

NIKOLAOS GONIS

NOTES ON OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 126 (1999) 211–212

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

POxy I 52

This is a report of four public doctors dated to 325. In lines 14f. the editors read ε[ι]δαμεν τὴν ποίδα ἔχουσαν κτλ. Similar documents published since show that the verb commonly employed to denote the doctors' inspection is a past form of ἐφορᾶν (όρῳμεν in POxy VI 896.32f. (316) is a case apart). Cf. e.g. POxy XLV 3245.14 (297) ἐφίδον τοῦτο[v]; LIV 3729.17f. (307) ἐφίδον | τὸν προκίμενον Ἰcίδωρον; LXIV 4441.i.7 (316) ἐφίδον τὸν αὐτὸν M[ο]χεῖν (for ii.14 see note ad loc.); and XLIV 3195.ii.37f. (331), which was probably drafted by the same four doctors (cf. POxy LXIII 4366.4-5 n.): ὅθ[εν] | τοῦτον ἐφίδαμεν. To be sure, the spelling ἐφίδ- is a mistake for ἐπείδ-: for the errors involved, see F. T. Gignac, *Grammar* i 136f.(false aspiration); id., *Grammar* ii 235 (ει- > ι- in augment). There is little doubt, therefore, that in POxy I 52.14f. we should restore ἐ[φί]δαμεν, read ἐπείδαμεν.

POxy I 159 = POxy descr. 1¹

This is an order for payment, dated to (έτους) β Φαρ(μούθι) κε (line 8); the hand suggests a date in the third century. Lines 3-6 have been edited as follows:

δὸς Παυσανίᾳ εἰς | λόγον πίccης | ἀποδόσεως φαρμάκ(ων) | δραχ(μὰς) δισχειλίας.

In the introduction the editor noted that the mention of φαρμάκ(ων) in line 5 'if correctly read...would be somewhat surprising' in the context of the archive to which this papyrus belongs. I would add that in terms of syntax the genitives ἀποδόσεως φαρμάκ(ων), translated 'as payment for drugs', raise serious difficulties. But the published photograph (pl. 1) suggests a different reading and articulation: ἀπὸ δόσεως Φαρμοῦ(θι). The new reading is in harmony with the drift of the context: 2,000 drachmas are paid on account of pitch out of the payment for the month of Pharmouthi, the month in which this text was written.

POxy I 189 = POxy descr. 13²

This is an order to pay from the late third century. Its prescript has been presented thus:

π(αρὰ) Θεωνίλλης τῆς λαζ(προτάτης)
'Ωρίωνι πλ(εῖτα) (vac.) χα(ίρειν).

What follows in the text makes it clear that Horion is an employee of Theonilla. The editor notes that the name of this *femina clarissima* 'is uncommon and there are mentions of property-owning women called Theonilla who may be the same person, e.g. *P. Oxy.* XXIV 2421.ii.26, which mentions Heraclas the πραγματευτής or commercial agent of a Theonilla'. In fact, Horion has the same functions as Heraklas: the plate (pl. 11) indicates that in line 2 πρ(αγματευτῆ) should be read in place of πλ(εῖτα); rho is made in the same way as the rho of ἀποπληρ(ώσαι) in 7.³

A note on the date of the text may also be in order. The editor considers the possibility that Horion is the same man as the addressee of the orders for payment POxy XVII 2142-43,⁴ the latter dated to 293; both texts 'are very similarly phrased to 189 and deal with the same kind of business'. Our document is dated to Tybi 29 of Year 2 of an unnamed emperor. If the identification holds, possible dates include 24.1.298 (L. Domitius Domitianus), 24.1.286 (Diocletian), 25.1.284 (Carinus and Numerianus), but

¹ Published in full in *BASP* 31 (1994) 18ff.; cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn, *ZPE* 108 (1995) 224.

² Edited in *BASP* 31 (1994) 53f.; some corrections by D. Hagedorn have been recorded in *APF* 42 (1996) 293.

³ For πραγματευτάι being 'private employees of large landowners' see J. D. Thomas, *JJP* 18 (1974) 241 with n. 8. πρ(ονοητῆ) might also be considered, compare e.g. the contemporary Oxyrhynchite dossier of Philantinoos (see PHarr II pp. 163ff.); but POxy XXIV 2421.ii.26 seems to switch the balance in favour of πρ(αγματευτῆ). I also draw the opportunity to note that the *formula valedicendi* in lines 7-9 is in a second hand, presumably Theonilla's.

⁴ The Horion of these two texts seems to be an agent of a certain Zoilos. The two individuals appear together also in the tax-list POxy XII 1573.13, and the letter POxy XLV 3253 (both assigned to the late iii/early iv cent.).

there should be earlier possibilities too. Note also that POxy XXIV 2421.ii.26 (cited above), has been thought to date from *ca.* 313-23, cf. BL VIII 257.

POxy X 1295 = Sel. Pap. I 129

In this second or early third century letter Tasois is ‘complaining that her correspondent Dionysius was attempting to alienate her son, who apparently was in his charge, and threatening to remove the boy from Dionysius’ influence’. In the edition lines 10-11 run as follows:

δέο οὖν, μὴ ἀνάπειθε αὐτὸν τοῦ | ἐκτός μου ε[ἰ]ναι.

In the apparatus δέο is interpreted as δέομαι (in Sel. Pap. δέομαι appears in the text); Gignac, *Grammar* ii 326 includes δέο among his examples of active forms of deponent verbs. But the phrasing of Tasois’ request was less subtle than appears in the edition, and this is in line with her tone in the rest of the letter. A photograph indicates that after delta only the foot of an upright is visible on the papyrus; in this writing the trace suits iota better than epsilon. That is, read:

διὸ οὖν μὴ ἀνάπειθε αὐτὸν τοῦ | ἐκτός μου ε[ἰ]ναι.

‘For this reason, therefore, do not (try to) persuade him to be away from me.’

POxy XXXVI 2748

This is a fragment of a second century copy of the *Iliad*, written across the fibres on the back of what the editor thought to be a ‘part of a writing exercise (?). This led J. Debut to include this text in her list of school-texts as no. 233 (ZPE 63 (1986) 263). R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teaching and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (1996) 287 classified it among the ‘indistinguishable items’. Examination of the original has shown that what stands on the other side of the *Iliad* is not a writing exercise. What is visible rather points to an official document, but too little survives to ascertain its exact nature. At the lower left-hand part of the sheet the end of a line of writing is visible; I read]αc. This is followed by a large unwritten area, apparently the intercolumnium (note that no sheet join can be detected), while at the upper right-hand part of the sheet there are exiguous remains of the beginnings of three lines, the second of which, written in very large characters, reads μον[, perhaps μονγ[. A reference to the prefect Munatius Felix, attested in office between 150 and 154, is one possibility among many.

POxy XLIX 3477

This text of 270 is an application for the anacrisis of a slave girl prior to her being sold for the first time. She was owned by an Aurelia Ael..., who has with her ‘as assistant and guarantor of the sale’ (συνετῶτος αὐτῆι καὶ συμβεβ[οιοντος] | τὴν πρᾶσιν, lines 10f.) a certain Aurelius Basileides alias Philantinoos. The woman has added her subscription at the foot of the document, but it is her assistant who has signed on her behalf (lines 22-3):

εὐδοκῶ. Α(ύρήλιος) Β[ας]ειλείδ[ης]
κ]αὶ ἔγρ(αψα) ὑπὲρ α[ύτη]ς γρ[άμματα μὴ εἰδυνής.

The edition offers no comment on what may have followed after Β[ας]ειλείδ[ης] at the end of 22. I believe that there probably stood Basileides’ alias followed by a verb, cf. the ensuing [κ]αὶ ἔγρ(αψα). Compare the following subscriptions, all by συνετῶτες of women:⁵

POxy XIX 2231.42ff. 241 Αὐρήλιος Σερῆνος ἐπικεκλημένος Λεωνίδης | συνέτην αὐτῇ καὶ | ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς μὴ | εἰδυνής γράμματα.

SB VIII 9878.42ff. 259 Αὐρήλιος | Ἀπολλώνιος | Απ[ολλ]ωνίου συνέτην α[ύ]τῃ κα[ί] ἔγραψα κτλ.

POxy X 1273.48f. 260 Αὐρήλιος | Θέων ὁ καὶ Νεπωτιανὸς συνέτην αὐτῇ καὶ ἔγραψα κτλ.

In the light of these examples, I propose that at the end of line 22 we restore Β[ας]ειλείδ[ης] ὁ καὶ Φιλαντίνοος συνέτην αὐτῇ]. The supplements are no doubt too long for the space available, but abbreviations must have been used, as the surviving parts of Basileides’ subscription indicate.

⁵ Cf. also MChr 211.30 (233), PLond III 978.19, 20 (331), MChr 361.21 (355), 363.26 (381).