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## Records of Loan Receipts from a Guild Association

### P. Texas inv. no. 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 x 18 cm</th>
<th>182 or 158 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provenance unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medium-brown papyrus incomplete at top and right, with left and bottom margins of .5-1 and 2.8-3.2 cm respectively. Papyrus has sustained much damage, with holes, cracks and worn places throughout. At points the ink is smudged or faded beyond recognition. All three hands of the document commit spelling errors; notable is the third hand's confusion of m and n (δημοσιοκραχος, 15; νησις or νικηφή, 16 [see comm.]). Writing parallel to fibers. Back blank.

P. Tex. inv. 8 belongs to a small collection of Ptolemaic cartonnage papyri purchased in 1986 by the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas. The papyrus preserves three complete loan receipts in different hands with remnants of another at the top. Of the complete texts, the third scribe writes in a lapidary uncial script, whereas the second uses a rapid, sloppy cursive. The first writer falls somewhere between these two extremes.

The receipts concern loans made to Menestheus son of Chares, Asklepiades son of Kasas (?; see comm.), and Xenikos, whose father's name is not given, and all are addressed to Herakles, whose official title may have been δημοσιοκραχος, a hitherto unattested word. All stipulate a six-month loan period from Phamenoth to Mesore of the twenty-third year. That year, coupled with paleographic considerations, suggests two possible second-century BC dates, 182 or 158. This papyrus most likely formed part of the bookkeeping of the lending institution, which in this case, judging from the phrase κοινῶν χρημάτων (see on 4 below), is an unnamed guild, or κοινῶν. Loan documents in which a guild is the lending institution are rare; for the Ptolemaic period I find only *P. Ryl. IV* 586 and 589.6 *P. Eras.* I

---

1 We thank P. van Minnen for reading a preliminary draft of this article and offering many helpful suggestions, and K. Rigsby for help with inscriptions. We are also grateful to the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas, Austin, for permission to publish this papyrus.

2 The few distinguishable letters do not permit identification as a separate hand.

3 The reading ἡρακλεῖ δημοσιοκράχος is uncertain; see comm. I have not been able to identify these names with other personae in the Ptolemaic papyri. Ξενικὸς is unattested in the Ptolemaic period, occurring elsewhere in 3rd/4th cent. AD pap. (I find only *P. Oxy.* XII 1413.22, 1486.1, 1496.2.20, 22, 34; XXIV 2421.1, 12. Cf. Ξενικος, SB XIV 11532.7).

4 Phamenoth has been restored in the second complete receipt. No day date seems to follow Phamenoth in line 2, the only place where any amount of space follows the month. Six months was a long period for this time (H.-A. Rupprecht, *Untersuchungen zum Darlehen im Recht der graeco-aegyptischen Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit* [Münchener Beiträge 51, 1967] 21ff.). Cf. *P. Ryl.* IV 589; cols. 1-8 are a ledger of principal and monthly interest on loans of a guild or gymnasium, carried over a six-month period.


6 Cf. the early *eranos* loan *P. Hib.* II 259 (235 BC) and for the Byzantine period *P. Strass.* IV 287, both cited and discussed by van Minnen, *op. cit.* (above n. 5) 65 n. 122.
D. Martinez and M. Williams

10 (II BC) may be an order to repay (or deliver on) a guild loan (see the note on this text which follows this article).

The practice of clubs making loans to members served two purposes. First, membership in an association entailed rendering assistance to one's colleagues in times of need, and extending loans from the common fund served as a corporate means of meeting this obligation.8 Second, in addition to expressing κοινωνία, the guild profited when loans were repaid with interest, as is the case, for example, in P. Ryl. IV 586.4-7.9 [ἐπὶ] κοινωνίας χρημάτων[10] χαλκοῦ νομίσματος τάλαντα πεντά[ήκοντα τρία δραχμάς ...] χλίας τόκου [ὡς ἐκ δύο δραχμῶν τῇ μνήμῃ] ἐκάστῃ τὸν μη[ν] καὶ ἐκαστὸν (cf. also ibid. 589 cols. 1-8; see our text below, on lines 4, 10, 14). The Texas papyrus specifies no rate of interest. This may point to an interest-free loan, as was the practice in eranos societies (J. Vondeling, Eranos [Groningen 1961] 29ff., 259-61).

We cannot, however, always argue from silence in cases such as these (Pestman, op. cit. [above n. 8] 14f.).

The format of this text in itself raises interesting questions. The three different hands and the ich-Stil of the entire document seem to indicate that Herakles allowed each borrower to make the appropriate entry in the ledger book (the third hand particularly is not that of a trained scribe). Normal practice would rather have the separate receipts glued together in a tomos synkollesimos or summarized into a ledger by a single hand (in er-Stil).11 I do not know of any Ptolemaic parallels for the scheme of the Texas document. For the Roman period, however, P. van Minnen has drawn my attention to CPR XVII B, two rolls from Panopolis in which transactions through a bank are entered in a ledger in different hands (also ich-Stil: cf. Sijpesteijn's introd., p. 3). See also below on αἰρέτ, lines 6 and 13.

Finally, lapidary script is not all that distinguishes the third entry. It also omits the ἐὰν — ἀνυπερθύνων default clause which concludes the first two receipts (and the fragmentary one at the top) and replaces it with the blander καὶ ἀπόγραται.

→ 1 [............] ἐὰν δὲ μὴ [ ... c. 6 litt. ...] [............] αὐτῆς ἀνυπερθύνων[1] ὑπότι. (traces) ἔρρησε (οὐκ Φωμενότ)

Μενεθεὶς Χάρητος Ἑρακλῆς διευθυνάρχοι καθίειν. [ὁμολογώ ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν]

4 κοινών χρημάτων χαλκοῦ τάλαντα ε καὶ δραχμὰ πεντακεῖς[κλίας ...] ὡς ἀποδόκαι καὶ ἐμὴ μὴν Μεσορῆ τοῦ τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτοῦ: [ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀπὸ-]

δο, ἐξέται καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτοῦ με παντὶ τρόπῳ ω ἐὰν αἰρέτ, ἀνυπερθύνων[10] ὑπότι.

8 ἔρρησε (traces?) Φωμενόθ

(μ2) Ἀσκληπιάδης Κοκάτους Ἑρακλῆς κλήρις οἱ ἀρχοὶ καθίειν. [ὁμολογώ ἔχειν]

ἀπὸ τῶν κ[ο]ινῶν χρημάτων χαλκοῦ δραχμὰς τριεχθένι[κλίας ...] ἐνεσεὶ[κοντα τριες τριῳβόλαν, ὡς ἀποδόκαι ἐμὴν τριή τρίτου]

12 καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτοῦ· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ [άπο] δο, ἐξέται καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἐτοῦ με

---

7 In general see van Minnen, op. cit. (above n. 5) 65f.
8 Failure to do so in fact could be a punishable offense: ἐὰν τὰς περιδὰς τινὰς ἐν ἁπάντη ἐν μὴν καὶ μὴν ςυνεπικλήτη ἐπὶ τὰς εὐλάβεις αὐτοῦ τῆς ἁπάντης δήλωσιν (read δόγως) νομίσματος (P. Mich. V 243.6 [guild nomos, 1st cent. AD]). Compare also the practice of guilds furnishing bail for arrested members (e.g., P. Mich. V 243.8-9; 244.9-10; Boak, art. cit. 218). In general, for good will or altruism as motives for making loans see P.W. Pestman JJP 16/17 (1971) 17f.
9 On P. Ryl. IV 586, the missing top portion of which has been identified as P. Graz I 1933 (SB VI 9255), see also C.H. Roberts and E.G. Turner, JEA 39 (1953) 113f. This text is a Blanketturkunde, see van Minnen, op. cit. (above n. 5) 66 with n. 125.
10 Although κοινών χρημάτων is read by the first editors, [ἐπὶ] κοινωνίας, the reading of 589.85, should probably be restored. See Roberts, Turner, op. cit. (above n. 9) 114, n. on line 11.
11 For the latter cf. P. Ryl. IV 589 cols. 1-8 (simply a list of names and sums); or if not a single hand, at least not a different hand for each receipt.
From line 3: "Menestheus son of Chares to Herakles demosiarch, greetings. I agree that I have received from the common funds... talents and five thousand... drachmae and three obols, which I will repay in the month Mesore of the twenty-third year, and if I do not repay, you may seize me without accountability in any way you see fit. Farewell. Phamenoth..."

Asklepiades son of Kasas (?) to Herakles demosiarch, greetings. I agree that I have received from the common funds three thousand... ninety-three copper drachmae and three obols, which I will repay in the month Mesore of the twenty-third year, and if I do not repay, you may seize me without accountability in any way you see fit. Farewell. Phamenoth...

Xenikos to Herakles demosiarch, greetings. I have received from the common funds 859 copper drachmae and three obols, which I will repay in the month Mesore of the twenty-third year and I will do as above written. Farewell. Phamenoth..."

1-2: The traces, if correctly identified, suggest the following reconstruction: [εἰκοστοῖς ἔτοιμον ἐδὲ μὴ ἀπόδοο, ἐὰν εἰς τοὺς ἑνεβραζέν με παντὶ ἕτερον ἢ ἐὰν αἴρῃ, ὑπενεβραζόντα] ἑντα. (traces) ἔρροξος Φαμενώθ. In line 1, however, the δ of δε is very uncertain, as is ἐξε (only smudges remain). Also, the supplement at the end of line 1 is somewhat short. A narrow piece of papyrus extends up at the fifth or sixth letter space of the lacuna before the beginning of line 2 but it seems to be only verso fibers.

3 Ἡρακλῆς δημοσιάρχης: ἗ρακλῆς [ἡ] δημοσιάρχης: For the spelling δημ- in the first hand (3) cf. also Μεσορής 5 and αἴρῃ 6 (see both ad loc.). The present case may, however, be due to the influence of the preceding Ἡρακλῆς (Mayser/Schmoll F 1.49f.). The reading as well as the interpretation (below) remain most uncertain, particularly in line 9 where the tops of the letters are completely faded from the papyrus. I present here images of the traces:

1. read Φαμενώθ
2. read δημοσιάρχης
3. read κείμενος
4. read Μεσορής
5. read δημοσιάρχης
6. and 13 read αἴρῃ
11. read ἑνενήκοντα
14. read ἔρροξος
15. read δημοσιάρχης and παντήκοντα
16. read ἑντα and εἰκοστοίς

In line 3 (1) we could also read Ἡρακλῆς ἑτεροίδει (read <εἰκοστοίς> ἐτεροίδει), in 9 perhaps Ἡρακλῆς (read Ἡρακλῆς ἑτεροίδει), and in 14, in the clearest but also most untrained hand, Ἡρακλῆς δημοσιάρχης (read <ἐκδημοσιάρχης>). This interpretation would give us a well-attested word which suits the general practice of associations, which held monthly banquets for their members (P. Mich. V 243.2; cf. P. Lond. VII 2193.15f.; de Cenival, op. cit. [above n. 5] 181ff.). That our text describes an official in charge of making loans, seeing to their repayment, and penalizing default, does not necessarily argue against συμποσιάρχης, since a guild official (especially a president) could be named after one of many functions. The reading does, however, force us to assume the coincidence that two different hands made almost the same mistake (or used similar unattested abbreviations for συμποσιάρχης). On the other hand, if we adopt the reading given in the text and lemma, we are obliged to explain the δημοσιάρχης, an addendum lexicum.

The word, if correct, is structurally similar to, e.g., ἐράνναρχος (BGU IV 1133.5 [19 BC]), "president of the eranos", or "administrator of the eranois-loans", since in this text he oversees loans and their repayment (cf. 10ff.; Denarch., op. cit. 69 fr. 3.4; Suidas 1762, IV p. 148 Adler s.v πληρωτής; Diog., vit. phil. 6.63. Similarly ἄρχερανος [IG XII 7.58.9; 3rd cent. BC], ἄρχερανοτής [IG II, 1297.10; 237/6 BC], and ἄρχερανοτική [IG II, 1369.35; late 2nd cent. AD; ID IV 1801.1f.?; 113/12 BC]). In general see Brashier, op. cit. (above n. 5) 15; San Nicolò, op. cit. (above n. 5) 218ff; Stöckler, op. cit. (above n. 5) 188ff; Vondeling, op. cit. (above introd.) 212ff, 230f., 264. Cf. also the προτάστος ἐράννων in BGU IV 1134-36 (10 BC), and on these texts see San Nicolò, loc. cit. Similar also in form and possibly function is χρηματιστάς in P. Ryl. IV 586.9f., 15f., 24 (c. 99 BC), "keeper of the χρήματα", i.e. the κοινά χρήματα, "common funds" (on which see below and the note on P. Eran. 110 following this article). By analogy, δημοσιάρχης could mean the "treasurer of the guild", the "administrator of public goods (τὸ δημόσιον)"; perhaps a secular equivalent of the Egyptian mr šn in cult associations. According to one of two
possible derivations, the *mr in* is the overseer of the inventory or goods of the temple (see F. de Cenival's discussion [above, n. 5] 154-159; cf. Huss, *op. cit.* [above n. 5] 115 n. 270). But there are no parallels for applying τὰ δημοσίαν/τὸ δημόσιον to the treasury or common goods of an association, unless we take as evidence a general tendency to transfer the language of public life to the language of guilds.

We may also derive δημοσίαρχος on the basis of δημόσια in its technical sense of "public fund" which in the Roman/Byzantine periods the members were obliged to pay through their guild to the state. Collecting the δημόσια in the form of taxes (*SB XVI* 12695, on which cf. van Minnen [above, n. 5] 64f.; J. Rea’s n. line 13 of the ed. pr inc.* [ZPE 46, 1982, 202]) or fines (δὲ ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ· ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ) was an important part of the responsibilities of guild presidents (e.g., the mid-first century AD Michigan guild *nomoi* *P. Mich.* 243-45 and in general see Boak, *art. cit.* [above n. 5] 214; van Minnen, *op. cit.* [above n. 5] 49, with n. 81, 64f.; cf., e.g., ἕδωκαν·καὶ·ἐν·τῷ·δήμῳ·καὶ·ἐν·τῷ·πολιτείᾳ). Collecting the funds,* art. cit.* [above n. 5] 64; with the double fine in *P. Mich.* V 245.24ff. (cited above) cf. the penalty clause in Ptolemaic loans, ἐκτίσεως καὶ ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ [δημόσιον ὀκτά] καὶ τὸ δήμοσίον τῶν ἱερῶν, *P. Tebt.* III 110.8, 92/9 BC; see Ruprecht [above n. 4] 100). Exceptions include δημοσίων for "state archive" in *SB I* 39267 (765 BC) and *BGU* XX 1971.6f. (mid. II BC), perhaps not surprisingly, since the former certainly and the latter likely, which is a common fund, had independent status as a polis. More significant is the same usage in *P. Petr.* I 14.10 (CJP I 126, C.Ptol. Sklav. 53; III BC, Crocodilopolis); similarly *P. Freib.* III 26.10 (rest. Wilcken; 179/8 BC; Philadelphia). Cf. also δημοσίων for "state" or "state granary", *P. Hibile* I 65.25ff. (approx. 265 BC); ὑμῖν δημοσία, *BGU VI* 1273.16, 17, 58f. (222 BC; Oxyrhynchos); περὶ τῶν δημοσίων. *P. Tebt.* III 2912.7 (139 BC ?), probably referring to lands. Potentially most interesting is the *nomos* "of the guild of Zeus hypsistos", but the relevant passage is to lacunate to afford much help; [*c. 19 litt. δημοσιοσ[ι] and [i]t[ei]s [to]π[es] το[πο][es] των συμβολ[ων] καὶ τάλλα ἐπ[ε] [c. 28 litt. ἵππες καὶ εἰσενεχοντο ἔκοσα[σ] [α]τον [κτημ[αι], *P. Lond.* VII 2193.20f., between 69 and 58 (?) BC; Philadelphia). Neither of the above explanations adequately account for δημοσίαρχος nor do they inspire much confidence in the security of the reading.

3 χρήσει: Very few sturdy marks trace remain; the word is not clear in any of the receipts (cf. below on line 14).

4, 10 'κοινῶν χρήσεων: "common" or "club funds"; a familiar phrase in inscriptions (F. Poland, *Griechische Vereinswesen* [Leipzig 1909] 488f. with n. **)), but in the papyri, as far as I can see, cf. only κοινῶν/χρησιμοποιοῦν χρήσεις in *P. Ryl.* IV 676-686 and 19636. Unfortunately for the former (quoted in intro. above) the phrase is surrounded by lacunae. In this text and others, however, it seems to mean the general operating account or treasury from which loans were made and other services provided to members; cf., e.g., the practice of furnishing bail (above n. 8) and *P. Mich.* V 244.18, which prescribes that if a member is bereaved, εἰσενεχοντο ἔκοσα[σ] ποιον ἤπειρα καὶ τῶν κυνον ἱεροῦ μὴ ἤμερον μὴν (Boak, intro., p. 103f.; van Minnen, *op. cit.* [above n. 5] 65). So in inscriptions κοινα χρήσεως describes the treasuries of political entities and of guilds; with respect to the former, e.g., the Athenian popular assembly (*IG* II 2.558.31 [Dittenberger, *Syll.* I 343], Attica, 303/2 BC), an amphictyonic league (*IG* II 2.1126.7 [SEG 28, 100], Delos, 380/79 BC), the "League of Islanders" (*IG* XI 4.1036.12, Delos, IV AD). For the latter, cf., e.g., *ID* IV 1521.33ff. (Delos, II AD?), which instructs, εἰς τοὺς [εἰκότας καὶ τῶν εἰκότων ἄνωθεν δοθήτων καὶ τῶν κοινῶν χρήσεων (33f.; in general, for this kind of decree, see cf. P. Berol. inv. 2515.15ff. in Brashar, *op. cit.* [above, n. 5] 12ff.); *FD* III 7.20.22, 62 (Dittenberger, *Syll.* II 705, Delphi, 112/11 BC, R.K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* [Baltimore 1969] pp. 86ff., # 15 [one of the "techntaii guild" inscriptions]); *IG* II 1317.9 (Attica, end of III AD; a fragmentary inscription concerning θεοφιλους of Bendis, in which κοινὰ χρήσεως is plausibly restored).

The Michigan first-cent. guild *nomoi* designate the common fund as simply τὸ κοινὸν (*P. Mich.* V 244.8 [with n. ad loc.], 13; 245.25, 28; cf. Poland, *op. cit.* [above, n. 5] 489 with n. *], fed by dues (ibid. 243.2f.; cf. Boak, *art. cit.* 215), special contributions (ibid. 243.5; Boak, *art. cit.* [above n. 5] 215f.) and the numerous fines imposed upon negligent members (ibid. 243.4, 244.7f., 245.25f., 28f., 35f. [with n. ad loc.]; Boak, *art. cit.* 218f.). From the basic sense, "common fund" (from which loans were taken), κοινὰ/περιμενον χρήσεις came also to mean the loans themselves, as in *P. Ryl.* IV 389.84f. (i.e., the principal on which interest was charged in the first 8 columns; see ed.'s intro.): πράξεως δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀργυροῦ χρήσεως [ἐπί]χρειας, χρήσεως, then follows a list of names and amounts owed. Cf. *I. Lasos* 23.9ff.II 2C: ἱνα, ἐὰν δέχῃ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, ἐπιχρηματίσῃ αὐτοῦ ποινήν τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἐπιχρημάτισαν αὐτοῦ κοινὰ χρήσεως κατὰ τὰν χρήσιμαν τὰν αὐτοῦ καὶ μηδὲν ἐπιπληθύνον τὴν ἐπὶ καθησυχασμὸν χρήσιν ταῖς. 5 Μιχελάτι: On this spelling see Mayer/Schmoll F 1.94.

6, 12 ἐνέχυρισαν: Usually *"take something as surety from someone"*: here *seize (persons)*, "take into custody." Cf. *P. Mich.* V 245.39ff., ἑξεναῖ τῷ αὐτῷ Ἀχίλλην ἐνέχυρισαν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ πλέτακῃ καὶ ἐν [τὰς οἰκίας] καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡρῴᾳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡρῴᾳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἡρῴῳ αὐτοὺς καθὼς πρότεινες (similarly 244.10ff., 18ff.). The Texas papermus may be our earliest example of the right of guild officials to compel payment by seizure of persons. In the Demotic documents of the Ptolemaic period surveyed by Boak, they apparently do not possess this privilege (*art. cit.* [above n. 5] 214f.).

6, 13 οἰκία: Mayer (*F 2.91) notes only one other example of -ei as a 2nd pers. subjunctive ending of the pres. middle/passive. Perhaps it is to be phonetically explained, esp. in line 6, since that scribe in two other places uses -ei for -η (see
above line 3 on δειμοσωάρχοι; Ἠρασκῆλη in line 9 below may be graphic or morphological). The fact, however, that two different hands reproduce this misspelling could indicate that the borrowers are copying from an exemplar, filling in the appropriate names and amounts (or abbreviating, as in the case of the third hand below). It is doubtful that we have a substituting of indicative for subjunctive endings, since this did not become common until after the Ptolemaic period (Mayser II 1.284ff.; Gignac II 358ff.).

9 Κακάτος: If this is correct (the fourth letter is severely smudged), it is the only occurrence in Ptolemaic pap. of the name Κακάς; cf. in Rom./Byz. texts nom. Κακάς, P. Berl. Leihg. II 26 ii.23; gen. Κακά, ibid. I 4 (verso) viii.23 (SB III 7196) and Stud. Pal. X 12.1ff.(5 times); as in our text, gen. Κακάτος T. Mom. Louvre I 600.2f. For names in -άσιος is preferred in Ptolemaic documents to Doric -ά (Mayser F 2.6ff.; Gignac II 16ff.; more generally, L. Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions II [Berlin/New York 1996] 71ff.).

10 Ka!ç`t`o`!: If this is correct (the fourth letter is severely smudged), it is the only occurrence in Ptolemaic pap. of the name Ka!ç; cf. in Rom./Byz. texts nom. Ka!ç!, P. Berl. Leihg. II 26 ii.23; gen. Ka!ç, ibid. I 4 (verso) viii.23 (SB III 7196) and Stud. Pal. X 12.1ff.(5 times); as in our text, gen. Ka!ç`t`o`! T. Mom. Louvre I 600.2f. For names in -άσιος is preferred in Ptolemaic documents to Doric -ά (Mayser F 2.6ff.; Gignac II 16ff.; more generally, L. Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions II [Berlin/New York 1996] 71ff.).

11 Νηράκλη": or Νηράκληι (what follows η is very doubtful; see above on lines 3, 9, 14) inst. of Ἕρασκῆλε in the other two receipts. The phonological confusion of γ/ε is common enough (Mayser-Schmoll F1.100ff.; cf. Gignac I 239ff.), and morphologically the dative ending -ει of most s-stem nouns frequently interchanges with a-stem -ηι/ηι in both Attic inscriptions (Threatte, op. cit. [see above] 138ff., 172f.) and papyri (Mayser F2.3ff.; Gignac II 69ff.; on Deklinationsmischung in general, Schwyrer, Grammatik I 582ff.). Specifically, however, with proper names in -κλη, this phenomenon is practically unknown in inscriptions (Threatte, op. cit. 207) and rare in papyri. Gignac (II 70ff.) gives no examples for Rom./Byz. documents, and where it does occur in Ptol. pap., Mayser (F 2.40ff.) explains it as graphic error rather than morphological confusion. To his examples add Θεσσάλη BGU X 1996.7 (241 BC); Κτησικλή, PSI IV 399.9 (III BC); Συνοικλή, P. Tebt. III 2.893.12 (II BC).

12 τρισχλίας: The horizontal bar of τ extends back in a wavy line over a letter space.

13 ηναγκάσωντα: the first α probably caused by conflation with ἤνεκα.

14 χείρεν: There are smudgy remains of what seems to be the tops of ρ and ε on the piece of papyrus which crosses the lacuna.

15 παντηκόντα: ε > α is not a frequent exchange in this period (Mayser-Schmoll F2 1.44).

16 εν νειᾳ Νιξ[ο]ρη; In general, for the rare μ/ν interchange see lit. cited by Martinez on P. Mich. XVI 757.46 (p. 104). The confusion in our text seems to be out of the previous syllables (see esp. L. Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I [Berlin/New York 1980] 491f.). This does not, however, explain δραξνα in 15.


The confusion in our text seems in no way phonetic, but the two erroneous v’s arose by assimilation to the previous syllables (see esp. L. Threatte, The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I [Berlin/New York 1980] 491f.). This does not, however, explain δραξνα in 15.

18 γέγραπται: [καθίκα] γέγραπται is also possible but makes the supplement a bit short.

University of Texas, Austin

David Martinez

Austin, Texas

Mary Williams

---

1 The edition in P. Erasm. I 10 is a reprint (with very few changes) of a previous edition by P. J. Sijpesteijn in ZPE 40, 1980, 126f.