudaimon the procedure of execution was already in an advanced stage. Before addressing himself to the *archidikastes* Eudaimon had petitioned the *praefectus Aegypti* and received from him an answer which in his eyes enabled him to lodge with succes an ἀντίρρησις.

For a penetrating study of how such petitions were dealt with administratively, see also R. Haensch in ZPE 100 (1994) 487ff.

The present text has attracted already some attention because of the anonymous strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome mentioned in l. 1.<sup>4</sup> In l. 19 the papyrus presents a date to Choiak 7 of a second regnal year which in all likelihood is the 2nd year of the emperor Macrinus mentioned in

<sup>3</sup> It is unclear whether the prefect's subscription ends already in l. 20, or only in l. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. Bastianini - J.E.G. Whitehorne, *Strategi and Royal Scribes of Roman Egypt* (Firenze 1987; = Pap. Flor. XV) 97.

ll. 13-14, i.e. December 3, A.D. 217. Supposing the question referred to in the text (*vide infra*) took place in or around Macrinus' 2nd regnal year (A.D. 217/18<sup>5</sup>) the anonymous strategus has to be placed between Aurelius Anoubion, still attested in August/September A.D. 216, and Aurelius Harpokration, attested for the first time in September/October, A.D. 218. In that case our strategus may be identical with Zenobius, attested in P.Alex.Giss. 62.7, which is dated to A.D. 218-222<sup>6</sup>. In fact, [Αὐρηλίῳ Ζηνοβίῳ] (13 letters in restoration) would fill the lacuna at the start of l. 1 perfectly, as ± 14 letters are lost at the left-hand side of the papyrus (cf. l. 2). On the other hand, as many as ± 60 letters may be lost at the right-hand side (cf. the note to ll. 3-4). It is, therefore, not astonishing that the details of the question which formed the subject of Eudaimon's petitions remain obscure; as usual in such lacunose texts we have supplied in our restorations only phrasings found elsewhere in this document or occurring in other similar texts, but we do not claim that no alternative restorations are conceivable. There is a question of a sale of (landed?) property (ll. 11 and 20) during the period of marriage (cf. ll. 12 and 21), but in possession before the marriage (cf. l. 11 and 20, προκρατεῖ). Bell supposed that the property in question belonged to Eudaimon's wife, Aurelia Ptolemais, who may have attempted to sell this without Eudaimon's permission. Unless, however, one assumes a scribal error in l. 22<sup>8</sup>, Eudaimon petitions the officials on behalf of a third person who in all probability will have been his wife. It looks, therefore, as if Aurelia Ptolemais (and therefore indirectly her husband Titus Flavius Eudaimon) was hampered to do something with property she possessed already before her marriage to Eudaimon during this marriage. From the fact that Eudaimon sends this document eventually to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome one may deduce that the property involved was located in that nome. Furthermore, as he addresses the strategus through another person, it may be deduced that Eudaimon himself was not present in Oxyrhynchus. We may assume that he lived in Alexandria of which city he was a town councillor. We are, therefore, dealing with another instance of an absentee landlord. We must leave it to jurists to eventually discover what the affair was about exactly and to decide which could have been the answer of the prefect (probably Lucius Valerius Datus, cf. G. Bastianini in ZPE 17 [1975] 307 and 38 [1980] 86 n. 5; ANRW 10.1 513 [addenda till 1985]; to the attestations collected by Bastianini now add P.Oxy. XLVII 3347.4 and SB XVIII 14007.5).

Notes:

2. Bell (*loc.cit.* 223 fn. 2) rightly remarks that if Oxyrhynchus were named in the lacuna at the end of this line, one would expect τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως instead of τῆς Ὀξυρυχιτῶν πόλεως

<sup>5</sup> The latest Egyptian dating by Macrinus as sole ruler, before Diadumenianus was joined to the rule, is either May 27, A.D. 218, or May 26 - June 24, A.D. 217, cf. D.W. Rathbone, ZPE 62 (1986) 106. In general see also D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt 1990) 169ff. It is well-known (see ZPE 13 [1974] 219ff.) that after his death Macrinus suffered '*damnatio memoriae*'. In the present text, however, his name was not deleted (a phenomenon which occurs regularly enough).

<sup>6</sup> In l. 6 of this papyrus [kept in the Musée gréco-romaine d'Alexandrie] there is a question of θεῶν Σεουήρου κ[αὶ Ἀντωνίνου, and in l. 11 of Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου [Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς (Σεβαστοῦ) καὶ (?) Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Ἀλεξάνδρου Καίσαρος (Σεβαστῶν)]. It should be noted that in this papyrus from Alexandria Αὐρηλίου is left out between Μάρκου and Ἀντωνίνου (this could point to an early point in Elagabal's reign).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the role of the βιβλιοφύλακες ἐγκτήσεων (l. 5).

<sup>8</sup> Read δυνηθῶ instead of δυνηθῆ? In l. 24 we read χρηματίζει, while χρηματίζω might be expected (the petition was submitted *de facto* by Eudaimon's representative, Aurelius Ammonios).

- in l. 3. From the wording in l. 8 taken in combination with that of l. 7 he assumed that Titus Flavius Eudaimon (a Roman citizen from before the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, whose forefathers had received the *civitas Romana* during the Flavian dynasty) was a councillor of Alexandria. This supposition is supported by our reading in l. 24. For a list of town councillors of Alexandria, see D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate* (Amer. Class. Stud., 23).<sup>9</sup>
- 2-3. The element -]ονος in the combination of names Αὐρηλίου Ἀμμωνίου .....]μονος is either the end of the name of the father of Aurelius Ammonios or Ammonios' alias name. An Oxyrhynchite town councillor Ammonios is also found in P.Oxy. XII 1562.4 (276-282), but this cannot be the same person. Cf. also P.Select. 5, Verso (III).  
For the specifically Oxyrhynchite use of the verb ἐπόρισα next to παρεκόμισα in the Arsinoite and Hermopolite nomes, cf. P.Heid. IV 325.4 n.
- 3-4. The restoration at the end of l. 3 is too long in comparison with other restorations at the right hand side of the papyrus, but words like Ὀξυρυγγιτῶν πόλεως or the first two names of the deputy-*archidikastes*, Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου (restored from l. 7, see note ad loc.), were possibly abbreviated or even just omitted.
4. Bell's interest was in the words μετὰ καὶ τοῦ ὑποκολληθέντος βιβλειδίου.
- 5-6. Since the deputy-*archidikastes* apparently instructs (l. 13) the strategus to do nothing until the κρίσις has come to an end, we assume that Eudaimon asks the strategus to inform the *bibliophylakes enkteseon* that they effect a *parathesis* concerning the conveyance of Eudaimon's property. In most cases which attest execution the strategus is petitioned in order that he instructs the local *bibliophylakes enkteseon* to perform the conveyance of property, cf. P.Oxy. XXVII 2473 and P.Coll.Youtie II 65 (examples of such requests for *parathesis*); cf. also the introduction above with regard to ll. 1-6.
- 6 (and l. 22). For περιγραφή = 'fraud', cf. R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the papyri* (Warszawa<sup>2</sup>) 462; P.Oxy. XLVII 3350.20n.
7. Unfortunately the name of the ἀνταρχιδικαστής = deputy-*archidikastes* (for occurrences of the title cf. P.Oxy. XLIII 3131.2n.; PSI X 1105.6, XII 1255.3; for the restoration of the title cf. our note to l. 15), who might be different from ὁ διέπων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιδικαστείαν, is not impeccably preserved. On the basis of some letters read with slightly greater confidence than others (our first reading was: ] ος Α . η ιος Μεγάλο[ ]) and in view of the date of this text we think that we are dealing with a Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Μετέλαος (on Marci Aurelii in

<sup>9</sup> In our opinion it cannot be excluded that the town councillor L. Septimius Hierax alias Philantinoos (SEG XII 557 = SB I 177; cf. Aegyptus 32 [1952] 402 and CdE 53 [1952] 316) also occurs in a papyrus from the Zereteli collection, P.Ross.Georg. II 40.4 (provenance unknown); as the papyrus contains a mutilated report of a town council's proceedings he may have been even president of the council of Alexandria and the proceedings may give us a rare glimpse into the business of the council of that city (cf. P.Ross.Georg. II 40.12n.; for a list of town council proceedings cf. A.K. Bowman, *op.cit.*, 32-34; for P.Ross.Georg. II 40 esp., see also *ibidem* 113). In favour of this hypothesis it may be argued that in the Ross.Georg. papyrus, l. 17, an Aurelius Dionysios, γενόμενος ---, occurs, while in another document from the same Zereteli collection, SB IV 7434.5, an Aurelius Dionysios, γενόμενος ὑπομνηματογράφος of Alexandria is mentioned. On palaeographical grounds the first editor of these texts dated them both to the 2nd century A.D., but the rather frequent mentioning of Aurelii in them makes us believe that such a date is not reliable and that a date after A.D. 212 is more likely. Furthermore, in SB VIII 9912.8 (A.D. 270) occurs an Aurelius Dionysios κοσμητεύσας βουλ(ευτῆς) of Alexandria. Are, after all, these Aurelii Dionysii all to be related to the same person or family? Unfortunately, other persons mentioned in P.Ross.Georg. II 40, viz. Antonius [ ] (l. 16), Statilius Serenus (l. 18) and Theophilos (l. 19) cannot be further traced down as being Alexandrians.

3rd-century Egypt cf. D. Hagedorn in *BASP* 16 [1979] 47-59), rather than that we fill the space available in the lacuna with a name consisting of the regular *tria nomina* of a Roman citizen (with a *cognomen* Ἀ. η. ιος, followed by a patronymic Μενελάου). Marcus Aurelius Menelaos must be placed between the *archidikastai* Aurelius Apollonios (A.D. 217) and Calpurnius Petronianus (ca. A.D. 225).

8. Cf. l. 15n.

11. The verb προκρατέω is attested also in P.Ross.Georg. II 28.8. The meaning of this rarely attested verb is 'to possess before (a certain time)'. LSJ cites only one example of this verb, but with the meaning 'to seize beforehand'. We exclude the possibility that one should separate προ | κρατεί.

12-13. In l. 21 the scribe used the article τῆς before συμβιώσεως, but here we cannot read the first letter after the lacuna as a sigma.

For the reconstructed text: ἵνα μηδὲν ---]--- νεωτερίζηται ἄχρι κρίσεως cf. P.Giss. 34.7: μηδενὸς νεωτεριζομένου μέχρι τῆς --- κρίσεως.

κρ[ίσεως seems to have been corrected by the scribe trying to change an original gamma into a kappa; apparently he did not succeed very well in his endeavour.

15. Already Bell assumed (rightly, we think) that an *archidikastes* was involved in the whole procedure reflected by our papyrus. At this point in the papyrus we expect the title to have been mentioned as part of an address in a petition from Eudaimon and directly preceding παρὰ Τίτου Φλαυίου Εὐδαίμο[νος κτλ.] (cf. Bell's description of 'c'<sup>10</sup>) and though a reading ἀρχι]δ[ι]κ[ασ]τη may not look very convincing in itself, we see no alternative for it (the more so, as we must assume that we are dealing with an official capable of giving orders to a strategus, cf. our reconstruction of ll. 7-14 and of the character of the document in general). On the other hand, one might expect that an *archidikastes*' full title would contain many more elements (cf. for the full titulature the lists in P.Theon., Appendix B). This, however, is not the case with an ἀνταρχιδικαστής (for the three attestations thus far known cf. above, l. 7n.), and as it happens, we have the letters ἀν[ preserved after a name + βουλευτής in l. 7. As we fail to see what a βουλευτής of Ἄν[τινόου πόλις (or, for that matter, of any other metropolis beginning with Ἄν[ ]) would be doing within the context of our document as far as preserved we think it best to combine the two elements ἀν[τ (l. 7) and -ἀρχι]δ[ι]κ[ασ]τῆ (l. 15) and restore here (and, consequently, in ll. 3-4 and 7) an ἀνταρχιδικαστής, who resided, of course, in Alexandria. At the same time this restoration explains the phrasing in l. 8, βουλευτῆς τῆς λαμπροτάτης ἡμῶν πατρίδος, said of Titus Flavius Eudaimon, who presumably was a town councillor of Alexandria (cf. l. 2n.); Marcus Aurelius Menelaos was a fellow-town councillor of Alexandria and used the plural ἡμῶν. An indication of the place, where Marcus Aurelius Menelaos was town councillor, was omitted in l. 7, because it would be quite clear from the following function indication ἀνταρχιδικαστής that he officiated in Alexandria.

17. For the restoration, cf. BGU II 614.12.

18. Restore, perhaps, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τιμήματος (cf. P.Oxy. XII 1562.3)?

19. Maybe one should restore at the start of the prefect's *hypographe* something like νόμ[ιμον εἶ τι ἔχεις, or νομ[ίμως or νομ[ίζω, but other restorations seem also conceivable. For the form and contents of such *hypographai* in papyri from Roman Egypt cf. G. Foti Talamanca,

<sup>10</sup> Apparently he found the word ἀρχιδικαστής preserved more or less completely somewhere in the text (cf. his use of [ ]-brackets in the second paragraph of his description of the text, *loc.cit.* p. 223).



*Ricerche sul processo nell'Egitto greco-romano*, II.1: L'introduzione del Giudizio (Milano 1979) 164ff.; J.D. Thomas in *Studia Hellenistica* 27 (1983) 369-382.

20. Supplement, e.g., δικαίως ἐνοή]θην?  
 21. οὐκολ[: either οὐ κολ[ or οὐκ ὀλ[.  
 22. γί[νεσθαι: the gamma starts with a superfluous oblique. In the following lacuna a restoration of a phrasing like, e.g., καὶ γράψαι τῷ τοῦ Ὁξυρυγγίτου νομοῦ, is conceivable.  
 24. It should be noted that in l. 1 καὶ ὡς χρηματίζει follows immediately after the petitioner's name, while here it follows βουλευτῆς ... Ἀλεξανδρέων. Its position in this line is the more usual one. Eudaimon mentions only his most important office, i.e. the membership of the council of Alexandria, and he does not bother to mention any other office(s) he had fulfilled or was still holding.

## APPENDIX

A list of ἀρχιδικασταί which supplements the list of these officials in P.Theon., Appendix 'B' (numbers in our first column refer to the numbers given in that list:

#	Name	Date	Reference
	Ἡρακλείδης	12/13	P.Köln V 227, B.20
	Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Ποτάμων, γενόμ.	58	P.Oxy. XLIX 3463.1
	Πάλλας	81	P.Oxy. XII 1471.2
	Ἄντωνίνος	81-96	P.Oxy. XLIX 3466.1
	Τίτος Φλαύσιος Σιλανὸς Σωτήριχος <sup>11</sup>	I	P.Prag. I 11.2
51?	Καλλίνικος	c. 100	BGU XV 2473.5
43?	Σερῆνος Ἡρακλείδου	I/II	P.XV Congr. 16.1
24?	N.N.	ca. 124	P.Oxy.Hels. 18.20
	Χρύσερμος	125/26	P.Oxy. L 3557.1
26	(Ἰούλιος) Οὐῆστινιανὸς Ἀσκλη- πιάδης ὁ καὶ Λεωνίδης	127	Proc. XIX Congr. Papyrology I 565.8 <sup>12</sup>
27	N.N.	127/8	SB XVI 12345.5 = P.Mil.Vogl.VI 210
27b	Μουνατιανὸς Μουνατιανοῦ	128	P.Mil.Vogl. VI 266.2,3 (also to be restored in P. Mil. I 26.1-2, cf. P. Heid. IV p. 193 ad loc.)
35	Αἰλιανὸς Εὐφράνορος	136	P.IFAO III 18.2
44	Κλαύδιος Εἰρηναῖος	141/2	SB XVI 12520.25 = SB III 6951
54	Κλαύδιος Ἰέραξ	146	SB XIV 12139 III 16
60	N.N.	158/9	P.IFAO III 11.9 (cf. BL VIII 153)
64	Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁ καὶ Ἡρωδιανός	159/60	BGU XV2472.8 (cf. III 881.1)

<sup>11</sup> Or read Σωτηρίχου for Σωτηρίχῳ, taking Soterichus to be the father's name with T. Fl. Silanus? The names 'Titus Flavius' point toward a Roman citizenship acquired under the emperor Vespasian or his sons.

<sup>12</sup> For the *archidikastes* Tiberius Julius Vestinianus Asclepiades qui et Leonides, cf. H. Devijver in ZPE 104 [1994] 69ff.

	Εἰρηναῖος Εἰρηναίου	169/70	P.Oxy. XVII 2134.3,5
	N.N.	Aft. i. 175	P.Stras. 370.3,7
	Διόδωρος	176/77	BGU VII 1574.5
	Ποτάμων ὁ καὶ Δίδυμος	182-186	SB XVI 12698.4,8
79	Διόδοτος	189?	SB XVI 12333.2,4
	Ἡρακλείδης Φιλοκράτου, διέπων	Early II	P.Mich. IX 528.3
	N.N.	II	BGU XV 2492.10
	N.N. (2 officials)	II	SB XIV 11607.3,4
	N.N.	II/III	P.Diog. 17.21
	N.N. ὁ καὶ Ἴππαρχος	Aft.6.i.215	P.Heid. IV 325.5, cf. P.Turner 40.1 (III)
	Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Μενέλαος	Aft. 3. xii. 217	P.Lond.inv. 2175
118	Σεπτίμιος Ἑρμίας ὁ καὶ Ἑρμαῖσκος	225-233	SB XVI 12837 = SPP XXII 70.1
	Αὐρήλιος Βησαρίων	238	P.Oxy. XLVII 3365.30
108	Αὐρήλιος Μάξιμος ὁ καὶ Ἑρμαῖσκος	248	P.Rain.Cent. 69.1
110a	N.N.	Aft. 250	SB XVIII 13974.2
	Αὐρήλιος Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ καὶ Διονύσιος	Bef. 30. 8. 251	P.Oxy. LI 3610.4
	Κλαύδιος Φιλώτας ὁ καὶ Ἰέραξ	289	P.Coll.Youtie II 73.12
	N.N. ὁ καὶ Τούρβων	c. 298?	P.Oxy. LXIX 3499.1
92	N.N.	mid III	SB XVIII 13302.3

Fragment of an ancient Greek papyrus scroll, showing several lines of handwritten text in a cursive script. The fragment is heavily damaged, with significant portions missing and the remaining text appearing as dark ink on a light, textured background. The text is arranged in approximately 15 horizontal lines, though many are partially obscured by the damage. The script is a form of ancient Greek cursive, likely from the Hellenistic or Roman periods. The fragment is irregularly shaped, with jagged edges and numerous holes and tears, particularly in the lower half. The ink is dark and somewhat faded in places, making some characters difficult to decipher. The overall appearance is that of an archaeological find, possibly from a library or a private collection.