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POxy I 52

This is a report of four public doctors dated to 325. In lines 14f. the editors read ε[τ]δαμεν την παίδα ἕχουσαν κτλ. Similar documents published since show that the verb commonly employed to denote the doctors’ inspection is a past form of ἔφορον (ὁρῶμεν in POxy VI 896.32f. (316) is a case apart). Cf. e.g. POxy XLV 3245.14 (297) ἐφίδον τὸ τοῦτον; LIV 3729.17f. (307) ἐφίδον τὸν προκήμον; LXIV 4441.i.7 (316) ἐφίδον τον αὐτὸν Μ[ο]νέιν (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.): ὀθ[εν] τούτον ἐπίδομεν. To be sure, the spelling ἐφίδον is a mistake for ἐπείδο:. For the errors involved, see F. T. Gignac, Grammar i 136f. (false aspiration); id., Grammar ii 235 (ἐὶ > - in augment). There is little doubt, therefore, that in POxy I 52.14f. we should restore ἐ[τ]δαμεν, read ἐπείδομεν.

POxy I 159 = POxy descr. 1

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

δὸς Πάσσανὰς εἰς ἱ λόγων πίσες ἵππος δύο χρυσακίων δραχμῶν διάπολου πλατηχάς.

In the introduction the editor noted that the mention of χρυσακίων 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 ἵππος δύο χρυσακίων, translated ‘as payment for drugs’, raise serious difficulties. But the published photograph (pl. 1) suggests a different reading and articulation: ἵππος δύο χρυσάκων Φορομοθῆς. 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. 2

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

παρὰ Θεονίλλη τὴς λαμπρὴς προτάτης
Ἅρωμιν πλατηχάς (vac.) χαῖρι (ἀπε). 

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.iii.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 πραγματευτής should be read in place of πληττάς; ῥο is made in the same way as the rho of ὑποληπτὴς 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

---

2 Edited in BASP 31 (1994) 53ff.; some corrections by D. Hagedorn have been recorded in APF 42 (1996) 293.
3 For πραγματευτὴν being ‘private employees of large landowners’ see J. D. Thomas, JJP 18 (1974) 241 with n. 8. πρ(ονοτη) 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(ονοτητη). 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 P.Oxy XXIV 2421.i.26 (cited above), has been thought to date from ca. 313-23, cf. BL VIII 257.

P.Oxy 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:

\[ \text{δέο οὖν, μὴ ἀνάπειθε αὐτὸν τοῦ ἵκτος μου ε[OF]**i**να}. \]

In the apparatus δέο is interpreted as δεόμαι (in Sel. Pap. δεόματι 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:

\[ \text{δὶο οὖν μὴ ἀνάπειθε αὐτὸν τοῦ ἰκτός μου ε[OF]**i**να}. \]

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

P.Oxy 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 \[ \text{[α]**pi**σική αἰθήμων, αἴτησιν}. \]

In the light of these examples, I propose that at the end of line 22 we restore \[ B[α]**c**ι\varepsilonιλεδ[η]**c** \]followed by a verb, cf. the ensuing \[ κ[η]**τερώσεις γράμματα. \]

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’ (\textit{συνεκτϊτος αὐτῆ καὶ συμβεβ[αιοντοτο] ἡ τὴν πράτιν, 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):

\[ \text{εἰοδοκό. Ἀ[ορσίλιος B[α]**c**ιελεδ[η]**c** κ[η]**τερωσεις αἰσχα υπὲρ α[ορσίλιος γράμματα μὴ εἰδίνης.} \]

The edition offers no comment on what may have followed after B[α]**c**ιελεδ[η]**c** at the end of 22. I believe that there probably stood Basileides’ alias followed by a verb, cf. the ensuing \[ κ[η]**τερώσεις αἰσχα. \]

Compare the following subscriptions, all by \textit{συνεκτϊτος} of women:

\begin{itemize}
  \item P.Oxy XIX 2231.42ff. 241 \textit{Αὐρήλιος Σερίνον[ε] ἐπικεκλημένος Λεανίδης | συνέτετιν αὐτῆ καὶ ἐγράφα υπὲρ αὐ-
                 τῆς μὴ εἰδίνης γράμματα.}
  \item SB VIII 9878.42ff. 259 \textit{Αὐρήλιος | Ἀπολλονίου | Ἀπολλονίου συνέτετιν α[ορσίλιος καὶ ἐγράφα κτλ.}
  \item P.Oxy X 1273.48f. 260 \textit{Αὐρήλιος | Θεόν ὁ καὶ Νεαπόλιτος συνέτετιν αὐτῆ καὶ ἐγράφα κτλ.}
\end{itemize}

In the light of these examples, I propose that at the end of line 22 we restore B[α]**c**ιελεδ[η]**c** \textit{ὁ καὶ Φιλαντίνου συνέτετιν αὐτῆ}. 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.

Wolfson College, Oxford Nikolaos Gonis

---

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