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REVIZIONS OF SOME HARRIS PAPYRI (LETTERS) *

**P.Harris I 102**

This short letter, hesitantly assigned to the first century, contains nothing more than conventional expressions of goodwill and salutations. The date of the papyrus is of some interest, for it appears to be one of the three first century papyri containing a *proskynema* clause (the list in G. Geraci, *Aegyptus* 51 (1971) 8). But the formulaic parts of the letter seem to favour a later dating than that of the ed. pr. Apart from the great rarity of *proskynema* clauses in the first century, it may be of some significance that the prayer of lines 5-7 in its full form is not attested earlier than the late second century (see below 5-7 n.). The final *formula valedicendi* (ἐρρώθηκαί τί εὐχόματι) also gains ground from the second century onwards, although it is not absent from the first century. ¹ Palaeography, though such crude and unpractised hands are difficult to parallel and date with confidence, would in fact favour a second century dating.

I reproduce the text of the first edition below, and juxtapose the result of a new collation of the original, followed by a translation and notes; cf. Tafel VII.

[...]

Back, downwards along the fibres:

Πτοιλεόμαι ἐν Ἡρακλ[...]

2 πλεῖστα χαῖρεν 3 ὑγαίνειν 6 τῷ- τῷ 6-7 προθ- θήκαι 10 ἐρρώθηκαί εἰ 11 ἀδέλφε

‘...renos to Ptolemaios, my brother, very many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and make your obeisance before the gods here, praying that the best things in life be yours. Greet Diogenes and Ptolemaios and all your people by name. I pray for your good health, brother.’

Back: ‘To Ptolemaios, from ...renos’.

---

* All the papyri discussed here have been studied on the originals, kept in the library of the Selly Oak Colleges at Birmingham. I wish to thank the librarian Ms M. Nielsen, who made the papyri available for my study. I am indebted to Drs R. A. Coles and J. R. Rea for advice and help; their contributions are acknowledged by their initials. Dr Coles also took the trouble of travelling to Birmingham with me to ‘operate’ on 104 (see below). Part of this paper was written at the Istituto Papirologico ‘G. Vitelli’ (Florence); I wish to express my gratitude to Professors M. Manfredi and G. Messeri-Savorelli for their manifold support. My thanks also go to Michael Sharp, who checked my English.

¹ Cf. F. Ziemann, *De epistularum Graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae* 335ff. Of course more examples can be added to those adduced by Ziemann in 1911. One of them is P.Oxy. XLII 3061, which the editor on the basis of the hand assigns ‘to the period Claudius–Vespasian’.
1. [...]. Cf. 12: [Gερ]ήγος does not seem to be favoured by the available space, unless this line was in ekthesis. No particularly strong candidate emerges from Dornseiff-Hansen or other lexica. (Schmidt's [B]ή[θ]ος can be discarded.)

2. I follow the editor in restoring the itacistic spelling in the lacuna on account of the space and the linguistic usage of the writer.

3-2 The correction was already suggested by Schmidt and Schuman (BL III 81).

4. The start of the line has caused problems. Reviewers suggested πάκιν or πάκειν (cf. BL III 81), but the syntax would not be satisfactory (cf. Bell's reservations in JEA 24 (1938) 142). Geraci, loc. cit. 195 suspected ἐνθάδε, and included this passage among the examples of the παρά τοῖς θεοῖς proskynema (list on p. 207). The papyrus offers a proskynema clause not previously attested, which may be considered as equivalent to the proskynema made παρά τοῖς ἐνθάδε θεοῖς, when the latter refers to the gods of the place where the writer lives (cf. Geraci, loc. cit. 191f.), or παρά τοῖς πατρῴοις θεοῖς. UPZ I 70.7f. (c. 152/1 BC) οἱ παρά τοῖς θεοῖς is a good parallel.

5-7 For the formula, found in many Oxyrhynchite letters of the second and third centuries, see my ‘PSI 1437 and its ghost proskynema’, Istituto Papirologico ‘G. Vitelli’: Comunicazioni (1997) 35ff.

7. άπασατα (l. άπασατα). For the omission of sigma before a labial stop see Gignac, op. cit. 130, who cites P.Oxy. XIV 1584.30 (ii) ἀπαζετα. The writer deleted the name (now irrecoverable) that followed immediately after the verb by writing a sinuous line through it, but it seems that he forgot to do so with κατ at the beginning of the next line.

9. άπατο' c’ (l. άπατος). For the interchange o > o see Gignac, op. cit. 286ff.

12. The writing is considerably abraded. I do not exclude that some scattered traces following the recipient’s name belong to a design. After the sender’s name there is ink which I cannot explain.

P.Harris I 103

This letter, the product of a ‘slow writer’, perhaps comes from the second century. The editor reports that on the back there are ‘traces of the address’: Λίαδόκικει ... ημό ... The first part of the address puzzles: Λίαδόκικει should be the name of the sender, but this does not square with what we have in the prescript (line 2), which was presented as follows:

ηγέτιος τῷ κυρίῳ μου
 ἄδειλφό ς εἰτ [πλε]ικ[τα] χαί-

ρειν.

Closer inspection of the papyrus shows that line 2 reads Λιαδόκικει π[λε]ικτες χαίρειν.2 Λαδόκικες is not a common personal name. Its only other papyrological occurrence is in the Oxyrhynchite PSI XII 1255.8 (iii), where it has the form Λαδόκκες. The name of the sender is more difficult: there is a hole at the start of the line, and after that I am not sure whether there is any ink at all (the surface of the papyrus is very dark), whereas the underdotted nu is impossible. But also here the back can be of help: after Λ[ιαδόκικει there survive some traces of the common saltire pattern, followed by what may be read as ηγέτιος. This does not recall any attested Greek name, but looks like the hellenised version of a Roman name. The reverse indexes in H. Solin, O. Salomies, Repertorium nominum gentilicium et cognominum Latinorum offer the following candidates: Megetius, Regetius, Segetius, Vegetius. The remnants of the first letter in the back, a short upright trace in the upper part of the line, may just admit Βηγέτιος (Βηγέτιος is ruled out by reason of space), Μηγέτιος, or even Ρηγέτιος. For the transcription of Latin e, long or short, which fluctuates between e and η, cf. Gignac, Grammar i 246f. To conclude, I propose that the prescript and the address be presented as follows:

ηγέτιος τῷ κυρίῳ μου
 Λιαδόκικει π[λε]ικτες χαί-

ρειν.

Back: Λ[ιαδόκικει (design) ηγέτιος.

2 Schmidt restored the names of the sender and the recipient as Θηγέτιος and Ἀείτιτι respectively.
This papyrus, dubiously assigned to the second century (a date in the earlier part of the third century is also possible), was described as ‘the second part of a clumsily written letter, so crabbed in spelling and expression that in several places the sense can only be guessed.’ Many of the difficulties can be overcome even without access to the original, and K. F. W. Schmidt has already made good some of the editorial infelicities, although he introduced some new (cf. BL III 81). The fresh study of the text has allowed some further improvements, revealed two more fragments of the letter which had remained unnoticed, and shown that at least 10 more lines preceded the published text (I owe the identification to RAC and JRR). One of the fragments (inv. 34e) was folded three times; before its unfolding (by RAC) it showed part of the address and the common saltire pattern on one side, and part of another saltire pattern on the other. The other was stuck on the back of the published fragment, and contains the name of the sender. Another fragment, which contains the beginnings of lines 6-10 and was not transcribed in the edition, seems to have been joined at a later stage. Unfortunately, the writing in the additional fragments has suffered considerably from abrasion, and the overall textual gain is slight.3

The address, not mentioned in the ed. pr., is now complete. It is written 3 cm from the edge which corresponds to the right-hand edge of the text on the front; this means that the papyrus was folded from left to right, pressed flat, and the right edge was tucked inside. Then the letter was bound, and the address was written on both sides of the binding, while a saltire pattern was drawn over the binding on both sides of the package (for this practice of packaging cf. P.Oxy. LIX 3988 introd.; for the function of the design in addresses see P.Oxy. XLVIII 3396.32 n.). The way the unopened fragment was folded may suggest that it had not been unfolded before. Perhaps the letter was never opened in antiquity.

3 It has not been possible to have the papyrus photographed after the additional fragments were joined. The photograph reproduced here is that of the previously published fragment.
... (10ff.) after having closed again and sealed ... god willing, I find the deposit ... Don’t think me inhuman. You’ll get to know in time how much money I spent until I prospered. And I’m trying to help Marinos out of some of his troubles. If I had not made good materials for myself, I (?) would long since have given him one half. You have no idea how much I’m wearing myself out, while you don’t care about this money any longer. If you manage to buy me a pair of cushions, do buy (them), and I’ll send you (some) papyrus through Herois. I send many greetings to Thasarion and Heronianos and Aphrodite and Germanos and all who love me, by name. I pray for your good health.’

Back: ‘Deliver to Ptolemaios from Leonides.’

1 This may be the first line of the letter. The scanty remains are indeterminable.
3 τελείας. This adverb is attested only in two other papyri, PSI I 41.22 (iv), and P.Ant. II 100.5 (vi).
6 κατάμαξον. The reading seems secure. No form of μάξον has occurred in any other papyrus.
7 δι’ ἀνέλειψιν. The broken context does not permit any guess as to the purpose of the deletion. The unread letter might be epsilon; omicron is less likely. For the collocation cf. P.Bon. 24B.13 (135) ἀνέλειψιν ἐξοντικὴ.
8 πορτικά. I have been tempted to read πορτύκτικα, but the word is attested only by lexicographers, and I cannot see how it would suit the context.
10 καὶ is one possibility, but does not seem much suitable to the syntax.
10-11 κλαίσας πάλιν καὶ εφραγτίσας. Cf. P.Flor. III 334.6ff. (iii) καὶ πάλιν τῇ εἰς εφραγτίδι ἀρφαλὸς καὶ κλαίσας εφράξαν τὸ διπανθηθέν ἀνάλωμα εἰς τοὺς θησαυροὺς; also P.Hamb. I 90.7ff. (iii) ἐκλάθη καλῶς καὶ τὴν καλλου[ν]... τα καὶ εφράγα τα.
εφραγίσας (l. εφραγτίσας). For the gemination of sigma see Gignac, Grammar i 159f.
11-13 These lines, numbered 1-3 in the ed. pr., were presented thus:

13 ὑπολαβῆς. BL III 81 records ὑπολαβῆς εἰν μ[έ] (Bell, Schmidt), and ὑπολαβῆς ἐν μ[έ] (Schuman). The break cannot have been more than four letters long. For the construction cf. P.Cair.Zen. IV 59636.9ff. (iii BC); μή ἔν ὑπολαβῆς μετὰ πρὸς τὰ παραθελεῖ καλὸν στοματικὸν.
15-18 The punctuation I have adopted was proposed by Schmidt. For the construction cf. B. G. Mandilaras, The Verb § 521; to his examples add P.Mich. VIII 512.4ff. (iii) εἰ μή ὑπολαβῇ καὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον πάλαι ἐν ἀπήλλαξιμοῖς ἡμέρες; cf. also P.Cair.Zen. IV 59599.4ff. (iii BC), P.Cair.Isid. 69.25ff. (310), P.Mich. XVIII 793.3ff. (381), P.Lips. 40.2.13 (iv/v). The sentence which forms the apodosis of the conditional (lines 17-18) is not easily intelligible.

4 Schmidt’s statement that μή = μοί with ‘Wiederholung des Pronomens wie in Z. Ἐφ’ cannot stand, although this phonetic interchange is not absent from papyri, cf. H. C. Youtie, Scriptiunculae Posterioresi 1 204.
The editor misunderstood ἐκπλέξαι, but was corrected by Schmidt. For the meaning of the verb see G. Casanova, Aegyptus 50 (1970) 54. We find ἐκπλέξαι with an accusative of person also in P.Tebt. II 314.6 (ii), 315.21, 28 (ii), P.Yale I 183.20 (c. AD 200), SB XII 10918.14 (iii), P.Kell. G I 74.30 (iv), and elsewhere.

The upsilon written above the omicron may have been a correction, as in lines 16 and 21; but the omicron has not been cancelled, and the upsilon may be an addition. Neither ποικύίων nor ποικύοιον match any Greek word. On the basis of the photograph J.R.R. suggested reading instead of π, and μ in place of α. As I was able to see on the original, there is an offset of this mu in the right-hand margin, which is due to the folding of the sheet (the same phenomenon is visible in line 22, and may account for the partial loss of ink from the line. All this results in the sequence ἓ λ τί η η ομοίων, which I am inclined to interpret as τό [οι] ἔμποιεῖν, that is ἔμποιεῖν = ἔμποι. The spelling of the word may be paralleled from forms such as ὕμποιον (Gignac, Grammar i 264) and ἴμπου-τ-ς ὑμποι (i 270). If this were the writer’s intention, it would be morphologically interesting: *ὑμποῖον does not appear anywhere else, but ἰμποῖον is common, and is attested already from the fifth century BC. This form ‘may represent the beginning of the transfer of ἰμποῖος to an adjectival of the first and second declensions’ (Gignac, Grammar ii 128).7

The omission of final nu before a word beginning with a vowel is well paralleled, see Gignac, Grammar i 112. I admit I am not entirely happy with this explanation, since two lines above πεποίηκεν is spelled without the iotaism, but have no convincing alternative to offer. The repetition of ἀνος may be paralleled by another repetition in line 20 (see next note).

The editor brackets it, but the repetition of the oblique cases of personal pronouns is a well-known colloquialism of the period, see S. G. Kapsomenos, Attēnai 73-74 (1973) 56ff.; cf. also H. C. Youtie, Scripta ionicae I 453, and G. M. Parássoglou, ELAHLNIKA 37 (1986) 278. But as Professor Hagedorn, to whom I owe the observation that in 19 cοι has been corrected from 2οι, remarks, ‘es könnte übrigens sein, daß das zweite cοι in Z. 20 nicht einfach eine Wiederholung ist, sondern daß der Schreiber ursprünglich den Satz wirklich mit cοι beginnen wollte und dann in ein Analoguth verfallen ist’. After that, the editor placed a full stop and took περὶ τοῦ κερματίου with the ensuing conditional. μεμοι-λήκην goes together with περὶ τοῦ κερματίου. P.Köln III 174.14f. (ii) μη μελικητι εἶ τῷ δὲ σοὶ περὶ κέρμωτος.

Although the bizarre σεύστουλον appears in the ed. pr., the commentary is right: ‘perhaps we should read σεύστολον. What is written after σεύστολον is a gamma penned above another gamma; the latter was written above another letter, possibly alpha. The superlinear gamma only repeats the correction. This is also the case with ἐκπλέξαι in line 6: after κει the writer initially penned a lambda; this was overwritten by pi, and at a later stage another pi was added above the line. For the interchange ξ > σ see Gignac, Grammar i 123. τῦλαι have not occurred in pairs elsewhere, but one may compare the ξυστή κερμικιάριων in P.Leid.Inst. 31.13f. (iii), BU 813.11 (iii), SB VIII 9834b.6 (iv).

The text edited in that place is SB XII 11022, a letter assigned to the first century, but to judge from the plate a third century date is strongly suggested. The word occurs in a broken context, difficult to restore. But one improvement is possible: instead of ἐκπλέξαι τὸ μείῳ [± 6] Ρ γιν ἐκπλέξαι τὸ μείῳ [ιονον (note that in the ed. pr. no estimation of the length of the break is given). For the expression cf. P.Brem. 17.10f. (ii) ἐκπλέξαι ὡ ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. For the orthography cf. P.Oxy. XIV 1758.16 (ii) μετάτριῳ[γ]. Two more points of detail: in line 4 for ην (γ) read την την (date); in 8-9 the restoration διαπεμψάμενος makes little sense, and should be abandoned.

The editorial comment ad loc. favours ‘tools’, but the writer of this letter clearly refers to yarn. The authority that Wilcken adduces is Th. Reil, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Aegypten 94. But Reil’s examples are limited to P.Oxy. VII 1069.8 and VIII 1159.15, 21.

7 I draw the opportunity to note that Gignac’s statement that the Modern Greek equivalent to ἴμποιος ‘is ordinarily μέσος,-η,-ο’ should be corrected to ‘μεσός,-η,-ο’.

---

5 The text edited in that place is SB XII 11022, a letter assigned to the first century, but to judge from the plate a third century date is strongly suggested. The word occurs in a broken context, difficult to restore. But one improvement is possible: instead of ἐκπλέξαι τὸ μείῳ [± 6] Ρ γιν ἐκπλέξαι τὸ μείῳ [ιονον (note that in the ed. pr. no estimation of the length of the break is given). For the expression cf. P.Brem. 17.10f. (ii) ἐκπλέξαι ὡ ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. For the orthography cf. P.Oxy. XIV 1758.16 (ii) μετάτριῳ[γ]. Two more points of detail: in line 4 for ην (γ) read την την (date); in 8-9 the restoration διαπεμψάμενος[μενος makes little sense, and should be abandoned.

6 The editorial comment ad loc. favours ‘tools’, but the writer of this letter clearly refers to yarn. The authority that Wilcken adduces is Th. Reil, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Aegypten 94. But Reil’s examples are limited to P.Oxy. VII 1069.8 and VIII 1159.15, 21.
Nothing about the address on the back was reported in the edition. The address on the back of this letter has not been read correctly. For ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγραφου, cf. P.Wash. II 106.4 (54 BC), on the view that this is a conjecture. The word ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγραφου, cf. P.Wash. II 106.4 (54 BC), was bought as could be obtained for 1 1/2 ob. In fact, Skeat had suggested that ‘ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγραφου, ἀπὸ τοῦ χαρταρίου, are presumably sheets cut from rolls of papyrus’. In conclusion, we know nothing about the τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου ἐν τότῳ.

Not long after the appearance of P.Mich. II 123, the publication of P.Mert. I 24 (c. AD 200) showed that we are not dealing with a hapax legomenon, and the views expressed by the editors of the Michigan papyri were at fault; but this seems to have passed unnoticed. The relevant passage of the Merton papyrus (lines 15-18) runs as follows: 

καλός σιλικέως ἀντιβιλάων Σεμίλαρονίο τὸ λογαρίθμον ίνα μοι αὐτό | διαπέμπηται. ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου 1 1/2 ob. The sharp contrast between the last two prices and those for ἄγραφος ἀρχόμενο led the editors of the Michigan text to believe that χαρταρίου was ‘just a small sheet’, the τοῦμ ἄγραφος ἀρχόμενο ‘a cheap grade of papyrus, unsuitable for writing, ‘not for writing’, while ἄγραφος designated a ‘new’ or ‘written’ roll (P.Mich. II pp. 98-9). But the evidence from these prices and the relative value of writing materials is not conclusive; and it does not seem to have been understood that 4 1/2 ob. was not the price paid for the entire roll. The pattern of the two entries that we singled out is notable: instead of τοῦμ + genitive we have a prepositional construction; 4 1/2 ob. was not the τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου, but what was paid for a part of it, and as much χαρταρίου was bought as could be obtained for 1 1/2 ob. In fact, Skeat had suggested that ‘ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγραφου, ἀπὸ τοῦ χαρταρίου, are presumably sheets cut from rolls of papyrus’. In conclusion, we know nothing about the τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου ἐν τότῳ.

References to the dispatch of writing material are not absent from papyrus letters. Cf., e.g., P.Wash. II 106.4 (18 BC), where the writer asks to have a κόλλημα ἄγραφον sent to her; SB VI 9017 #15.3f. (ἰδίῳ) καλῶς ποιέως, ἀράμβος. ἐγράφων [ἰ διὰ καὶ ἐνυπνόν] ἐπιστολῆς, ἔδραμεν; 123r.vii.39 Ἐπιστολή πὸμενος ἐπιστολῆς, ἵνα γέγραψα[ν] τὸ ἔπιστευμένον, ἵνα τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιστεύμενοι. In the following lines he asks to receive his letter ‘sent to her; SB VI 9017 #15.3f. (ἰδίῳ) καλῶς ποιέως, ἀράμβος. ἐγράφων [ἰ διὰ καὶ ἐνυπνόν] ἐπιστολῆς, ἔδραμεν; 123r.vii.39 Ἐπιστολή πὸμενος ἐπιστολῆς, ἵνα γέγραψα[ν] τὸ ἔπιστευμένον, ἵνα τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιστεύμενοι. The sharp contrast between the last two prices and those for ἄγραφος ἀρχόμενο led the editors of the Michigan text to believe that χαρταρίου was ‘just a small sheet’, the τοῦμ ἄγραφος ἀρχόμενο ‘a cheap grade of papyrus, unsuitable for writing, ‘not for writing’, while ἄγραφος designated a ‘new’ or ‘written’ roll (P.Mich. II pp. 98-9). But the evidence from these prices and the relative value of writing materials is not conclusive; and it does not seem to have been understood that 4 1/2 ob. was not the price paid for the entire roll. The pattern of the two entries that we singled out is notable: instead of τοῦμ + genitive we have a prepositional construction; 4 1/2 ob. was not the τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου, but what was paid for a part of it, and as much χαρταρίου was bought as could be obtained for 1 1/2 ob. In fact, Skeat had suggested that ‘ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγραφου, ἀπὸ τοῦ χαρταρίου, are presumably sheets cut from rolls of papyrus’. In conclusion, we know nothing about the τοῦ τοῦμ ἄγραφου ἐν τότῳ.

References to the dispatch of writing material are not absent from papyrus letters. Cf., e.g., P.Wash. II 106.4 (18 BC), where the writer asks to have a κόλλημα ἄγραφον sent to her; SB VI 9017 #15.3f. (ἰδίῳ) καλῶς ποιέως, ἀράμβος. ἐγράφων [ἰ διὰ καὶ ἐνυπνόν] ἐπιστολῆς, ἔδραμεν; 123r.vii.39 Ἐπιστολή πὸμενος ἐπιστολῆς, ἵνα γέγραψα[ν] τὸ ἔπιστευμένον, ἵνα τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιστεύμενοι. In the following lines he asks to receive his letter ‘sent to her; SB VI 9017 #15.3f. (ἰδίῳ) καλῶς ποιέως, ἀράμβος. ἐγράφων [ἰ διὰ καὶ ἐνυπνόν] ἐπιστολῆς, ἔδραμεν; 123r.vii.39 Ἐπιστολή πὸμενος ἐπιστολῆς, ἵνα γέγραψα[ν] τὸ ἔπιστευμένον, ἵνα τοὺς τοῖς ἐπιστεύμενοι.
Revisions of some Harris Papyri (Letters)

The letter was assigned to the second century, but the sender’s gentilicium would make a third century date preferable; palaeography also favours a later dating.

**P.Harris I 106**

This is the right-hand part of a letter assigned to the second century, but it is probably somewhat earlier (c.f. Tafel VII). In line 8 for Ἰησοῦ δὲ παρὰ Νίκου τῆς κακίας read κόμυκα δὲ παρὰ τῆς αὐτῆς κακίας. κακίας may refer to the commodity, in which case its amount, probably in λίτρα, should have followed, but it may also be a proper name, Κακίας.

**P.Harris I 108**

This text (c.f. Tafel VIII) should be placed in the early fourth and not the third century. There is a remote possibility that Philantinoos, the recipient of the letter, is the same as the one who figures in the small archive chiefly comprised by P.Harr. II 230-4. (The sender’s name is indeed ᾿Εὐτόλμιος, as Bell suggested.)

In line 5 προθμένην must be a misprint for προθμένης. Last, it is not true that ‘on the verso along the fibres, [there are] eleven lines of writing largely effaced’: the letter is written along the fibres on the back of piece cut from a third century document of uncertain nature.

**P.Harris I 109**

This third/fourth century letter (c.f. Tafel IX) is written in a rapid and confident script by someone with good command of Greek. This becomes particularly noticeable in lines 14-18, which form the end of the body of the letter. Below I reproduce this section as printed in the ed. pr, and juxtapose what I read on the original. To this I have appended a translation and notes.

15 ῾Εγράψαμεν δὲ τῇ ᾿Αντινῳ ὑπὶ ἑιδότες ὥσποὶ δεησεῖ ημᾶς ἐκδημεῖν, γράφω σοι. περὶ ὧν βούλει ἐπίστελλεν κελεύων. 'I wrote these things to you although I am before court and busy. I am writing to you from Antinoou, without as yet knowing where we shall have to go. Send me word with your commands for any matter you wish.'

14 ἑιδότες is a technical term denoting a person who stands in court in P.Abinn. 63.44 (after 350), P.Mich. XIII 660.3 (703-15) and SB XVI 12542.15, 17 (same date). This may be the sense here too; the writer’s intention seems to be to stress that he writes this letter under inconvenient circumstances: legal and other business are pressing. However, it cannot be ruled out that ἑιδότες simply means ‘standing on my feet’, which can also be inconvenient and may show the writer’s haste. But I have found nothing similar in any other papyrus.

15 ἐπίστελλεν. The last letter is considerably smudged, but ou is impossible to read. ἐπίστελλε is the verb we should reasonably expect in this sense, cf. SB V 7743.18 (i/ii), XIV 11584.9 (ii), P.Iand. VI 107.13 (ii), P.Oxy. XIV 1664.10 (iii), BGU IV 1080.16 (i/ii). I have found ἐπίστελλον only in P.Gen. II 103.10 (147), but the context is different and the reading itself not entirely certain (cf. the editor’s note ad loc.).

Some more points of detail. In line 1 instead of καθολικῶν, and place period after it. If this is true, it will give the perfectly acceptable τάξεως τοῦ κυρίου μου καθολικῶν 'of (?)

---


12 Read co, not cr, as the editor corrects.
the officium of my lord the rationalis’, and make our papyrus not earlier than 286, the year when the office became established in Egypt, cf. R. Delmaire, CRIPEL 10 (1988) 113 (the hand does not favour any thought that this may be Claudius Marcellus, rationalis in the reign of Philip the Arab). In lines 4-5 for πάλης. υψηλόν μοι οὖν ἄνθρωπα σωτάραι καὶ υψηλόν μοι συνώνησαι (I owe συνώνησαι to Professor Hagedorn). Last, in 7-8 for ποιήσων read ποιησάμενον.

P. HARRIS I 110

In this fourth century letter ‘the writer asks his correspondent to make and obtain certain payments’. The text as printed invites suspicion at various points. A re-edition seemed necessary; it is presented below.

κυρίῳ μου πατρί Ἄλεξάνδρῳ  

Δ[ήμου] ος (vac.) χαίρειν.  

τῷ ἀναδίδοντι σοι τούτῳ μου  

τὸ πιττάκιον, κυρίε μου  

5 πάτερ, ποιήσων δοθήσαι ἀ-ἐ-  

λάβαμεν παρὰ Παλλαδίου.  

Λουκᾶν τὸν (δεκαδέχρην) ἀπαίτησον  

τὰ τρία τάλαντα. προσορόειν,  

[ά]π᾽ ἐμοὶ πολλά τὸν κύριόν μου  

10 ['Ε]λπίδιον μετὰ τῶν ἀδέλφων  

[εὐ]τῷ καὶ τὸν δεσπότην μου  

[υἱὸν] Δ[ίονυσίου] καὶ τὸν νέους  

ἐρρέσθαις κε  

[εὐ]χαριστοὺς πολλοὶ.  

[χρόνιοι καὶ] εὐ-  

[το] χούντα διὰ παντός.  

Back, downwards, along the fibres:

κυρίῳ μου πατρί Ἄλεξάνδρῳ [  

4 πιττακίων 7 χ]

‘To my lord father Alexandros, Didymos, greetings. Have the man who delivers you this note of mine, my lord father, be given the things we received from Palladios. Exact the three talents from Loukas, the decurio. Give many greetings from me to my lord Elpidios along with his brothers, and to my master (and) son Dionysios. I pray that you may be well for many years, and always in good fortune.’

Back: ‘To my lord father Alexandros …’

1-2 In the ed. pr. these lines were presented thus:

κυρίῳ μου πατρί Ἄλεξανδρῳ  

πλ[εύχε]ται χαίρειν.  

Line 2 is 1 cm inset, but the edition’s layout is probably a printing mistake. As for the reading, although there is considerable damage, the name of the sender, Δ[ήμου] ος, is in little doubt.  

πατρί. There is no need to take the term of kinship literally, cf. G. Tibiletti, Le lettere private 32f., Youtie, Scriptur culae Posteriores II 529, P. Oxy. LV 3812.17 n.

4 πιττάκιον (πιτ-τικιον): πιστολήδιον ed. pr. (The entry in Gignac, Grammar i 320 [examples of apohairesis] should be deleted.) For the practice of writing a diastole between double tau cf. Gignac, Grammar i 164; E. G. Turner, GMAW 1, p. 11 n. 50.

In a similar context the word πιττάκιον also occurs in, e.g., P.Gen. I 2.2 (iii) καλὰς ποιήσεις δοῦσ' τῷ ἀναδίδοντι κοι τὸ πιττάκιον. - - (δρ.) Λ (δβ.) δ. A parallel usage is P. Oxy. LIX 3990.3f. (ii) τῷ ἀναδίδοντι κοι τὸ ἐπίπταλον. - - δ. (δρ.) κ.δ.

7 Λουκᾶς. This is not a very common name, and occurs mainly after the fourth century, apparently under Christian influence. It turns up only once in a document earlier than the fourth century, BGU IX 1900.24, 56 (c. 196), where we
find a Loukas, father of Heroninos; the son’s name would point to a pagan rather than a Christian, but I doubt whether this conclusion is for the better of Heroninos’ religion. This Loukas does not appear in any of the prosopographies of the Roman army in Egypt (list in H.-A. Rupprecht, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde* 86).

(δεκαδάρχης; χαθοντάριον?) ed. pr. On the competition of the *decurationes* see H. Melaerts, *Studia Varia Bruxellensis* 3 (1994) 99ff. For the abbreviation employed here, a chi with an iota below, cf. J. F. Gilliam, *BASP* 13 (1976) 57 (= *Roman Army Papers* 38f). For an analysis of the very similar tachygram for ἵκονταρχής (chi above the line with rho below) see A. Blanchard, *Sigles et Abbreviations* 26.1.4 (I have also considered, but think less likely, the possibility that the abbreviation here stands for χειρὶς (πριν ἥχην), which in few texts [P.Flор. II 254 (259), P.Lond. III 1157.25 (iii), P.Landlisen F.9 (c. 350)] is represented by a chi divided by a vertical line, cf. Gilliam, loc. cit. 57 n. 6, and P.Landlisen F.9 n. This would not be out of context in our text, but, unlike the other examples, here the vertical line does not extend beyond the junction of the two obliques of chi.) I have resolved (δεκαδάρχης), but there is no means of telling whether the writer intended a form ending in ἄργης or ἁργός. Both forms coexist in literary texts from the fifth century BC, and in documents from the third century BC; cf. L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri* 66, and P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Aegyptus* 66 (1986) 158.

8 τὸ τρία τάλαντα: τέσσαρα τάλαντα ed. pr. The distance between rho and alpha is bigger than what would reasonably be expected, but there is no trace of ink between theputative iota and alpha (τρία cannot be read). The tone of the imperative (ὁπάταρσον) seems to imply that the sum of three talents was not regarded as an insignificant amount. This may suggest that the date of the letter must not be too far from the beginning of the fourth century, when three talents still had a considerable market-value; see the price lists in R. S. Bagnall, *Currency and Inflation in Fourth Century Egypt* pp. 61ff.

9 [οἴ]ποι ἐμοὶ: [ὑπέφ] ἐμοὶ ed. pr. There is a short horizontal followed by an upright trace between the edge and the epsilon in line, which were not reported in the ed. pr. The υπέφ of the ed. pr. is impossible; it is too long to fit into the lacuna, and also creates a construction hitherto unattested in the papyri. Instead we should expect ἀπό, probably elided, which does not contradict the remaining traces. This conventional salutation also occurs in BGU IV 1587.25 (iii), P.Col. X 290.5 (v/vi). SB XVIII 13589.1 (iv) and P.Oxy. 1770.29f. (iii); other examples of the construction with somewhat different wording include P.Haun. II 16.15f. (ii/iii), PSI XIII 1359.10f. (ii/iii), XII 1246.6f. (iii), P.Stras. VII 637.14 (c. 340), P.Oxy. XXXI 2602.13 (early iv), LXI 4127.39f. (iv).

10 [Ἐ]ξαπίθιος: Διονυσίδος ed. pr. I owe the reading to JRR. There is no space for more than one letter before the break. Διονυσίδος, itself implausible only in its rarity and not in its formation, becomes a ghost name.

11 δεκαπλήν. The use of this word while κύριον was employed in line 9 is paralleled in contemporary letters such as P.Oslo II 59.8f. (iv) and P.Oxy. XLVIII 3396.22f. (iv), and marks the increasingly frequent use of δεκαπλῆς instead of κύριον in the fourth century, see D. Hagedorn, K. A. Worp, *ZPE* 39 (1980) 165ff.; for the practice in letters of the fifth and sixth centuries see I. Suñol, *Stud. Pap*. 4 (1965) 39ff.) It may also be that stylistic variety was intended.

12 [υ]ν: [ι]ν ed. pr. τὸν was conjecturally restored by Schuman (cf. BL III 83), but the article is otiose. We expect a name or designation of relationship to follow, [υ]ν, seems the likeliest restoration. There are parallel constructions with κύριος: P.Oxy. 1770.29f. (iii) ἀξιός ὑμών τοῦ κύριον μου ὑπὸ θεόν; also P.Oxy. I 123.1, 26 (iii/iv), XLVIII 3408.1, 31 (iv), P.Col. X 290.5 (v/vi). SB XVIII 13589.1 (iv) τὸ δεκαπλῆς μου υἱόν θεοδόροφ may also be compared.

12-15 In the first edition these lines appeared thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄρωνος</td>
<td>εὐ</td>
<td>τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐ</td>
<td>πολλὸς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line 14 the supplement adopted by the editor destroys the alignment. The practice of indenting the closing *formula valedicendi* is well attested in contemporary letters, but in none of them is such a breach of the alignment in evidence. It
is thus obvious that εἷς διάγοντα must be expelled, so that χρόνονες be placed below [εῖς]χομαί. The syntax, although it violates the classical norm, should not cause problems, cf. S. G. Kapsomenos, EEThess 7 (1957) 338 n.5, and Mandilaras, The Verb §§ 914f. The closest parallel to this construction that I have been able to find is BGU IV 1080.24f. (ii?) ἐρρᾶσθαι εἰς καὶ εὐπνῆσαντα ι ἐγώμαμε κύριε μου νεί. 16

The papyrus breaks off after Ἀλεξάνδρος (the editor seems to have taken what survives to be the whole of the address). We expect a design or a blank space to have followed, and then the name of the sender in the nominative or in the genitive preceded by (probably) παρά, the latter perhaps abbreviated.
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This fifth century text was described as a business letter, which ‘has possibly remained unfinished, as the name of the bearer still required to be added at the end’. It was edited as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tafel VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κυρίῳ μου ἀδελφῷ Ἀνουντίῳ Ἀρήσφῳ 2nd hand. Θεόδωρος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐμφον παρά σοῦ εἰς ἕμον λόγον μυριῶδας ἐκατόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεντῆκοντα μόνα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐτοῦ ἥ καὶ ποίησον τὸν λόγον παντὸς καὶ ἄποστιλὸν μὲ διὰ τοῦ κ(υρίου)ου μῶ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than one point invites comment; my examination of the papyrus resulted in what I present below. 16

(i) The nature of the document. The editor took the text to be a letter, but acknowledged the difficulties of such an identification. But there is no problem if we take the document to be what it really is, a receipt put in the form of a letter. As far as I am aware, there are parallels only in earlier texts: BGU IV 1029.4-5 (188/9) and P.Heid. IV 332 (ii/iii). Both texts lack a date. The editor of the latter text notes that this is not a receipt in the strict sense of a document that should have contained a date, but rather a private communication concerning the payment effected. This classification accords with what can be read in line 6 (see below). 17

(ii) The unread part of line 6. At the beginning of the line the papyrus has ὁ οὐτός (μυριῶδας) ξ. This is a formulaic phrase which recurs in receipts, and means that the same person as the one mentioned before has made a further payment, usually to the one who issues the receipt (cf. also Youtie, Scriptiunculae I 299); parallels are too numerous to cite. The sense here is that Anoutios made a further payment of 60 myriads (of denarii) to Theodoros, in addition to that of 150 myriads he had made earlier. The editor mistook the somewhat irregularly formed symbol for the myriads for sigma, and ξ for ζ. The large horizontal running along much of the interlinear space between lines 5 and 6, if it is not just a numeral marker over ζ, perhaps serves the purpose of setting off the two payments; the same practice may be seen in another receipt, BGU IV 1029.4-5 (mentioned above).

15 εἷς διάγοντα has been treated as if it stood in the original text and was used as a parallel in P.Oxy. XX 2273.3 n. and Tibiletti, op.cit. 63.

16 The name of the recipient is also problematic: his second name (line 2) is an unicum (the editor also felt uneasy; in the index of personal names at the end of the volume he added a question mark next to the name). But the papyrus is badly abraded, and what I have been able to see does not contradict the editor’s reading Ἀρήσφο. I should note that there might have been a letter lost in a lacuna between the rho and the putative eta: at that point the papyrus is broken along an original vertical fold, and the distance between the two pieces may have been larger than what now appears under the glass. I cannot think of a suitable name. The dative ending is also not without difficulty. A patronymic is expected, that is Ἀνουντίος Ἀρήσφου. If this is not an error, he would have had a double name. There are names expressed without ι καὶ between the names (see P.Mich. V introd. p. 15), but this is very rare.

17 The boundaries between letters, receipts and orders to pay are not always clearly delineated. Compare for example O.Leid. 329 (ii/iii), styled as ‘letter’ by the editors but in essence an order to pay, which includes features typical of private letters alongside more formal elements such as the σεσυματίζω subscription and the date.
(iii) The reading κ(υρί)ou in line 8, an abbreviation used exclusively for Nomina Sacra – and at any rate one would expect a name to follow, as the editor observed. But the papyrus has διὰ τοῦ υιοῦ μου; for the expression cf. e.g. P.Wisc. II 72.20f. (ii) πέμψον μοι διὰ τοῦ υιοῦ σου.

To conclude, I present lines 6-8 as revised, and append a translation:

{o αὐτός (μυριάδας) ξ, καὶ ποίησον
tόν λόγον παντός καὶ ἀπό-
ετιλόν με διὰ τοῦ υιοῦ μου.

6 : OPSIS 7-8 1. ἀπόστειλόν μοι

'The aforesaid (has paid) 60 myriads. And make up an account of everything, and send (it) to me through my son.'

P.Harris I 112

This is a fifth century letter. Cf. Tafel VI. In line 4 the editor read καὶ ν... ἐπιρέαζον. Reviewers suggested νόν or νονι (BL III 82), but the papyrus has πριν.

In line 8 the editor printed ἐμβληθηναι. The letter transcribed as beta looks like the delta of the type that is identical with the Latin d (same shape also in παιδιά in line 10). That betas were occasionally formed in this fashion is well known; cf. A. Jörden, ZPE 92 (1992) 221 and the examples cited there, to which add those cited in P.Sta.Xyla 2 introd. (para. 4). But I should note that a clear beta (in u-shaped form) occurs at the beginning of line 11 (Βενιω) of this letter. Another papyrus furnishes us with a beta where we should have delta: P.Harris 91.4 gives μοβ instead of the expected μοδ (cf. BL VIII 147), i.e. μὸδ(ίνον), while an earlier document, P.Oxy. LX 4068.18 of 200, has παρέβραμε[ɔ] for παρέδραμε[c]. In the light of this, one might be tempted to consider whether the latinate delta in place of beta is always a palaeographic whim, and not evidence for the sporadic interchange of the two sounds. But we still lack a clear example of a non-latinate delta written instead of beta. (I have found nothing suitable in Coptic.)

In 11-12 we find ἀπεστείλα πρῶς τὴν σήν | [τιμιώτητα. The upper parts of some letters from the beginning of line 12 still survive, and exclude τιμιώτητας; θε[υμα]ςτί[οτητα] is a possibility. Although the scribe wrote τὴν σήν τιμιώτητα in 3, we may allow for some variation on his part.

The edition does not report that on the back of the letter (along the fibres) runs the address, which, so far as it is preserved, is identical with the prescript: τῷ δεσπότῃ μου τιμιωτάτῳ (design?) ὀδελφῷ Γεροντίζω, probably followed by the name of the sender, Δίδυμος.

P.Harris I 151

Of this letter, assigned to the late second century, but in fact datable to 98-102 (see below, fr. 2.8-9 n.), two fragments survive. The editor transcribed the first ten lines of the larger fragment, and reported that ‘fragments of at least six more lines follow, with a portion of the date’. But the date clause appears in the smaller fragment (inv. no. 65e), which does not physically join the other and was not reported in the edition (it contains parts of 9 lines from the end of the letter). That both fragments belong to the same text can be established on the basis of the hand, as well as of the address on the back (ignored in the ed. pr.).

The text was published without translation and commentary, and sense is sometimes hard to obtain. A new version of the text is presented below. It is difficult to be sure about the amount of textual loss between the two fragments. But probably lines 1-10 represent less than a half of the original letter.

---

18 One of these examples is BGU XII 2147.20 (464), where the editor prints Φ[ο]ίδ[άμιμον]ς. In BL VIII 52 this was branded as a ‘Druckfehler’ for Φοιβάδ[άμιμον]ς. Dr. Wm. Brashear, who kindly checked the original for me, sent me a drawing of the passage in question and commented: ‘Kein Druckfehler!’ (letter of 15.1.1997). Compare P.Oxy. LVI 3862.24 (iv/v), where again we have Φοιβάδ[άμιμον]ς.
'Herakleides Sarapatì tò ëmò[1] χ[αι]ρειν. γίνομα ότι τῇ κῇ εµβεβη[κα εἰς] Κό-
πτον. ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν, εάν εὑρίς τῇ[νά] εἰς
Κόπτον ἐρυγμένον, γράφαι μο[ι ὄν] ἔχεις
κειμένον ἔργον, ἔπει διὰ Θεον, οὖν
οὐκ ἐγραψες. τετυμίασκε τῷ ἔργῳ ὦδε.
βλέπε µὴ ἐκβάλλης σοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ἀλλὰ
πρὸς Ὀψαλμὸν δὲ πώλει. εάν δὲ ἐλ-
θω εἰς τὸν Ὁξιρυγχεῖτην, τοὐχὶ σὺ γρά-
ψω. εάν δὲ πέμπῃ σὺ Ἀκουσίλα; ε,
[ c. 12 ] [ ], [ ], [ ], [ ]
[ c. 12 ] [ου αὐτῶ εάν
[ c. 13 ] [τ] χαλκὸν ἔπαν
[ c. 13 ] [ ], [ ], [ ]
[ c. 13 ] [τ] χι Καὶ χρὴ...
fr. 2
[ γιοι]
[ -οιοισε σου]
[ -µου εἰς µα]
[ -νυδη α]
[ c. 5 ] [Κόπτον µε[
[ νῦν ἔγω εἰς [.
[ τ., ἐν τῇ α[ [ [ 
[ ἔτους Αὐτοκράτ[τορος Καίσαρος Ν[ερῶα]
[ Τραϊάνου Σεβαστοῦ Γερµανικοῦ µ[ ]]
Back, downwards along the fibres:
παρά ᾿Ηρακλείδου Χαίρηµον (ονος) [ (design?) Σαραπάτ] τοῖ ἐµῶι
9 Ὁξιρυγχεῖτην 9, 10 coi

'Herakleides to Sarapas, my dependant, greetings. Let me tell you that on the 27th I entered Koptos. Therefore I ask you, if you find someone who comes to Koptos, to write me what goods you have in store, because you didn’t write to me through Th…on. Here the price of the goods has gone up. Be careful not to throw your goods away, but rather sell them watchfully. If I come to the Oxyrhynchite (nome), I’ll write to you soon. If Akousilas sends to you … (fr. 2) … (Year) … of Imperator Caesar (Nerva Trajan Pius) Germanicus…'

Back: ‘From Herakleides, son of Chairemon, to Sarapas, my dependant.’

fr. 1
1 τῷ ἐµῶ[1] χ[αι]ρεῖν: τῷ ὀδή[χαφ χαι]ρεύειν ed. pr. For the term ὁ ἐµὼ see Preisigke, WB s.v. 1 ‘Bediensteter, Sklave’. J. A. Straus, ANRW 10.1 (1988) 851 n. 27 considers it doubtful whether this, as well as the term ὁ χαρήµον designate slaves.19 The address ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι τῷ ἐµὼ χαρήµον appears here for the first time in the papyri, but may be paralleled by τῷ ἡµετέρῳ in BGU IV 1079.2 (41), where the person styled thus may well be a slave (he is called

19 A clear example of a person styled as ὁ χαρήµον but who is not a slave is provided by P.Turner 35 (222), where a certain Valerius Longus acknowledges a delivery of wheat as rent on land from an individual whom he addresses as Αὐρηλίῳ Φαίσκεσκ εἰδῶι.
It is not clear whether we have to think of a slave in Letter 48 of Apollonius Tyaneus. The author uses ὁ ἐμὸς along-side τῶν ποιὸν (for different persons); stylistic variation (the case of BGU IV 1079 may be somewhat relevant), or intentional semantic differentiation? (See further R. J. Penella, The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana [Mnemosyne Suppl. 56] 115).

This sense should be understood also in P.Kell. G I 73.27 (not ‘the work’, as the word has been translated), and perhaps P.Louvre I 67.10 (iii). In P.Rain.Cent. 161.13 (v’)? a goldsmith says καὶ γὰρ πολλὰ ἐργά ἐποίηση[ν] ἐκ [κλ.] ; the editor translates ‘I did many jobs for you’, but the goldsmith probably refers to objects he has made; the same applies to a similar statement of the writer in line 24 of that text.

It is likely that in this context ἐμὸς is a translation of the Latin suus.
As published, this ‘rudely written’ third century letter contains an oddity in line 4, while something at the end of line 6 was unread. The new collation removed the first of the difficulties, and revealed that some more lines of the letter survived, but were not transcribed, apparently because of their fragmentary state. A new edition is offered below.

Φιλοσάραπις Καννεϊτί τῇ ἀδέλφῃ
πολλὰ χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάντων
εὐχημέει ὑγειαίνειν καὶ (τῷ) προσκύνημα σου ποιῶ καὶ τὰς χάριτας ὑμῶν ἀδέλφῃ. . .


σκοντες ἄλλα εὐεργήθη.

10 φε μοι α. . . ε. . . [ ]

Back, downwards along the fibres:
Καννεϊτί ἀδέλφῃ

3 l. εὐχημέειν 8 l. -ταμίσασθαι 9 l. ἄλλα.

‘(1-7) Philosarapis to Kanneis, my sister, many greetings. Before all else I pray for your health and make your obeisance and acknowledge my gratitude before my lord Sarapis. So write to me, sister, (about whatever ?) you may wish. For I wish …’

Back: ‘To Kanneis, my sister …’

3-4 (τῷ) προσκύνημα σου: προσκύνημα σου ed. pr. I have not found the article missing from any other example of the phrase in the papyri.

4 ποιῶ καὶ τὰς χάριτας: ποιῶμαι καὶ χάριτας ed. pr.

4-5 τὰς χάριτας ὑμῶν ἀδέλφῃ. For this collocation, common in petitions of the third and fourth centuries, but less frequent in private letters, see A. E. Hanson, *ZPE* 9 (1972) 234 and n. 9; after the fourth century the examples are few. It normally construes with the dative; the prepositional construction here is probably due to the preceding proskynema clause. Another expression of gratitude to Sarapis is found in BGU II 423 (= Sel. Pap. I 112).6 (ii), and possibly P.Turner 18.17f. (84-96). For other expressions of thanks to the god(s) in pagan, as well as in Christian letters see Tibiletti, op. cit. 123f.

6 Dirt and abrasion have rendered the end of the line virtually illegible. We expect περὶ ὧν: the phrase γράφεις/γράфон περὶ ὧν (ἐὰν) βούλη (or θέλεις/-ης) is a common epistolary exhortation (some two dozen examples in DDBDP); perὶ ὧν might be another possibility, but in a similar context I have found it only in P.Stras. I 73.8 (iii). But this cannot be confirmed on the papyrus.

7-10 The second part of line 7 and lines 8-10 were not transcribed in the ed. pr.

7-8 Perhaps read [:]οι τῆς ἄνωταμίσασθαι (l. ἀνωταμίσασθαι), but the surface of the papyrus at the end of line 7 makes it unverifiable.

9 εὐεργήθη- or ἐν ἐφέ- or ἐν ἐγρή-.

9-10 γράφει μοι? What follows cannot be read as ἀδέλφη.

12 What survives on the back is probably only the first half of the address: π(αρὰ) Φιλοσάραπιδος or the like must have followed in the lacuna.

23 To the late examples cited by Hanson add P.Rain.Cent. 91.11 (419), P.Oxy, XVI 1877.8 (c. 488), 1884.13 (504), P.Lond. V 1729.28 (584), P.Oxy. LIX 4006.6 (vi/vii).

24 Note that in P.Princ. III 186.13 (28) [θέλεις] at the start of line 14 is not guaranteed; βούλη may also do.

25 Generally in similar relative clauses the genitive singular of the personal pronoun is rare. In P.Oxy. II 293.11 (27) [πε]ρὶ οὐ ἔδειν θέλην, ὧν seems preferable to οὐ.
This is another third century letter, which, as published, makes little sense. I hope that the new edition will make it more intelligible, despite the remaining difficulties.

On the back there are scant traces of an address, not mentioned in the ed. pr.

᾽Ω[ν]νόωρις Ἰηρακλειανῷ
τῷ ἀδελφῷ πλείστα χαίρετιν.
καλὸς ποιήσεις, ἀδελφὲ,
καθὼς ἔπον τῇ συμβίῳ
5
couv [ὄς], ἐὰν ἔσαι τῇ ἑ. ὅτω
ἡ ἡμ[ῶν] ἁδ[ι]όντι κοι τὴν
ἐπ[ε]ἐ[ὲ] Ἐ[Λ]εξανδρεί[αν] πορεύ-

t[α]η[ο]ι[ν], ἔδεὶ ἔδω τῇ ἤθ-
ἐν ὑμ[ῖ]ν ἐμ[ὲ]ν[α], ἀδελ фа.
10
[± 11? J. ἔ οι[ω], [,] ]

‘Onnophris to Herakleianos, my brother, very many greetings. You’ll do well, brother, as I told your wife to give whatever she may … to Ischyron’s wife or to the man who is delivering you the letter, named Sarapion, since he is going to Alexandria, to … the goods to my daughter, since I myself was not able to wait, because I am (not?) doing (well?). (Don’t do otherwise?), brother. I pray (for your good)

health.’

4 συμβίῳ. For the term see H. Zilliacus, Zur Sprache griechischer Familienbriefe des III. Jahrhunderts n.Chr. 30.
5 ὅ[ς] ἐὰν ἔσαι τῇ ἑ. ὅτω: τετί, ἐὰν ἐ. ὑποδότῳ ed. pr. Perhaps ἔξω, but chi is not assured, and the same would admit a further letter (ὕρη ?). On ὅτι recitativum see P.Oxy. LVI 3855.7 n. On the construction of ἐὰν with ἔσαι see H. Ljungvik, Zur Syntax der spätgriechischen VolksSprache 16f.
9 ἐπ[ε]ἐ[ὲ] Ἐ[Λ]εξανδρεί[αν] πορεύ-
10-11[τά]λην ὀνόματ[ι Σαρα[π]ίο[ν]](τι), καὶ ἐδω[ῆ]τῃ πορευ-

水肿. The word here probably has the sense ‘wares of different kinds, goods’ (LSJ s.v. IV); cf. also P.Heid. VII 406.21 n.
14 Something on the lines of ἄλλα ὀρα[θά]λλα μὴ μὴν ὃμα[λ]ῆς[ε]ι is to be restored in the lacuna; for these clichés see H. Steen, C&M 1 (1938) 162ff.; also M. Naldini, Il Cristianesimo in Egitto no. 12.4-5 n.
16 ] [ ] ἔ οι[ω], [,] ]: ἀδελ фа, ὑπο[κ] ed. pr. It does not appear likely that this line contains an accompaniment to the formula valedicendi. Perhaps the writer added an afterthought, and the sentence continued and ended in the next line, now lost.
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