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EDITORIAL FOREWORD

In October 1954 our Vice-President Sir Harold Bell will attain his 75th birthday. In view both of his many contributions to the study of Graeco-Roman Egypt and of his invaluable services to our Society, Sir Harold’s many friends have wished to mark the occasion and to pay their tributes of friendship in the pages of the Journal, and the wide range of contributors to the present volume will, we hope, convey to Sir Harold some idea of the regard in which his colleagues hold him. We all send him our best greetings and good wishes. For the admirable portrait of Sir Harold which forms our frontispiece we are indebted to his son Mr. David Bell.

In December last Professor Emery, assisted by Dr. A. Klasens, Mr. H. Smith, Mr. S. A. Abbati and for a short time Mr. H. G. Harris, with Mrs. Emery caring for the expedition’s welfare, resumed his excavations in the early dynastic cemetery at Saqqarah, and he has uncovered and cleared one of the largest brick tombs ever found, which, though robbed and burnt, may perhaps be attributed to King Ḫa-ta. A brief account of this tomb will be printed in the Society’s Annual Report. The full report of the previous season’s work is in the hands of the Press, while the Archaeological Survey volumes Rock Tombs of Meir, Vols. V and VI, can now be obtained by members at the prices of £6 and £3. 10s. respectively. An Index of the Journal, Vols. XXI–XL, is in preparation and in due course will be published in pamphlet form.

The Society has suffered a grievous loss in the death of its President, Sir Robert Greg, which has followed all too quickly on that of Lady Greg, noticed in this Foreword a year ago. Of Sir Robert, Mr. I. E. S. Edwards writes: ‘Sir Robert Hyde Greg, K.C.M.G., President of this Society since 1949, died in Cairo on 3rd December last at the age of seventy-six. His connexion with Egypt began in 1911 when he was appointed Second Secretary at the British Agency, an office which he held until his promotion to the rank of First Secretary at Lisbon in 1915. Between 1917 and 1921 he was seconded for service with the Egyptian Government and placed in charge of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Subsequently he served as British Minister both in Bangkok and in Bucharest, but Egypt had already won a special place in his affections and in 1929 he accepted an opportunity to return to Cairo as British Commissioner for the Egyptian Debt and continued to live there after his retirement in 1940 until his death. Throughout his official career and in the years of leisure which followed he interested himself in many branches of art and particularly in Egyptian art of every period, an interest which he shared with his wife, who predeceased him by only a few months. His private collection of Egyptian antiquities, which he bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum, was a constant source of pleasure to him. He was a prominent member of the Committees of Egyptian, Coptic, and Moslem Monuments and was chosen by the Director General of the Antiquities’ Service as a member of an advisory panel set up in 1943 to make recommendations on the conservation of the Theban tombs.'
'Owing to his residence in Egypt Sir Robert was probably not known personally to many members of the Society, but Egyptologists of all nationalities who visited Cairo will always remember him and Lady Greg for the warm and generous hospitality enjoyed in their beautiful house and garden at Gizah. Nor will they forget his eagerness to help them in seeing archaeological sites situated in places which were not easily accessible without a motor-car. Until he was compelled by failing health to limit his activities, he was a frequent visitor at the camps of excavators, even undertaking the long and arduous journey to Sesebi, two hundred miles south of the Sudan frontier, when the Society was excavating there in 1936–7. His acceptance of the presidency of the Society coincided with its return to field-work in Egypt after an interval of more than twelve years, when the Committee felt that his special knowledge would prove valuable in preparing plans to obtain the best possible results under the prevailing conditions. That we can now look back on four seasons of successful work is an achievement to which he contributed, and all of us are conscious of the loss to the Society caused by his death.'

We have also to announce with great regret the death of Dr. H. H. Nelson of the University of Chicago, for thirty years a member of our Society. The most enduring scientific monument to his name is the sumptuous publication of the temples of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu and Karnak, but by living scholars and students he will be best remembered through his generous hospitality at Chicago House to all Egyptologists who visited Luxor.

With the appearance of the Belegstellen to Vols. IV and V of the Berlin Dictionary, the publication of this colossal work has attained completion, and Professor Grapow and the German Academy are to be heartily congratulated on having thus reached the end of an undertaking the inception of which goes back to the last decade of the nineteenth century. The Academy, however, is not content to rest on its oars, and is already contemplating a second edition embodying the improvements suggested by practical experience; acting on a suggestion by Sir Alan Gardiner, it proposes also to produce specialized vocabularies of related groups of texts, and a start has been made with the medical papyri. It is also proposed to reproduce mechanically the volumes already issued of which the stocks were destroyed during the war, so that the original edition may again be obtainable during the time that the Neuarbeitung is in preparation. It is impossible, however, for plans at once so extensive and so desirable to succeed without the collaboration of foreign scholars; the Academy appeals for the assistance of all Egyptologists, whether in the Verzetelung of new texts or in the communication of published discussions of words and phrases, and it is hoped that this appeal will meet with a wide response. Any scholars who feel themselves able in any way to assist this highly desirable project are requested to address themselves to the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Ägyptische Wörterbuch, Berlin, N.W. 7.

Since the above was printed we have learnt to our sorrow of the death of Professor Campbell Bonner on July 12 last. He had already passed the proofs of his article in the present volume.
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ST. ANTONY AND THE DEMONS

By NORMAN H. BAYNES

With lively gratitude for the friendship of Sir Harold Bell

Of Greek popular religion Nilsson wrote: 'the Greeks had religious ideas . . . but they never made them into a system' (Martin P. Nilsson, Greek Popular Religion, 1940, 4). There were no doctrines but only some simple fundamental ideas about life and death (op. cit. 63). The power of the religion of ancient Greece was a result of the absence of dogma (ibid.). In pagan Greece every man might interpret the ideas about life and death according to the propensities of his age. But with Christianity this liberty was curtailed: a sacred book was given an orthodox interpretation and men sought for an explanation of a revealed faith. 'It is dogma that differentiates a Christian from a pagan society' (T. S. Eliot). Perhaps what students of the Byzantine world most need is a careful consideration of the thought of the ordinary East Roman; we have many monographs on the leading thinkers, but very little has been written on popular theology. What questions did the common folk ask? What problems troubled them? The Life of Antony—Athanasius' masterpiece—provides a window which lets us see the outstanding importance which the Devil and his demons held for the monks of Egypt in the fourth century. Here we can trust Athanasius: he knew personally the ascetic world for which he wrote, he knew the Coptic language. We think of Athanasius as a Greek, but there is not a little to suggest that he was himself by birth a Copt.

To become familiar with Byzantine popular thought it is essential to remember that the East Roman Christian knew and believed his New Testament; he read it or heard it read in church; it became a part of his life. Thus for the modern student the most useful introduction to Byzantine thought is perhaps to re-read the New Testament. It may be that he has failed to realize how profound is the pessimism when the world is regarded in its alienation from Christianity. This world is ruled by an evil power; the ruler of this world cometh, Christ had said, and hath nothing in me (John xiv, 30). It is true that the ruler of this world has been judged (John xvi, 11), but that judgement has not been executed; it is only in the future that the ruler of this world shall be cast out (John xii, 31). In this world the counsel is: keep sober, keep awake, for your enemy the Devil prowls like a roaring lion looking out for someone to devour (1 Peter v, 8). That is the instant peril, and thus Christ's task on earth, as He Himself said, was to cast out demons and heal diseases (Luke xiii, 32). To the Twelve He gave power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases (Luke ix, 1). The casting out of demons and the healing of disease are both aspects of the same saving activity, for it is the Devil who causes disease (cf. the woman whom Satan had bound for eighteen years (Luke xiii, 16)). The belief in the maleficent power of the countless foes of men is firmly founded in the Gospels. For Paul the Christian's fight is not against flesh and blood but against
evil governments, against evil powers, against the world rulers of the dark, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places (Ephesians vi, 12). Christianity came as a deliverance from the ‘power of the dark’ (Colossians i, 13, cf. Luke xxii, 53). Such is the sombre background of Coptic monasticism.

The aim of Antony’s discourse to his followers is practical: he would strengthen and encourage his monks. The novice is terrified by the claims which virtue makes, but, Antony urged, do not fear concerning virtue and do not be offended at the word, for virtue is not far from us nor is it set outside of us. The work of virtue is within us and the doing of it is easy if only we will it. The Greeks leave home and cross the sea to learn literature. We have no need to leave home in search of the Kingdom of Heaven, for Christ Himself said ‘the Kingdom of Heaven is within you’. So virtue needs only our will. If our soul remains as it was when it was created, then we shall be virtuous and it will not be difficult to keep our minds from evil thoughts. This doctrine has been regarded as Pythagoreanism by some, as Pelagianism by others, but this statement of Antony’s thought is incomplete. The object of asceticism for a Christian is that the Lord may be our fellow-worker in achieving victory over the Devil (§ 36). The Christian’s confidence is founded on divine aid, but this aid needs man’s co-operation.

In his address Antony seeks to answer the monks’ problems; naturally they raised the problem of the existence of demons: how was it that God had created them? And Antony replied that God had not created them: He did not create anything evil. The demons had fallen from the state in which they had first been on their creation. How was it that the Devil could work his will on Job? Of himself, Antony explained, the Devil could have done nothing: he had to ask God’s permission twice before God, in order to test Job, gave his consent. Even to attack swine the demons had to secure God’s licence; how much more if the assault was to be made on man?

But if the Devil can assume any shape at pleasure and can quote scripture for his purpose, how shall the monk recognize that the vision is not sent by God? Here Antony can adduce an unfailing aid—a psychological test. If it is a vision of the holy ones it is not confused; it will not strive nor cry, nor will anyone hear their word (Isaiah xlii, 2). The vision will come quietly and so gently that immediately joy and courage are awakened in the soul, for the Lord is with them. Who is our joy and the power of God the Father. The thoughts of the soul remain without confusion and the waves are calmed . . . a longing for sacred things and for the future comes upon the soul and it will desire that it may be altogether united with them. And if some, as being human, fear the sight of the good, those who appear straightway take away the fear through love, as did the angel Gabriel (§ 35). But when the evil ones attack there is confusion, a resounding din and shouting like that of undisciplined youths. From this there arise faint-heartedness in the soul, disordered thoughts, depression, remembrance of relatives and fear of death.

This section of Antony’s address is characteristic: it is a good example of his desire to provide a practical guide for his disciples.

For the pagans the demons constituted a real difficulty since some demons were good and some were evil. (For the horror which the bad demons inspired in Porphyry, see J. Bidez, Vie de Porphyre, 100.) Christians regarded all demons as evil; they knew that
there was a great variety of demons and a great difference between them (§ 21), but Antony will not discuss their nature and distinctions. It is through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit that Christians can know which demons are less wicked and which are more so, in which pursuits each one is interested and how each is routed and expelled (§ 22). With Antony’s simplicity contrast the work of Michael Psellos with its elaboration and obscurity, e.g. the six classes of demons and the habitat of each.¹ Antony limits his exposition to the needs of his followers; he is concerned only with the practical methods of meeting the attacks of the demons. The first line of defence is a stricter devotion to asceticism—an upright life and faith in God are a great protection. Next comes the sign of the Cross (whether it be made on the person or on the house) accompanied by prayers (§§ 22, 23, 35; cf. § 13). The sign of the Cross fills the demons with dread, since it was on the Cross that the Saviour stripped them naked and held them up as an example. Or the Christian may chant a psalm or—more vigorously—blow into the face of the demon while calling on the name of Christ (§ 39), or—best of all—may summon up courage and challenge the demon (§ 43) asking him ‘Who are you and whence do you come?’

At times the demons would attempt to gain their end by feigning piety or would encourage excesses of asceticism so that the monk revolts against discipline. Then the supreme need—and the Christian’s privilege—is God’s gift of the discerning of spirits through the Holy Ghost (§ 38). In this discrimination we reach the crown of Byzantine asceticism.

It is clear that there was a widespread belief that the demons possessed the power to foretell the future and Antony seeks to explain how such a belief had arisen. The bodies of the demons are more subtle than human bodies and the demons were thus able to travel at a far greater speed. A demon, for instance, goes to the source of the Nile in Ethiopia and sees the heavy rainfall there; then he hurries back to Egypt and announces that there will be a plentiful flow of water. Or X may have a friend Y living up the river whom he visits frequently. The demon sees X starting out and then hastens to tell Y that X is coming to see him. When X arrives Y naturally concludes that the demon had foretold the future. In truth the demon had only guessed what X intended to do. The demons are guessers (§ 23). Or take any professional man such as a doctor: from dealing with many patients he knows the symptoms of a malady; he ‘foretells’ the course of an illness, but in truth he is only using his medical experience. So pilots and farmers can ‘foretell’ the weather (§ 33). We do not possess virtue in order to prophesy, but that by the rightness of our life we may please God. To gain the gift of prophecy what is needed is purity of heart; then the Christian can see the future more clearly than the demons can (§ 34).

The belief in the subtlety of the bodies of the demons lived on. Of this there is an illustration in the Vita Basilii attributed to Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The Byzantine fleet was anchored near Monembasia; here the shepherds were on friendly terms with a number of demons settled there and the demons said ‘yesterday Syracuse was captured by the Arabs’. Some would not believe the statement because it was made by

---

¹ Cf. K. Svoboda, La Démonologie de Michel Psellos; J. Bidez, Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs, vi. B 3784.
wicked demons who could not prophesy. But it was urged that this was not a question of prophecy; it was the subtlety of the demons' bodies and their consequent speed of movement which gave them the power to announce that an event had occurred a long distance away.\footnote{Vita Basilii, chap. 70. I owe this reference to Professor Jenkins.}

And Antony is so refreshingly human. His address was drawing to its close when he suddenly thought: 'Perhaps they think that I am only talking', and he began to report his personal experience with the demons. The Pauline hierarchy of the powers of evil might well have daunted a simple monk, but in Antony's address there is no fatalism, no despondency, but a note of triumph. This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith (I John, v, 4). It is a heartening message.

There has recently been published a new translation of The Life of Antony,\footnote{R. T. Meyer, Saint Athanasius, The Life of Saint Antony in the series Ancient Christian Writers, Westminster, Maryland, 1950.} and it is to be hoped that students of history, and not merely of Church history, will read and re-read the Vita.

LONDON
POLITAI AS LANDHOLDERS AT KARANIS
IN THE TIME OF DIOCLETIAN AND CONSTANTINE

By A. E. R. BOAK

It is a great pleasure to be able to make this slight contribution to the study of social and economic conditions in Egypt at the beginning of the Late Roman Empire as a testimonial to the inspiration and assistance which I have received from the outstanding interpreter of the civilization of Roman and Byzantine Egypt to whom this volume is dedicated.

The subject of my investigation is that class of persons among the landowners and taxpayers of Karanis who are designated officially as politai, or more fully archontes kai politai in contrast to the persons registered as inhabitants of Karanis and its dependent district or horiodiktia, who are called kometai, i.e. ‘villagers’. There can be no doubt but that the term politai in this connexion means citizens of a polis, a term which in this period was applied to both the old Greek cities of Egypt and the former metropoleis or nome capitals to which their names now stood in the relation of territoria.1 Our information regarding these politai is derived from certain papyri in the archive of Aurelios Isidoros of Karanis, now in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo.2 Isidoros was a landowner, a tenant farmer, and held at various times the more responsible village offices.3

For our subject, the chief documents are two reports submitted by Isidoros and his fellow sitologoi of Karanis for the year 308 to superior officials who were examining their accounts. One of these documents (Cairo, Journal d’entrée 57033, unpublished) dated in 309 is a kατ’ ὀνόμα record of the payments in wheat and barley made by the landholders of Karanis and its horiodiktia for 308. This contains nine relatively complete columns and a very fragmentary tenth, all on the recto, besides a summary on the verso.4 The report is divided into two sections. One, occupying cols. ii and iii, is devoted to ἄρχοντες καὶ πολίται; the other, cols. iv–x, to κωμηται. Each of these sections in turn is divided into separate reports of wheat and barley collections. The wheat return for magistrates and citizens occupies col. ii, their barley return col. iii. The village wheat report fills cols. iv–viii; their barley report cols. ix and the fragment of x, indicating the loss of approximately three additional columns.

The second document in question, Cairo 57030, the last half of which was published

2 For permission to publish this archive, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Museum authorities.
4 In addition to the wheat and barley lists, the report includes a small quantity of broad beans, entered as a single item without reference to contributors, col. viii, 168.
by the writer some years ago, is dated in 312. It reports the amounts of wheat and barley collected by the sitologoi for 308 and the disposition of the same. Individual payments are not recorded, but the returns from the several categories of land (γῆ βασιλικῆ and ἱδιωτικῆ, σπόριμος and ἀστόρος) are given separately, and likewise the totals of wheat and barley contributed by villagers and citizens respectively. From this and the preceding document we can form a fair idea of the extent and character of the landholdings of citizens in the Karanis area.

Cairo 57033 shows that there were twenty-one politai who paid taxes in wheat and twenty who paid in barley. Since, however, the majority paid both, the total number of these citizen landholders was only twenty-three, of whom four were women. Two pairs and one group of three united in making joint payments and hence may be considered to be joint landholders. Two of the politai are described as gymnasarchs, one as a bouleutēs, and two as veterans. All of these, and in addition the joint landholders, are listed without their fathers' or mothers' names. In contrast, the wheat return of the villagers includes 117 names, in addition to three groups of unnamed brothers and one of anonymous partners. As we may assume a similar proportion between villagers and citizens in the barley lists, the village landholders outnumbered the citizen by more than 5 to 1.

The wheat collected from the politai measured 632 6/8 artabas, the barley 335 1/3 2/7 artabas (Cairo 57030, 32, 34), whereas the villagers contributed 4022 1/2 artabas of wheat and 3195 3/24 of barley (id. 31, 33, 54–55; 62–63). Accordingly, the villagers produced well over six times as much wheat as the citizens and nearly twelve times as much barley. This shows that by far the greater proportion of land under cultivation in the Karanis area was in possession of the villagers.

Nor do the politai appear as a group of large landholders among a village peasantry. Their wheat list in Cairo 57033 shows only four paying more than 50 artabas (221 1/2, 143, 57, and 51 respectively), but seven less than 10 artabas. And though the largest wheat payment by a villager was only 141 artabas, there were eleven kōmitai who contributed more than 80 artabas. Unfortunately, the damaged condition of the barley lists makes it impossible to calculate the total holdings of any of the larger contributors on the basis of the rate of taxation. Regrettable also is the loss of so much of Cairo 57396 (unpublished), apparently a complete list of the individual landholdings of both citizens and villagers, that we cannot find there the size of the estate of a single citizen. And in the long report of individual payments of the chaff or straw levy for 310 (Cairo 57086 = P.Boak 31) only a few of the citizens of Cairo 57033 can be identified partly because of the omission of their parental names and partly because some of their contributions were made apparently by agents, whose principals were not recorded.

But some at least of the citizens of Cairo 57033 can be identified in other documents of the Isidoros collection. These are:

1. Abok, a gymnasarch (57033, 21, 40), makes payments of 12 and 5 modii of wheat in an undated list of individual contributors (Cairo 57032, 72, 107, unpublished).

1 'Some Early Byzantine Tax Records from Egypt', Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 51 (1940), 34–60, no. 4.
2 Ét. de Paph. 7 (1948), 135 ff.
2. The brother pair, Alexandros and Herakles (57033, 21, 43), are also found in 57032 (ll. 167, 184) furnishing 27 modii through one Demetrios, and 9 through Asklas and Heras. Their father's name Horion is given in the land register 57395, 3–6, where they are listed as owners of γῆ ἰδιωτικὴ στρώματος, γ. βασιλικὴ ἄφροχος and γ. ἰδιωτικὴ ἄφροχος. Only the fractions of their arourai remain for the first two categories, but of the third they held 17 $\frac{23}{11}$ arourai.

3. Apollonios, a veteran (57033, 35, 48), is credited with five payments totalling 7 sargana or 175 litrai in the chaff return for 310 (57086, 35, 49, 148, 187, 213), which was the third largest contribution. At the tax rate of 25 litrai per aroura, he must have had 42 arourai in grain. In the grain report of 57032, Apollonios pays 170 modii (ll. 120, 129), and he also appears as owner of 9 arourai and joint owner with a sister, Sempronia, of an additional 5 $\frac{3}{8}$ arourai in an undated list of landholders (Cairo 57378 = P. Boak, 33, 4–5).¹

4. Another veteran, Neilos (57033, 44), in 309 paid Isidoros the sum of 17 T. 3,100 dr. for the future delivery of 150 artabas of beans. In the contract of sale he is described as 'an honourably discharged ex-centurion' (Cairo 57375).²

5. Ptolemaios, son of Ammanianes (57033, 31, 51), occurs in a register of holders of unsold lands (aparta) in Nea Ptolemais, Bachias, and Kerkesoucha compiled in 313–14 as the possessor of 1 $\frac{1}{12}$ arourai (Cairo 57373 = P. Boak 32, 50).³ In the land register of 37395, his holdings are itemized as γ. βασιλικ. στρ. 1 $\frac{3}{10}$ 1 $\frac{1}{12}$ arourai; βασιλικ. ἄφρος. 2 $\frac{1}{12}$ 1 $\frac{2}{12}$ arourai; ἰδιωτικ. στρ. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ arourai; ἰδιωτικ. ἄφρος. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 $\frac{1}{8}$ (recto, viii, 6–10).

6. Serenilla, daughter of Ptolemaios, was a citizen of Antinoopolis and enjoyed the ius liberorum as we learn from a receipt for the rental of some of her property which she had leased to Isidoros in 297–299 (Cairo 57080 = P. Boak 4, A.D. 300).⁴ She is entered also in 37395 as the owner of both inundated and unflooded private land, but the amounts of each are lost. As the mother of Aurelia Ptolema, she is mentioned in Cairo 57055 to be discussed below.

7. The sister and brother pair Soucheiaina and Horion (57033, 21, 42) are contributors of 54 modii in 57032, 74. But it is uncertain whether this Soucheiaina is the daughter of Theon who with a certain Nemesinos holds 2 arourai in the list of 313–14 (57373, 67), or whether she is the one who, with associates whose names are illegible, appears as one of the children of Chairemon in the land register 57395 (verso, i, 15–17).

In addition to the politai named in the report of the siologoi (57033), several others appear in the Isidoros documents:

1. Aurelios Kapiton of Arsinoe, who with Aur. Ptolemaios of Karanis leased 5 arourai from three villagers of Karanis (Cairo 57400 = P. Boak, 14).⁵

2. Aurelios Nemesinos, past exégetes and bouleutês of Arsinoe. In 296 he rented 4 arourai of wheat land to Isidoros (Cairo 57405 = P. Boak 13).⁶ Very probably this Nemesinos was the Philadelphos, son of Nemesinos of 57033, 37, 56.

¹ Ét. de Pap. 7, 55–57.
³ Ét. de Pap. 7, 50–55.
3. Aurelia Ptolema. In 304 this woman, acting through her husband A. Johannes, a gymnasiarch, issued a receipt to Isidoros for her share of the crop which he had raised on land leased from her for 303–4 but asserted a claim for the unpaid share of the previous year's crop (Cairo 57046 = P.Boak 27). Two years later she gave Isidoros another receipt for 4½ artabas rental (Cairo 57692, unpublished). And in 314 and 315 she gave him two additional receipts for rentals paid for 312, 313, and 314 at 9 artabas per year (Cairo 57055 = P.Boak 30). In these two receipts she described herself as the daughter of Serenilla, residing in the amphodion Phremi of Arside. It is very tempting to regard this Serenilla as the Serenilla daughter of Ptolemiaios of 57033.

4. Aurelios Zoilos, son of Apollonios, a prytanikos kai exegetikos hyperetes. In 296 Zoilos leased 10 arourai to Isidoros at 10 artabas per aroura (Cairo 57041 = P.Boak, 26). Later, in the years 309–12, he gave Isidoros four receipts for payment of rental on land leased to him during the period 308–11 at 9 artabas per year (Cairo 57376 = B.Boak 19; 57035 unpublished; 57096 = P.Boak 7; 57037 = P.Boak 20).

Further study of the Isidoros papyri probably will bring to light other politai who held land in the Karanis area. But the foregoing examples enable us to draw some general conclusions regarding the role of these non-resident landholders in the agricultural life of this region. They were not all Arsinoites, but some were from Antinoopolis, and possibly other cities as well. Their estates were no grand domains, but small to moderate properties comprising land of various tax and production categories. Many of them, perhaps the majority, leased their land to voluntary tenant farmers, who made written applications for the leasehold. On occasion, a citizen might himself be a tenant of a villager.

There is nothing to indicate that these citizens had built up their properties from uncultivated public or private lands to any greater extent than the villagers. One gets the impression that a considerable number of the known politai had acquired their properties by inheritance, which would account for the joint holdings. The ties between Karanis and Antinoopolis in the preceding centuries are well known and we might expect Arsinoites to marry daughters of village landowners.

Whether the conditions just described changed to the advantage of the politai and the disadvantage of the villagers under the increasing fiscal burdens of the Byzantine period is a question of primary importance. But, so far, evidence on this point is entirely lacking.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

1 Ét. de Pap. 5, 107–9.
2 Ibid. 114–17.
3 Ibid. 5, 104–7.
4 Cf. op. cit. 2, 21–27 (7); 3, 42–45 (19–20).
TWO NOTES

By CAMPBELL BONNER

I. The names Nonnos, Nonna

This note lays no claim to originality, and my reasons for offering it in a tribute to an eminent scholar are simply these: (1) the pertinent evidence bearing upon the origin of the name Nonnos was overlooked by a reference book on which students are accustomed to rely; (2) this evidence, though used by some well-known authorities, is not conveniently accessible to many readers of Greek literature; and (3) the evidence has been slightly reinforced by some observations of my own.

According to Pape's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, Nonnos and Nonna are Egyptian names meaning 'holy'. There is reason to think that this was a hasty guess, perhaps suggested by two circumstances which prove nothing, namely, that the epic poet Nonnos lived in Panopolis (Chemmis, Akhmim) and that in the Greek of Byzantine times νόμος, νώμα came to mean 'monk', 'nun'. A compiler like Pape could scarcely be expected to offer correct etymologies for all proper names; but it is surprising to find his statement repeated in 1924 by Christ-Stählin (*Gesch. d. griech. Litteratur*, ii, 2, 965, n. 5), and supported by only two references, neither of which is cogent. One is a late papyrus (P.Grenf. 1, 54, 8, incidental mention of a Nonnos in a lease of a.D. 378), the other a second-century inscription from Delphi, to which we shall return later.

Egyptologists to whom I referred the question have not been able to cite any mn words in dynastic Egyptian that mean anything like 'holy', and it appears that the Copts used either the Greek ἄγιος or their own word οὐκε. Furthermore, it is significant that the names Nonnos, Nonna do not occur in Ptolemaic papyri. In the Zenon correspondence various other Egyptian names are to be found, but the two in question are not among them. There is not one instance among the more than 1,800 entries in the first fascicle of Peremans and Van 't Dack's *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*. When the names Nonnos, Nonna do make their appearance in papyri, chiefly of the fourth and fifth centuries, there is good reason to think that they were imported by people of non-Egyptian origin; and, in fact, in documentary papyri and also in inscriptions, a Nonnos or a Nonna sometimes has kinsmen with Jewish or Christian names. Thus in Preisigke's *SB* i, 616, Alexander, also called Nonnos, is the father of a Samuel; in PSI 933, a Nonna is mother of Georgios and wife of Joseph; in P.Cair. Masp. 67288, iv, 35, a Nonna is mother of Mathias; in P.Amh. i, 192, Nonna is sister of Symeon; in Wessely, *Stud. Pal.* iii, no. 140, Nonnos is son of Barnabas.

So far as I have observed, the earliest instance of Nonnos as the name of an Egyptian man is the Delphic inscription (*SIG* ii, 847, end of second century) which is cited by Christ-Stählin. An acrobat of various accomplishments records the fact that the Delphians (evidently greatly degenerated) had been so pleased by his performance that
they made him a citizen and a councillor. He calls himself Νόννος ὁ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρεύς. Demetrios is evidently a name assumed to comport with his quality as an Alexandrian. In view of the mixed population of Alexandria and the migratory habits of mountebanks and other public entertainers, it is doubtful whether the versatile Nonnus-Demetrios had a drop of Egyptian blood in his veins.

It is true that the names Nonnus and Nonna are common in Egyptian papyri of late Roman and Byzantine times; through Preissigke's *Namenbuch* and other aids one is led to thirty-five or forty examples. But if papyri had been preserved elsewhere in such numbers as Egypt offers, those names might have been recorded even more frequently in other countries, especially Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. Of the fifteen Nonnus who were important enough to be listed in Pauly-Wissowa, only the poet Nonnos of Panopolis has any connexion with Egypt. One is a sixth-century Byzantine official from Asia Minor; the others are mostly Christian ecclesiastics from Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine. In the inscriptions of Asia Minor the names in question are fairly common. Non(n)os and Non(n)na occur some ten times in the inscriptions published in *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, and there are as many instances of the probably related Nanas, Nana, Nonnus. A search of CIG and SEG (fasc. vi, viii, ix), which does not pretend to thoroughness, yields four examples of Nonnus or Nonna from Phrygia, Lydia, and Isauria, three from Palestine, and sporadic instances elsewhere, as in Italy and Cyrenaica. There are also several examples of the related Nounos, etc. It is worth noting that the mother of the great Cappadocian, Gregory of Nazianzus, was called Nonna. That name has also been found recently on a magical amulet, a Chnoubis stone (see my *Studies in Magical Amulets*, 54–60), now in private possession in Stamboul. Through the good offices of Mr. Henri Seyrig I have been provided with a photograph and description of it, and hope to publish it soon.

In Parchment 5 from Dura-Europos νόνος occurs meaning father,¹ and on a late sarcophagus-cover from Cyzicus νόνα seems to be a female relation of the older generation.² Mr. H. Grégoire, who thinks 'aunt' the most likely meaning, cites the Hesychian glosses νάνας, uncle, νάνα, νάνη, aunt, and νένος, uncle (Pollux 3.22, and Plut. *Mor.* 1033 E, where a corrupt word in an epigram was brilliantly emended by Wilhelm).³

The right way to the understanding of these words was pointed out by Kretschmer nearly sixty years ago.⁴ He calls them *Lallnamen*, words made by babbling repetition of similar syllables (like papa, mama), and applied to various family relationships. Such words appear in many languages and cannot be used to prove kinship among them. The connexion of kin-names with other babbling words may be illustrated by Ital. nonno, grandfather, and ninna ninna, which are mere lullaby words sung to soothe infants. Kretschmer observed, on the evidence of inscriptions, that names so formed are a characteristic peculiarity of Asia Minor; and it is much easier to believe that they spread from there southward through Syria and Palestine to Egypt than that a reverse movement from Egypt could account for their distribution.

² H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscr. gr. chrétiennes*, 1, no. 16. ³ *Hermes*, 35 (1900), 469–70.
Nonnus the poet was born in Panopolis, but his family may have been of Anatolian or Syrian origin. He shows a special interest in Berytus, where he may have studied in youth—a conjecture based on his encomium upon that city in Dionys. 41, especially ll. 10-21, 143-54, 389-98. That may argue a Syrian connexion; yet, on the other hand, the fame of the law school at Berytus undoubtedly drew students from all countries bordering upon the eastern Mediterranean, regardless of their nationality. It would be idle to suggest that Nonnus’ choice of a subject for his epic was influenced by an Anatolian or a Syrian connexion, for wherever books were available, older Dionysiac poetry was at hand—in particular Dionysios’ Bassari, of which Nonnus certainly made use.2

Editorial addition. Professor Bonner very kindly allows us to recall another Nonna, wife to Abinnaeus the well-known præpositus of the fort at Dionysias between A.D. 340-50, whose archive Sir H. I. Bell is engaged in re-editing. Her full name is Ἁνφιδία Νόννα ἡ καὶ Πολυκέτιος (P.Lond. 251, 11, 317 = M., Chr. 270), and she is a person of some consequence, owns property in Alexandria and Philadelphia, and is very probably an Alexandrian citizen. It appears probable that Abinnaeus himself originated from Syria. Was the same true of his wife? The archive, which allows only guesses about when and at what age Abinnaeus married, does not offer an answer to this question.

II. Anaptyxis in an Emended Inscription

Anaptyxis and epenthesis are technical terms used to denote the insertion of a vowel into a word in order to facilitate the utterance of a hard combination of consonants.3 This note considers only some instances of the phenomenon as it occurs within a word.

In English the internal anaptyxis of a dull vowel like French mute e may be observed in careless or uneducated speech, as in prairie, which I have heard pronounced pr(e)airie, el(e)m, ath(e)letic, the last a pronunciation which is all too common among athletes and their admirers. In Greek, epsilon is the vowel most commonly developed in internal anaptyxis; anaptyxis of alpha has been cited in such pairs as σκυδαλμός, σκυδαλμός; μαλακός, μαλκός (Hesych.); ταράσσω, θράσσω; but perhaps in some cases one might say that an original alpha had been first dinned and then suppressed under the influence of a following accent. Linguists must decide on the basis of the history of the individual words. I have recently called attention to an anaptyctic alpha in the vulgar Greek of Byzantine times; in a charm on a bronze amulet παρασ is written for πράσ.4

The consonants associated with the phenomenon of anaptyxis are usually combinations of a stopped consonant with a liquid or a nasal; between two stops it has not often been noted. This may be a matter of chance, for the difficulty of pronunciation which leads to anaptyxis is certainly no less, perhaps even greater, than in the other cases. K. Dieterich has called attention to ἐπτάκις for ἐπτάκις in P.Leid. J 395 (= Pap. Graec. Mag. XIII), 473.5 There is a similar Latin example in the recently published Tablettes Albertini (actes privés de l’époque vandale), Textes, iv, 3, subscripturus.6

1. Keydell in PW 17, col. 905.
2. Keydell, loc. cit.
4. Amulets chiefly in the British Museum, Hesperia 20, 334 and 335 (where ‘among them’ should have been added after ‘elsewhere’ six lines from the end of the first column).
5. Untersuchungen zur Gesch. d. griech. Sprache, 42 (Byz. Archiv, 1, 1898).
Another example of anaptyctic alpha, here between two stopped consonants, came to my attention through a friendly criticism of my Studies in Magical Amulets. Writing in Rev. des études byzantines, 9 (1952), 261, Mr. V. Laurent remarks with justice that I should have taken account of certain previously published Byzantine amulets, which unfortunately escaped my attention, among them a group published by him in BZ 36 (1936), 300–15. One of them, a heliotrope in Przemyśl, bears an inscription for which I would propose a reading different from the editor’s; and that reading involves anaptyxis of alpha. The stone is a good example of the type described briefly in Studies in Magical Amulets, 90–91, and fully treated by Drexler in Philologus, 58 (1899), 594–608. Such pieces are primarily uterine amulets, though sometimes used for various abdominal disorders; the Medusa design has evolved from an octopus-like conventional representation of the uterus. The accompanying inscriptions, which present several variants and sometimes occur without the Medusa design, are charms addressing the womb as if it were a dangerous wild beast; the first clauses describe its fierce behaviour, in the last it is adjured to be quiet and go to sleep.

The present occasion does not justify further discussion of a formula the general purport of which was explained long ago. Except for one word I accept Mr. Laurent’s reading and interpretation. Freed by him from obvious corruptions and orthographic errors, the inscription reads as follows (p. 305):

υστέρα μελάνη μελανωμένη, ὦς ὄφις κήλησαι, ὄς θάλασσα γαλήνισον, ὄς πρόβατον πράσινον, καὶ ὄς ΚΑΤΝΟC.

There the inscription breaks off, as many late incantations do when space is lacking, and κοιμῶ for κοιμάω (Jannaris, Hist. Gram. 850b) is to be supplied. Translate ‘Black, blackened womb, be charmed like a snake, be calm like the sea, be tame like a sheep, (go to sleep) like a κάτνος’.

Mr. Laurent (305) sees in the last word a corruption of κάτος (κάττος) cat, or κάτλος, kitten, the latter, as the proposer himself recognizes, a hypothetical diminutive. For the mention of a cat or kitten he finds an analogy in two modern German charms collected by Drexler (604 f.), in which the womb is commanded to sleep like a kitten. Certain difficulties remain: (1) a diminutive κάτλος is not attested, and one would expect καττίνο (cf. mod. Gr. γατί); (2) it is not the best method to interpret an unintelligible group of letters as an error representing an unattested word.

I would suggest that the alpha is anaptyctic, and that the original word was κτίλος, a tame animal, a pet; this would be an exact parallel to παράος (πράος) on the London bronze amulet. The changes that brought it to the corrupt form which it takes on the Przemyśl amulet are (1) anaptyctic development of alpha; (2) λ was read as ι, a form of ι often found in papyri and inscriptions of Roman times. The artist of the Przemyśl heliotrope, or else some predecessor in the tradition, changed the ι to its better form, but accepted the meaningless κατνος without question.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

1 See Studies in Magical Amulets, 90.
OI ETI ZENHE

By ARISTIDE CALDERINI

Studiare le varie fluttuazioni della popolazione in Egitto durante l’età greco-romana è di sommo interesse per chiarire notevoli problemi di ordine economico, politico e sociale e può formare oggetto di ampia trattazione intesa a completare e a rendere miglior ragione di quelle ricerche sulla ἀναχάρησις che hanno di recente interessato l’attività e la dottrina del prof. Victor Martin1 e della sign. Préaux.2

Il problema mi si è presentato più di una volta nella compilazione del mio Dizionario geografico e topografico dell’Egitto greco-romano,3 che mi ha già fornito e mi fornirà anche in seguito preziosi materiali di discussione e di confronto; ma fin d’ora mi par conveniente di esaminare alcune espressioni che si riferiscono a questo argomento, per avere sempre maggiori possibilità di penetrare nella intricata e non facile ricerca.

Osservo anzitutto che la presenza di ἐγένοι in Egitto e più tardi di ἐπιέγενος4 è dimostrata da parecchie decine di citazioni che ho già raccolto dai documenti superstiti e che appaiono in ogni secolo dal III4 al VI5.

In particolare l’espressione ἐπὶ ἡγένης è significativa non tanto in età tolemaica, i cui esempi sono pochi e non particolarmente rilevanti,5 ma soprattutto in età romana. A chiarirne il significato valgono assai bene i suoi contraposti in formule consuete: in primo luogo il suo contrapposto cogli ὅδεa; esso risulta chiaro nell’editto di Antonino Liberale del 1546 (BGU II, 372 = W., Chr. 19),6 dove è detto che gli ἀνέστοιοι e gli ὀδοῖοι che si aggirano con intenti criminali ἐπὶ ἡγένης debbono tornare ἐπὶ τὰ ὅδεα,7 e il medesimo ripete l’editto del 158p P.Fay. 24 per τῶν ἐπιέγενων di Emeeria, e meglio l’editto del prefetto Sabaziano Aquila del 193p (P.Gen. 16 = W., Chr. 354) che impone πάντας τῶν ἀπὸ ἡγένης δῶτας κατασφέρειν εἰς τὴν ὅδεαν.8

Il contrapposto vige ancora nel IVp perché in una lettera cristiana di quel tempo (P.Fay. 136 = Ghedini, Lettere cristiane, n. 37) leggiamo l’osservazione che ἄμυνον


2 L’Économie royale des Lagides, Bruxelles, 1939, pp. 500 e segg.

3 Approssimato dell’occasione per annunciare che il secondo volume del Dizionario è in stampa a Madrid come pubblicazione di quel Consejo Superior de Investigaciones cientificas e uscirà quanto prima.


5 La citazione più antica la trovo in un ὑπόμνημα presentato a Zenone dal pastore Pemenasis (IIIp 4 P.Cairo Zen. 111, 5493) dove si dichiara che il ricorrente non poté pagare le tasse perché da 4 mesi era ἐπὶ ἡγένης; poco dopo nel 167p (P.Hamb. 91, 26) in un altro ὑπόμνημα allo stratego dell’Ermopoli una prigione di guerra ricorda di essere καταβαθειρόμενος ἐπὶ ἡγένης e invoca di non essere dimenticato; in un papiro dell’Ermopolite di tarda età tolemaica (BGU VIII, 1768) gli ὀκτὰ ἡγένη sono forestieri contrapposti al λαὸς che è rappresentato dagli indigeni.


ARISTIDE CALDERINI

(= οὐκ εἰς τοῖς ἴδιοις, οἴδας ἐὰν τόχοι εἶναι, ἢ ἐπὶ ξένης καὶ ἀλλαγμένου τοῖς ἴδιοις καὶ μη ἐπὶ ξένης)

Altra volta il contrapposto è fatto fra ξένης e l' ἴδιος τόπος: tale il caso di un papiro del Προσ.-Georg. 1, 21, dove si legge il contrapposto θύων έξω τοῦ ἴδιου τόπου ἢ ἐπὶ ξένης (I, 27), oppure ἐπὶ ξένης καὶ ἐπὶ τόπωι (II, 4) e cosi via; 1 fra ξένης e κώμη, come in c. 553 37 ἐπὶ ξένης, δαλ che si conclude che con ξένη si intende un paese forestiero, non straniero, cioè un luogo anche a piccola distanza da quello nativo, dove ciascun individuo è iscritto nei propri ἴδια. 2

Se ne può trovare la conferma in due regolamenti di associazioni pubblicati nei P.Mich.: 43 244 (regolamento per una associazione di ἀπολύσιμοι, cioè di esenti da talune liturgie), in cui (II. 8 seg.) sono fissate alcune multe che variano di entità per coloro che non si presentino ad una adunata che sia indetta dal presidente, secondo che si tratti di tenerla ἐπὶ κώμης, oppure ἐπὶ ξένης, oppure ἐπὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως, dove si vede che per ξένη non si deve intendere altro che località minori del distretto, esclusa le metropoli; una disposizione parallela si osserva in 47 245, 36 (regolamento di una associazione di mercanti di sale).

Sarà agevole ora raccogliere in ordine cronologico la serie circonstanziata dei singoli casi che si presentano di individui che sono detti essere ἐπὶ ξένης o che ne ritornino:


19/20º P.Oxy. II, 252, 10 = W., Chr. 215: il fratello di un γέρδιος prega i τοπογραμματεῖς e i κωμογραμματεῖς di iscrivere l'assente nel registro degli ἀνακεχυρωρικότες per la stessa ragione del precedente.

30/31º P.Fay. 259 (solo descritto) si parla di persone che si trovano ἐπὶ ξένης.

44º P.Oxy. II, 251, 11: il padre di un ἄτεχνος denuncia che egli ἀνεκχύρησεν ἐπὶ την ξένην e ne chiede anch'esso l'iscrizione fra gli ἀνακεχυρωρικότες.

61º P.Oxy. 262, 6: il proprietario di uno schiavo γέρδιος ne annuncia la morte avvenuta ἐν τῇ ξένη εβίου ἐγκαταστάσεως.


72/73º St.Pal. 1, 64, 142: si accenna ad individui che sono detti ἀπὸ ξένης καὶ τευτελθόντες (cf. BL 1, p. 408).

1º P.Corn. 23a, 35 (Philadelphia) in un registro di tasse figura un γέρδιος ἀπὸ ξένης.

1º P.Oxy. VIII, 1154 = Olsson, Briefe, n. 79: particolarmente interessante è una lettera che un certo Teone manda alla sorella o moglie con questa raccomandazione: μὴ ἀγωνιάσῃς δε περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἐπὶ ξένης εἰμὶ: αὐτόπτης γὰρ εἰμὶ τῶν τόπων καὶ οὐχ

---


2 Una relativa vicinanza della ξένη si deve ritenere quella a cui allude in 531º (?) P.Lond. v, 1695, 19 (Aphroditio) dove si tratta di acqua che va presa ἀπὸ τῶν υδρευμάτων ἐλείνας ὀρείφας.
eiμι ξένον, dove la vicinanza di ξένη a ξένος in due diversi significati e accostati anche alla specificazione dei τόποι è per se stessa particolarmente significativa; Teone pare alludendo poi alla speranza di arruolarsi nell'esercito.


114° BGU I, 22 (Arsinoite): una donna λαξανωπόλης si rivolge ad uno degli strateghi dell'Arsinoite, dichiarandosi vittima di un assalto e di un furto in casa sua; l'impresa criminosa è stata possibile τού ἄνδρος μου ὄντος (= έν τοῖς) ἐπὶ ξένης.1

132/7° P.Flhor. III, 319, 6 (Ossirinchte): un tale che era stato assente da casa parecchio tempo (ἐν οἷς — ἐπὶ ξένης ὄντος πολλῷ χρόνῳ) rivolge una petizione al prefetto per deplorare furti.

133° VBP 75A, 11: due coniugi di 28 e di 20 anni denunciano nel censimento di quell'anno ad Ἀγκυρώνων κόμης accanto a se stessi un figlio di 3 anni che è ἐπὶ ξένης γεννησίας cioè nato fuori del paese (cf. BL II, 2, p. 183); lo stesso individuo coi rispettivi genitori è poi sconosciuto nel censimento del 147° (VBP 75b, 18) come diciassettennne, ma ancora probabilmente si trova ἐπὶ τοῖς ξένης.2

171/2° P.Mich. IV, 223, 977 (Karanis): si accenna ad un οἰεψ της ἀπὸ ξένης κατεκαθαριζόμενος.3

197° P.Osl. III, 81, 8 (Arsinoite): in una azione presso lo stratego un tale dichiara che durante la sua assenza (ἐπὶ ξένης ὄντος μου) ebbe danno nei riguardi di una liturgia. 198° P.Tebt. II, 397, 25 = M., Chr. 321: petizione di una donna che dichiara di non avere κύριος perché il marito è ἐπὶ ξένης.

ΠΙΙ° BGU VII, 1619, 5 (Philadelphia) si accenna a individui ἀπὸ ξένης κατεκαθαριζόμενος(?)

203° PSI XII, 1239, 10 (Oxyrhynchos) un tale dichiara di essere stato escluso dal censimento διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ ξένης έλθατ.

244/5° P.Flhor. I, 5, 14: in una scheda di censimento di Arsinoe si ricorda un tale ἐπὶ ξένης.

c. 300° BGU III, 949, 5 (Herakleopolis Magna): lettera di un fratello che è ἐπὶ ξένης al fratello per sollecitare l'invio di vivande.


567° P.Cairo Masp. I, 67002, 1, 19, cfr. BL I, p. 100 (Antinoe): in una richiesta del villaggio di Aphroditò al duca della Tebaide si allude ad un 'infelice' che è 'finora' ἐπὶ ξένης σὺν τέκνοις.

VI/VII° P.Grenf. II, 91, 7 = BL I, p. 192 (Tebaide): nella lettera diretta ad un vescovo, si parla di doppia mercede che Dio Signore darà ad un tale che si trova ἐπὶ ξένης.

---

1 Aggiungi 119° P.Oxy. XII, 1547, 23 la menzione di un tale di 57 anni che nel momento del censimento è ἀνάδονος dove la parola corrisponde a ἐπὶ ξένης; è dell'età di Adriano o di Antonino Ostr. Wilb. 76, 7-8 (Alto Egitto) che ricorda τὰ παραθέντα διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας ξένης, cfr. 140° (?) P.Ross.-Georg. II, 16, 30.

2 Aggiungi qui 161/210° P.Oxy. XII, 1446, 84, 89, dove in una lista di coltivatori di terreni stai accanto alla rubrica dei morti si dà anche quella degli ἀνάδονοι.

3 In ΠΙΙ° BGU VII, 1619, 5 (Philadelphia) si ricordano altri tornati ἀπὸ ξένης.
Dal complesso di queste testimonianze che si riferiscono tutte a spostamenti nell'interno dell'Egitto, e forse a distanze relativamente brevi dalle sedi originarie, risulta che tali allontanamenti danno sempre disagi, quando non siano causa di dolori o di danni nei luoghi temporaneamente abbandonati, sicché si comprende l'ansia della interrogazione dell'oracolo, che si legge in una lista del III/IV P.Oxy. xii, 1477, 9 (= Edgar-Hunt, Sel. Pap. i, 195) e ir δ ἀπόδημος ;

Pare risulti anche dalle citazioni esposte in ordine cronologico che soprattutto negli ultimi secoli (il caso di P.Oxy. viii, 1154 è del I) il soggiorno ἐπί ξένης sia dovuto quasi sempre alla ἀναχώρησις, cioè ad una situazione economica di grande disagio, il che potrebbe essere confermato dalle dichiarazioni di quelli che si riconoscono ξένοι, e che per questa loro qualità sono trattati e tenuti in condizione di inferiorità materiale e morale. Il che spiega anche l'invocazione di II/III P.Lond. 144, 15 (II, p. 253; Arsinoites) in cui chi scrive prega il suo κύριος, μη ἄφειναι με ἐπί ξένης ἀδιαφορηθηναι.

Ma di ciò e di altro sarà scritto in una prossima occasione.

1 Cfr. più oltre a l. 15 eir φυγαδεύσωμαι;
2 P. es. II/III P.Mich. iii, 506, 10; III P.Ryl. iv, 691, 14; 348 BGU II, 405, 12 ecc.
3 Si consideri anche il τέλος ἐπιξένων per cui vedi Wallace, Taxation in Egypt, Princeton, 1938, p. 278.
CONSANGUINEOUS MARRIAGES IN PHARAONIC EGYPT

By JAROSLAV ČERNÝ

The flattering invitation to contribute to this anniversary volume was accompanied by an editorial suggestion that an inquiry into consanguineous marriages, especially those between brothers and sisters, in Egypt in Pharaonic times might be of interest to the scholar whom we wish to honour. I readily accepted this valuable hint, for while Sir Harold has been interested in the possible origin of the custom of such marriages, which was so widespread in Graeco-Roman Egypt, I myself have been for a number of years past on the alert for evidence bearing on the existence of this custom in earlier periods of Egyptian history. It seemed to me therefore that this was an opportunity of setting forward such evidence as I had found, and of formulating the conclusion which I feel justified in drawing from it.

So far as Roman Egypt is concerned, the topic has been treated by Professors Hombert and Préaux in an admirable article in which the joint authors state that marriages between brothers and sisters are attested during the Pharaonic period in the royal families only, though we may be misled by the fact that the majority of our sources are concerned only with royalty. This cautious statement is correct, or very nearly so. It has been generally maintained of a number of Egyptian kings that they were married to their sisters, and enough evidence seems to have been adduced to accept the custom as proven within the royal families. Outside these, so far as I can see, only one instance has been noted on a stela of the Twenty-second Dynasty from the Serapeum. This informs us that the ‘great chief of Me Pedœese, son of the great chief of Me Takelot’ had a son, ‘the high-priest of Ptah Peftewebast, son of the great chief of Me Pedœese, his mother being Taërë, daughter of the great chief of Me Takelot’. Taërë was the child of Takelot as was Pedœese himself, in other words Pedœese married his own sister Taërë. It is true that Legrain did not seem to be quite satisfied that both Takelots, the father of Pedœese and the father of Taërë, were one and the same person, but to me their identity seems indubitable, especially in view of the title of ‘great chief of Me’ common to both Takelots, who must have been contemporary. It is out of the question that there could have been two contemporaries of the same name and of the same exalted rank, so we are duly justified in assuming their identity.

The instance of consanguineous marriage just quoted occurred in the family of a

2 First observed by Breasted, Anc. Rec. iv, p. 388, n. a; quoted by Griffith, Marriage (Egyptian), in Hastings, Encycl. Religion and Ethic.
3 Mariette, Le Séræpœum de Memphis, III, pl. 24; Lieblein, Dict. de noms, No. 1011; Chassinat, Rec. trav. 22, 9 f.; Legrain, ibid. 29, 178 f.
4 Ibid. 29, 179.
chief of Libyan mercenaries settled in Egypt at the relatively late date of the Twenty-second Dynasty, and it constitutes no proof that such a marriage was frequent or even possible in earlier periods and other classes of society. Though no serious attempt has ever been made systematically to collect evidence of consanguineous marriages, Egyptologists seem always to have accepted their existence as self-evident without stating clearly their reasons for such a belief.\(^1\) These reasons must have been firstly that such marriages are well-attested for the Graeco-Roman period in contemporary papyri, secondly the testimony of classical authors, and thirdly and above all the fact that in Egyptian texts—of all periods, as it was believed—wives were called ‘sisters’ of their husbands. Of these three the evidence of the Greek papyri is out of consideration, since it is precisely the conditions reflected by them which have to be proved or disproved for earlier periods, and the assertions of Greek authors possess no validity except for the Egypt of their day. As for the third reason, there are three possibilities: either all wives who were called their husbands’ ‘sisters’ were their real sisters, or some were and some were not, or thirdly, none of them were; in the two latter cases the term ‘sister’ would not imply any blood relationship, but would be merely an equivalent of the word ‘wife’. Quite apart from the fact that the custom of employing the expression ‘his sister’ where ‘his wife’ is meant appears, as will be shown below, only as late as the Eighteenth Dynasty, it is not difficult to demonstrate that some wives were called their husbands’ ‘sisters’ even though they were born of different parents. Thus in the Theban tomb No. 3 of Pashed the owner’s wife Nadjmebeḥdet is three times called ‘his sister’\(^3\) although her parents are ‘her father, the boat-captain of Amīn Tjay’ and ‘his sister, the lady of the house Satty’, while Pashed is a son of ‘his father, the servant of Amīn Memna’ and ‘his sister, the lady of the house Huy’.\(^4\) It is doubtful whether many examples of such a convincing type could be adduced, but even one is enough to prove that a ‘sister’ is not always a real sister.

No certain example of this use of the word for ‘sister’ is forthcoming from the inscriptions of the Old Kingdom,\(^5\) and I have found no documents of that period bearing on our subject. On the other hand, for the period extending from the end of the Sixth to the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, the situation is far more favourable. For most of this period the proper names of persons are, more often than not, followed by an indication of parentage which consists usually of the name of the mother, more rarely that of the father, and sometimes of the names of both parents. Further, for this

\(^1\) Erman, Ägypten, 221; new ed. by Ranke, 180; Müller, Liebespoesie, 7 and 9; Wiedemann, Das alte Ägypten, 92; Kees, Ägypten, 77; Shorter, Everyday Life in Ancient Egypt, 49; Petrie, Social Life in Ancient Egypt, 110; Meyer, Gesch. Alt. 1, §§ 167, 176. Only Montet, La vie quotidienne en Égypte au temps des Ramsés, 53, declared: ‘Jusqu’à présent on n’a jamais pu citer un Égyptien, noble, bourgeois ou vilain, qui ait épousé sa sœur de père et de mère.’

\(^2\) Erman, loc. cit.

\(^3\) See Černý–Bruyère–Clérel, Répertoire onomastique de Deir el-Médineh, p. 40.


\(^5\) In the first ten volumes of Junker, Giza, out of 42 women represented in the company of a man, so that they could be considered his wife, 24 are actually called hmt:ḥ ‘his wife’ but the relationship of the others to the man is not expressly stated, with the exception of one who is termed ‘his sister’, evidently his real sister, but not his wife. In Borchardt, Denkm. Alt. Reichs (CCG), 27 women are ‘his wife’ against no case of ‘his sister’.
period we have at our disposal rich material consisting of funerary stelae abounding in genealogical indications and, what is more, readily accessible in large groups in accurate publications. For the purpose of the present article a part of this material has been subjected to examination, namely stelae at Berlin, in the Musée Guimet and the Louvre in Paris, at Leyden, in the British Museum, and at Cairo; in all, 358 stelae ranging from the First Intermediate Period down to the Eighteenth Dynasty. They yielded records of 490 marriages; in some cases marriages could be established only from a combination of genealogical indications, while in others the wife was expressly designated as such. The following results have been obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of stelae</th>
<th>Total number of marriages</th>
<th>Conclusions based on genealogical indications</th>
<th>Wife called hmt-f 'his wife'</th>
<th>Wife called sn-t-f 'his sister'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Musée Guimet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyden</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit. Museum</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that against 258 cases where the wife was called hmt 'wife' of her husband, there were in the material consulted only six where she was called 'his sister'. These six stelae could, in fact, have been excluded at the outset, for they all belong to the Eighteenth Dynasty, as their style shows unmistakably, though their exact date within that Dynasty is impossible to establish. We can therefore conclude safely that before the Eighteenth Dynasty wives were not called 'sisters' of their husbands. This result, which at first sight does not seem of much importance to our topic, is in reality of considerable value, for it permits us to detect two cases where a marriage between a brother and a sister, if not absolutely certain, is at least highly probable.

The first case can be established on the evidence of three Louvre stelae, C16, 17 and 18. They all belong to one and the same man, the 'reporter (whmwt) of the Vizier, Senwosret', and are manifestly of Twelfth to Thirteenth Dynasty date. On all three Senwosret is represented in front of an offering-table on the other side of which, and facing him, sits a woman called on C17 only 'the lady of the house Deto' or whatever the correct reading of her name may be. On C16, however, she is called

1 Published in Äg. Inschr. Berlin, vol. 1.  
3 Most of them published in Gayet, Mus. Louvre, Stèles de la XIX dynastie. The publication is notoriously bad, but I was able to consult very accurate copies by J. J. Clère.

5 In Hierog. Texts B.M., t-VI.  
6 Only such as contain genealogical indications among the first 150 Middle Kingdom stelae published in Lange-Schäfer, Grab- u. Denkmale (CCG), i.e. between Nos. 20001 and 20150.  
7 Brit. Mus. Nos. [298], Hierog. Texts B.M., vi, 45; [393], op. cit. vi, 43; [353], v, 46; [1012], vi, 46; [1318], v, 47; and [1366], vi, 44.

8 Their photographs are conveniently accessible on the plates of an article by Boreaux, Bull. Inst. fr. 30, 45 ff.
his wife, the lady of the house Deto’, while according to her legend on C18 she was his sister, the lady of the house Deto’. Since we have found, on overwhelming evidence, that wives were not called ‘sisters’ before the New Kingdom, we are left with two alternatives; either we accept ‘his sister’ on C18 as a simple mistake for ‘his wife’, which is unlikely, or we are compelled to admit that Deto was Senwosret’s wife as well as his sister.

The other instance is supplied by the Berlin Middle Kingdom stela 13675. There the wāreb-priest Efnaierison with uplifted hand recites a formula of offering for his daughter of his sister Bab’ and his sister of his mother Iymeru’. Bab is therefore either Efnaierison’s real daughter born of Efnaierison’s sister Iymeru, in which case he was married to his sister by the same mother, or the expression his daughter’ is to be taken as his niece’, which in view of the lack in Egyptian of words for distant relationships cannot be entirely excluded. In no case, however, can we understand as ‘seine Nebenfrau’, for there is no authority for such a rendering of the word snt. The His beloved sister, lady of the house whom we meet on the Cairo stela 20075 is a true sister and not a wife of the owner of the monument, where she is named and represented after his mother and grandmother—the latter being inaccurately called mut-f his mother’. We happen to know the name of the wife, Pesesh, from the Cairo stela 20718; there she figures as the mother of his son Pepy. In exactly the same way His beloved sister, lady of the house Iny’ of the stela Brit. Mus. [222]5 is a sister, and nothing else, of Kenef. She is represented in the right-hand bottom corner of the stela, while ‘his wife’ Pepy is seen in the upper half opposite Kenef. A real sister of Ransob is evidently also ‘his sister Ankhentodjem’, since the wife of Ransob is ‘his wife Nakhtu’.

One of the documents which corroborated Erman’s view that a ‘sister’ was a woman in a kind of loose marriage (’Nebenfrau’) in contrast to the full marriage with a ‘wife’ was an inscription at Wādi Hammāmāt of Year 3 of Ammenemes II8 where the names of two members of the guild of quarrymen, Sehepetepibre and Mentuhotpe-Khnoms are followed by those of two ladies Imem and Eserōnkh, both called snt-f his sister’. The pronoun f can refer only to the second quarryman, and we can no longer believe with Erman that each man was accompanied by ‘his sister’ and that these two women were in reality their wives. Rather were they two courageous sisters who did not shrink from a two-days’ journey into a complete desert to look after their brother. It is perhaps even possible that Mentuhotpe-Khnoms was much attached to his sisters and had their names perpetuated on the rock without their being present at all.

---

1 The inscriptions will be found in Äg. Inschr. Berlin, 1, 196; a description in Ausführliches Verzeichnis der äg. Altertümer (2nd ed., Berlin, 1899), p. 94.
2 See the recent note by Clère, GLECS 6, 35 f.
3 On the stela C5 of the Musée Guimet, l. 8, we read his beloved son, son of his brother of his (own) mother’, in other words ‘his son’ is here used inaccurately as an equivalent of ‘his nephew’.
4 As did Erman, the author of the Ausführliches Verzeichnis. See also below.
5 Hierog. Texts B.M., pl. 34.
7 Erman, Ägypten, 222.
8 Leps., Denkm. II, 138b; Couyat-Montet, Hammāmāt, p. 70, no. 96, and pl. 24.
When the genealogical indications, namely the filiation appended to the names of the husband and of the wife, of our set of 358 stelae are examined more closely—cf. col. 4 of the table above—we can tabulate the results as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of marriages</th>
<th>Names of both parents of husband and wife named (different)</th>
<th>Mothers only named</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Names different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Mus. Guimet</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvre</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyden</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit. Mus.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that in four cases only\(^1\) are we told the names of both parents of the husband and the wife. They are different, the wife therefore cannot be her husband's sister. In 97 cases the names of the mothers only of both the husband and the wife are given. In 95 of these the names are different, so that the wife cannot be her husband's full sister, though the possibility remains that in some cases at least they had the same father unknown to us; in other words the wife may have been her husband's half-sister.

In two cases the names of the mothers of both the husband and the wife are the same, so there is a priori a strong possibility that the married couple were brother and sister. The two cases in question occur on Louvre stela C44 and Brit. Mus. stela [363]. In the former\(^2\) the names are \(\text{Sithathör} \), on the latter\(^3\) \(\text{Waḥka} \). Both these names, however, are very common in the Middle Kingdom, so that the identity of the names of the mothers may be a mere coincidence. On the Brit. Mus. stela [363] the name Waḥka is borne by the mother, a brother, the son, and the daughter of the owner.\(^4\)

It is possible, even probable, that the number of such instances could be increased if further stelae were investigated, but it is doubtful whether the proportion of not quite 2 per cent. as compared with the cases where the names of the mothers are different would be substantially altered.\(^5\)

Conditions for investigating marriages of the New Kingdom are considerably less favourable than those for the Middle Kingdom. Not only has the custom of appending genealogical indications to names almost disappeared, but also the expression \(\text{Waḥka} \) in

\(\text{Berlin 7312 (Aeg. Inschr. 1, 194-5), Leyden V 116 (Beschreibung, 21, 25, no. 35); Brit. Mus. [504] (Hierog. Texti, III, 13) and Cairo 20114.}\)

\(\text{Still unpublished.}\)

\(\text{Hierog. Texti B.M. III, pl. 7.}\)

\(\text{The index of the catalogue of the Cairo M.K. stelae lists 15 examples of the name Waḥka for women (besides 33 for men) and 13 of Sithathör.}\)

\(\text{I should like to point out that this method of establishing consanguineous marriages is not new. Miss Murray, Anc. Egypt, 1927, 45 ff., has used some of my stelae and also some others in this way to indicate the Egyptians for the custom of marrying not only their sisters, but also their daughters and their mothers. Her reconstructions of the genealogies seem to me incorrect and I cannot accept her conclusions. Lack of space, however, prevents me from refuting her assertions in detail here.}\)
sntf ‘his sister’ has now become a current designation for ‘wife’ and is no longer restricted to real sisters. It will require a careful examination of dated material to establish the date when this change took place. New Kingdom stelae are not suitable for it, since relatively few are precisely dated and the dating of most of them depends on considerations of style, the development and chronology of which have not yet been worked out. For our purpose it seems preferable to have recourse to the Theban tombs, which to some extent have been studied and arranged in chronological order.¹ From the beginning of the New Kingdom down to the start of the independent reign of Tuthmosis III the wives seem to be referred to in the Theban tombs only by hmtf ‘his wife’ in such instances where the relationship to the husband is expressed at all (tombs 81, 71, 15, 67). The earliest dated tomb in which the expression sntf ‘his sister’ is used of a wife is tomb No. 24, reign of Tuthmosis III, where the wife of the owner Nebamün is called both qa µ → ḫ 3 i s ‘his wife, the lady of the house Royset’ and qa µ → ḫ 3 i s ‘his beloved sister, the lady of the house Royset’.² In the tomb of Amenemḥet (No. 82) of the same reign, though the wives are called qa ‘his wife’, in one case the owner’s brother Amenmosé is represented in the company of qa µ → ḫ 3 i s ‘his sister, the lady of the house . . . ’;³ she may, of course, well have been both his wife and his sister. In No. 85 (of Amenemḥab), which is dated to the reigns of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II by the occurrence in it of their cartouches, Amenemḥab’s wife is called mostly ‘his sister’, but also ‘his wife’.⁴ The evidence seems therefore sufficient to show that the custom of calling wives the ‘sisters’ of their husbands had its origin in the reign of Tuthmosis III. Why the frequent marriages between brothers and sisters in the royal family should have given rise to the custom only then, as Clère tentatively suggests,⁵ is not easy to see, for such marriages had been taking place for many centuries. Was it perhaps the effect of the joint reign of Ḥatshepsut and Tuthmosis, who were probably half-sister and half-brother?

From various monuments of New Kingdom date it would be possible to compile a list of married couples and to show that the husbands and wives were of different parents, but this would in no way contribute to the elucidation of our problem. It is therefore better to turn our attention to the fragments of a few documents which would have been of paramount importance if they had come down to us intact.

These fragments, which are preserved in the Turin Museum, belong to several papyri which when complete contained lists of the houses in a village of the workmen engaged on the excavation of the royal tombs at Thebes at about the middle of the Twentieth Dynasty.⁶ The names of all the inhabitants of each house were recorded, the name of each person being followed by those of his or her parents. The village itself

¹ Besides the dates in Gardiner–Weigall, Top. Cat. of the Private Tombs at Thebes, see also Wegner, Mitt. d. Deutsch. Inst. Kairo, iv, especially pp. 93 ff. and the table, pp. 141 ff.
² Rec. trav. 9, 97 and Urk. iv, 153, 17 respectively.
³ Davies–Gardiner, Tomb of Amenemḥet, pl. 5; for the name of Amenmosé see pl. 15, and for Gardiner’s remarks on the brothers and sisters of the owner, see p. 5.
⁴ Urk. iv, 922.
⁵ GLECS, 6, 36.
⁶ An account of them is given by Botti in Rendiconti R. Accad. Naz. dei Lincei, Classe sc. morali, 31, 391 ff.
has been identified at Dér el-Medinah and excavated by the French Institute of Oriental Archaeology in Cairo. It was found to have contained in its last stage, before it was abandoned some time in the second half of the Twentieth Dynasty, 68 houses, and even if we admit that a few workmen might have lived in the buildings outside the walls of the village, the total of the workmen's houses could not have been much over seventy. Each of the Turin lists therefore enumerated originally about seventy households, headed in each case by the names of the owner and his wife, e.g.:

'House of Ipuy, son of Neferhor, his mother being Merutmut, | his wife Henutmirer, daughter of Nekhenmut, her mother being Hathor, | his daughter', &c.

We can still recognize in the fragments eleven married couples where the names of both parents of both the husband and the wife are preserved; they are in every single case different, so that the husband and wife could not be even half-brother and half-sister. In ten other instances only the names of the fathers are extant and they also differ; here the couple could be only half-brother and half-sister. In one case the names of the fathers alone are certainly different; the name of the husband's mother is Henutwatty, while that of the wife's mother is but partially preserved as Henut[...]. Thus here also is the possibility that the husband and the wife were born of the same mother. But let it again be pointed out that there is no positive indication that consanguineous marriages were practised in this village of workmen.

To conclude this already too long contribution I should like to restate the results reached. Outside the royal families we know of the certain occurrence of consanguineous marriage in the Twenty-second Dynasty and two practically certain cases in the Middle Kingdom. There are further two possible, though not very probable, Middle Egyptian instances. One Twentieth-Dynasty case is very doubtful. We thus see that consanguineous marriages were possible, but could hardly be termed common. Moreover, in all cases the best we can prove is that the married couple were half-brother and half-sister, that is children either of the same father or of the same mother. We have no certain instance of a marriage between full brother and sister. This is a disappointing result, and I am the first to regret it. But the trouble lies in the nature of our sources and not in our approach to the problem. Nothing can be gained by relying on unwarranted assertions in the books of our predecessors; only patient collecting of facts may in future replace mere guesses by more exact knowledge.

Oxford

1 Bruyère, Rapport... Deir el-Médineh (1934–35), iii, Le village, etc., Cairo, 1939.
COMPLAINT OF AN ASSAULT, WITH PETITION TO THE POLICE

By S. EITREM AND LEIV AMUNDESEN

P.Osl. inv. no. 1482 comes from a mixed lot, purchased in 1934 by the Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture. The handwriting shows the style of a professional scribe, a clear, even, upright cursive.

20·6 × 8·7 cm. Oxyrhynchus 3rd cent. A.D.

Ἀυρηλίῳ Ἀλέξ[άνδρῳ τῶν
ἐπεὶ τῆς εἰρήνης
παρὰ Ἀυρηλίου Ἀ[...] τοῦ
καὶ Αφύγχος ἄγων[θετήσαν-
tos τῆς 'Οξυρυγχεῖτων πόλ[εως.
'Εσπέρας τῇ διελθουσίῃ ἡμέρα
Διδύμη τις, γυνὴ Ἁγαθοῦ Δα[i]-
μος μαγείρου, παρισοῦσα τὴν
οἰκίαν μου καὶ εὑρόνσα με ἐστῶ-
tα μετὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἐξύβρι-
σεν ἡμᾶς ῥήτοις τε καὶ ἄριτοις,
γυνὴ ἀναιδείᾳ μεγίστη καὶ θρά-
σει κεχορηγημένη· ἐπιτα
ἐπισχόντι μοι αὐτὴν παρα-
νόμοντος ἀποσχέσθαι ἡμῶν
dia tò tῆς ὀρας ἀδηλον εἰς το-
σότων ἀπονοιας ἠλθόνσα ἐπι-
πηθήσασα μοι, ἀνασασθηκή-
νῃ τοὺς τρόπους, ἐξέτεινεν
καὶ τᾶς θείρας καὶ ἔτυ[p]ψεν με
καὶ διελοιδηρήσατο τις τῶν
περιστώτων θυγατριδῶν
οὐς ἐμαρτυράμην, ο[τ]οί μόνοις δὲ,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑνὰ τῶν τῆς ἡμετέρας
πόλεως δημοσίων [παρόντα.
Τοσοῦτα ὁν ὑποθέτω ἐγὼ
ὁ τυχὼν πεπληγμένος δίδω-
μι σοι τὰ βιβλιδία ἀξίων σε
κελεύων ἀχθῇ[ναί αὐτὴν ἐπὶ

2 ἐπὶ 5 -χιτῶν 11 ἀρρήτους 13 ἔπειτα 28 βιβλιδια
COMPLAINT OF AN ASSAULT, WITH PETITION TO THE POLICE

30 σε, ἵνα τῆς προ[σ ἀπαντάς σου

32 Date lost.

Translation

'To Aurelius Alexander, of the police magistrates, from Aurelius A[—] alias Aphynchis, former exhibitor of games in the city of the Oxyrhynchites.

Yesterday evening a certain Didyme, the wife of Agathos Daimon, the cook, passing my house and finding me standing there with our family, treated us with insolence, using speakable and unspeakable expressions—a woman abundantly furnished with the utmost shamelessness and effrontery. Thereupon, when I stopped her, advising her to keep off from us, she advanced to such a degree of madness that, taking advantage of the obscurity of the hour, she leapt upon me, and, being distracted in her senses, even stretched out her hands and smote me, and railed furiously at some of my daughter's sons, whom I called to witness, and not only at them, but even at one of the officials of our city who was present.

'Having suffered so much, I, the victim of the assault, deliver to you this petition, asking you to give orders that she shall be brought before you, so that I may experience your beneficence toward all men. Farewell.'

Complaints of this kind were sent either to the strategus (epistrategus, praepositus pagi), or to the local police authorities, or simultaneously to both. Concerning the legal procedure, cf. M., Gdz. 33 sq. When a case reached the prefect, he generally ordered the strategus and the irenarchs to make the necessary inquiries and take the appropriate steps (P.Strasb. 5, 46 sqq., A.D. 262).

Notes

1. On the various police officials cf. Oertel, Liturgie, 278 sq. The interrelation between the ἔργονοφυλακες, ἔπαντης ἔρημος, and οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς ἔρημος is not quite clear. The Panopolis papyrus SB 4036 (cf. Hirschfeld, KL. Schriften, 616, W., Gdz. 414 sq.) books ἔργονοφυλακες and οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς ἔρημος separately; whether ἔρημο αρχαί are listed ll. 11 sqq. remains uncertain. On the various groups of irenarchs, for the whole nome, the toparchy, the pagus, the village, cf. P.Tead. 17, 15 n., P.Oxy. 2107, introd. Aur. Alexander of our text is probably the acting member of his group of police officials in Oxyrhynchus. Therefore τῶν seems preferable to τῷ in his title (in the fourth century A.D. we meet with guilds, cf. P.Oxy. 2233, 3 n., A.D. 350).

3. A certain Ἀμμώνιος ὁ καὶ Ἀφροχύς is mentioned P.Oxy 1277 (his son Aurelius Theon buys a triclinium, A.D. 255). On the official ἀγονοθετής, rarely mentioned in Egypt, cf. P.Oxy 1284 (A.D. 250), 9 n., 1416 (about A.D. 299), 5 n., 2105 (A.D. 147-8), 6, 2144 (late third century), 27, P.Ryl. 117 (A.D. 269), 18, OGIS, no. 713 (second half of third century A.D.); his office was often combined with that of gymnasiarch and held simultaneously, probably only for a few days at a time, cf. Liebenam, Städteverwaltung, 542.

10. ἐξυβρίζω mostly intr.; with acc. pers. LS. quote only Ant. Lib. 12, 2.

11. ἀρήτοις ἄρρη-, cf. Mayser, 1, 212 sq. In Hes. Ορ. 4, we meet with the combination ἀνδρες . . . ἄρρητος τ' ἀρήτοι τε, without any moral connotation, = 3 ὁμοὶ ἄφατοι τε φατοὶ τε. He is followed by Timon of Phlius, fr. 32. But Sophocles already uses the expression in the sense which became proverbial, OC 1001, ῥητῶν ἀρρητῶν τ' ἔτος, and it is one of the favourite phrases of Demosthenes in his speeches: (I, 4 πάντων κύριων καὶ ῥητῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτων); 18, 122, βοστὶ καὶ ἄρρητ' ὄνομαξων; 21, 79, καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν πάντας ἡμᾶς ῥητα καὶ ἄρρητα κακ' ἑξείπτω; 22, 61, ὀμοὶ ῥητὰ καὶ ἄρρητα. From later literature we may quote Achilles Tat. 6, 5, ῥητὰ καὶ ἄρρητα βοῶν. This 'polar way of expression' (Kühner–Gerth, Gr. Gramm. II, 2, pp. 587 sq.) was copied by the Latin poets; Catullus, 64, 405, omnia fanda nefanda malo permixta furore, Virgil, Aen. I, 543, deos ememores fandi atque nefandi, Horace, Ep. I, 7, 72, dicenda tacenda locutus. The present phrase and those in ll. 12–13, 18–19 give our text a certain literary flavour.


13. κεχορηγημένη: a nice sarcasm, of her 'war equipment'!

14. ἐπισταγόντες μοι . . . παραμονοῦντος, a very harsh anacoluthon, the gen. abs. following immediately on the dative; cf. Mayser, 2, 3, pp. 67 sq. Blass–Debrunner quote (§ 423, 4), as 'sehr ungleich', Acta, 22, 17, ἥγεντο δὲ μου ὑποτρέφοντι . . . καὶ προσευχόμενον μου, and propose to cancel καὶ, but ask (§ 278) 'Hat Lk. wirklich so geschrieben?'. Some manuscripts (E al.) have emended the text to προσευχόμενως. The traditional text should probably be kept unaltered.

16. διὰ τὸ τῆς ὄρας ἁδηλοῦν, to be combined with the following (ἐλθούσα) ἐπιτηδεύσασα: covered by the darkness she managed, in her frenzy, to carry out her corporal attack, cf. P.Tebt. 283, ὄψιν ὥρας τῆς ὄρας; P.Tebt. 793, 11–12, ὄψει τῆς ὄρας τινας; ΝΤ, &c.—ἄδηλον, indiscernible, here to the eyes as 1 Cor. xiv. 8 to the ears.

18. ἀνασεσοβημένη τοὺς τρόπους, cf. ἄ. τὴν κόμην, 'with ruffled hair', Luc. Tim. 54, quoted by LS., 'like the wild Boreas or Triton, painted by Zeuxis'. But the furious woman was 'ruffled' in all her ways and manners.

21. Cf. Her. 2, 1218, 3 τῶν δὲ διαλυοῦμεθαίνα πάσι (ὅργῃ προσποιεύμενον), where πάσι explains δια-. Dem. 21, 86, ἀπελήσας καὶ διαλυοῦσθείς.


A similar complaint of ὄβρις was published by us as P.Osl. 22. A revision of the text has brought to light some necessary corrections. For convenience we give a re-edition of the document with the emendations incorporated. Cf. the facsimile, P.Osl. II, pl. IIIb.
'Ηρώδη τῶν καὶ Τιβέρίων ἀνθρώπων Ἀρσενίκου Θεμίστου μερὶ (δος) παρὰ Σαμαριτῶς τῆς Θεο[ ...] ἀπὸ καὶ μῆς Θεοδάδειάς ὦ με[ ...]
de ἔργοις καὶ τρόποις εὑ[ ...] κατασταθεὶς ὑπὸ σοῦ τῇ ... περὶ αὐτῶν αὐθαδίᾳ καὶ τὸ[ ...] χρόμενος ἐκάστοτε ἐπέρχεται μοι καὶ ... ἐν τῇ ἱδίᾳ μου οἰκίᾳ ἀβρείς ἀνήκεστ[ ...] μοι συντελεῖ, οὐ μόνον κακολογῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πληγαῖς ἀλκοζόμενος. Ὁθεν οὐ [δυναμενὴ καθησυ-
χάζειν πολλοὶ χρόνωι ἄν][ ...] πάσαν ὁμέραν κυνουεύουσα ἐπὶ σε κατ[ ...] ἀθενὴς καὶ ἀβοθνητος ὑπάρχουσα[ ...] καὶ ἀξιω ἀχθηναί
αυτὸν ἐπὶ σε πρὸς τήν δεξοῦσαν ἐπέξοδον,
ἔνα δυνηθοὶ διὰ τῆς[ ...] βοηθείας καὶ ἀντι-
λήψεις ἐν τῇ ἱδίᾳ μετὰ[ ...] πάσης ἁπνηίας ζῆν καὶ δι ὑπὸ σοῦ πεφιλανθρω[ ...] πημένη. Διευτύχιε.

("Ετους) δωθεκάτου Ἀυτοκράτορος Καύσαρος Τραμανὸ
Ἀδριανὸν Σεβαστῳ Αὔρῃ ζ.]

Oslo

3 the lacuna must have contained the name of the accused man. 4 κύριος καὶ τασταθεὶς 5 καρ.
ταρ?[?] The letter before the lacuna seems to be α or χ. (ταρ[κολοντος])? καρ[δρω]? Turner.
AN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ‘BOOK OF HOURS’

By R. O. FAULKNER

One of Sir Harold Bell’s interests has always been the course taken by pagan religion in Egypt after the coming of the Greeks, so that the papyrus here described, though written in hieratic and purely Egyptian in character, may, it is hoped, serve his interests in that it emanates from the Ptolemaic period. In the space at my disposal I cannot discuss this text in detail—I hope to do that elsewhere in due course—but it will be possible to say enough to give a general account of its content.

The papyrus in question, of which a sample is shown on pl. II, was presented many years ago by Sir Alan Gardiner to the British Museum, where it bears the number 10569. Owing to numerous breaks, its length is uncertain, but the part now extant measured when complete probably between 8 and 9 feet, with a height of 14½ inches. As now preserved the papyrus comprises 34 columns each containing between 26 and 28 short lines of text, with 70 unplaced fragments, and it is inscribed on the recto only; down the right-hand edge of each column there has been ruled a faint red guide-line. As is usual with religious manuscripts, it bears no date, but palaeographic considerations clearly indicate that it belongs to the Ptolemaic period; a comparison of the forms of certain signs, e.g. A, h, s, m, with those in Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie*, vol. III, suggests that this manuscript is a little later than the Bremner-Rhind Papyrus (Brit. Mus. 10188) and should perhaps be dated to the third century B.C. Of its provenance nothing is known, but internal evidence points clearly to a Memphite origin for the text; apart from the all-pervading Osiris the most prominent deity appears to be Sokar, with Ptah and Apis by no means overlooked, and on the whole the gods of Upper Egypt are avoided; Thoth of Khmun alone of the latter has much attention paid to him, and Amun of Thebes is not even mentioned. In general the gods named are Osiris, Sokar, Apis, Ptah, and the cosmological gods of the Heliopolitan Ennead. Other gods, such as Nefertum, Mnevis, Anubis, or the four Children of Horus, are named occasionally, but do not attain to any real importance.

The damage the papyrus has suffered is considerable, but the middle portion (cols. 6–23) is fairly well preserved. Col. 1 is almost entirely destroyed, but it is possible to restore the title of the work in 1, 1 with reasonable certainty as $\tilde{\text{t}}\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{o}}\tilde{\text{h}}\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{t}}\tilde{\text{a}}\tilde{\text{e}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{e}}\tilde{\text{s}}\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{a}}\tilde{\text{l}}\tilde{\text{l}}\tilde{\text{ }}\text{[h}i\text{s names]}.$ The text which follows consists of invocations to various deities and the like, and is divided into sections to be recited at successive hours of the day, hence the title of this paper, which derives in the first place from Mr. I. E. S. Edwards; the rubric in question implies that all the entities so invoked were regarded simply as manifestations of Osiris, in whom all divinity was deemed to be concentrated. The text is written entirely in black ink except for the hourly rubrics, e.g. $\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{g}}\tilde{\text{u}}\tilde{\text{m}}\tilde{\text{a}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{s}}\tilde{\text{b}}\tilde{\text{a}}\tilde{\text{r}}\tilde{\text{h}}\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{r}}\tilde{\text{e}}\tilde{\text{c}}\tilde{\text{a}}\tilde{\text{t}}\tilde{\text{i}}\tilde{\text{o}}\tilde{\text{n}}\tilde{\text{r}}\tilde{\text{ }}\text{Th}i\text{r}d\text{ }\text{h}o\text{u}r.\text{ }\text{R}e\text{c}i\text{t}a\text{t}i\text{on}$: (6, 10), and the preposition ‘to’ in red before the first line in each column; compare Budge, *Greenfield Papyrus*, pls. 40–42 (Book of the Dead,
AN ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ‘BOOK OF HOURS’
ch. 141—2), which not only show a very similar appearance to our text, but also contain a certain number of invocations common to both. Of the various hours, the first must have been named in 1, 2; the second falls in 3, 28; the third in 6, 10; the fourth in 7, 5; the fifth in 11, 1; the sixth in 15, 18; the seventh in 24, 15; the eighth in 25, 10; and the ninth in 26, 12. The remaining hour-rubrics are lost, but it will be remarked that the ‘hours’ are by no means evenly spaced. Although the deities invoked are mostly the well-known gods of the Egyptian pantheon, other entities are not excluded, as we shall see. It is impossible to give a translation of the whole papyrus here, but a number of sample quotations may be of interest:

2, 1 To Sokar in the Lake of Uu.¹
Sokar in Kefny.²
Sokar in Ped-she.²
Sokar in all his foundations.
Sokar in all his shrines.

2, 20 Sokar in all his tombs.
Sokar in all his seats.
Sokar in all places.
Sokar where he desires to be.³
To the Shetyt⁴ and him who is in it.

2, 25 The upper bier of Sokar.
The lower bier of Sokar

3, 1 To the shrines of Sokar.
The mummies of Sokar.
The mummy-mats of Sokar.
The harpoon of Sokar.

3, 5 The amulets of Sokar.
The hymns of Sokar.
The staves of Sokar.
Khons and Khopri.
The Night-bark and the Day-bark.

3, 10 Anubis in the Shetyt.
Khantenirt in the Shetyt.
Thoth in the Shetyt.
Isis and Nephthys in the Shetyt.
Wepwawet . . .

3, 15 The Songstress⁵ of Upper Egypt.
The Songstress⁵ of Lower Egypt.
Edjò of the South.

¹ Unidentified.
² Unidentified, but associated with Sokar already in Pyr., see Gauthier, Dict. géogr. 11, 158.
³ The formula ‘X. in all the places where his ka desires to be’ usually marks the end of a series of invocations of a given deity; the division of the formula between two lines is quite exceptional (another instance 17, 5–6), and here we have the minor variant ‘where he desires to be’.
⁴ The sanctuary of Sokar at Memphis.
⁵ The hieroglyphs for goddesses.

² [sic], read mrt. On these goddesses see Gardiner, Admonitions, 59 f.
3, 21 The southern Djed-pillar.

To Ptah-Sokar, South of His Wall, [Lord of 𓊬Ankh-towé(?)].

4, 1 To Osiris-Sepa, most august of the Spirits of Ḫn.

5, 𓊬+16 The Shade of Onnophris, justified.
The Living Aps.
Horus the protector of his father.

The above-quoted passages give an idea of the general trend of the papyrus, but, as already remarked, entities other than gods and sacred objects are named; we have invocations of the demi-gods (6, 1-4); deified or semi-deified mortals (6, 8-9); the ancient kings (6, 7); the blessed dead (14, 4 ff.); the gates of the Netherworld (13, 10-11); the eastern and western horizons (13, 8-9); the stars (13, 20-21); terrestrial phenomena such as mountains, plains, lagoons, swamps, the sunshine, cattle, etc. (10, 27-28; 17, 12 ff.); that is to say any being or any thing which could influence human welfare or invoke the emotions of wonder and awe. In fact the whole purpose of this text seems to have been to call upon every agency, divine or not, which could in anyway exercise a favourable influence on Egypt and its inhabitants. I quote some of the relevant utterances:

6, 1 To the Excellent Souls
Who follow Rē, 𓊬
Who follow Osiris,
Who follow Horus.

6, 5 All the gods and goddesses,
Male and female.
The Kings of Upper Egypt and the Kings of Lower Egypt.
The deified ones and the favoured ones.¹
All those who go down favoured to the Silent Land.

The gods and goddesses who go forth from the Netherworld.

13, 10 The great doors in the Netherworld.
The mysterious portals [in the Netherworld].
The gate-keepers of [the portals (?)] in the Netherworld.

13, 18 The western horizon of Atum.
The eastern horizon of Sokar.

13, 20 The stars which rise in the east.
The stars which set in the west.

Those who are honoured with Rē.

14, 5 Those who are honoured with Osiris.
The great ennobled ones.
The excellent souls.

¹ i.e. those who have attained divine (ntr) or semi-divine (hs) status. On the hryw, a term used of persons sanctified by drowning, cf. ZAS 45, 132; Griffith Studies, 402.
The august spirits.
The shades of the living.
14, 10 The sweet breeze in the sunshine.
14, 15 The gods of the thrones.¹
    The gods of the laps (?).
The gods of the fields.
The gods of the mounds.
The gods of the courts.
14, 20 The gods of the caverns.
The gods of the nomes.
The gods who govern the Netherworld.

17, 7 The soul of Re.²
    The soul of Shu.
The soul of Geb.
17, 10 The soul of Osiris.
The soul of Hefat.
The soul of the lagoon.
The soul of the bird-marsh.
The soul of greenness.
17, 15 [The soul of] freshness.
    [The soul of] sunshine.
    [The soul of] the bull.

10, 27 Mountains, plains, fields, mounds.
    Seas, rivers, floods, canals, the waters of Osiris and [Hapy (?)].

Yet another feature of this papyrus is what amounts to a geographical list of the cult-centres of Egypt (7, 6 ff.); starting with the principal religious cities, considered as centres of Osiris-worship, we have:

7, 6 Sokar-Osiris [in Memphis].²
    Sepa, most august of the Spirits of On.³
Osiris who dwells in Karnak.
    Osiris the unique one [who dwells in] Sais.
7, 10 Osiris in Khmun.
    Osiris ... [in Abydos].⁴
Osiris of Naref, pre-eminent in [Ninsu].⁵
Osiris in ...⁶
Osiris in Sambehdet.

Here the text goes on to enumerate the lesser cities of Egypt in geographical order from Edfu northward in the form ‘Osiris in ...’ such-and-such a place. This list is

¹ For what follows cf. Budge, Book of the Dead (1898), 319.
² Restored from the duplicate list, 8, 25.
³ Cf. 4, 1, quoted above.
⁴ Restored from 9, 3.
⁵ Restored from 9, 4.
⁶ The duplicate text (9, 5) reads Djedet, but the traces here do not suit.
followed immediately (8, 25 ff.) by a duplicate list reading 'All the gods and goddesses
who are in . . . '; this duplication is invaluable for the restoration of lacunae.

As has been already remarked, the hour-rubrics are spaced quite irregularly through
the text, and some analysis of the content of the hourly readings may be of interest.
The first hour (1, 2) has lost the first third of its content; with few exceptions the
remainder is devoted to the cult of Sokar and his associated deities; see the quotation
above, 2, 1–3, 21 (p. 35). The second hour (3, 28) is at first devoted to Osiris, but
after a considerable loss goes on to invoke a mixture of deities; Apis, Horus, Anubis,
Thoth, Isis, Nephthys, and the Songstresses, passing on to 'The Guardian Spirits'1 and
the demi-gods, the ancient kings and sanctified mortals; see the quotation above,
6, 1–9 (p. 36). The third hour (6, 10) is very short, comprising only 21 lines of
invocation. The deities are Sokar, Ptah-Sokar, Osiris, Osiris-Sokar, Sokar-Osiris, 'the
Mysterious One', Apis and Sakmet. The fourth hour (7, 5), on the contrary, is long,
including as it does the duplicate lists of towns. It extends to 10, 28, and the concluding
lines are worth quoting:

10, 15 The living Apis, duplicate of Ptah.
Apis in the sea.
Apis who runs in the towns and nomes.
The feet of His Majesty in the waters of Kuy and Pekhuy . . . .

10, 20 Nefertem who protects the Two Lands.
The Songstress of Upper Egypt and the Songstress of Lower Egypt.
Imseti, Ḥapy, Duamutef, Kebsnenuf.
Nekhebuary body . . .
Anubis in his (proper) shape.

10, 25 Thoth Lord of writing.
Djaty3 in her bandage.
Mountains, plains, fields, mounds.
Seas, rivers, floods, canals, the waters of Osiris and [Ḥapy (?)].4

The fifth hour (11, 1) is longer still, extending to 15, 17. It consists mainly of a
eulogy of Osiris, but breaks off at 13, 9 into a miscellany of invocations of which con-
siderable extracts are quoted above (pp. 36–37). The sixth hour (15, 18) is the longest
of all, comprising the equivalent of nine columns of text and coming to an end only in
24, 14. The gods it names are Osiris, Ptah, Ptah-Sokar, Ptah-Osiris, Rē, Isis, Nūt,
Nephthys, Gēb, Thoth, Horus, Anubis, Ḥathōr, the four Children of Horus, Mnevis,
Atum and Min, besides the lines mentioning 'the soul of Rē', etc. (17, 7 ff.) quoted
above (p. 37). The seventh (24, 15) and the eighth (25, 10) hours are both short,
occurring the equivalent of no more than a column of text apiece; both are consid-
ervably damaged, but in the former occur among other items Sokar, Sopd, Beb, the knife

1 [اسحابن] ḫtš stwrw, 5, x + 23.
2 The meaning of this cryptic invocation is quite obscure to me.
3 For this goddess cf. Wb. v, 519, 5, though I suspect a corruption of the name of Tayt, goddess of weaving.
Actually the name is written אב here, as though it were the word for 'crane'.
4 These last two lines have already been quoted above, p. 37.
of Sakhmet, the devouring flame (nsrt wurt wnn imy . . .), Anubis, Wepwawet, and the suite of Osiris, while the latter names Osiris-Apis (25, 11), the kings of Upper Egypt, the kings of Lower Egypt, the royal consorts, the kings' mothers, the kings' children, peasants (shtyw), nobles (shrw), foreigners (?). (f h a k e n, lit. ‘distant ones’), travellers (e l q m), as well as apparently the names of other functionaries or the like of which only ? or nothing at all remains; all these persons are regarded in our text as resident at Memphis, a clear indication of its place of origin. It then becomes geographic for a few lines and names ‘the great summit of ‘Ankh-towe’, Rostau, Memphis, and the western desert, while in the sadly battered remainder we catch glimpses of Sokar, Osiris-Apis again, and Mnevis. The ninth hour (26, 12) starts off as strongly Osirian, but from here on the papyrus is in bad condition and requires further study if anything satisfactory is to be made of it. No other hour-rubrics have survived, but judging from the length of the document as now preserved, it can hardly have gone beyond the twelfth hour; if it had continued for another twelve hours to complete the twenty-four it would have been double its present length.

It is hoped that in due course it may be possible to publish this papyrus as a whole in transcription with accompanying translation and commentary; in the meantime, perhaps this synopsis may serve to give some idea of its contents to students of Egyptian religion.

OXFORD
THE TOMB OF QUEEN TWOSRE

By SIR ALAN GARDINER

In seeking a subject for my tribute to an old friend and great scholar, I could have wished to find one closer to his own special domain of research. Failing in this I have had to fall back upon a topic from a much earlier phase of Egyptian history, the decision being taken with better heart owing to my long acquaintance with Sir Harold’s wide range of interests, which could in no case leave him indifferent to any objective of the Society whereof he, like myself, is a Vice-President. The Queen Twosre with whom I shall here be concerned was one of the four women of the dynastic period who for a brief space held the rank of Pharaoh. However, her position among the rulers at the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty is still a much debated problem. It will not be possible to deal here with all the evidence bearing upon her career, and I shall confine myself to discussing the tomb which she caused to be made for herself in the Valley of the Tombs of the Kings (no. 14). That I am able to do even as much is due to the kindness of Dr. Caminos, who in March 1950 made at my request a thoroughgoing investigation of the cartouches still visible there. To reproduce his skilful and painstaking sketches of the various walls, let alone his elaborate coloured facsimiles of the usurped cartouches, would be far too costly an undertaking for this Journal, and I must content myself with verbal descriptions of his results.

First of all, a few lines upon the general nature of such usurpations. These can be effected in two ways. One possibility, as Caminos points out, is to cut away the entire surface and to incise the usurper’s name at the lower level thus obtained. The other possibility, which was that adopted in Twosre’s tomb, consists in filling up with plaster the entire surface including all the incised signs of the name to be usurped, and then carving the usurper’s name in its place. This second method is open to the grave disadvantage that the superimposed plaster is apt to fall away, bringing to light the original signs, when it requires the most careful scrutiny to ascertain which of the two names was the earlier. This is a question that can only be settled by highly competent scholars in front of the original monument, and in the present case it would be useless to expatiate upon the evidence, the more so since for the sake of those who desire to delve more deeply Dr. Caminos’s materials will be deposited in the Griffith Institute at Oxford.

The main point at issue is whether certain cartouches of King Siptah have been replaced by those of Sethos II or vice versa, but before considering that crucial matter it is desirable to summarize the main facts concerning the tomb. There cannot be the shadow of a doubt that this was originally intended for, and therefore presumably commissioned by, the King’s Great Wife Twosre. Throughout the entire length of the tomb she was the main person originally depicted. Again and again the fact that the owner of the tomb was a queen is shown by the use of the suffix-pronoun of the 2nd pers.
fem. in the accompanying legends. However, except in one single case to be mentioned later, her figure has always been plastered over, and more than once visibly changed into that of a king.\textsuperscript{1} This state of affairs is correctly stated in the Text to Lepsius's great work,\textsuperscript{2} which we shall see to have accurately stated all the facts with regard to the usurpations. The last usurper has everywhere been Setnakhte, the founder of the Twentieth Dynasty, whose two cartouches occur replacing earlier ones repeatedly upon the walls, his work being very rough. It is clear that Setnakhte must have been buried in the tomb, since his cartouches are found on the broken sarcophagus in the Pillared Hall (L), and he has no other tomb in the Valley.

Despite the prominence which Twosre thus arrogated to herself, at the time when her tomb was decorated, she perforce rested content with her title of $\text{Nfr}$ $\text{Rtr}$ $\text{Gt W}$ $\text{Kng's Gt Wf}$, and did not dare to represent herself as an actual Pharaoh. It follows that she at that time admitted, however grudgingly, the existence of a husband who was the real king, and to this admission the tomb bears irrefutable testimony. On the right wall of the Entrance Corridor (A) this king is shown followed by the uneffaced figure of his queen and offering incense and pouring libations to the god $\text{G}b\beta$; she for her part brings a gift of ointment.\textsuperscript{3} On the opposite wall one of the scenes depicts the king standing alone and presenting the symbol of Māc 'Truth' to Isis.\textsuperscript{4} There are some other representations of a king elsewhere in the tomb, but before discussing them let us pause for a moment to consider the identity of Twosre's husband in the two scenes already mentioned. His cartouches have in both cases been usurped and replaced by others. Lepsius,\textsuperscript{5} following Champollion,\textsuperscript{6} stated categorically that the original cartouches were those of Siptah (prenomen Akhenrēt-setperēt, nomen Merenptah-Siptah), while the usurper was Sethos II (prenomen Userkhepurēt-setperēt-miāmūn, nomen Sety-merenptah), and this view was accepted unhesitatingly by de Rouge, Maspero, and Breasted.\textsuperscript{7} It was the contradiction of this view by Ayrton\textsuperscript{8} which led me to ask Dr. Caminos to investigate the matter afresh, and his verdict in favour of the priority of Siptah, amply corroborated by the diagrams he sent me, places the matter beyond a doubt.\textsuperscript{9} What makes this conclusion doubly sure is that a year and a half later Professor Edgerton made an independent examination of the tomb and arrived at precisely the same result.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{1} E.g. in the two scenes immediately to the left of that cited below, n. 4. In both cases the queen's tall feathers have been replaced by the king's $\text{nemes}$ headdress, see below, p. 42, n. 2.

\textsuperscript{2} Leps., Denkm., Text, 111, 210.

\textsuperscript{3} Leps. op. cit. iii, pl. 201, a; Porter and Moss, Bibl. 1, 18 (5).

\textsuperscript{4} Leps., op. cit. pl. 201, b; Porter and Moss, op. cit. 1, 18 (3).

\textsuperscript{5} Leps., op. cit., Text, 111, 210.

\textsuperscript{6} Champollion, Notices descriptives, 1, 449; also Id., Lettres écrites d'Égypte, 255.

\textsuperscript{7} For references see Theodore M. Davis, The Tomb of Siptah, pp. xv-xvii.

\textsuperscript{8} Proc. SBA 28, 185-6.

\textsuperscript{9} The usurpation of Siptah's work by Sethos II is confirmed also by the block published by Petrie in his Riqqah and Memphis, vi, pl. 57, no. 23; see his remarks, ibid. 33. Throughout the present article I have used the simple form 'Siptah' to designate Merenptah-Siptah, not the later Rōmesse-Siptah casually mentioned below, p. 43.

\textsuperscript{10} It is only right to mention that M. Clère, who in 1948 visited the tomb at my behest, inclined to support Ayrton in his view; his examination was, however, avowedly rapid and confined to one of the four cartouches. A cursory examination by Černý in 1950 tended to favour Dr. Caminos's findings; Caminos succeeded also in convincing M. Leclant and Mr. Champion, both of whom accompanied him on a subsequent visit to the tomb.
Since we have already encountered one certain representation of Siptah standing alone and performing a cult-act, the existence of other representations of the kind farther along the tomb could not surprise. There exist in fact at least three more, all of them well executed and without any trace of plaster. In Corridor B there is one on each wall, that on the left depicting the king being aspersed with water by Anubis. On the right wall of Hall E he wears the nemes headress with uraeus, as in the two representations in Corridor A, but here above his head is the sun’s disk with uraei, which we now know to have been, even at this relatively early date, a symbol equivalent to King of Upper and Lower Egypt. Either above these three figures or in the near neighbourhood the cartouches of Setnakhte can be seen cut over those of Sethos II. Under them there remains no trace of earlier cartouches. Dr. Caminos is convinced that by these depictions Siptah must have been originally intended and it seems impossible to dispute this view, even if in one or other of the cases Twosre’s workpeople may have left Siptah’s name uncut, so that Sethos II would have been able to insert his in a blank space. The name of Siptah is visible, in fact, only twice in the tomb, namely, in the two cases near the entrance already mentioned. There is one place at least where the figure and the cartouches of Sethos II are original; this is on one side of the last inner pillar to the left in Hall J; other pillars in this hall have been plastered over and show Setnakhte outlined in black, whereas here the figure of Sethos II has been carefully carved and painted, and is without any trace of usurpation. Perhaps Sethos II found this surface unoccupied, and utilized it for his own ends.

To return to the plastered-over figures of Twosre. It has been already explained that these almost invariably bear the cartouches of Setnakhte, but in various places there are distinct signs of earlier cartouches that can naturally only have been those of Sethos II. No trace of the signs composing his names remains, however, and of the underlying cartouches of Twosre there is likewise as a rule no trace, though in various places there may still be discerned, beside her principal title King’s Great Wife, the two epithets Lady of the Two Lands and Mistress of Upper and Lower Egypt. On the jamb to the right of the entrance Champollion, confirmed by Lepsius and Lefebvre, claimed to have seen the additional title Hereditary Princess, but of this apparently no sign subsists. Dr. Caminos has unfortunately over-

---

1 Leps., op. cit. III, 206, a.
2 See above, p. 41, nn. 3 and 4.
3 JEA 30, 50. The disk with uraei is found also upon three of the pillars of Hall J, where, however, it belongs to the superimposed black-painted figures of Setnakhte.
4 Leps., op. cit., Text, 111, 213; Porter and Moss, 1, 19 (17).
5 First found, according to Wb. II, 232, 4, with Ḥasēpsowe of Dyn. XVIII. Borne also by most queens of Dyns. XVIII-XIX, for some references see Gauthier, Livre des rois, II, 333, 356; III, 9, 76, 125.
6 Not much less commonly than nbt trw according to queens of Dyns. XVIII-XIX; some references, Gauthier, op. cit. II, 330, 356; III, 9, 75, 125.
7 Leps., op. cit., Text, III, 209.
looked, if indeed it has escaped destruction, a new cartouche of Twosre which may perhaps have been superimposed later by some adherent of hers. This, none too well copied by Lepsius, must have read as in the annexed Fig. 1, and recalls, without being identical with, the prenomen found in foundation deposits of Twosre's funerary temple a little to the south of the Ramesseum.

The last new fact brought to light by Dr. Caminos is the presence of a hieratic graffito in each of the two unfinished side-rooms just in front of Corridor K. These graffiti, written in large black characters on an extremely uneven surface, read as follows:

1. \( \text{Year 7, second month of...} \)
2. \( \text{Year 6, second month of Inundation, day 18...} \)

Since Sethos II died before the conclusion of his sixth year, and Setnakhte reigned a much shorter period, these dates can belong only either to Merenptah-Siptah or to Twosre; the possibility of Sethos II's immediate successor Ra'messe-Siptah can be disregarded since he is nowhere mentioned in the tomb and was probably quite ephemeral. If the two dates belong to Twosre, they would be the only certain datings in her reign and the sole decisive evidence of her kingship provided in this particular place.

What general conclusions can be drawn from the facts above set forth? The scene where Siptah precedes Twosre and offers incense to Gëb, coupled with her title of King's Great Wife, is adequate proof that he was her husband, though it is the sole existing evidence of the kind. Her acceptance of him as the lawful king is attested, not only by her title, but also by his position here in front of her and by his appearance alone certainly in one and probably in several other parts of the tomb. That Champollion overstepped the mark in concluding Siptah to have been a 'souverain en sous-ordre' has been demonstrated by Theodore Davis's discovery of a fine tomb of his own. On the importance of Twosre herself cannot be over-estimated.

---

1. Lepsius, op. cit., III. pl. 206, 8; Text, III. 213.
2. Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, pls. 16, 17; see also the wine-jar, ibid., pl. 19, 2; also the limestone bricks from Kanfr, Hayes, Glazed Tiles, pl. 1, with p. 7. In all these cases the epithet appended to Sitrē was mry İmnn or mry n İmnn 'beloved of Amûn'. It may be recalled here that there was at the beginning of Dyn. XIX another Queen Sitrē, who according to Sethe (ZAS 65, 89) and to Lefebvre (Ann. Sere. 51, 192) was the consort of Sethos I; whether it was this latter Sitrē who was buried in the Tombs of the Queens (no. 13) is still uncertain.
3. It is possible, however, that it is to her reign that belongs the fragment of an ostracon dated in a Year 8 published Daressy, Ostraca (CCG), Text, 74, No. 25923; Černý's transcription of this shows that Daresy's is correct save for the omission of n in the prenomen of Rameses II (l. 3). The addition of Stp-n-Rē to Twosre's name on this ostracon may well be significant; it is only at the time of her kingship, so far as we know, that she ever used the verb stp in her cartouche, and then it was always stp n Mut, not stp n Rē. To Černý I owe also knowledge of another Cairo ostracon (J 72452) bearing the name of the queen; the first two lines read as follows: Year 2; first month of Winter, day 8, the day when Rwod (or the agent...), with name omitted came with [a] dispatch to [the Vizier?] saying 'Start upon the tomb of the King's Great Wife Twosre'. It is amusing to find that on the next two days the workpeople were idle, and that subsequently their holidays were much more numerous than their working days. Still, the work can hardly have dragged on until Year 7 as the graffito in Twosre's tomb might seem to suggest!
4. Ayrton (loc. cit.) quoted a scarab in the Fraser collection (Fraser, Catalogue, pl. 11, no. 315), where the prenomen of Siptah appears to be combined with Twosre's nomen. This is, however, extremely doubtful, and one might even doubt this scarab's genuineness.
5. Accepted by Lefebvre in his article 'A propos de la reine Taousert', Musée, 59, 216.
6. See above p. 41, n. 7.
She is the sole queen of the Ramesside period to have possessed a tomb in the Valley, and the sole queen who caused to be built for herself a temple at the edge of the western desert.\footnote{See above p. 43, n. 2.} Moreover, at some moment or other in her life she exercised undoubted power as an actual Pharaoh.\footnote{Her subsequent adoption of two cartouches has been already mentioned. Her explicit assumption of the \textit{inubiya}-title ("King of Upper and Lower Egypt") is evidenced only by a very few occurrences: on the wine-jar in her funerary temple (Petré, op. cit. pl. 19, 2); on the limestone bricks found at Kantîr (above p. 43, n. 2); and lastly on the Bilgai stela, published by me \textit{ZÄS} 50, 49 ff. I remain as convinced as ever that the queen whose name has been cut out on the Bilgai stela was Twosre, the more so as the steward of the \textit{Mansion of Millions of Years of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt} (name erased) \textit{in the House of Amûn} mentions her funerary temple (or cenotaph) in exactly the same terms as on the bricks from Kantîr. I take this opportunity of mentioning further my conviction that the Amenemhes and the Thouoris given by Manetho as the last rulers of Dyn. XIX correspond to Amenemhes and Twosre respectively, though without necessarily accepting his statement of their relative order or the position that he assigns to them.} So far as I am aware, no one has hitherto made the necessary deduction from Sethos II’s usurpations in the tomb. It is well known that in due course Twosre became Sethos’s wife.\footnote{The decisive evidence is found on a pair of bracelets found in an anonymous tomb discovered by Theodore Davis (\textit{The Tomb of Siptah}, unnumbered pls. [X, XI]. Lefèbvre (loc. cit. 217) rightly compares this scene of Twosre offering wine to Sethos with that on the famous throne of Tutânkhamûn.} Surely that must have been the reason why, when he substituted his cartouches for those of Siptâh, he left her figure and titles intact; her figure behind his will have reflected her changed status as no longer the wife of Siptâh, but now as his. On the other hand, Sethos will have found it intolerable that she should be displayed elsewhere performing cult-acts as though she were the real Pharaoh. Accordingly, in all such scenes he replaced her figure by his own. None the less, Sethos does not appear to have been satisfied to adopt, for the purpose of his funerary arrangements, the easy way subsequently taken by Setnakhte, for he has himself a fine separate tomb in the Valley (No. 15). Here there was no mention of Twosre at all, and the only other lady ever mentioned in connexion with him appears to have been another wife—was she his first or his second \textit{Great Queen}?—named Takhaât who is seen standing by his side in a statue of him in the possession of the Cairo Museum.\footnote{Borchardt, \textit{Statuen (CCO)}, iv, 99, Cairo no. 1198.}
EPONYMOUS PRIESTHOODS OF ALEXANDRIA
FROM 211 B.C.

By S. R. K. GLANVILLE and T. C. SKEAT

[Note.—The following abbreviations are employed: Gk. = Greek; Dem. = Demotic; s. = son of; d. = daughter of; f. = father of; fil. = filiation; Al. = Priest of Alexander and the deified Ptolemies; Athl. = Athlophoros of Berenike Euergetis; Kan. = Kanephoros of Arsinoe Philadelphos; Pss.A.P. = Priestess of Arsinoe Philopator; Yr. = year.]

Nearly fifty years have elapsed since the first list of eponymous priesthoods of the Ptolemaic period was published by Walther Otto in his Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten, i, 1905, 175–96. In the very next year the list was largely augmented, so far as the reigns of Ptolemy II and III were concerned, by the publication of the Hibeh Papyri, and in 1912 a revised and comprehensive catalogue was included by Plaumann in his article Hiereis in Pauly–Wissowa. Plaumann’s work still ranks as a primary authority, since the article, 'Eponymous Priests under the Ptolemies', which Sir Herbert Thompson contributed to the volume of Griffith Studies (1932, pp.16–29), claimed to do no more (so far as Alexandria was concerned) than register the additional evidence which had accumulated since Plaumann’s day. Actually this statement should be read in the light of Sir Herbert’s characteristic modesty, since his article in fact includes, in addition to the new material, many invaluable corrections and revisions of the Dem. evidence utilized by Plaumann.

In the twenty years which have passed since Thompson surveyed the material, further evidence has accrued though, understandably, progress becomes slower as the gaps in the list are filled one by one and the chances of filling those which remain constantly diminish. How our knowledge has grown during the half-century may be illustrated by the fact that, for the forty-two years 211–170 for which information is relatively abundant, Otto in 1905 could give the names for some nine years; Plaumann increases this to fifteen; Thompson adds a further nine, making a total of twenty-four; while we have added six, making thirty, so that our list for this period is now 71 per cent. complete.

Unfortunately lack of space has made it impossible for us on this occasion either to cover the whole of the Ptolemaic period, or to include Ptolemais. We have accordingly restricted our survey to Alexandria, beginning with the year, 211–210 B.C., in which Ptolemy IV Philopator inaugurated a new priesthood, the Athlophoros, in commemoration of his mother, the famous Berenike, whose memory has been more effectively immortalized by the pen of Callimachus. By choosing this starting-point, moreover, we are enabled at the outset to propound a new canon, which, we suggest, might be denominated 'Bell's Law' in honour of the great scholar whom we have each had the privilege of calling both colleague and friend. This rule is, that normally the
Athlophoros of one year was the Kanephoros of the next. Though exceptions occur, the general validity of the canon is beyond doubt, and provides a most valuable form of control.¹

In the following table Gk. and Dem. forms are shown in parallel columns. The Gk. names are shown in the nominative case, whereas previous compilers have retained the genitive case in which they invariably occur on the monuments. Where the Dem. forms vary, we have printed those which seem most plausible, and have noted variants only when they suggest a real divergence of evidence. Where Dem. evidence only is available, we have printed, in square brackets in the Gk. column, what seem to us the most likely Gk. originals, an added question-mark denoting a high degree of uncertainty. Finally, we must make it clear that we have not attempted a complete bibliography of every document quoted, but have usually confined ourselves to a single reliable edition. Prosopographical notes have been kept to a minimum. For convenience, the priest-hoods have been numbered serially, as in the earlier lists of Plaumann and Thompson, references to which have been included.

**PTOLEMY IV PHILOPATOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Al.</th>
<th>Athl.</th>
<th>Kan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211–210</td>
<td>[Δύνα η d. Περγάμος]</td>
<td>(1) [Γενναίο? d. Θέμιστος]</td>
<td>(1) Τραπέζια d. Διονύσιος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Otto (op. cit. 1, 159) did indeed note that in some cases the Athlophoros of one year was the Kanephoros of the next, but the material available to him was quite insufficient to enable him to postulate a general rule to this effect.
(3) Kan. Fil. in Gk. column restored from Athl. of (2) (Bell's law), but if this is correct, the Dem. fil. trityn must be a blunder. Fil. of Athl. (doubtful in Dem.) is confirmed by that of Kan. of (4) (Bell's Law).

(4) Kan. = Athl. of (3) (Bell's Law). No names are recorded for the last three years of Philopator or the first of Epiphanes. Plaumann 56 which he dates between the 12th and 18th years of Philopator is in fact the Raphia decree of 217, cf. Thompson 31.

PTOLEMY V EPIPHANES

(5) Al. Aristomenes is the celebrated Acanarian, regent during Epiphanes' minority.

(6) Al. Σάντης s. Εὐμένης
Year 3 Athl. Χριστύνη d. Σόλων
207-206 Kan. Σωστράτη d. Αντιγένης
BGU 1266. Thompson 39.


(8) Al. Πανσάνα s. Δημήτριος
Year 5 Athl. [ ? ] d. Αντικλῆς
201-200 Kan. Φίλη τη d. Αντικλῆς

(9) Athl. and Kan. presumably sisters. The Gk. name of Athl. is uncertain: perhaps Σωστράτης, though this form does not seem to be exampled. Reich suggests Σωρης. Kan. = Athl. of (7) (Bell's Law). No names are recorded for Yr. 6.

(10) Al. [ ? ] s. Πτολεμαίος
Year 7 Athl. [ ? ] d. Πτολεμαίος
199-198 Kan. Θέμας d. Πτολεμαίος
(9) Al. Name known only from P.dem.Hamburg 10 unpubl., quoted by kind permission of Professor Erichsen. Athl. No plausible suggestion for the Gk. has yet been made; cf. Kan. of (10) (Bell’s Law). P.dem.Hamb. 10 reads ὑσύς. Kan. P.dem. Hamb. 10 reads ἵσυττος, i.e. the scribe has omitted the second syllable of the Gk., whereas in the other Dem. papyri the third syllable is omitted. Pss.A.P. here appears for the first time; she appears to have been appointed for life, or at least ‘during pleasure’. Her father, Ptolemy the Megalopolitan, was governor of Cyprus from 197, cf. Archiv, 13, 24–28; Bengtson, Strategie, III, 232.

| (10) | Al. | [Δημήτριος σ. Σιτάλκης] | Al. | ῥμίσεις s. σιτῆς |
| Year 8 | Athl. | [Αρεία d. Διογένης] | Athl. | ῥυ' d. πυγήνς |
| 198–197 | Kan. | [ ] d. Απελάδης | Kan. | ιπ' ιπ' |
| | Pss.A.P. | [Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαῖος] | Pss.A.P. | hρ' n' d. πτολέμας |

(10) Al. Σιτάλκης seems certain in spite of the second t in the Dem. For representation of Gk. kappa by t in Dem.; cf. πργντων for Πραξινίκη (21) and ἱστωτος for Σέλευκος (50–52). Athl. = Kan. of (11) and Kan. = Athl. of (9) (Bell’s Law).

| (11) | Al. | Ατρός s. Ατρός |
| Year 9 | Athl. | Πύρρα d. Φιλίνος |
| 197–196 | Kan. | Αρεία d. Διογένης |
| | Pss.A.P. | Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαῖος |
| | Rosetta Stone (Gk.). Plaumann 60. |

(11) Al. Perhaps as a descendant of Aetos s. Apollonios (? the Δioκετες) who was Al. in 253–252 (Plaumann 16). Athl. = Kan. of (12) and Kan. = Athl. of (10) (Bell’s Law).

| (12) | Al. | [Σωδώς(? ) s. Αὐδρων] |
| Year 10 | Athl. | [Ἰδίμεια d. Υπερβάσας] |
| 196–195 | Kan. | [Πύρρα d. Φιλίνος] |
| | Pss.A.P. | [Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαῖος] |
| | P.Lond.dem. 10624 (JEA 26 (1940), 72). P.Lond.dem. 10629 (b). Thompson 42. |

(12) Athl. has the same name and fil. as the Kan. of 243-242, cf. Thompson 17 and T. B. Mitford, JHS 17 (1937), 31–32. The Dem. fil. is interesting since it attempts to reproduce the genitive of the Gk. fil. (‘Υπερβάσας) instead of the usual nominative; P.Lond.dem. 10629 (b) similarly has ἱβρῆς. The fil. of the Kan. in 243-242, on the other hand, is given in Dem. as πρβς, i.e. the nominative. The nominative of the Gk. fil., ὑπερβάσας, has not yet to find a result in any document. Kan. = Athl. of (11) (Bell’s Law).

No names are recorded for Yrs. 11–12.

| (13) | Al. | [ ] s. Εὔμηλος |
| Year 13 | Athl. | Ατταμιάωρα d. Διογένης |
| 193–192 | Kan. | Απολλωνία d. Αθηνόδωρος |
| | Pss.A.P. | Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαῖος. |
| | P.Teb. 816. |

(13) Athl. apparently = Kan. of (14), but see note ad loc.

| (14) | Al. | Μέων s. [ ] |
| Year 14 | Athl. | [ ] d. [ ] |
| 192–191 | Kan. | Αρτέμιδωρα d. [Διογένης] |
| | Pss.A.P. | Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαῖος |
| | BGU 1270. Thompson 43. |

(14) Kan. The editors print the name as Ἀρτεμίδωρα, but it is tempting to assume that Bell’s Law operated and that the name is in fact the same as that of the Athl. of (13).
(15) Athl. The Gk. original of the name is uncertain; Thompson suggests Πάρτα. Hippalos perhaps the celebrated epistrategus, who was Priest of Ptolemy Soter at Ptolemais at least as early as 185, cf. Thompson, Ptolemais 8. Kan. The fil. is omitted (as also in the case of Pss.A.P.); if Bell’s Law operated, the fil. should terminate in -ros (cf. Athl. of (14)), and it is possible that the full name was Αθηνοδόρα d. Αθηνόδωρος, the similarity of names explaining the omission by the Dem. scribe. If so, she was presumably a sister of the Kan. of (13). No names are recorded for Yrs. 16–17.

(16) Athl. The name Καρνεῖος is unexamined, but Youtie states that the reading of the papyrus (Καρνεῖος) seems certain. Kan. The Dem. is obviously extremely corrupt; Youtie states that in the Gk. Παλαιτεία is absolutely certain, and that the fil. cannot be made to approximate to anything like the Dem. No names are recorded for Yr. 19.

(17) Athl., by an exception to Bell’s law, did not become Kan. in the following year, but did occupy this priesthood four years later, cf. (21). Kan. According to Youtie, Τούλη ‘should be taken as certain’; the name appears to be unexamined.

(18) Al. A double filiation seems to occur commonly where priest and father have the same name, and/or the name Πτολεμαῖος is involved; in the present instance the father is undoubtedly the Πτολεμαῖος s. quīrīms who was Al. in 225–224 (Plaumann 43; Thompson 26 a); cf. Otto, op. cit. 1, p. 181, n. 3. Kan. is not the Athl. of (17) (Bell’s Law fails), but the fil. is the same in both cases and the priestesses may well have been sisters. The Athl. of (12) may be another sister, but the interval of time is appreciable and Φιλῖνος a common name.


* Communicated by, and published with the kind permission of, Prof. H. C. Youtie.
(20) Athl. Fil. might also be Τηλήμαχος, though this is less likely. Kan. For the fil. there are several alternatives, e.g. Πραξίαδης; she does not = Athl. of (19) (Bell’s Law fails).

(21) Al. [Ἡγιαστράταρος s. Ἡγιαστράταρος] Athl. Ἰῃςτρτς s. Ἰῃςτρτς
Year 24 Athl. [Κλαυνέτη d. Τιμόθεος] Athl. glyντ d. tymθνς
Pss.A.P. [Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαίος] Pss.A.P. hrνn d. ptltmyns
P.Lond.dem. 10722, 10723 unpubl.

(21) Al. For the omission in the Dem. of a syllable of the Gk. name Ἡγιαστράταρος, cf. the fil. of the Kan. of (10), who may have been his sister. Athl. Perhaps a sister of the Al. of (17). Kan. = Athl. of (17); it is impossible to conjecture the reason for this unusual interval between the holding of the two priesthoods.

(22) Al. [ ] s. Ζηγόδωρος] Athl. sstrt d. yyn
Year 25 Athl. [Σωτράττη d. Ἰάνων] Kan. is d. d. sisy
Pss.A.P. Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαίος


(22) Al. The termination seems to exclude Κοκανός, for whom see (28). Athl. Griffith, reviewing Mitzram 1 in JEA 20 (1934), 110, suggested reading sîtrt’s, representing a Gk. original Στρανώτις, but the final s cannot in fact be seen. Kan. is not the Athl. of (21) (Bell’s Law fails). No priesthoods are recorded for Yr. 1 of Philometor.

PTOLEMY VI PHILOMETOR

(23) Al. [Πολονάξισ d. Πολος] Athl. Ε traveler d. Ά traveler s
Year 2 Kan. [Σωστράττη d. Εθφάναρ] Pss.A.P. Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαίος

(23) Athl. The name is so doubtfully read that it is difficult to say whether or not she became the Kan. of (24). Kan. = Athl. of (24) (Bell’s Law reversed).

(24) Al. Φίλιων s. Κάστωρ Athl. [φ]λην d. [σ]υρν
Year 3 Athl. Σωστράττη d. Εθφάναρ Athl. syyrmn d. rθyrnn
179–178 Kan. Ελεύθερη d. Φίλινος Kan. hyrn d. phylxynσ
Pss.A.P. Εἰρήνη d. Πτολεμαίος
P.Freib. 12–33.

Al. (omitted)
Plaumann 64. Thompson 48.

(24) Al. is presumably identical with the Philon s. Kastor who was Strategus in Cyrenaica under Epiphanes, cf. Bengtson, Strategii, 111, 158. Athl. = Kan. of (23) (Bell’s Law reversed). In Dem. the Kan. is described as ‘Kan. of Arsinoe Philopator’, and the name of the Pss.A.P. is omitted; apparently the similarity of the names of the Kan. and the Pss.A.P., especially in Dem. dress, caused them to be confused. Kan. The name of the Athl. of (23) is so uncertainly read that it is impossible to say whether she was the same person. No names are recorded for Yr. 4.
(25) Kan. almost certainly belongs to the family of Theodoros s. Seleukos, Strategus of Cyprus in the last years of Euergetes II, who had a sister Artemo, cf. (44) and T. B. Mitford, 'Seleucus and Theodorus', Opuscula Atheniensiæ, i (1953), 130-71. No names are recorded for Yr. 6.

(26) Al. The Dem. suggests that the Gk. fl. terminated in -δος. Athl. does not = Kan. of (27) (Bell's Law fails).


(29) Athl. apparently a sister of the Pss. Q. Kleopatra at Ptolemais in the same year, whose name is given as Ἐπικράτης δ. πτελώμας s. ἐντέκτας; if so, the Gk. scribe has omitted one generation in the fl., cf. Thompson, Ptolemais 16. Athl. does not = Kan. of (30) (Bell's Law fails). Kan. = Athl. of (28) (Bell's Law). Pss.A.P. The last recorded appearance of Eirene d. Ptolemy.

(30) Kan. Not the Athl. of (29) (Bell's Law fails), but possibly the mother of the Al. of (38).
(31) Athl. Polykrates, the former Strategus of Cyprus, cf. T. B. Mitford, Opuscula Atheniensia, 1 (1953), p. 131, n. 5; Bengtson, Strategie, III, 232. Pss.A.P. Kines is the minister of Philometor, colleague of Komanos, for whom see (28), (29); Kines himself was for a number of years Priest of Philometor and Kleopatra I at Ptolemais, cf. Thompson, Ptolemais, 13–18. After this year the records of eponymous priesthoods become extremely fragmentary, and gaps in the series are no longer specially noticed.

PTOLEMY VI PHILOMETER, PTOLEMY VIII (EUNERGETES II), AND KLEOPATRA II

(32) Al. perhaps identical with the Melancomas s. Melancomas s. Philodamos who appears as ἐν τῆς πόλεως in an inscription from Citium (OGIS 134) which though undated is probably to be assigned to this period. Athl. and Pss.A.P. presumably sisters. Noumenios may be the Strategus of the Thebaid in 171–170, cf. Bengtson, Strategie, III, 226.

PTOLEMY VI PHILOMETER AND KLEOPATRA II


(35) Al. [Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Βασίλεας Πτολεμαῖος Al. πτωλήμης s. pr-ro ἱγρινεῖς pr-ro-t
and Βασίλισσα Κλεοπάτρα] Athl. ἱγρινεῖς d. ἱγρινεῖς
[Νικαιά ἡ Ἱερώνυμος] Kan. ἱγρινεῖς d. ἱγρινεῖς
[Ἀρσενόθη ἡ Χαρίμορφος] Pss.A.P. ἱγρινεῖς d. ἱγρινεῖς
P. dem. Lond. 10561 wrongly describes Al. as 'Ptolemy priest of King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra'. Father of Kan. most accurately given in P. dem. Lond. 10618; 10561 has "nymys".


(36) Dated Yr. 22? Yr. 23? by Spiegelberg, but the name of the Kan. suggests that of the Athl. of Yr. 24, which, if Bell's Law holds, indicates that the present pap. belongs to Yr. 25. Kan. Plaumann restores fil. as [Hieronymos] on the assumption that she is identical with the Athl. of (35).

(37) Al. Cf. Rémondon, op. cit.; Bengtson, Strategie, III, 225 (Strategus of the Xoïte nome). Athl. Rémondon suggests that the Dem. is a translation, and not a mere transliteration, of the Gk. Kan. Plaumann 71 gives Thiana d. Aetoi (?) as Kan. for Yr. 26, from P. dem. Louvre 3440 (all other names lost); if the date is reliable this gives the name of the Kan., but to judge from the P. dem. Lond. the fil. ended in -οτος.

(38) Al. Fil. appears to be the feminine Stratoniê, for which cf. (30), but it is unparalleled for the mother's name to be given, and the gender of the Dem. may be a mistake. For the name Stratoniê, cf. the Kan. at Ptolemais in 137, μηθυλί d. mmtrtcos s. strtnys (Thompson, Ptolemais 22). Pss. A.P. Restored in Gk., but virtually certain.

(39) Date according to Thompson's notes 'somewhat uncertain', but '32' seems only possible reading. Pss. A.P. The latest certainly dated appearance of Timarion of Metrophanes.

(40) Al. [Εὐστοχος (?) s. Δίων]

(dated uncertain) Athl. [Ηρώτη (?) d. Ηρόκλεως]

Kan. [ ]

Pss. A.P. [Τιμάρων d. Μηθυλίδης]

Al. [nymys d. ]

Pss. A.P. [Tmtryan d. mtropns]

P. dem. Lond. 10620 (a).
The date is lost, but the name of the Pss.A.P. shows that the papyrus belongs to this period. Al. It is tempting to suggest that the s is intrusive, and that the Gk. was therefore the common name Εὐνυχος (cf. (46)). Εὐστόχος, which Thompson suggests, is not found earlier than the fourth century A.D.

All the names (except possibly the Athl.) are apparently identical with those in (43), q.v. Athl. Possibly a sister of Θεοκλής s. εικάς (Theokles s. Archias) who was Priest of Ptolemy Philometor at Ptolemais in 137, cf. Thompson, Ptolemais 22. Kan. Presumably sister of the Pss.A.P. who here appears for the first time in succession to Timarion d. Metrophases.

This pap. is assigned by Spiegelberg to the 25th Yr. of Philometor, but the name of the Pss.A.P. is against this, and in fact all the names (with the possible exception of Athl.) are identical with those in (42). The explanation is that after Philometor's death, just before the end of his 36th Yr. his brother, the future Euergetes II, usurped the throne and proclaimed his own 25th Yr. The change of régime apparently left the occupants of the priesthoods unaffected. Athl. The fil. is apparently identical with that of the Athl. of (43), but there is a difference in the name. Probably Κλεοκλής, the less common name, is correct, and Βερενίκη in (42) a blunder.

Pss.A.P. On Artemo d. Seleukos, who here appears for the first time, see T. B. Mitford, Opera Atheniensia, 1 (1953), 130–71 passim. Her father Seleukos and brother Theodoros were successively Governors of Cyprus under Euergetes II. The Artemo d. Theodoros who was Kan. in 176 (25) is no doubt connected with the same family. The P.Ryl. editors read the name (in the genitive) as Ἀρτέμιος, but Ἀρτέμης can be regarded as a certain restoration.

For Athl. and Kan. see (46). Kan. τριφωθίς, which seems inevitable, is noteworthy as the first appearance of an Egyptian name for the holder of any priesthood; for a later example, cf. (57).
(46) Al. Πτολεμαίος ὁ γενόμενος ἐγ ψαλίδεως
Athl. [ ]
Year 33 Kan. Πτολεμαίου κτλ.
138-137 Pss.A.P. Χρηστιμὸς ὁ Σελευκός
P.Amb. 44. Plaumann 74.

(46) The date rests upon the mention of Yr. 33 (τρίτων καὶ τριακοστῶν) in l. 2 and of Yr. 34 in l. 8. The Athl. appears to be either identical with, or at least a sister of, the Kan. of (45). Conversely the Kan. appears to be the same as the Athl. of (45) (Bell’s Law).

(47) Al. Πτολεμαίος ὁ γενόμενος ἐγ ψαλίδεως
Athl. Ψειδώρα d. [ ]
Year 36 Kan. Φιλολλήν d. Φιλότος
135-134 Pss.A.P. Χρηστιμὸς d. Σελευκός
P.Teb. 810.

(47) On the identity of this son of Euergetes II, who may be either Memphites or the future Soter II, see the editors’ note ad. loc. and Otto–Bengtson, Zur Gesch. d. Niederganges d. Ptolemäerreiches, p. 46, n. 2, where powerful arguments in favour of the latter are adduced. For Soter II’s tenure of the Alexander priesthood after he had become king see (52)-(55). At the present time he was a boy of about seven or eight. Pss.A.P. The editors read (in the genitive) Τμοῦς τῆς Θε[.].γου, with the note ‘not Σελευκός apparently’, but the restoration given above is certain.

(48) Al. [ ]
Date uncertain Athl. [ ]
Year 35 or 45 Kan. Φίλοννα d. [ ]
136-135 or Pss.A.P. [ ]
126-125 P.Teb. 137. Plaumann 75.

(48) The editors give the date as Yr. 25, 35, or 45 but the first-named can now be excluded, since the names for that year are given in (43) above.

(49) Al. [ ]
Date uncertain Athl. [ ]
(? late) Kan. Νυμὴν d. (?)
Euergetes II) Pss.A.P. Χρηστιμὸς ὁ Σελευκός.

(49) Ascribed by Thompson to ‘late Euergetes II or early Soter II’, on the grounds of the name of the Pss.A.P., but if it belongs to the latter reign, it must date from the first few months after Euergetes’ death, since there is no mention of the three new priesthoods [see (50)] introduced by Kleopatra III not later than Yr. 2, 18 Phamenoth (cf. Otto–Bengtson Zur Gesch. d. Niederganges d. Ptolemäerreiches, p. 126). Kan. To judge from the Dem., the fil. began with Εὐ- and probably ended with-νικος. Thompson suggests Εὐδομίαξ with a query.

(50) Al. Αἰσχίλλωνος s. Εϊραίνος
Year 51 Hieros Polos. Εὐδόκων s. Εὐρήμων
120-119 Athl. [ ]
Kan. [ ]
Pss.A.P. Χρηστιμὸς ὁ Σελευκός

(50) Al. Κτυπάλλωνος s. Εϊραίνος
Hieros Polos. Ροππράν s. Ρομπρά
Athl. [ ]
Kan. [ ]
Pss.A.P. Χρηστιμὸς ὁ Σελευκός

(50) Al. Ιρεναῖος perhaps the well-known Diokeites who is found holding that office in 114-112. At this period he was Chief Eklogistes (if indeed this is the same person), cf. W. Peremans, Prosopographie Ptolemaica, i, 1950, nos. 29, 148. Hieros Polos. Cf. (51). Athl. Recurs as Kan. in (51); if the latter is correctly
assigned to the following year, this constitutes the last ascertainable example of the operation of Bell's Law. Thompson's reading krt'mn (for which he suggested Gk. 'Póðov) is incorrect: there is no trace of anything before the initial t.

(51) Al. Hieros Polos. [Πτολεµαίος s. Κάστωρ]
Year 52 Athl. [Ἱσπερίας] d. [Διονυσίος]
119-118 Kan. [Θεοδώρος] d. [Αδριάνος]
Pss.A.P. [Ἀρτέµιδ Σέλευκος]


**KLEOPATRA III AND PTOLEMY IX SOTER II**

(52) Al. [Βασίλειος Πτολεµαίος Ψελλόφυτωρ Σωτήρ] Year 2 Al. pr-0 ptwrmys ptnr mr mw.t
116-115 Hieros Polos. [Κρατέρος s. Κρατέρος] nt lk hb
Steph. [Μαρκάνης] d. Θεοδώρος
Athl. [Κράτεις d. Θεόδωρος]
Phosph. [Θεοδώρης d. Θεόδωρος]
Kan. [Διονυσία d. Διονύσιος]
Pss.Kleop. III [Μαρκήσση d. Νικήσση]
Pss.A.P. [Ἀρτέµιδ Σέλευκος]

(52) The first occurrence of the reigning sovereign occupying the Priesthood of Alexander. For his earlier tenure of the office see (47). Except for a brief interval in Yr. 6 (cf. (54)) Soter II seems to have retained it until his expulsion in 107. Hieros Polos. The Gk. names are taken from (54), and can hardly be doubted despite the reduplicated t in the Dem. form. Possibly -tetr is due to a confusion with the fil. of the next three priestesses. Steph., Athl., Phosph. The fil. no doubt represents the same person, who must have been of the highest rank to have three of his daughters holding eponymous priesthoods in a single year. tetr might represent either Διοδώρος or Θεοδώρος, but in view of what has been said it seems safe to conclude that he was the Theodoros s. Seleukos who was Governor of Cyprus until about 118 (?), cf. Mitford, op. cit., p. 169, and whose sister and another daughter held priesthoods nine years later (57). Pss.A.P. The last recorded appearance of Arctemo d. Seleukos.

(53) Al. [Βασίλειος Πτολεµαίος Θεὸς Ψελλόφυτωρ]
Year 3, 4, 5 Σωτήρ
115-114 (Other holders of priesthoods not specified.) Plaumm 77.
114-113 Year 3: P.Grenf. 1, 25; P.Strabas. 81, 83, 84.
113-112 Plaumm 77.

(54) Al. hrgm[δ] δ[ωρο]ς s. Σωτήρ
Year 6 Year 4: P.Grenf. II, 20; P.Par. 5 = UPZ
112-111 180; P.Strabas. 85; P.Lond. 880; BGU 994. Plaumm 78.
1204 = M., Chr. 152.
Plaumm 79.
EPONYMOUS PRIESTHOODS OF ALEXANDRIA

Ps. A. P. Χαρμ(?)[ ] d. [ ] 0[ ]
(Other priesthoods not mentioned.)

For Al. (1) and remaining priesthoods: Greek
inscr. in Cairo, de Ricci, BSA A 21
(1909), 330. (Yr. 6, Phaophi —). Plau-
mann 80.

For Al. (2): P. Adler Gk. 3 (Yr. 6, Hathyr
16); P. Strasb. 86 (Yr. 6, Mesore).

(54) At the beginning of the year the office of Al., held for the past three years continuously by Ptolemy Soter II, was conferred, for reasons which we cannot guess, upon a private individual; but the interlude can have lasted for a few weeks only, since P. Adler Gk. 3 shows that Soter II had resumed the dignity by a date which, allowing for the time taken for news to reach the Thebaid, cannot be later than the beginning of Hathyr. Hieros Polos. Cf. (52).

(55) Al. Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος Θεὸς Φιλομήτωρ
Years 8, 9, 11
110–109  Σωτήρ
(Other holders of priesthoods not specified.)
Year 11: BGU 996. Plaumann 83.

(56) Date uncertain
(Other holders of other priesthoods not specified.)
P. Oxy. xiv, 1723.

KLEOPATRA III AND PTOLEMY X ALEXANDER I

(57) Al. [ ] s. [ ] Ῥωθής
Year 11 = 8
107–106  Ps. Kleop. III. "Ελενος s. Άπολλ. οs
Ps. Kleop. III. Θεοβάρμον d. Άπολλ. οs
Hieros Polos. Διαμήτηρος s. [ ] οs
Ps. A. P. "Ολυμπίας d. Σέλενος
Steph. [ ] d. ["Ιρελέθης
Phosph. Κλεοπάτρα d. Καλλικράτης
Kan. [ ] d. Τιμιδώρος
Athl. Παλικρατεία d. Θεόδωρος
d'Ég. 13 (1938), 139–51.

(57) This is the latest extant document to give a full list of the priesthoods and their holders. Ps. Kleop. III. The fil. both here and in the Ps. Kleop. III was read "Απολλ(οδώρ)ον in the original edition, but M. Préaux informs us, after re-examination of the papyrus with M. Hombert, that neither this nor Άπολλωνίων is a satisfactory reading in either case. The letters in the middle of the name, though perfectly preserved, are written very cursively in a way unexamined elsewhere in the document. Helenos is described in the papyrus as Governor of Cyprus and holder of several other important posts and honorific titles. He appears to have become Governor under Ptolemy Alexander I before the latter became King of Egypt, and he remained in office at least until about 105. Whether all the documents in which Helenos is named refer to the same
person, or whether, as Otto and Bengtson have maintained, there were two Heleni (possibly grandfather and grandson) is a very complicated question to which there is as yet no final answer. Pss.Klep. III. Clearly a sister of the foregoing. For the Egyptian name cf. (45). Pss.A.P. A sister of Theodoros s. Seleukos for whom see (52) and the Athl. below. Cf. the stemma in *Opuscula Atheniensia*, 1, 170. Phosph. For Kallikles cf. perhaps the dedication to Philometor by Kallikles s. Kallikles published by Mitford in *JHS* 57 (1937), 32–33. Athl. A d. of the same Theodoros. Cf. *Opuscula Atheniensia*, 1, 170, where by a slip her name is given as Pasikrateia.

(58) Al. *Βασιλεύς Πτολεμ[αῖος ὁ ἐπικαλομένος]̄*

Year 12 = 9  

106–105  

(Holders of other priesthoods not specified.)  


(58) It is no accident that we have not a single dated document giving the holders of any priesthood during the remainder of the Ptolemaic period.¹ The indefinite tenure of the Alexander priesthood by the reigning sovereign stultified the employment of the priesthood in a dating clause, and the proliferation of new priesthoods for propaganda purposes likewise defeated its own object. The only possible mention of an Alexander priest in the first century B.C., is an inscription published by E. Breccia in *BSAA* no. 19, pp. 128–9, a dedication by *Διορίλον Ζαλιον ἐπιφάνειος ὁ ἱεραπείης Αλεξάνδρων τοῦ αὐτοῦ*, dated *Lia. Φαρμοῦθι ἡμέρας*. The omission of the name of a ruler after *Lia* suggests the Ptolemaic rather than the early Roman period, in which case the date must be either 70 or 41 B.C. *τοῦ αὐτοῦ* seems to mean that he had held the priesthood for 25 years at the time of the dedication.

LONDON

¹ But P. dem. Hamburg 2 (unpubl.), dated Year 34 of Ptolemy Soter II, gives Al. *wnsyµ's s. nswyqrs* (just communicated by Professor Erichsen, by whose kind permission we record it.)
L'INTERPRÉTATION DU PAPYRUS BARAIZE

By B. A. VAN GRONINGEN

Le papyrus grec trouvé par M. Baraize à Deir-el-Bahari et publié avec un savant commentaire par les regrettes Collart et Jouguet,1 a donné lieu au cours des dernières années à des discussions très intéressantes. Elles se rapportent à l'interprétation générale, mais encore et surtout au point de savoir si, oui ou non, l'Égypte ptolémaïque connaissait un droit de rachat et de récupération de biens confisqués. Les deux points de vue opposés ont été exposés en dernier lieu et avec clarté par MM. Wenger² et Schönbauer.³ Provisoirement je n'entre pas encore dans ce débat. Il est utile de revenir tout d'abord au texte lui-même et son explication, je dirais, lexicologique.

Le lecteur sait de quoi il s'y agit. Pétéaroëris, le plaignant, expose au stratégè Daïmarchos que sa femme Tsénonpmous possédait naguère 80 arours de terre non accessible aux inondations (γῆς ὑπεροῦν 5–6); dans la période des troubles (ἐν τῇ γενομένῃ παραχῇ 7–8) elle s'était réfugiée dans le Delta (ἐν τοῖς κάτω τόποις 11). Sans aucun doute en vertu d'ordonnances royales, les autorités avaient vendu 53 arours à un certain Pernsâs. Mais plus tard la femme est revenue sur les lieux et, ainsi s'exprime le texte, ὑπομενούσης συνπληρώσαι τὰς διὰ τῆς διαγραφῆς ἀροῦσας νῦ, οὔχ ὑπομένει[ε]ξει-(lire ε)διαζόμενος τὰς λοιπὰς ἀροῦσας κ[ξ], παρὰ τὸ κ[αθ]ήκον βιαζόμενος. C'est là le premier passage à examiner. A une exception près, tout le monde a accepté la traduction des premiers éditeurs: 'et elle consentait à payer complètement les 53 arours du bordereau de vente; lui n'y consent pas, et il s'approprie les autres 27 arours par une violence illégale.' Traitions d'abord l'exception. C'est M. Schönbauer qui traduit: 'war sie bereit, die durch die Zahlungsüberweisung des Staates genannten 53 Arouren voll herzugeben, aber nicht bereit, sich betreffs der übrigen 27 Arouren um ihr Eigentum bringen... zu lassen.'⁴ Seulement on se demande comment les participes masculins εξειδιαζόμενος et βιαζόμενος peuvent se rapporter à la femme du plaignant, à moins d'admettre une faute de copiste tout à fait singulière. Et puis on aimerait trouver une preuve à l'appui de la traduction absolument anormale du verbe συμπληροῦν. Pourtant c'est précisément ce verbe qui mérite notre attention spéciale et, sans y ajouter une interprétation plus rationnelle, M. Schönbauer a pourtant eu raison de rejeter celle des premiers éditeurs. En effet, on a beau consulter les dictionnaires, nulle part on n'y trouvera pour συμπληροῦν la signification de 'payer complètement' qu'on lui attribue ici. D'accord, dira-t-on, mais le verbe simple πληροῦν signifie très normalement 'payer' et par conséquent on peut bien admettre que le composé n'offre qu'une variante de

---

1 Ét. de Pap. 2, 23 ss., repris avec quelques corrections de Wilcken (Archiv, 11, 292) dans SB 8033. Cf. aussi WB iv, s.v. ἀπομετρέω. Au reste à la ligne 20 le papyrus semble avoir non pas ἀπομετρήσω, mais -όσω (voir le fac-similé dans l'édition princeps). Ce qui d'ailleurs ne pourra être qu'une erreur.
3 En dernier lieu Aeg. 30, 198 ss. On peut y lire l'historique du débat.
4 o.c. 202.
B. A. VAN GRONINGEN

cette acception si fréquente. Seulement, même pour le verbe simple il faut s’entendre. Le verbe ‘payer’ s’emploie en français1 de deux façons différentes. On dit ‘payer’ une somme, une taxe, une dette, en général une valeur. Mais on dit également ‘payer’ un livre, une maison, une marchandise, en général toute chose échangée contre une valeur. Or le grec πληρῶν ne se rencontre nulle part, à ma connaissance, dans le sens indiqué en second lieu. Il se construit toujours avec le complément direct de la valeur payée. Le grec dit couramment πληρῶν τάλαμον, δραχμάς τοσαύτας, τέλος, τόκον, τιμή, etc., mais nulle part je n’ai trouvé p. ex. πληρῶν οἰκίαν, γῆν, ὄνεια. On peut dire πληρῶν ἀρτάβας τοσαύτας p. ex., mais alors il s’agit non pas d’artabes qu’on achète et qu’on paye en espèces, mais les artabes constituent elles-mêmes l’instrument d’un payement qui se fait en nature. Il est donc inexact de traduire dans notre texte συμπληρῶσα τὰς ἄδοιρας par ‘payer complètement les arrores’, celles-ci ne constituant d’aucune façon une espèce de monnaie. Au reste, on pourrait toujours se demander pourquoi le papyrus porte cette bizarre circonlocution au lieu d’un terme direct et clair comme racheter, récupérer, ἀναλαμβάνειν, ἀπολύειν (-ώσα), αὐτοφάλλοις, σελεραθαι, à la rigueur λυτρῶν.

Partout ailleurs le verbe signifie ‘compléter ; rendre complet’. C’est encore, à n’en point douter, le sens qu’il faut lui accorder ici. Tsénopomus consent apparemment à ‘compléter’ à l’avantage de Pemsaïs ‘les 53 arrores auxquelles se rapporte la diagraphe’ officielle qui consitue son titre légal; autrement dit, à mettre à sa disposition les 27 arrores qui manquent au total de 80 qu’elle possédait naguère. Evidemment moyennant payement. Mais le plaignant n’insiste pas sur ce détail, d’abord parce qu’il n’est pas d’importance directe, et puis aussi afin de mettre en évidence ce qu’il considère comme la remarquable bonne volonté de sa femme. Pour Pemsaïs la chose n’était pas sans importance. La femme avait donc, à son retour sur les lieux, constaté que Pemsaïs n’avait acheté qu’une partie des terres qui lui avaient appartenu, mais qu’à l’heure actuelle il les cultive toutes et les considère comme son bien propre.

Ici plusieurs questions se posent. D’abord: pourquoi Pemsaïs n’a-t-il acheté ou pourquoi le fisc ne lui a-t-il vendu que 53 arrores? Ceci s’explique très aisément si l’on fait attention à un détail dont personne ne s’est encore occupé, savoir qu’il s’agit de γῆ ἔπειρος, de terres que les eaux de Nil n’atteignent pas directement. Ce sont les terres qui empient sur le désert et qui ne sont cultivables que du moment qu’on les arrose artificiellement et régulièrement. Aussitôt que cet arrosage est négligé — et ceci n’est que naturel en temps de troubles — le désert reprend ses droits, la superficie cultivée se rétrécit et un total théorique de 80 arrores se réduit aisément au total pratique de 53. Pemsaïs n’a entrevu provisoirement, quand il a adressé aux autorités compétentes sa demande de pouvoir acheter les terres devenues vacantes par suite de la disparition de Tsénopomus, que la possibilité de mettre en valeur un total de 53 arrores. Et c’est pour cela que le bordereau de vente indique ce total. Seulement, la possibilité d’agrandir le terrain cultivable existe; le passé le prouve. Pemsaïs a donc spontanément repris le travail normal d’arrosage et son activité lui a permis de rétablir la situation ancienne: il a reculé au dépens du désert l’extrême limite de la γῆ ἔπειρος; il cultive de nouveau

80 aroures. A son retour au village, Tsénénonmous a constaté cet état de choses. Rien ne permet de croire qu'elle ait eu l'illusion de pouvoir faire annuler la vente des 53 aroures. Et quand, après sa mort, le mari s'adresse au stratège, dans le document que nous étudions, il n'est aucunement question de cela. Ici, il faut être entièrement d'accord avec M. Schönbauer. Mais les 27 aroures restantes posent un autre problème. Elles n'ont pas été vendues du tout. Sans le dire en termes exprès, le plaignment admet que l'État ne les a donc pas confisquées, puisqu'il ne les a pas vendues. Elles font donc encore bel et bien partie des propriétés de feu sa femme, dont il est apparemment l'héritier. Elles appartiennent donc à lui, Pétéarœris. Pemساïs 'se les est appropriées par une violence illégale' (εξεισάζομενος ... παρὰ τὸ καθηκὸν βιαζόμενος 14-15).

Il est clair encore pourquoi la femme a commencé par offrir la partie non vendue à Pemساïs, moyennant payement, cela va sans dire. C'est que les 27 aroures constituent évidemment la portion du terrain la plus éloignée du fleuve, celle qui est la plus difficile à mettre en culture. A elles seules, elles sont probablement peu rémunératrices.

Pemساïs, de son côté, considère l'agrandissement de sa terre comme dû à son effort personnel. De plus, il sait que de la sorte il a agi en bon et loyal sujet du roi, qui ne demande pas mieux que de voir s'étendre la γῆ ἐν ἄρετῇ. Il est convaincu que les aroures gagnées sur le désert lui appartiennent comme défricheur, évidemment sans préjudice aux droits de principe que Sa Majesté peut faire valoir. C'est probablement en vertu de ces considérations qu'il n'est point entré dans les propositions de la femme.

Ceci étant posé, le reste du texte se comprend sans difficulté. Pétéarœris, faisant la démarche à laquelle se rapporte notre papyrus, demande que les autorités constatent que Pemساïs n'a effectivement acheté que 53 aroures, afin qu'il puisse délimiter sur le total la portion qui revient à Pemساïs. C'est bien là le sens qu'il faut, avec Wilcken, donner au verbe ἀπομετρεῖν. Il est psychologiquement exact que le plaignant ne dise pas que Pemساïs pourra délimiter ce qui revient de droit à lui, Pétéarœris. Les 27 aroures restantes reviendront de nouveau, puisqu'elles n'ont pas été vendues (ἀπρατον 21), aux anciens propriétaires. Nous nous trouvons donc en présence d'une contestation très curieuse. Les deux parties se placent à des points de vue essentiellement opposés: le plaignant au point de vue strictement formel, le défendeur sur la base de ses droits moraux. Je me demande si Pétéarœris a bien eu une autre intention que celle d'obliger indirectement le détenteur des 27 aroures à les lui acheter.

Reste le problème juridique qu'on a si aigrement discuté, celui du droit de rachat de terres confisquées. Si l'interprétation donnée ici est exacte, le papirus Baraże ne nous apprend rien à ce sujet. Je termine par une paraphrase du texte: 'Pétéarœris à Daïmachos. J'ai à me plaindre des injustices de Pemساïs. Jadis ma femme

1 La mort de la femme, qui explique pourquoi la requête est présentée par son mari, se déduit avec certitude de l'expression τῆς ὑπάρχοντος μου γῆν (20–21); alors qu'à la ligne 4 ὑπάρχοντες est un participe de l'imparfait, à la ligne 21 ἐπάρχουσαν est au présent.
2 o.c. 203: 'Den Erwerb vom Staatse jagt er anschisend in keiner Weise anzufechen. Die Diagraphe als Zahlungsanweisung des Staates gilt mit der Quitting als vollgültiger Erwerbstitel.'
3 Archiv, 11, 293 s.
4 On s'attend à une forme du moyen, ἀπομετρήσωμαι, puisque le mesurage n'est certainement pas effectué par Pétéarœris en personne.
5 La bonne interprétation, déjà entrevue par Collart et Jouguet (o.c. 37), ressort clairement de l'ensemble.
possédait 80 aoures de terre non inondée. Au cours des désordres elle s’est réfugière dans le Delta et n’est revenue sur les lieux que lorsque les mesures relatives aux terres abandonnées étaient devenues irrévocables. Pemsais était devenu, grâce à ces mesures, le propriétaire de 53 aoures du total primitif. Je m’aperçois maintenant qu’il s’est approprié par-dessus le marché les 27 aoures non vendues, qui reviennent de droit à ma femme et à moi, son héritier. Je vous prie donc de charger les autorités locales de présenter un rapport sur l’état des choses et de faire en sorte que je puissie faire tracer la limite exacte entre ce qui m’appartient et ce qui est à Pemsais.’

LEYDEN
UNE PAGE D'ORIGÈNE CHEZ PROCOPE DE GAZA

By O. GUÉRAUD

Parmi les papyrus patristiques trouvés à Toura en 1941 figurent les restes d'un Περὶ Πάσχα d'Origène: commentaire littéral sur Exode xiii, 1–11, suivi de considérations générales sur la symbolique pascale. Les trois quaternions qui portaient ce texte sont, dans l'ensemble, très mal conservés; il m'a fallu et il me faudra encore beaucoup de patience pour en donner une édition utilisable. Par bonheur, il subsistait de cet opuscule, dont l'existence même était à peine attestée, quelques lambeaux méconnus, perdus dans les catenae: maintenant identifiables, ils aident à leur tour à rétablir le texte mutilé du papyrus.

Un appoint particulièrement précieux m'a été fourni par Procope de Gaza, dans la partie de son Commentaire relative au passage en question de l'Exode.1 Disposant du texte grec grâce à des photographies du Ms.grec 558 de la Bibl. Nat. de Munich, j'y ai retrouvé, en nombre inespéré, des passages du Περὶ Πάσχα. Les coïncidences avec des parties conservées du papyrus sont suffisantes pour montrer que les emprunts de Procope à Origène varient, comme il est naturel, en étendue et en fidélité: on y rencontre citations littérales, abrégés, résumés, paraphrases, coupures, interpolations, interventions, voire dispersion des membres d'un même développement.

En définitive, Procope nous apporte un bon nombre de restitutions certaines. Ailleurs, il nous permet de déborder au delà des coupures brutales du papyrus et de compléter le début ou la fin d'un développement, sous une forme sans doute peu éloignée du texte original. Parfois, enfin, il nous fournit au moins le fil conducteur, l'enchaînement d'idées, qui relie deux fragments isolés du papyrus, et nous les rend intelligibles.

Dans les quelques pages dont je dispose ici, je voudrais proposer au jugement des spécialistes la restitution, de prime abord assez aventureuse, d'une page de Procope au Περὶ Πάσχα d'Origène. Le fragment ci-après du papyrus, sur lequel je fonde cette identification, forme le coin inférieur gauche — et l'unique vestige conservé — de la page 14 du 2e quaternion.2

1 Migne, PG 87, col. 561–73 (quelques lignes seulement du texte grec, le reste en traduction latine).
2 De tout ce quaternion il ne subsiste que des coins inférieurs de pages, sauf pour les p. 15 et 16, réduites l'une au début de ses l. 1–2: κε[ et τ[, l'autre à la fin de sa l. 1: ]ωνις. Les pages comptaient 35 à 37 lignes de 19 à 23 lettres.
O. GUÉRAUD

Ces restes misérables ne nous révèlent même pas le sujet traité. La p. 13, recto de 14, n’est guère plus brillante, mais quelques mots significatifs (στερρότητα, ὄδαροῖς, φλογί, ἐκαυσάων) montrent qu’elle était consacrée, comme déjà les pp. 10-12, au commentaire des versets 8 et 9, sur l’obligation de manger l’agneau pascal rôti au feu et non cru ou bouilli à l’eau. Des pp. 15 et 16, il ne reste pratiquement rien; la p. 1 du quaternion suivant nous plonge en plein commentaire du verset 10, oũ ἀπολέιτε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἔως προὶ etc.

Le texte commenté en ce bas de p. 14 est donc à chercher dans la limite des versets 8–10. Or 13 des lettres conservées, les groupes κατὰ[ et νοντος δῦ[ ], se retrouvent, convenablement placées, dans un passage de Procope ayant pour lemme la fin du verset 9, κεφαλὴν τοῦ τοῖς ποσὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐνδοσθίοις. Le commentaire sur ce lemme débute par quelques lignes prises aux Glaphyres de Cyrille d’Alexandrie: elles ne nous intéressent pas. Le reste est un emprunt à une autre source (changement souligné par ἄλλως) que je crois être le Περὶ Πάσχα ὧν ὀριγενὲς; en voici le texte (Migne, cols. 569–572).

Ἀλλως τε οἱ μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς μεταλαμβάνουσιν αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ χειρῶν, οἱ δὲ τοῦ στήθους, ἀλλοι καὶ τῶν ἐνδοσθίων αὐτοῦ, ἔτεροι καὶ τῶν μηρῶν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν ποδῶν ἐναράκτες οὐκ εἰσὶ πλεῖονες, ἐκατόν καὶ τὴν ἀδιά μεταλαμβάνοντος σὺν δόμαν ἄπτε ἀυτοῦ. Καὶ, εἰ δούλαι, τῶν τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκατόν μερῶν· οἱ οὖν ἦσαν, ὡς ἦν ξυνήθεις ἄπτα δύσωςτα τῶν λόγων ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ; τῶν δὲ ὀφθαλμῶν οἱ γεννᾶμεν τηλαγιῶς δοποίται, μὴ προσκοπτόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ποδῶν· τῶν δὲ χειρῶν οἱ ὄντες ἑργατικοί, μηκέτι τὰς χειρὰς ξυνήθεις ἄνεμεν ἄνεμον μὴ δὲ πρὸς τὸ διδόναι συνεκαταλέμασιν ἐρασόμενοι παίδειας πρὶν ὄρθοτημα ἐλέειν. Ἀλλοι δὲ τὸ πρὸς τὸ στήθος ἀναπεσόντες αὐτοῦ, διὰ ταύτης τῆς βρωσεως γενόσονται καὶ τίνες οἱ προδόται τῷ Χριστῷ. Ὁ οἱ δὲ τὰ ἐνδοσθία πρῶγοντες, φιλοσοφοῦντες οὕτοι δοποίται καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ· τὰ γὰρ ἐνδοσθία συνελήφθην ταῦτα ἐξει πεποιθηκέναι καὶ τὴν ὅλην ἐκείνην τῶν σάματος ἐργάζεται· τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ ἐν μυστηρίως μνοῦμεν. Ἡγομον τὸν ἀποκεφαλυμένον καὶ οὗν εἰς μέσον τῶν τῆς ἐνανθρώπησες λόγων, εἰ γε κεφαλὴν τήν θεότητα λάβωμεν. Ὑστοὶ δὲ μεταλαμβάνουσα τῶν μηρῶν ἀμόλυντοι τήν σάρκα φυλάττουσιν. ἀκολούθουντες ὅπου ἄν υπάργχῃ Χριστός· οἱ δὲ τῶν ποδῶν, μηκέτι ὄντες ὀνείριοι τῇ σπονδῇ, τρόχουνες εἰς τὸ βραδείον τῆς ἀνα κλήσας τῷ Χριστῷ. Εἰς τ’ ἄν καὶ κεφαλὴ, μὲν ἡ πίστις, πόδες δὲ τὸ ἔργα ἀν χωρὶς ἡ πίστις νεκρό ἐστοι. Καὶ τοιχίη μὲν ἡ βρωσις τῶν πᾶσα ἐσθιότων ἐστιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ αὐτό πάντες εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐσθιών τῶν ποδῶν πρῶγοντε· ἐπεὶ δὲ μάλιστα ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλὴ εἰπεῖν τοῖς ποσὶ· χρείαν ὁμοῖαν οὐκ ἔχου. Ἑμεῖς μὲν ἀχρόνια τὰ πρωγόμενα, ἐν δὲ σώμα Χριστοῖ. Αλλ’ ὅση δύναμιν τῶν μελῶν τὴν ἀρμονίαν τηρήσωμεν, μήπως ἐγκληθοῦμεν ὡς διαπόντες τὰ μέλη Χριστοῦ.


Ce texte nous invite à restituer, sur le papyrus, ἐκατόστου | κατὰ τῇν ἀδιά μεταλαμβάνον ἄπτε αὐτοῦ]. La rencontre d’une formule, complétant si parfaitement deux lignes mutilées, dans un passage de Procope dont le sujet tombe si bien à point en cet endroit du papyrus, ne peut guère être le fait du hasard.
Il va de soi, d’autre part, que Procope n’a pas emprunté à Origène ce génitif absolu, qui résume et conclut une phrase, sans lui emprunter, plus ou moins textuellement, le reste de cette phrase.

Son emprunt s’est-il borné là ? La coïncidence littérale ne se poursuit pas plus loin. Cependant, l’ensemble du passage chez Procope présente une cohésion, une unité, très fortes : la première phrase pose brièvement un schéma d’interprétation, que la suite reprend point par point et complète, avec l’appui de l’Écriture. Si donc la première phrase vient bien d’Origène, il y a une très forte présomption pour que la suite en vienne aussi ; et nous arrivons, à partir de 13 lettres inintelligibles, à réintégrer dans le Περὶ Πάσχα une page entière.

L’absence de concordance entre les dernières lignes de la p. 14 et Procope ne doit pas trop nous impressionner. La paragraphos conservée sur le papyrus confirme bien le passage, en ce point, à une phase différente du développement. Mais on imagine assez Origène procédant posément, par une transition méticuleuse et quelque peu redondante (noter καθὸ διώκει[θα] reprenant καθὰ τὴν . . . δύναμιν), trop lente pour le goût et les besoins de Procope. Chez celui-ci au contraire la transition est abrupte à l’excès et donne l’impression d’une coupure, cause peut-être d’un certain remaniement.

Diverses remarques viennent renforcer la vraisemblance des présomptions ci-dessus. Un relevé a été fait par L. Eisenhofer des sources identifiables de Procope. Pour le commentaire relatif à Exode xii, 1–11, les sources reconnues couvrent de loin la plus grande partie de son texte. Dans certains cas où la source était simplement ‘Origène’ (d’après quelque catena), nous pouvons maintenant préciser : Περὶ Πάσχα. Un assez long passage (Migne, col. 569, II. 41–49) qu’Eisenhofer croyait, sur la foi de la Catena Coptica, dispersa, n’avait rien à voir avec ce dernier et provient, lui aussi, du Περὶ Πάσχα. Plusieurs autres, jusqu’ici sans source identifiée, se retrouvent dans le même argument. Bref, il apparaît à présent que le Περὶ Πάσχα a été, après les Glaphyres de Cyrille, la principale source de Procope dans cette partie de son commentaire.

Or cet important morceau, dont la cohésion nous a frappés, et qui s’encadre chez Procope entre deux extraits des Glaphyres, est justement l’un (et même le plus long) de ceux auxquels Eisenhofer n’avait trouvé aucune source : ce fait seul nous inviterait à chercher du côté du Περὶ Πάσχα.

Précisément, l’inspiration, la présentation, le style du commentaire allégorique contenu dans ce passage me semblent s’accorder très bien avec la pensée et la manière d’Origène en général, et du Περὶ Πάσχα en particulier.

Le thème fondamental de ce commentaire se ramène à deux conceptions. Étant admis que l’agneau pascal désigne symboliquement le Christ, et les chairs de l’agneau les saintes Écritures, chacun de nous absorbera plus ou moins de ces ‘chairs’, et de parties différentes, selon que sa capacité de digestion spirituelle lui permet d’en assimiler. D’autre part, l’absorption de ces ‘chairs’ (c’est à dire notre union progressive avec le

---

l'Idéa que chacun célèbre la Pâque 'suivant ses forces' est déjà évoquée dans le même quaternion du Περί Πάσχα, à propos du choix comme victime pascale d’un agneau ou d’un chevreau, selon qu’on est plus ou moins parfait ou pécheur; c’est par une discrimination similaire, remarque Origène, que le Christ, multipliant les pains, les fait de blé pour les uns et d’orge pour les autres. Pareillement, dans notre passage, les uns choisiront la tête, les autres les pieds ou telle autre partie du corps de l’agneau.

La seconde idée trouve aussi son parallèle dans le Περί Πάσχα. Interprétant le délai de 5 jours qui impose l’Exode entre la sélection et l’immolation de l’agneau, Origène y voit une allusion à nos 5 sens: nous ne pouvons procéder à cette ‘immolation’ mystique avant que le Christ ait purifié, spiritualisé chacun de nos sens; et, les passant en revue, il caractérise par une formule de l’Écriture l’effet de cette purification sur chacun d’eux.

Ce passage rappelle singulièrement, par son inspiration fondamentale, celui qui nous intéresse. Ici aussi nous voyons défiler, non plus spécialement les cinq sens, mais les principales parties du corps, et des formules tirées des Écritures évoquent leur métamorphose par l’absorption des parties correspondantes du corps de l’agneau.

La découverte de formules scripturaires adéquates pour toutes ces parties constitue un tour de force qui, dans un cas, tient de la jonglerie. Qu’arrive-t-il, en termes de l’Écriture, à qui absorbe la ‘poitrine’ de l’agneau pascal? Un passage du 4e Évangile résout la difficulté: lors de la Cène, Jean, ayant laissé tomber sa tête sur la poitrine de Jésus (ἀναπεσών... ἔπι τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), lui demande qui le trahira; et Jésus lui dévoile le traître.1 Mais ἀναπεσών ἔπι τὸ στήθος peut signifier aussi, sans faire aucune violence au grec, ‘s’attabler pour manger la poitrine’; et voilà comment, dans notre passage de Procope, ἔπι τὸ στήθος ἀναπεσόντες αὐτοῦ διὰ ταύτης τῆς βρώσεως γνώσονται καὶ τίνες οἱ προδόται τοῦ Χριστοῦ. A ce degré de subtilité, nous dirions que l’exégèse tourne au calemboir; mais tel n’est pas le point de vue d’un homme pour qui aucun mot des Écritures n’est fortuit ni indifférent. Il verra au contraire, dans ce double sens possible, une coïncidence significative; d’autant plus que l’absorption de la ‘poitrine’ est toute mystique, symbolique, et qu’il s’agit, comme chez Jean, de la poitrine du Christ, véritable agneau pascal.

Cette confusion de réminiscences bibliques, si adroitement adaptées au sujet et fondées dans la phrase, cette ingéniosité qui culmine dans le passage relatif à la poitrine, tout cela me semble très digne de l’érudition, de la dextérité et de la hardiesse d’Origène.

La même hardiesse apparaît dans la liberté de notre auteur envers la lettre de l’Exode. Ayant admis que ‘tête, pieds et viscères’ veulent désigner les diverses parties de l’agneau, il y ajoute tranquillement, avec leur interprétation symbolique, celles que l’Exode ne mentionne pas. Cela aussi me paraît conforme à l’imperturbable logique d’Origène qui, une fois acceptées certaines présomptions, en développe jusqu’au bout les conséquences, au risque de déconcerter les esprits moins intrépides.2

---

1 Jean, xiii, 25-26; cf. 21, 20. Une partie de la tradition porte ἀναπεσών; mais le passage est plusieurs fois cité par Origène avec la leçon ἀναπέσων.

2 Cf. par ex. Homil. III in Genes., Lonnatsch vol. 8, pp. 158 sq., où Origène, après avoir mentionné
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Je suis frappé, enfin, par l’élan, le souffle, qui animent le passage dans son ensemble. Le morceau est bien enlevé, sans platitude; il s’élève peu à peu jusqu’à cette sobre éloquence, née de la préoccupation morale, pratique, du désir d’éclairer et de sauver, qui caractérise si souvent Origène et l’emporte au dessus de la froideur du commentaire exégétique.

Si l’on admet que cette page de Procope est tirée du Περὶ Πάσχα, il reste à se demander avec quelle fidélité relative elle en reproduit le texte. Le fait que nous n’y retrouvons pas les restes des dernières lignes de notre p. 14 nous rappellerait à la prudence, s’il en était besoin. Procope a sûrement coupé, abrégé. Inversement, certains heurts dans la logique du développement nous font soupçonner l’intrusion de corps étrangers. Nous en avons la certitude à propos de la phrase ἡμών τῶν ἀποκεκρυμμένων... λόγου, interprétation différente, insérée au passage pour la bonne mesure, et qui vient des Glaphyres de Cyrille. 1 J’élèmerais volontiers du même coup les quelques mots qui suivent, εἶ γε κεφαλὴν τὴν θεότητα λάβομεν, dont on voit mal la raison d’être; de même aussi, un peu plus loin, la phrase εἰν δ’ ἂν καὶ κεφαλὴ ... νεκρὰ ἐστιν, qui rompt le mouvement et introduit une idée étrangère.

Dans l’ensemble, le texte se déroule avec tant d’aisance et de naturel qu’on est tenté de croire relativement bénignes les altérations de Procope. 2 J’ai eu le sentiment, à propos d’autres de ses emprunts au Περὶ Πάσχα, que ses citations tendent à devenir plus littérales dans les passages où le style de l’original, par son caractère et son élévation, s’impose, se prête mal aux remaniements: tel a pu être ici le cas.

CAIRO


1 Emprunt non relevé par Eisenhofer; c’est la suite du passage de Cyrille qui précède, chez Procope, notre morceau origénien.

2 Signalons, sans nous exagérer sa valeur, une confirmation relative de cet optimisme. Si l’on admet que les lettres κ[ι], qui commençaient la p. 15 du papyrus (cf. p. 63, n. 2) appartiennent au passage qui se lit chez Procope τῶν τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκάστου μερίδων, et si l’on prélève à partir de là le contenu normal de cette p. 15 (en éliminant les interpolations signalées), on trouve que le passage καὶ ποικίλῃ μὲν ἣ βρῶσις de Procope tomberait dans le haut de la p. 16 du papyrus, où subsistent justement, comme fin de la l. 1, les lettres ἦως.
THE PRAEFFECTVS AEGYPTI AND HIS POWERS

By HUGH LAST

One who is in no sense a papyrologist, and who has not even specially concerned himself with the history of Graeco-Roman Egypt, might have been wise to decline the invitation to join in this tribute to Sir Harold Bell and to leave the few pages he would occupy to be better filled by another. But gratitude for the very great services which Sir Harold has rendered to the University of Oxford, and the recollection of the way in which we worked together at the time when those services began, made me more than usually reluctant to abstain. Twenty years ago, with Grenfell dead and Hunt in failing health, it began to be clear that, so far as documentary papyri were concerned, the magnificent traditions they had established might soon or late be lost to the University unless a younger man were sought to carry them on. When the man was found, Sir Harold gave the most generous help in training him to be a papyrologist, of a calibre which makes his threatened loss to the subject by no means the least of the heavy blows that have lately fallen on the Faculty of Literae Humaniores. Nor did Sir Harold’s services to the University cease until in 1949 the inexorable working of the age-limit compelled him to vacate the Honorary Readership in Papyrology which he had held since 1935, and so to end his notable part in the work of building round the library of Professor Hunt, which had been presented by his widow to The Queen’s College and by that College had been deposited in the Ashmolean Museum, the chief school of Greek papyrology in British lands. To one who has given his leisure so lavishly and with such effect to the University to which we both belong let me take this opportunity of expressing the gratitude which every Oxford man who cares for the study of the ancient world should feel.

The problem with which it is the purpose of this note very briefly to deal is one of some slight interest to historians of the Roman public law. In Annals, 12, 60, 3 (2), writing of the process by which official duties were given to various kinds of people who did not hold imperium,¹ Tacitus uses the words ‘nam diuus Augustus apud equestris qui Aegypto praesiderent lege agi decretaque eorum proinde haber iusserat ac si magistratus Romani constituiscent’—which in my opinion probably mean that Augustus by a constitutio (‘iusserat’) had given the equestrian prefects of Egypt power to hear legal cases and also to issue edicts with the same effectiveness as those of Roman magistrates. Whatever the precise extent of this grant to the praefecti Aegypti, that the means by which it was made was by constitutio finds confirmation when Modestinus (D 40, 2, 21) records that ‘apud praefectum Aegypti possum sermonem manumittere ex constitutione diuii Augusti’. Modestinus here refers to manumission by one of the forms with complete effect—manumissio uindicta—and implies that the addictio of the praefectus

¹ See M. I. Henderson in JRS 41 (1951), 83 f. with n. 82.
Aegypti was given by Augustus the same validity as that of a praetor or any other magistrate with imperium.

So far the story is plain—that Augustus by a constitutio authorized the prefects of Egypt to undertake legal business of a sort normally conducted only by magistrates or promagistrates and also, like them, to issue edicts (of which several are partially preserved in inscriptions and papyri). Unfortunately however a variant account is preserved in D 1, 17, 1, which is ascribed to Ulpian’s fifteenth book ad edictum and reads

Praefectus Aegypti non prius deponit praefecturam et imperium, quod ad similitudinem proconsulis leges sub Augusto ei datum est, quam Alexandriam ingressus sit successor eius, licet in provinciam uenerit: et ita mandatis eius continetur.

The modern treatment of this excerpt is interesting. O. Karlowsky treated it with characteristic caution, taking it merely to justify the statement that in the matter of competence the prefects of Egypt were on all fours with the proconsuls. Mommsen, however, moved by degrees to a more definite position. In the Staatsrecht he took a view not unlike that of Karlowsky, though he was ready to accept ‘lege’ as meaning ‘durch einen besonderen Volksschluss’ and quoted Tacitus, Ann. 12, 60, 3 (2) as if it were consistent with this view; and this account is more or less repeated in Staatsrecht (Leipzig, 1887) at 557 (= Dp, 6, 2 (Paris, 1889), 166) and 753, n. 1 (= Dp ibid. 393, n. 1). But twelve years later in the Strafrecht (Leipzig, 1899), 231, n. 1 he went so far as to say that

Augustus liess dem Präfekten von Aegypten durch Volksschluss (lege) das staathalterliche Imperium (imperium ad similitudinem proconsulis) beilegen (Dig. 1, 17, 1). Dasselbe wird für alle übrigen nicht senatorischen Statthalter geschehen sein. Im Titel aber führen sie alle das magistratische Imperium nicht.

In 1901 A. H. J. Greenidge, as often, put in a phrase what may turn out to be the essence of the truth on one aspect of the matter, when he wrote that the praefectus Aegypti ‘exercised the reality without the name of the imperium’, and in 1905 O. Hirschfeld showed commendable restraint in speaking of the prefect ‘dem nach Angabe eines späteren Juristen ein imperium ad similitudinem proconsulis und zwar durch einen Volksschluss übertragen worden ist’. This was the position until in 1912 U. Wilcken, in a passage destined to meet the eyes of many who were not students of Roman law, gave fresh currency to Mommsen’s latest view by writing

Der Präfekt, dem unter Augustus durch Volksbeschluss ein imperium ad similitudinem proconsulis übertragen war (Ulpian, Dig. 1, 17, 1), war nach dem alten römischen Grundsatz sowohl in der militärischen wie in der zivilen Verwaltung die Spitze. Beschränkt war sein Imperium dadurch, daß er gewisse letzte Entscheidungen dem Kaiser vorzubehalten hatte.

It is possible that this passage more than any other is responsible for the widespread
acceptance won for its doctrine since the time of its publication: its followers extend from Jean Lesquier in 1918 to H. G. Pflaum in 1950. Certainly there have been exceptions (of whom M. Wlassak cannot be claimed as one), but what to my knowledge is the latest pronouncement of all leaves no doubt that there is room for some further remarks. In 1952 there was published a posthumous work by H. Siber in which we read:

Der praefectus Aegypti ist der einzige ritterständische Statthalter mit einem ihm schon unter Augustus verliehenen Imperium (Ulp. D 1, 17), auch mit der Zuständigkeit zur in iure cesso (Mod. D 40, 2, 21).

(Whether mammisio undicta is to be regarded as a case of in iure cesso or not is an issue on which I need not comment here.)

To complete the story it is now necessary to add that in 1928 S. Solazzi published an article in which he argued that D 1, 17, 1 (Ulpian) is interpolated. Not all his points were equally effective. I do not myself think it impossible to regard ‘mandatis eius’ as meaning ‘mandatis praefecti’ in the sense of mandata received by him from the princeps, as indeed it was understood by C. H. Monro; nor should I accept the suggestion (for which the remarks of E. Wölflin cannot be prayed in effective aid) that ‘ad similitudinem’ in the language of Roman law is a post-classical, or even sixth-century, variant for ‘ad exemplum’. But it is not, so far as I am aware, in the manner of Ulpian to institute a comparison that is inapt. Admittedly, since two comparanda by the mere fact of their duality must be distinct, they cannot be identical and therefore in some degree must differ one from another. But if it is right to regard the subject of D 1, 17, 1 as the time at which a retiring prefect of Egypt laid down his powers, the comparison introduced by the qualification of his ‘imperium’ as one ‘quod ad similitudinem proconsulis lege sub Augusto ei datum est’ is, as Solazzi reasonably pointed out (art. cit. 299), singularly inappropriate. For, whereas according to Ulpian the prefect of Egypt ‘non prius deponit praefecturam . . . quam Alexandriam ingressus sit successor eius, licet in prouinciam uenerit’, we are told by Ulpian himself (Book II ad dictum in D 1, 16, 16) that ‘proconsul portam Romanæ ingressus deponit imperium’. Without holding that practice can never have changed during the lifetime of a Roman jurist or that no jurist can on different occasions have made two statements which, placed side by side and without their contexts, might have some appearance of inconsistency, one may still think it unlike the mind of Ulpian to drag in a comparison which does nothing to support the doctrine of the passage in which it appears. To me at least it appears reasonable to regard the authorship of the phrase ‘et imperium, quod ad similitudinem proconsulis lege sub Augusto ei datum est’ as at least doubtful.

1 L'Armée romaine d'Égypte (Cairo, 1918), 115.
3 ‘Zum römischen Provinzialprozeß’ in SAWW 190 (1919), 4-7.
4 Römisches Verfassungsrecht in geschichtlicher Entwicklung (Lahr, 1952), 336.
5 ‘Di una pretesa legge di Augusto relativa all’ Egitto’: Aegyptus, 9 (1928), 296 ff.
6 The Digest of Justinian, translated by C. H. M., 1 (Cambridge, 1904), 56.
7 Derived from W. Kalb, Das Juristenlatein (Nürnberg, 1888), 82; id., Roms Juristen (Leipzig, 1890), 145, n. 3.
8 ‘Instar, ad instar’: Archiv für lat. Lexicographie und Grammatik, 2 (1885), 581 ff. at 594.
I do not myself believe these words to be Ulpian's. But, if they were, it would still be necessary to inquire further. First, what did he mean by describing the 'imperium' of the prefect of Egypt as one 'quod ad similitudinem proconsulis ... ei datum est'? If we ask about the degree to which the likeness here expressed by 'ad similitudinem' approached identity, it will be in point to consider the excerpt from Ulpian's thirty-ninth book ad Sabinium preserved in D 26, 5, 1, pr. It runs

Siue proconsul siue praeses siue etiam praefectus Aegypti siue proconsulatum optineat prouinciae uel temporis causa praeaside defuncto uel quia ipsi prouincia regenda commissa est, tutorem dare poterit.

Siue proconsulatum optineat prouinciae] siue procurator qui praesidatum optineat prouinciae—Mommsen.

The meaning of this is pretty clearly that a tutor could be appointed by anyone in the position of a provincial governor: indeed the rule is expressed by Gaius (1, 185: cf. Inst. 1, 20, pr.) in the words 'tutor datur ... in prouincias ... a praesidibus prouinciarum (ex) lege Iulia et Titia', where 'praeses' is used to include all the four kinds of provincial governor enumerated by Ulpian. But Ulpian certainly cannot be said to identify the praefectus Aegypti with a proconsul: on the contrary he distinguishes them. And so I would submit that, even if all the relevant words ascribed to him were accepted, it would be impossible to represent him as having in this passage said or implied that any imperium possessed by the Prefect of Egypt was an imperium pro praetore (pro consule it cannot have been). Nor is it, so far as I am aware, ever so described in extant documents.

What then was the imperium which either Ulpian, or the interpolator of the passage containing this word, had in mind? The Prefect had immediate control of the military forces in Egypt. So far as these forces were concerned he was in a position similar to that of a legatus Augusti pro praetore, and that position might seem to require that he should have imperium of the sort 'sine quo res militaris administrari, teneri exercitus, bellum geri non potest' (Cicero, 5 Phil. 45). So much may be admitted. About the way in which imperium in such cases was acquired—by delegation from the princeps—it will perhaps be enough to refer to some remarks of mine in JRS 34 (1944), 123 f. There remain the kinds of authority, which came to be called 'imperium', needed for (i) the preservation of public order, which involved the administration of criminal justice, and (ii) the conduct of civil proceedings (other than such as demanded powers which had been conferred by special enactment on the delegant). For the first of these kinds of power Ulpian uses the expression 'imperium merum', and for the kind which enabled its holder to perform acts of the second class as well as of the first 'imperium mixtum' (D 2, 1, 3). These two were powers of the sort held by every provincial governor, and governors not of senatorial rank (whatever may be the truth about senatorial governors) seem to have received them by delegation from the princeps. The outcome of this, in

1 On the meaning of 'praeses' in administrative contexts see G. Barbieri, L'Albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (Rome, 1952), 562 ff.
2 D 1, 21, 1, pr. (Papinian): cf. 26, 1, 6, 2 (Ulpian).
3 Mommsen, Sr 2, 267 ff. (Dp 3, 30 ff.).
my opinion, is that the *praefectus Aegypti* did nothing which he could not do as a delegate of the *princeps*, and that Mommsen, who admitted that equestrian officers such as the Praetorian Prefects are never described as ‘pro praetore’ and that they are expressly distinguished by Pomponius from the ‘magistratus legitimi’ (*D i, 2, 2, 19*),¹ was probably misled by our controversial excerpt *D i, 17, 1* when he wrote of the *praefectus Aegypti* as he did in *Sr 3, 557* (*Dp 6, 2, 166*) and in *Strafrecht*, 231 n. 1.

If space allowed, it would fall next to examine what may be the only clue to the date of the possible interpolation in *D i, 17, 1*; but, as I want to leave room for one final remark about another point, the question of date must here be treated very briefly. It has been suggested above (p. 68) that the reference of Tacitus in *Ann. 12, 60, 3 (2)* is to a *constitutio*: in support of this it may be said that section 1 of the same chapter is enough to show that Tacitus knew a *senatus consultum* when he met one, and it may be added that ‘iusserat’ with ‘diuus Augustus’ as its subject is not a verb which he is likely to have used when describing some legislative act whose validation depended on the acceptance of Augustus’ proposal by some body such as the Senate or an Assembly. We are thus left to regard this measure as a *constitutio*—unless indeed it was a *lex data*, as A. von Premerstein argued,² but about the cogency of the evidence on this point which he adduced I must leave readers to form their own opinions. Nor, if Tacitus authorizes us to believe that the measure referred to as a ‘lex’ in *D i, 17, 1* was really an imperial *constitutio*, can I do more than recall that the use of ‘lex’ in this sense is commoner after the classical age of Roman jurisprudence has ended than before.

The final point which I should like to mention is the point which the interpolator (if indeed such a one was the author) may have had in mind when he wrote ‘et imperium quod ad similitudinem proconsulis lege sub Augusto ei datum est’ in *D i, 17, 1*. This *imperium*, like his *praefectura*, the *praefectus Aegypti* is thus said to have retained until his successor entered Alexandria. It has been observed already (p. 70) that in such a context, which deals with the *depositio* of the Prefect’s powers, any comparison of him with a proconsul is pointless, because a proconsul kept his *imperium* till he had returned to Rome.³ But there is another aspect of the matter in which some sort of similarity did exist between the Prefect and a proconsul. Though a proconsul retained his *imperium* until he re-entered Rome, it was a different question how long he had effectively to exercise it. The answer to this question is given by an excerpt from Ulpian’s tenth book *De officio proconsulis* preserved in *D i, 16, 10, pr.—*

Meminisse oportebit usque ad adventum successoris omnia debere proconsulem agere, cum sit unus proconsulatus et utilitas provinciae exigat esse aliquem per quem negotia sua provinciales explicant: ergo in adventum successoris deebit ius dicere. If this principle were in the mind of the man who wrote the dubious words in *D i, 17, 1*, the doctrine of the excerpt as it stands would be that the *praefectus Aegypti* did not lay down his prefecture or cease to use his powers of jurisdiction until his successor had entered not merely Egypt but also Alexandria itself. In that case it would be possible

¹ *Sr 2*, 934 f. (*Dp 5, 219 f.*).
³ *D i, 16, 16—Ulpian.*
to speak of the time at which a *praefectus* stopped employing his *imperium mixtum* in Ulpian’s sense of that phrase (above, p. 71) without implying that his authority over the legions under his command was exercised in any other capacity than as a delegate of the Augustus. And, despite *D 1, 17, 1*, the lack of evidence that the *praefectus* was *pro praetore*, or indeed in his own right held any general *imperium* at all, leaves me to believe that it was as such a delegate that he carried out his work. But, if the controversial words in *D 1, 17, 1* are interpolated, I must frankly confess my inability to give a wholly satisfactory reason for the interpolator’s decision that it was worth while to insert them.

OXFORD
LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION FOR THREE MONKS

By VICTOR MARTIN

Among the yet unpublished Greek papyri in the Geneva collection figures (as Inv. 28) a short Byzantine letter written in the straggling hand characteristic of the sixteenth-seventh century. It is in a perfect state of preservation and measures 31 by 12 cm.

The text is as follows:

†Παρακαλῶ τὴν ὑμετέραν μεγαλοπρεπὴν ποθεινότητα ἐπερχομένοις τοῖς γραμματηφόροις θεοφιλεστάτοις μοναζομένης ἐπὶ τὰ ἐνταῖθα τυπώσαι αὐτοῖς τρία ζώα: Σκιθίωτα γὰρ εἰς καὶ ὀρθόδοξοι(†).
†Δεσπό(τὴ) ἐμῷ π(αντῳ) μεγαλοπρεπ(εποτάτῳ) ποθεινοτάτῳ ἀδελφῷ(†) Ἰωάννη κόμε(τι) χαρτοῦλ(ἀρίῳ)

†Θεόδωρος ἀδελφὸς(†)

'I supplicate your magnificent desirableness, on the arrival of the bearers of this letter, being monks most beloved of God, on the spot to earmark for them three animals; for they are from Skithis and orthodox. (Addressed) To my master, of all the most magnificent and most desirable, brother John, count, secretary, Theodoros his brother.'

This letter belongs to the first batch of papyri acquired by Édouard Naville for the University library of Geneva, and Jules Nicole referred to it in a press article dated October 6, 1893, and devoted to a preliminary presentation of the lot in the following terms: 'Quelques documents intéressent l’histoire anecdotique de l’Église d’Orient. Ainsi un joli billet adressé par un évêque ou le supérieur d’un couvent à l’administration des postes pour lui recommander trois cénobites en tournée. Il est si court que je puis bien le traduire ici en substance: "Vous voudrez bien donner des chevaux à ces bons moines, car ils sont orthodoxes." On savait dans ce temps-là empêcher l’hérésie d’aller trop vite.'

After more than 60 years it seems high time to make this curious letter known in its original text, and no better occasion can be imagined than the publication of a volume dedicated to the accomplished scholar to whom we owe so much admirable work in the field of Byzantine papyrology. May he also accept this small contribution as a token of gratitude for an invaluable friendship of long standing.

A few remarks only will be added.

Of the sender and the recipient neither the identity nor the status can be fully ascertained. Nicole’s opinion on the point remains problematic. A chartularius or secretary can be civil as well as ecclesiastical, private as well as public, and the comes title, at the period concerned, had become a mere courtesy appellation devoid of all real

1 This witty but somewhat fanciful description shows that Nicole had deciphered, if only provisionally, our letter. No transcription from his hand has, however, been found among his papers.
LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION FOR THREE MONKS

The fact that both persons are styled 'brother' is not a proof of their being monks themselves. In the present case, however, the sender is certainly an ecclesiastical personality and the brotherhood which he shares with the recipient makes it thus probable that they are of the same condition. For there is no positive argument for Nicole's view that Johannes was an official of the *cursus publicus*. He might as well be a dignitary in a monastery. It is known that, at the time, the great landowners had their own private postal organization. Why not the great monasteries as well? They could thus favour each other in the manner alluded to here.

As for the meaning we have attributed here to the verb τυπώσατι, a parallel is furnished by P.Giss., 54, 14 (τυπώσων (sic) τὸν σιτῶν τὸν δημόσιον τῆς κτήσεως ημῶν). In both cases an object is reserved for a predetermined end either by a mark put on it or a note written about it in some ledger.

But the chief interest of our letter lies in the reasons put forth to back the grant of the favour asked for: the would-be beneficiaries are said to be Σκίθωται καὶ ὀρθόδοξοι. The first word means that they belong to the famous monastic settlement of the Wādi Natrun in the Libyan desert west of the Nile in Lower Egypt, the origin of which is connected with the abbot Macarius whose name is still attached to one of the four Coptic monasteries still existing there. The region bore in Roman times the name of Σκίθως as is attested by BGU 648, 7 of the second century A.D. The adjective Σκίθωτης was apparently hitherto unattested and our text is the first papyrus to allude to the locality in its monastic connexion.

The exact doctrinal meaning of the word ὀρθόδοξος in the present context, and the question whether there is a relation between this particular notion of orthodoxy and the residence at Skithis must be left for decision to scholars more at home in the theological and ecclesiastical conflicts of the time. We shall limit ourselves on this point to the remark that allusions to orthodoxy are not frequent in the papyri, the most notable one being that in SB 5174 and 5175, two deeds of sale dated respectively of A.D. 512 and 513, where the vendor describes himself as μοναζών ποτὲ μὲν Μελιτιανός, νῦν δὲ ὀρθόδοξος (sic). As our letter and those deeds must be nearly contemporary, the opposition of ὀρθόδοξος and Μελιτιανός there makes it possible, if not certain, to attribute the same meaning to the former adjective in our letter.

**Geneva**

1 Cf. Seeck in P-W, s.v. comites, 634 ff.
2 Cf. W., Ggs., 374.
4 For the various spellings of the word in the Latin and Greek tradition and the corresponding Coptic see the articles of H. Kees in P-W, s.v. Skiathis, 2 and Nitriai. The form with iota, now well attested by the papyri, ought to be preferred to that with η and adopted thence into French (Scété) and English (Scetis).
5 On the Meletian schism see H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, 38 ff., and especially on the deeds of sale just quoted and their bearing upon the duration of the sect, *ibid*. 42.
THE PRAISES OF ANTIOCH

By ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Sir Harold Bell has thrown much light on ancient Alexandria; on this occasion of happy gratitude it may be appropriate to offer a note on Antioch, for with all their differences the two cities had much in common. Both were new foundations; both were cities which were also the seats of royal courts and administrative machines; both were cultural centres; both were seats of Jewish life; both were focal points in the development of Christianity. Yet, while Alexandria is known in literature largely from the descriptions of outsiders, Antioch had one son, Libanius, who in his Antiochicus (Orat. XI) set down what the city and its history meant to him. We shall fix our attention on three statements which he here makes.¹

(1) [57 f.] Let a man consider our nobility of birth, and remark that the best elements in any place have come together here as though to some land chosen by the gods to hold men worthy of admiration. We alone have origins which have brought together what is admired in each race—the antiquity of the Argive, the Cretan respect for law (eunomia), a royal race from Cyprus, and the line of Heracles. As for those whom we received from Athens and all the other Greek breeds with which we have been blended, the tale will be told when we come to those times.

(2) [115, after the tale of the advent of the Cyprian deities² and of Isis, 111 ff.] Our city was an abode of the gods, so that we could, if we wished, vie even with Olympus. The life of the gods there is a tale of poets, whereas the situation in Antioch is clear to the eye.

(3) [164 ff., after a reference to the way in which the Athenians of old threw their land open to all who needed refuge and to the way in which strangers streamed in from all sides] There is no city of which we have not received a part. [Nearly half the population of each city is here, for luxury or business or the display of knowledge or escape from poverty or in contempt for their hometown as smaller or in preference for the climate of Antioch.] Indeed, if a man had the idea of travelling all over the earth with a concern not to see how the cities looked but to learn their individual ways, Antioch would fulfil his purpose and save him his journeying. If he sits in our market-place, he will sample every city; there will be so many people from each place with whom he can talk. As for those who have chosen this city in preference to their own, it is not held against them that they live away from home, but those who have stayed behind envy them and blame themselves for not having emigrated.

The glorification of a city was a regular form of composition, best known from Athenian Funeral Orations, and it acquired its conventions.³ The claim of eugeneia,

¹ Square brackets are used where the text is abbreviated. My sincere thanks are due to Professors Campbell Bonner, Sterling Dow, Glanville Downey, and Roger A. Pack for their helpful criticisms of a first draft.
² Cf. L. Lacroix, BCH, 73 (1949), 176.
made in the first quotation, was usual— one might say inevitable; 1 the reference in the second to civic temples was also normal and admitted of elaboration in various forms. 2 As for the third passage, the readiness of the Athenians to open their doors to refugees (mostly in mythical times) was a favourite theme; 3 Aristides (i, 184 Dind.) went so far as to speak of Athens as having received all men and given them a share in her land and laws and citizenship and to say (185), 'having sprung from the spot, they received men from everywhere who needed a city'. This means that Athens provided a refuge and a temporary home with full privileges to people and then helped them to find homes of their own elsewhere (178 ff., 184); that did not change her unity of autochthonous citizenry, and is mentioned as one of her public services, like her clearing the sea of pirates and her giving the lead in colonization. (People came to Antioch from choice and not from need, and they stayed there, the older elements contributing to the body politic of Antioch.)

Much was said about Athenian readiness to welcome strangers, and the presence or absence of this attribute was a familiar feature in descriptions of cities and peoples. 4 Again, when Libanius proceeds to speak of the uprightness of the men of Antioch in their dealings with the strangers within their gates, that is traditional. 5 Yet there is something individual about all three points as he makes them. A city's eugenia was usually claimed with reference to the singleness and not the diversity of its pedigree. 6 'Home of the gods' has parallels, 7 and a city could be said to contain temples of all the

---


2 Cf. Menander, 362 Sp.; Ps. Dion. Halic. Ars. i, 3 (II, i, 257, 13 ed. Usener–Radermacher); Dio Prus. xxxii, 41. [In Thuc. ii, 38, 1 sacrifices regularly through the year are mentioned simply as among the amenities of civic life.] Later (228) Liban. calls Antioch 'dear to the gods'. He does not, I think, ascribe piety to the Antiochenes: given his convictions and the strength of the city, that might have been hard for him even when writing an encomium.


4 Cf. Fr. Pflüger, Reisebilder d. Herakleides (S.B. Wien, 227, ii, 1951), 115; the Periclean statement known from Thuc. ii, 39 is parodied in Arist. At. 38. The Garrulous Man in Theophr. Char. 3, 3 will say that there are many strangers in town; i.e. it was a commonplace. Liban. xi, 268 returns to the advantages which Antioch offers to all races (ibid. 189; the classrooms are open to all).


6 Cf. Isocr. xii, 124 f.; Aristid. 1, 163 f. Dind.

7 Cf. Aesch. Eum. 918 on Athens as a citadel of the gods; Maxim. ap. Eus. HE ix, 7, 5 on Tyre as a temple and dwelling-place of the gods. Steph. Byz. s.v. Θεοδοτὸς mentions a Theopli in Egypt. (The application of the title Theopoli to Antioch belongs to the sixth century: Honigmann, PW, vii A, 257.)

Again, loco cui nomen Theopoli est in CIL xii, 1524 is explained by H. I. Marrou, Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique, 'Retractatio', 695, n. 14, as the equivalent of civitas Dei, chosen by Augustine's correspondent Dardanus as the name for his place of retirement in the Alps. W. W. Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 251 f. explains Μοδώοια ἡ τῶν δεῶν as meaning that the city was named after a nymph called 'Modoura, daughter of the gods'. Expositio totius mundi, 45 Lumbrozo (Geogr. gr. minim. 11, 510 § 34) says of Egypt etsim ibi deos habitasse aut et habitare scimus; cf. Asclep. 24 (Nock–Festugière, Hermès Trismégiste, 326, 17 f.; cf. 327, 6 sedes religionum quae fuit). Libanius uses a different thought, 237 (if the gods really come down upon earth, they could not find a better residence than Antioch).
gods (cf. p. 77, n. 2), just as in fact many cities had a sanctuary or altar dedicated to all the
gods jointly, but it is not usual to find in this context a reference to gods or cults from
outside the Greek area. Thirdly, the theme of a Hellenic city’s hospitality and fairness
to strangers has been noted; the fact of its being a focal point for the trade and inter-
course of men from a wider range, even from the world at large, was also used in
encomia; but further, the wise Solon was credited with having encouraged foreign craftsmen
to settle in Athens. But is there any Greek parallel for the multiplicity and variety of
resident aliens being treated as a feather in a city’s cap? Traditionally speaking, the
marked presence of such elements in a community could be a matter for criticism rather
than for eulogy; and tradition, as enshrined in classical literature, was for Libanius a
determining factor in thought.

Why then did he make these points, and make them with such emphasis? I venture to
think that in the first place he was adapting the conventional laudes Romae and was sug-
gestiging that Antioch could vie with Rome, and in the second place he was hinting that
Antioch could on one ground claim superiority to the ‘second Rome’, Constantinople.

That Rome had given a home to men of all origins was a commonplace; Polemo had
called her ‘an epitome of the inhabited world’. Libanius could not indeed claim that

1 Cf. Menander Rh. 385 f. Sp.; Aristid. xxvii, 6, 126 Keil (384 Dind.) on Cyzicus as a focal point; Aristid.
1, 182 Dind. on Athens as binding earth together by the Ionian colonization; Dio Prus. xxxii, 36 on Alexandria
as affording to all the equivalent of a city’s market-place, bringing together all manner of men, showing them
to one another, and coming as close as could be to making them of one race (37 shows that this would
be regarded as a compliment; cf. 40 on the nationalities Dio could see in the city. But his purpose was to make
the Alexandrians realize how bad an impression their behaviour in the theatre or the stadium made visitors
take home).

The Potter’s Oracle, in prophesying the destruction of a city which must be Alexandria, tells of a day when
‘those passing through will say, “This was a city which nourished all, a city in which was settled every race
of men!”’ (G. Manteuffel, De opusculis graecis . . . [Trav. soc. sc. et lettres de Varsovie, i, xii, 1930], 104; to be
complemented by P. Oxy. 2400); preceding splendour is contrasted with later devastation (cf. Isaiah xiii, 19 ff.).
So in Philo, In Flacc. 163 ‘a little while ago ruler of the megalopolis or rather polis, Alexandria’ serves to
emphasize the fallen state and former splendour of Flaccus. The B text of Expositio totius mundi, 46 Lumbrosa
(geogr. gr. min. ii, 519, § 34) says of Alexandria omnes gentes invenit et omnia philosophorum praeterea omnenque
docrinam, but this is an elaboration of the A text, in omnen gentem invenit philosophorum omnenque doctrinam
(the first omnen is bracketed by Th. Sinko, Arch. lat. Lex. xiii, 1904, 554). The same work says of Antioch
(32 Lumbrosa; geogr. gr. min. ii, 517, § 23) multitudinem populorum accipienti, omnis sustinet (in the B text,
multitudine populorum ornata, undique accipienti omnes sustinet): but (cf. Lumbrosa) populorum probably means
just ‘people’, and undique belongs to the inferior recension. It would accordingly be unsafe to infer that
Libanius is using a phrase currently applied to Antioch. Cf. ibid. 78 Lumbrosa (GGM i, 526, § 58) on Arles.
2 Professor Dow kindly refers me to Plat. Rep. 557c, 561e; cf. 422e (concerned with size), Arist. Pol. 1323a25,
1327a13. M. Clerc, Dar. Sagio. i, 1881. For the Alexandrians as ‘mixed’ cf. Polyb. xxiv, 14, 5 (G. Lumbroso,
Archio 5, 400 thinks that what is meant is a mixture of different Greek strains, but is there not a hostile
insinuation of something more?), Phil. In Flacc. 4 (with H. Box, ad loc., for Philonic connotations of such a
phrase), Leg. 120. Thuc. 1, 2, 6 states that the most influential exiles from the rest of Greece came to Athens
and so the population grew to a size which made the Ionian colonization necessary; this is a historical inference,
in contrast with such patriotic claims as Isocr. xii. 124, Hyperid. Epit. 7. Cf. in general A. Diller, Race Mixture
3 Cf. Gernertz (cited p. 76, n. 3). Even in relation to Rome this mixture of races was sometimes deplored;
4 In Galen xviii, i, 3477 and (without name) in Athen. 208; cf. W. Stegemann, PW, xxii, 1339 and W. L.
Knox, J. Theol. St. 47 (1946), 180 ff. (for Iren. Haer. iii, 3, 1, on which passage cf. also Chr. Mohrmann,
Vigil. Chr. iii, 1949, 57 ff.). Amm. Marc. xiv, 6, 21 contrasts the attitude of contemporary Romans to
cultivated strangers with that of an earlier day.
THE PRAISES OF ANTIOCH

Antioch had admitted the world to her civic body, as Rome had (a point which he mentions, xxx, 5); but he does say (167 f.) that Antioch welcomes the excellences of newcomers just as she does those of her own children and that 'even as they (the Athenians) gave to the men from Pylos (descendants of Neleus) a share in their offices and used them in the highest posts, so we have honoured strangers in the most emphatic way and have derived profit from them, so that even now their houses have the highest standing'. And Antioch, he says, is perfectly fair in its treatment of them; she did not in times of famine expel strangers as Rome repeatedly did.2

Various writers had spoken of Rome as a 'home of the gods' and as welcoming the gods of all nations, and the pagan speaker in Minucius Felix (Oct. 6) claimed that her universal domination was the reward of this (which is a variation on the older idea that Rome's rise was the reward for her piety). Libanius does not speak of the gods of all nations; but he does emphasize that the Cyprian deities and Isis came of their own accord, which was something special.3 Moreover, he has three interesting stories about the behaviour of foreign powers towards Antiochen shrines. At his wife's request Cambyses restored the roof of a temple built by Semiramis to Artemis in Meroe, a village near the site of the later Antioch, and he heightened and he endowed the temple; he also set up an image of the Persian sungod—and all this in spite of his reputation for savagery; so well did the ancestors of Antioch stand with the gods. Ptolemy II carried off the image of Artemis, but, being warned by his wife's illness and dreams, restored it. The Romans wanted to carry off Zeus Kas(s)ios but were stopped by thunderbolts.4 These stories are not unique; it might be tempting to think of a possible contrast with the sack of the Capitol by the Gauls, but, since there is no evidence that Libanius knew of that, this cannot be pressed. On the other hand, he does say (239) that Daphne has so many Roman visitors that Italy can no longer boast of being unsurpassed in such things. What of the suggestion of an implied slur on Constantinople? I venture it, because of the fact that Constantine had gone to conspicuous lengths in offering inducements

1 Cf. above, p. 77, n. 5.

2 On such expulsion later cf. J. R. Palanque, Rev. ét. anc. 33 (1931), 346 ff., and on peregrini at this time, Kübler, *PW*, xiv, 655. Themist. xviii, 222A speaks of such expulsions as continually recurring, and Ambrose, *Off*. iii, 46 (PL xvi, 159), as normally proposed; so we need not suppose that Libanius had made an addition to his original text.


4 XI, 59 ff. (cf. v, 42), 109, 116. In lx, 2 he tells how Shapur I meant to burn the temple of Daphne but was turned from his purpose by Apollo and made an act of reverence; to this story I hope to return elsewhere.
to people to settle in his new foundation. Very good; people come to Antioch because they want to, and even their fellow townsmen do not blame them but envy them.

Later in his speech Libanius shows that he had both Rome and Constantinople in mind; he says (270), ‘As for the city which surpasses Antioch in house-walls, Antioch is superior to it in its abundance of water, in the mildness of its winter, in the urbanity of its inhabitants, and in training in wisdom; to the city which is even larger it is superior in the highest excellence, Greek culture and eloquence.’ The first rival is Constantinople, the second is Rome. (It may be remarked that in the bulky writings of Libanius what was to the ancients as to us Antioch’s natural rival, Alexandria, is very seldom mentioned.)

1 Cf. Themist. iii, 488; Anon. Vales. 30 (conveniently accessible in J. C. Rolfe’s Loeb Amm. Marcell. iii, 526) quaestis et unidue civibus, with D. J. Westerhuis ad loc.; A. Alfeld, Constantin, 112 (omitting Scr. orig. Const. ii, 146 as legend); W. Telfer, Harv. Theol. Rev. 43 (1950), 45 f. Liban. i, 30 spoke of many men outstanding in culture as moving to Constantinople, but that is apropos of his own visit in 340.

2 What is involved is not mistrust or hatred of foreigners by those amongst whom they have settled (e.g. Eurip. Fr. 360, 11 ff.) but the idea that residence abroad was in itself open to criticism. For this cf. 271 (pardonable for the charms of Antioch to make a man forget his home town); Lys. xxxi, 6 (written to be sure, with reference to the special situation of Athens in 403); Aristaeus 249 (it brings contempt on the poor and shame on the rich as suggesting that they had been banished for vice; cf. 257 on how to behave if you are abroad); Philodem. Rhet. ii, 145 f. Sudhaus (with H. M. Hubbell, Trans. Connecticut Acad. 23 (Sept. 1920), 308), a defence of philosophers for choosing to live in large cities; Philo, V. Mos. ii, 232 (settlers abroad not to be penalized as though they were wrongdoers, especially if a nation outgrows its bounds: cf. Virt. 219 on the nobility of proselytes), Spec. leg. 1, 68 (deep piety needed to induce a man to go abroad in order to sacrifice); Plut. De exilio, 8, 662b (not honourable or just to leave one’s city and dwell in another—except under necessity. Yet note ibid. 14, 659b, the most noted and best men live abroad of their own choice, shunning the distractions entailed by living at home; this comes after a reference to great philosophers of the past and presumably refers to contemporary philosophers); Lucian, Patr. enc. 8, ‘Thus to sojourn is a reproach’; Liban. Ep. 385 advises a friend to stay in Egypt if he is satisfied that this is required for his pursuit of philosophy. Temporary residence abroad for study was normal; but in Chion, Ep. 11, 62, ed. Düring (Göttingen Högskolas Årskrift, 57 (1951), 5) a father is represented as urging his son to come home, since to stay abroad more than five years would constitute εξεβεία as contrasted with δοξοθύμα. Liban. Ep. 756 speaks of a man as ‘wishing to become a doctor rather than to live in luxury at home’, but adds that, though every city between Antioch and Alexandria wished to secure him, he preferred his Ancyra.

W. W. Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 40 has noted that nearly all men of letters born in the Seleucid kingdom migrated; this was probably at all times not uncommon with professional men (cf. Liban. xi, 188). In general, a Greek settled abroad only from economic necessity (Hes. Op. 637 f.) or because he was exiled or a fugitive (cf. F. Cumont, L’Égypte des astrologues, 193; add Vett. Val. 63, 29 Kroll). Artemidorus speaks repeatedly of living abroad and (twice) of building a house abroad; the associations are mostly sinister (I. 36; III, 15, 26; IV, 53; V, 69: IV, 34; V, 27). It may be noted that the section of Stobaeus called II ἡ χειρ (III, 40) is really entirely concerned with exile. Is there a Greek parallel to Propert. iii, 22, 1?

It is therefore the more remarkable to read what Strabo, 673 f. says of Tarsus. Though well equipped with educational institutions, it hardly draws foreign visitors, and the Tarsians not only go abroad to complete their education but commonly remain abroad. (Cf. Liban. xi, 186 for students staying on at Antioch.)

It may be presumed that these settlers in Antioch were men with no obligations (such as those of curiales) in their own homes and that they did not lay themselves open to any such measures as C. Theod. xiii, 3, 7; xvi, 5, 12.

3 τοῖχος, i.e. walls of houses and buildings (cf. 222); it is not τεῖχος.

4 For parallels cf. Reiske and Foerster, ad loc., and Foerster, Arch. Jahrb. 12 (1897), 144. For Constantinople as the second city cf. also Liban. xxx, 5; in Ep. 114 he allows that Constantinople excels all other cities in gifts from the sea. For the climate of Antioch cf. Herodian, vi, 6, 4.

5 In xlii, 16 he speaks of Alexandria as surpassing other cities specially in superhuman sciences which make men happy (i.e. philosophy), but that is said ad invidiam, in a passage intended to bring out the badness of Optatus as governor, which resulted in the sages leaving the city. In xxx, 35 he speaks of the continuance of sacrifice in ‘the city of Sarapis’ (cf. 44 on the temple and Harv. Theol. Rev. 45 (1952), 213 n. 98): he refers
Libanius had held a chair at Constantinople and had been treated with much consideration by Imperial authority. But he could have said with Wilamowitz, ‘Mit Orden lasse ich mich nicht an den Wagen dieses Systems annageln’. Though he refers (xi, 129) to God as girdling all things with what might be called the golden chain of the Romans, he shows but little of the feeling for Rome’s achievement which we see in Aristides and in Claudian. (Claudian, in becoming a most accomplished Latin poet, was the complete antithesis.) Libanius remained a Greek at heart and called his hero Julian ‘a Greek in a sense’ (‘Greek’ is an epithet which the emperor had used of himself at Antioch). 1 In this instance the reference is to kindly humanity; elsewhere (xi, 184) Libanius can say ‘if indeed a man is to be called Greek by reason of literary culture rather than of race’. 2 There was no keener devotee of religio grammatici, in one sense which may be given to that phrase. But Libanius had also at this time a deep religio loci; he did not shrink from grouping himself with the (often despised) Syrians, in contrast with the Romans. 3 He gives us one more reminder that we must not underestimate the strength of regional and local feeling in any period in the Empire. 4 Later he was to take a less favourable view of Antioch, as indeed of life in general, 5 and we should hardly suppose that even in the Antiochicus he meant literally all that he said. An encomium is an encomium and has its conventions and its exaggerations. Yet the points in which this encomium differs from the ordinary type remain significant.

Finally, it should be observed that Libanius was in his teens when Constantinople (Ep. 205) in 360 with sympathy to the Alexandrians who had suffered in the recent troubles; Ep. 100, 2 ‘raise up for us the city of Alexander which is speaking to destruction’ probably relates to the same situation (H. Silomon, De Libanii epistolarum libris I–VI, Diss. Gött. 1909, 39). Apropos of the sparing of Antioch by Theodosius he speaks of a massacre of Alexandrians (xx, 39 ff.) and describes their theatre as ‘a place for war with their rulers’ (xix, 14); elsewhere he mentions that threats had been effective with their populace, which was ‘quick to anger’ (xxvi, 18). Otherwise I have noted (from Richsteig’s invaluable index) only xlix, 12 (the problem of the curiales in Alexandria as everywhere else), Ep. 632 (they would appreciate Gerontius as governor), 1352 (they are happy under Hierax), 756 (cited p. 80, n. 2). Of Egypt he speaks with respect: cf. Ep. 592, ‘holy Egypt’, and 632 on the enviability of seeing the Nile and Egypt (cf. 385, 1). Progymn. xxvii, 1 (viii, 533, ed. Foerster) speaks of Alexander as founding a city such as no one else did; but this is regarded as a spurious work. We may contrast the generous words of another Antiochene, Ammianus Marcellinus (xxii, 16, 7 ff.) and feel that Libanius shows a ‘beredtes Schweigen’ as far as Alexandria is concerned. (So also he likes to refer to Constantine with a circumlocution: xx, 24; xlii, 22; xlvi, 3; xlii, 2.)

1 xiv, 25 (for this sense of ‘Greek’ cf. xiv, 12; xix, 13); Julian, Mîtis. 367c. For Julian’s love of the Greeks on the basis of piety and culture cf. xiv, 27.

2 Isocr. iv, 50, here echoed, is in itself a glorification of Athens and the art of speech as there cultivated; Isocrates had no generous ideas about non-Greeks (cf. G. Mathieu, Idées politiques d’Isocrate, 42 ff.). Cf. Lib. xvi, 47 on the pride which the Antiochenes took in their cultivation.

3 Ep. 301, 13; cf. lxiv, 9 and Galen xviii, i, 347 κατὰ μὲν ἡγεῖ εἰς τὴν ἣμετέραν Ἀσίαν.

4 Cf. Ep. 6, 6, on a man who would rather be senator of Corinth than of Rome; H. Bengtsen, Welt als Geschichte, 10 (1950), 86 ff.; M. Hammond, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 60 (1951), 147 ff.; Nock, Gnomon, 21 (1949), 228. So, even as late as the third century of our era, Sagalassus proudly called itself the friend and ally of Rome (A. H. M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 142; cf. B.M.C. Lycia, etc. 251 for a coin showing clasped hands with the legend ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΣΑΓΑΛΑΣΣΩΝ and the late Homonoia coins discussed by Zwicker, PW, viii, 2268).

5 Cf. R. A. Pack, Studies in Libanius, 2, 11. Later Libanius, xvi, 16 (in 363) speaks of the inhabited area of Antioch as large enough for citizens, metics, foreigners, the king and his camp and of the climate and (79) of the city as containing the race of Inachus (cf. xi, 44 ff.) and a portion of Athenians; in xix, 53 (in 387) he tells again of the climate of Antioch and its many immigrants coming from all sides, kindly received and given no cause to regret their decision. He had not forgotten these motives.
was building and that he had every reason to know the *laudes Romae*. They had found eloquent expression in Aristides, and Libanius felt for him the greatest admiration; his expression of devotion (lxiv, 4), 'clinging to the footprints of Aristides', is borne out by the facts. The tentative suggestion here offered is therefore possible if no more.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

1 Cf. xxx, 5 (with the alliance of the gods, the Romans conquered their opponents and gave them a better life than they had had before, freeing them of fears and admitting them to citizenship). What is said of Rome in *Epp.* 1379, 1493, is said in compliment to Rufinus. *Ep.* 435, 1 (for text cf. P. Maas *ap. H. Fuchs, Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom*, 27) describes the attitude imputed by Libanius to his friend, not his own; 1063 'I envy you having Rome and Rome having you; you have that which has no peer in the world' is apropos of the reception of the historical work of Ammianus Marcellinus.

SUR L'ÉCRITURE DES OSTRACA THÉBAINS D'ÉPOQUE ROMAINE

By CLAIRE PRÉAUX

DANS un article qu'il offrit récemment à David Moore Robinson, Sir Harold Bell a rassemblé, au sujet des abréviations qu'on trouve dans les papyrus, le fruit de sa longue et féconde expérience de paléographe.¹

Généreusement, il entend que cette étude, qui analyse et classe un copieux dossier de faits, trace aussi un programme de recherches. « La principale utilité de cet article — dit-il — est de suggérer le sens de recherches que d'autres pourraient avoir l'occasion de poursuivre. »

Cette suggestion, je voudrais qu'il y trouve tout de suite une réponse, si modeste et si limitée soit-elle, dans le volume que lui offrent ses amis et ses disciples. Qu'il veuille y voir la preuve de l'intérêt que suscitent ses observations et la promesse de l'influence qu'elles auront sur l'édition des ostraca de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne.

Ayant rappelé qu'il y a trois méthodes d'abrégation — par suspension, par contraction, par symbole — Sir Harold recherche à quelle époque et dans quels milieux furent plus spécialement utilisées chacune d'elles. Au sujet de la contraction — où l'on voit une des origines possibles de la graphie des nomina sacra — il résume ainsi son expérience : « la contraction était très rare à l'époque ptolémaïque et à l'époque romaine; en réalité, je doute qu'on en puisse trouver un exemple authentique jusque bien avant dans l'ère chrétienne, et les lectures qui l'impliquent devraient être contrôlées. »

Or, dans les éditions d'ostraca, on relève par centaines les mots truffés de parenthèses, qui indiquent les abréviations par contraction, même si l'on ne considère que les ostraca thébains d'époque romaine qui sont presque tous antérieurs à 250 de notre ère.

La constatation de Sir Harold résistera-t-elle à l'épreuve des ostraca ? Je dirai tout de suite que oui. Et c'est pour justifier cette affirmation que j'ai voulu lui offrir les quelques notes qu'on va lire. Elles se fondent sur les ostraca de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne d'Oxford, dont je dois à sa suggestion, accueillie par l'Egypt Exploration Society, le privilège de poursuivre l'édition que commença M. J. G. Tait.

Lorsqu'il dresse un reçu de taxe, dans sa hâte et vu l'espace restreint dont il dispose, le scribe n'insiste que sur les éléments les plus expressifs. Le choix de ces éléments dépend de la connaissance préalable du contexte qu'il suppose chez le lecteur et de l'allure plus ou moins caractéristique des lettres.

Ainsi, dans un reçu dont le lecteur est censé connaître le schéma, la compréhension est assurée suffisamment par le début des mots: le scribe s'arrête à l'élément qui doit faire distinguer chaque mot de ceux qui ont même début, ou, plus patient, il poursuit jusqu'à une lettre résistante, dont la forme ne se laisse pas dissoudre dans la cursive:

¹ Abbreviations in documentary Papyri, Studies presented to David Moore Robinson, II, pp. 424–33.
\(\chi\), \(\lambda\), \(\delta\) (lettres à obliques exigeant le retour de la main en arrière), \(\omicron\), \(\omega\) et, moins souvent, \(\pi\) et \(\tau\). Par exemple, il lui faut écrire les noms propres jusque \(\Pi\eta\chi\omega\) et jusque \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\sigma\pi\) pour que le lecteur distingue \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega(\omicron)\) ou \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega(\nu\omicron)\) de \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega(\omicron\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\tau\gamma\tau\omicron)\).

Dans ce dernier nom, le scribe pourrait s'arrêter à \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega\) ou à \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega\). S'il ne le fait pas, c'est que sans doute les lettres \(\epsilon\) et \(\omicron\), trop offertes aux ligatures et discernables précisément par ces ligatures qui les caractérisent, n'ont pour ainsi dire plus de forme en soi. Voilà par quel procédé usant d'un minimum de signes, le scribe donne à son lecteur le moyen de choisir sans hésiter et correctement dans le répertoire des noms propres thébains. Sans hésiter, parce qu'il a mis en vedette des lettres caractéristiques; correctement, parce que le nombre des noms propres thébains est restreint.

Mais, pour atteindre l'élément caractéristique qui permet d'identifier un nom d'homme commençant par \(\Pi\alpha\) ou \(\Pi\eta\epsilon\omega\) ou \(\Psi\epsilon\omega\), il faut toujours dépasser ce début banal. Voyons comment celui-ci est traité, par exemple, dans le cas de \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega\). Ce qui alerte le lecteur, c'est le \(\Pi\), car, à l'endroit du texte où il est parvenu, s'il connaît la diplomatique du reçu, il cherche une des lettres initiales de la plupart des noms propres qu'on porte dans la région. Le scribe insiste toujours sur cette initiale. Il n'est pas utile qu'ensuite le lecteur distingue une à une les lettres \(\epsilon\tau\epsilon\). Il suffit que la sommaire ondulation qui en tient lieu soit un peu plus articulée et plus longue que ne le serait le \(\alpha\) de \(\Pi\alpha\chi\nu\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\), par exemple, pour que le \(\chi\) qu'il aperçoit lui permette d'identifier \(\Pi\eta\chi\epsilon\delta\omega\). Ce résidu de \(\epsilon\tau\epsilon\) ne peut toutefois se réduire à rien, car, s'il y avait là une abréviation par contraction, le \(\chi\) serait susceptible de plusieurs interprétations. Il cesserait d'être un repère sûr. La signification dépend donc à la fois du contexte et de la connaissance qu'a le lecteur d'une série de possibilités limitée. Un reçu théban n'est donc pas écrit pour être déchiffré lettre par lettre: il suppose un destinataire qui pratique une lecture globale, c'est à dire un destinataire averti. Dans sa double intention de rapidité et de clarté, le scribe joue de tous les éléments expressifs: la place des mots aussi bien que les lettres qui les composent. Si un mot est suffisamment identifiable par sa place dans un contexte formulaire, il sera résorbé à l'extrême; s'il comporte une lettre très caractéristique, elle seule émergera de la sommaire indication du reste. L'écriture ne peut s'étudier sans le texte.

Au contraire, lorsqu'un ostracon porte un fragment d'œuvre littéraire, une lettre privée ou une liste de noms, le lecteur doit surmonter l'inattendu à chaque mot. Aussi, le scribe communique-t-il avec lui par des conventions universelles, qui sont nécessairement abstraites. En effet, dans ces textes-là, il faut que la signification de chaque lettre soit unique et immuable; qu'elle ne varie pas selon le contexte. Et c'est cela qui est abstraction. Tandis que dans un reçu théban, tel \(\chi\) sera le signe-clé de \(\Pi\alpha\chi(\omega\nu)\) ou de \(\Pi\alpha\chi(\nu\delta\omicron\mu\omicron)\), selon la place où il se trouve dans le développement d'une formule. L'écriture des reçus est commandée ainsi par une secrète connivence entre le scribe et le lecteur. Pareille entente unit, de nos jours, le médecin au pharmacien, lecteur inconnu mais averti, à qui il adresse ses ordonnances. Aussi y a-t-il de frappantes coïncidences, dans la nature des simplifications et dans le choix des éléments caractéristiques, entre les grimoires réputés hermétiques des ordonnances médicales et l'écriture réputée difficile des ostraca. Ces écritures paraissent indéchiffrables à un
lecteur quelconque; elles sont conçues pour un lecteur « qui est dans le jeu ». Et aussi bien, qui, dans l’Antiquité, aurait lu un ostracon, s’il n’était « du métier »? Nous pouvons en être sûrs: ce n’était guère le contribuable, le plus souvent pauvre paysan illettré, ignorant même la langue grecque. L’écriture nous confirme, par son caractère, que, même s’il arrive que le contribuable le détiennne, le reçu est fait pour l’administration.

Cette qualité du lecteur, que nous avons ainsi dégagée d’une première série d’indices, l’analyse des simplifications d’écriture qui affectent chacune des étapes du reçu va nous la rendre plus évidente encore.

La plupart des formules d’époque romaine — à l’opposé de celles de l’époque ptolémaïque et de l’époque byzantine — mentionnent dans la date le nom du souverain, avec un train plus ou moins long d’épithètes. Comme ces mots n’ont pas d’intérêt, ils sont généralement écrits extrêmement vite. Par respect pour la majesté impériale, on a visiblement évité l’abréviation par suspension. Je ne crois pas qu’il y ait non plus de contraction, même s’il arrive qu’au cœur des mots certaines lettres ne nous soient pas perceptibles. Ici cependant, la contraction n’embarrasserait pas le lecteur. Mais elle exigerait du scribe un instant de réflexion, le minuscule arrêt que requiert le passage dans un autre mode de l’expression. L’abréviation par contraction — comme l’abréviation par monogramme, fréquente dans les ostraca ptolémaïques — suppose une écriture sinon lente, du moins plus posée. Si paradoxal que cela paraisse, je crois qu’il est plus rapide d’esquisser les lettres non caractéristiques d’un mot que de ménager, dans sa pensée et dans l’élan de sa main, l’hiatus d’une abréviation par contraction.

Ce que le lecteur doit pouvoir repérer, c’est assurément le commencement et la fin des mots, pour savoir où il en est de sa progression dans la formule. Et le scribe fait droit à ce besoin. Le nom des empeurs est presque toujours aisément identifiable par le début. Dès lors, entre Ἀντ. et ν de Ἀντωνίον, par exemple — seuls éléments utiles et partant clairement tracés — on trouve tous les degrés de simplification des lettres, à l’exclusion cependant de la suppression. Il y a toujours un résidu, au moins une infime ondulation du trait qui joint τ à υ.

La simplification est particulièrement désinvolte à l’égard des lettres redoublées, et c’est ainsi que le milieu du nom Κωμόδιον est souvent si maltraité que maints éditeurs d’ostraca le transcrivent Κωμ(μόδιο)ν ou Κωμ(μόδιο)ν, ce qui ferait supposer un système de contraction. Sir Harold Bell signale précisément le cas de Κωμ(μόδιο)ν dans Wilcken, Gr. Ostr. 947, et il invite à se méfier d’une transcription qui suggère le procédé de la contraction. Je suis sûre qu’il a raison. Dans les ostraca de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne, tous les cas de ce genre que M. Tait, puis moi-même, avions pris d’abord pour des contractions, je les ai revus de près, lorsqu’il me semblait avoir saisi l’intention des scribes: j’ai toujours trouvé une trace — ne fût-ce que la longueur d’un trait — qui permettait de caractériser le procédé comme simplification plutôt que comme contraction. Aussi verra-t-on que j’ai pointé maintes lettres que mes prédécesseurs auraient mises entre parenthèses.

C’est aussi en vue d’une lecture globale que sont tracés les mots Κάσιαρος et κυρίου, les éléments caractéristiques (αι de Κάσιαρος et le υ final de κυρίου) étant moins simplifiés que les autres et guidant le lecteur.
Le même sens instinctif des points d'appui que cherche le lecteur pousse le scribe à bien dégager le signe de l'année. L'année est une des variables des reçus, tout comme les noms propres et les nombres. Aussi est-elle un des éléments les plus solides dans la rapidité fluide de l'écriture. Sauf rarissimes exceptions, qui appelleront peut-être une révision de lecture, le chiffre de l'année n'est jamais surmonté d'une barre: il se distingue nettement ainsi du quatrième du mois, qui l'est toujours.

Il y a quelques mots où les éditeurs d'ostraca voient souvent des abréviations par contraction. Pour ne relever ici que ceux qui apparaissent dans les reçus de blé thébains d'époque romaine, je signalerais γ(εν)η(ματος), dans la formule μεμέτρηται εἰς θησαυρόν γενήματος x ετος; parmi les noms de mois, E(πειρ)φ; et, dans la signature, σ(εο)η(μείωμα). Encouragée par l'article de Sir Harold Bell, j'ai revu les photographies de tous les reçus de blé de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne et j'ai passé au crible mes transcriptions. Je n'en trouve qu'un petit nombre où il faille maintenir les parenthèses. J'ai rangé les tracés de γενήματος, de Ενείφι et de σεσημείωμα: en ordre de simplification croissante et, dans des graphies qui, considérées isolément, n'offraient aucune trace perceptible des lettres εο-, τει- ou -εα-, j'ai presque toujours découvert, en les comparant aux graphies un peu moins simplifiées, que la main s'était attardée un instant, que le scribe avait bronché, c'est-à-dire, qu'il n'était pas entré dans le système de la contraction, mais qu'il avait atteint l'extrême limite de la simplification. Il faut admettre aussi qu'un mouvement de la main de très faible amplitude, confiné à un calame assez gros, se noie dans l'encre et qu'on n'en est averti qu'à la longueur ou à l'épaisseur d'un trait à l'intérieur duquel se cache l'intention esquissée.

La simplification de l'écriture de Ενείφι illustre bien ce principe de la résorption des éléments non significatifs au profit des éléments caractéristiques, que notre analyse a essayé de dégager. Le φ est une lettre très caractéristique et rebelle aux ligatures. Il suffira donc du ε initial et du φ (d'où la qualité de lettre finale est indiquée par le chiffre du jour, qui la suit) pour offrir au lecteur toute facilité d'identifier Ενείφι. En conséquence, le scribe ne fait qu'esquisser τει-, lettres floues, qui se dissolvent dans leurs ligatures. L'esquisse, si sommaire soit-elle, a cependant sa fonction: elle indique que ε et φ font partie du même mot; elle les réunit.

Dans σεσημείωμα, la résorption de εο- est parfois totale et la graphie η appears plutôt comme un symbole que comme une contraction. Il s'agit ici d'une signature et la nature de la communication du scribe avec le lecteur exige ici, moins encore que dans le corps du reçu, la lecture lettre par lettre: le nom de celui qui signe est si simplifié qu'il échappe très souvent au lecteur moderne. Nous sommes ici dans le domaine des marques de contrôle, non plus de l'écriture. Et nous nous trouvons ainsi plus loin encore, s'il se peut, que dans le corps du reçu, de la notion de contraction, qui suppose une lecture analytique.

Nous voudrions avoir fait sentir, par quelques notes qu'on vient de lire, à quel point l'écriture des ostraca est un moyen d'expression conçu pour un milieu limité. C'est un langage de « service intérieur » à l'usage de l'administration fiscale. Le paléographe ne saurait en utiliser les données sur le même pied que celles qu'il recueille dans des écrits d'usage universel. Les procédés d'expression y sont étroitement commandés
par le texte. Il n’est pas de convention, touchant les lettres, qui y soit appliquée automatiquement à n’importe quel mot et quelle qu’en soit la place.

Celui qui entreprend aujourd’hui de déchiffrer des ostraca thbébins d’époque romaine est attiré nécessairement dans l’attitude d’esprit du lecteur antique. Dans son cheminement de plus en plus aisé à la quête des points de repère que le scribe d’autrefois a si judicieusement plantés au long du texte, le lecteur d’aujourd’hui est tenu de recréer en lui un mode de perception, une qualité d’attention qui soient exactement celles que requérait le scribe. Il y a dans ce travail une intimité de communication concrète avec un homme antique qui est profondément émouvante.

BRUSSELS
AN UNPUBLISHED MERTON PAPYRUS:
LETTER FROM THE SENATE TO THE STRATEGUS

By B. R. REES

This papyrus,¹ which by kind permission of Mr. Wilfred Merton I offer as a humble tribute to one whose most recent protégé and pupil I am proud to call myself, is full of interest but not too well preserved: it is broken off at the bottom, and there are two largish holes, of which the second, four lines from the bottom on the left, is too large to be restored. What remains is concerned with the election by the local senate of two officers to supervise the corn-supply at Oxyrhynchus, acting on the orders of the rationalis. Such officials were chosen by the σουλή and their nomination then communicated by the πρυτανις to the strategus, who gave them their instructions (Oertel, Die Liturgie, 217 f.). It is clear that in the present instance some difficulty has arisen, possibly in the form of an objection by the elected men, and that the πρυτανις wishes to enlist the support of the strategus in order to deal with it. The precise nature of the difficulty must remain obscure, as presumably it is stated in the most badly damaged part of the papyrus.

No date has been preserved but on first inspection the letter can be dated between c. A.D. 270 and c. A.D. 340 on internal evidence, and further examination narrows this down to c. A.D. 300. In the first place, if the restoration of l. 3 is accepted, the title of ἕναρχος πρύτανις, though found as late as A.D. 345 (P.Lond. ii, 233 p. 273 (= W., Chr. 44), 1), is by then equated with προπολεμητομενος, which had already begun to supersede it in A.D. 330 (CPR 19, 1). Again, the first occurrence, as an epithet of Oxyrhynchus, of λαμπρὰ καὶ λαμπροτάτης, the almost certainly correct supplement of l. 1, is attributed by O. Hornnickel, Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden, 35, to A.D. 272 (P.Oxy. X, 1264, 2), and, though this epithet is found as late as A.D. 546 (P.Lond. v, 1797, 5), κρατίστη as applied to the σουλή of Oxyrhynchus does not occur after A.D. 338 (E. Zehtmair, De appellationibus honorificis in papyris graecis obvitiis, 57). With this fits in the association of the epithet διασημότατος with the καθολικός, of which there is evidence from the creation of the office in the early third century until c. A.D. 350 (Zehtmair, op. cit. 22). The hand too is in accord with a broad dating c. A.D. 300: the old Roman type epsilon is still to be found but is giving way to a type intermediate between it and the Byzantine; the upsilon is usually Y-shaped but the flatter variety also appears, while sigma is restored to its proper shape. Palaeographically then a date before A.D. 300 rather than after it suggests itself. On the other hand, the use of Latin dates (II. 9, 14, 15) makes it highly improbable that it is much earlier. In A.D. 292 Claudius Dioscurides, alias Chaereas, was strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome (P.Oxy.

¹ In editing the papyrus, which will appear in P.Merton, ii, I have availed myself of the transcript and rough notes made by Mr. H. T. M. Bass, late of the British Museum, which have been of great service to me.
x, 1255), and, if one were prepared to attribute the Ἀδρήλιος here to a lapsus stili, the name would fit the lacuna, though not perfectly. But the many gaps in the list of strategi for this period (see H. Henne, Liste des Stratèges des Nomes Égyptiens à l'Époque Gréco-romaine), and the fact that the name Dioscurides is fairly common, reduce the value of this hypothesis.

9'9 x 21'2 cm.

Written along the fibres. Verso blank.

'Oξυρυνχειτῶν τῆς λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) πόλεως]
η κρατύστη βουλή δι[α 
τοῦ καὶ Σερήνου γυμ[νασαρχήσαντος] β[ουλ(ευτων) ἐνάρχ(ου) πρυτάν(εως)]
Ἀδρήλιος Διοκσκουρ[ οιοδάμων].

5 στρατηγὸ το̂ φυλάττων χαίρετω.
κατὰ κέλευσι τοῦ κυρίου μου διασημο-
tάτον καθολικὸν Ἀδρήλιον Σαραπίωνος
ἐκ γραμμάτων τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπιτρόπου
κατὰ τὴν πρὸ τῆς καλαντῶν ιούνιων

10 ἦρθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς κρατύστης τοῦ βου-
λευτηρίου εἰς ἐμβολαρχίαν Σε(ρ)ήνου Ἦραι-
σκοῦ καὶ Ἀγαθεῖνος Ἀγαθεῖνον πίστεων
καὶ ἐπικείμενος ἀλ(λ) ἑπεὶ ἐγὼν
ἐπικαλήσας καὶ τῇ πρὸ τοῖς καλαν-

dω ἱουλίων κατὰ χρ[αμά]τιον παρα
[c. 14 letters] ήκω ἐπὶ τῆς
[c. 15 letters]. [ἐ]πὶ τῶν ἤρη-
[μένων] . . . . . .]
dιὰ τοῦ τούτου ἐπὶ
[c. 14 letters] ὁσσος τῷ ἀν(τῷ) Σαρα-
πίων . . . . . .]
i πρὸσφερτε ἐπιτη-
δίως [. . . .] [. . . .]

20 .

15 ἔφη ἐπί τῆς ἀρχής τῆς ἐμβολαρ-
χίας ἀναγκαίου ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπικα-

25 [c. 13 letters] τῆς γνωμομένης
[c. 25 letters]. μελλουσις

9. ιουλιων. 10. ὑπο. 11. Ἠραι. 12. αλ'.

'The most high senate of the illustrious and most illustrious city of Oxyrhynchus through... also called Serenus, ex-gymnasiarch, senator, prytanis in office, to Aurelius Dioscuri... their most dear strategus, greeting. By instruction of my lord, the most distinguished rationalis Aurelius Sarapion, and acting upon a letter from my lord the procurator, upon the eighth day before the calends of June, there were elected to the control of the embolē by the general body of the council Severus, son of Heraisicus, and Agathinus, son of Agathinus, for their loyalty and integrity. But since I knew,
being in attendance also on the seventeenth day before the calends of July, by a document from... (so that) you may in no way deter them from the performance of their duty as controllers of the embole, which is obligatory, until the arrival of my lord the procurator, in order that...

1 ff. For the chronological significance of the honorary titles see the Introduction: τῆς Λαμπρᾶς καιλαμπροτάτης is preferred to τῆς Λαμπρᾶς with πόλεως—the latter also is found occasionally at this period (e.g. in P.Oxy. 1, 55, 6 and P.Harr. 64, 3)—as being much commoner in the third and fourth centuries and a better supplement in view of the probable size of the lacuna.

2. δή... A prytanis named Serenus occurs in a.d. 307 (M., Chr. 196). On the other hand, for the early part of a.d. 292 (see Introduction, s.f.), Aurelius Apollo alias Dionysius was prytanis (P.Oxy. 1, 59); but Aurelius Asclepiades was then acting-strategus—for Aurelius Apollonius—(Mecheir 16), and Claudius Dioscurides is not attested as strategus until Payni 19 at the earliest. So, if Oertel is right in suggesting that the prytanis' term of office ended with the Egyptian year and if the scribe has indeed written Aurelius here instead of Claudius, the papyrus would have to be dated to a.d. 203 at the earliest, a dating which would be hypothetical to a degree.

3. This supplement is almost certainly right; cf., for example, P.Oxy. 1, 55, 2, 3; 59, 4, 5.

4. Αἱρηλὼ διοκουρί. See Introduction and 2 n.

6 f. τοῦ κυρίου μου διασημοτάτου καθαλικοῦ. On the honorary epithet see the Introduction. The καθαλικοῦ makes his first certain appearance in Egypt in a.d. 246 (P.Lond. Ill, p. 108, 1157 verso, 6) but W., Gdz. 157, Freisigke (PW, s.v.) and Bell (CAH XI, 656) would date his introduction earlier, even possibly as early as a.d. 202/3 (P.Giss. 48 [= W., Chr. 171]), connecting it with the financial reforms of Severus. His activities in the third century until Diocletian's Reforms chiefly extended to the supervision of the public arable land and the imperial estate. After his establishment by Diocletian as the chief representative in Egypt of the rationalis of the Eastern Empire, these responsibilities were enlarged so as to include the whole of the financial organization, including the tribute; he was thus in control of the res privata as well as the largetialia, and in fact Wilcken believed there were two separate καθαλικοὶ, one responsible for the former, the other for the latter department (see Gelzer, Studien, 41 and Addendum, p. ii). Unfortunately, the present document does not enable us to decide whether these were indeed two officials or whether it was simply a case of the one καθαλικοῦ controlling two departments. The immediate concern of the καθαλικοῦ here is certainly with the embole, as it is in P.Rein. 56, but it may well be that it is his more general responsibility for the whole financial organization which is being referred to; cf. P.Oxy. IX, 1204 (A.D. 299), where the complaint of a decaprote that he has been illegally conscripted into office is dealt with by the καθαλικοῦ. For some of the difficulties about the identity of the later καθαλικοῦ see W., Gdz., 162 f. and N. Hohlwein, L'Égypte romaine, 285 f. Aurelius Sarapiis is not elsewhere attested as καθαλικοῦ.

8. ἐπτρόπου. The 'looseness of usage' which 'prevailed in regard to this title' (J. G. Milne, History of Egypt under Roman Rule, 125) and our ignorance of the precise functions both of the καθαλικοῦ in this connexion and of the ἐμβολάρχης who are the subject of this document make it hard to determine just which of the many procuratores is here referred to. Clearly the embolarchs were officials somehow concerned with the collection of the embole, for whose appointment the senate was responsible, on the one hand to the strategus directly, on the other to the καθαλικοῦ indirectly, and to our ἐπτρόπου less indirectly (I. 24). What we require then is a procurator connected both with the embole and the καθαλικοῦ whom we presume to be here concerned particularly with the administration of the res privata (see 6 f. n.). The ἐπτρόπου διαταγμάτων κτήσεως is found in connexion with the καθαλικοῦ in P.Lond. II, 234, p. 287 [= W., Chr. 179] (A.D. 346), where they are both concerned with enforcing the collection of the imperial revenues (see Johnson and West, Byzantine Egypt, 33). This ἐπτρόπου is the successor of the ἐπτρόπου ὁσιάσεων (W., Gdz. 163) and may well have had some responsibility for the embole from domain-land. The ἐπτρόπου Νέας πόλεως, on the other hand, had charge of the granaries at Neapolis and was thus very closely connected with the embole, while we find his vis-a-vis, the procurator Augustorum, acting in conjunction with the καθαλικοῦ as early as a.d. 246 (P.Lond. Ill, p. 108, 1157 verso). But it was a long step from Neapolis to Oxyrhynchus, and the actual collection of the embole seems unlikely as an extension of the duties of the two officials responsible for its storage. Again, the ἐπτρόπου πρωτεύουσας Ἀγιάστου, found at this period (M., Chr. 196) as the probable successor of the ἱδας λόγος (W., Gdz., 163; Hohlwein, op. cit. 329), would have nothing to do with the embole, though a great deal with the rationalis rei privatae. The ἐπτρόπους too is referred to as an ἐπτρόπου (BGU 1, 168, 3, 4; SB IV, 7361, 6; P.Oxy. II, 237, 14; see V. Martin, Les Epitrètages, 109 and n. 1) and so is the Prefect (A. Stein, Archív., 4, 151 and F. Zucker, BZ 20, 96), but the date and circumstances rule out the possibility that either is meant here. The ἐπτρόπου διαταγμάτων κτήσεως seems the most likely candidate. His connexion with the καθαλικοῦ is now established by P.Oxy. xx, 2267.

10. ἐπτρόπου. The procedure is illustrated by P.Oxy. xxi, 1414, 19 ff., and 1415, 4 ff.; see also A. H. M. Jones, Greek City, 330, n. 42.

II. ἐμβολάρχιαν. A verbum novum; the reference in the Konträrindex is to this passage. The ἐμβολάρχης is testified only by P.Lond. iv, 1441, 60, 64; 1457, 117 (both eighth century), and neither document throws light on his duties. If this document is to be dated to the late third or early fourth century and after the municipalization of Egypt had begun to take place (see B. R. Rees, The curator civitatis in Egypt, in JFP 7–8 (1953–4) 86 f.), is it fanciful to see in these two embolarchs the immediate successors of the δεκάπρωτοι? If so, then we should have to admit that either the office or its title did not last long, unless it be that an historical mischance of the most extraordinary kind has removed all evidence of its existence until the eighth century! Or we may have to do with assistants of the sitołogi, decaproti or exacto—whoever, in other words, had control of the collection of the embole at the time when this document was written. The reading is certain.


15. κατὰ γραμματίον. A reasonable conjecture.

16. ηἱ. The first letter might be almost anything.

17. ξι. Again a random shot but it fits the traces nicely.

18 f. ὅπι τοῦτο ἐπὶ στέλλω σοι, ἑλπίζω] is just possible. So, at the end of the line and beginning of the next, is ἔπισ τῶ ἀετῶ βασιλείας . . . . . ]; possibly this is the more attractive reading but there is no parallel for βασιλείας.

ABERYSTWYTH
EARLY CHRISTIANITY IN EGYPT: THREE NOTES

By C. H. ROBERTS

I

SIR HAROLD BELL's cool and critical survey of the private letters, Christian or supposedly Christian, in his 'Evidences of Christianity in Egypt in the Roman Period' is not likely to be soon superseded; certainly the decade that has passed since its publication has made no substantial additions to his list. But Bell very rightly calls in, to supplement the meagre and disappointing evidence of the documents, that of the Christian literary texts and emphasizes that their diffusion at such an early date is in itself proof of the growth of Christianity; there is, however, one factor that he leaves out of account, their provenance. This has become a matter of more consequence since in a recent article Dr. W. Telfer has committed himself to the astonishing statement that 'Egyptian Christianity in A.D. 190 was thus confined to the city (sc. Alexandria) and its environs'. He reaches this conclusion by arguing ex silentio that because in the Paschal controversy in the time of Pope Victor the Palestinian bishops claimed that 'they of Alexandria hold the Pascha on the same day as we do' no other bishops then existed in Egypt. Dr. Telfer does not pause to consider why the Church of Alexandria should have imposed on itself a self-denying ordinance against any missionary activity, conduct the more extraordinary when we recall the close connexion between the Jews of Alexandria and those of Egypt (as evidenced by the Jewish War in the reign of Hadrian) and the abundant evidence for relations—business, official, religious, literary, and personal—between the Greeks of the capital and those of the nomes; indeed, for any use Dr. Telfer makes of their evidence, no papyri might ever have been dug out of the soil of Egypt. The difficulty he raises is best resolved either by assuming that the agreement of the Church of Alexandria carried with it that of the churches of Egypt (likely enough when we recall the predominant position enjoyed in later times by the Patriarch) or by recognizing with Lietzmann that the organization of the Egyptian Church was peculiar in that the so-called cities (or nome capitals) of Egypt and villages were placed not under bishops but under presbyters, and that the institution of the first bishoprics outside

1 Harv. Theol. Rev. 37 (1944), 185 ff.
2 The little reason there was to classify P.Ryl. 11, 243 as Christian is further diminished by the observations by H. J. Rose on the use of the phrase συν Θεό in Harv. Theol. Rev. 33 (1940), 65. Equally Wilcken's observation (Archit. 9, 87) on the meaning of the phrase πορεδέχατο ἡμᾶς ὁ τόμος ὑμῶν ὁς Θεός ἡβελεν (not mentioned by Bell) from which it is clear that it has no esoteric meaning, but is a traveller's diction, removes any ground for thinking that BGU 1, 27 is Christian. A possible, but in my view unlikely, addition to the list of Christian letters is P. Ryl. 14, 604.
5 The Founding of the Church Universal (= The Beginnings of the Christian Church, 11), 82.
Alexandria by Demetrius (A.D. 189–232) may well have been a consequence of the new status accorded the nome capitals by Septimius Severus in A.D. 202.

Dr. Telfer's solution is disposed of by the evidence of the biblical papyri. From these we know that in the course of the second century the Bible was being read at Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. iv, 656), at Antinoopolis (P. Ant. i, 7), in the Fayyūm (PSI viii, 921 and perhaps P. Lips. 170), and at Karāra in the Heracleopolite nome (P. Bad. iv, 5. 6). We may properly infer that Christian communities, however small or insignificant, were widely scattered between the Thebaid and the Delta and if this was so, we may be sure, a fortiori, that the seed was well planted in Lower Egypt. The historical importance of these literary texts deserves recognition in yet another connexion. Of recent years it has become fashionable to solve the mystery that surrounds the early history of the Church of Alexandria by the discovery that it did not exist; such Christianity as there was was Gnostic and the 'Great Church' did not succeed in taking hold there until the end of the second century, and then was probably grafted on to this doubtful stock by Rome. Supporters of this theory (prominent among whom are W. Bauer and W. Till)² can point not only to the unmistakable evidence for Gnostic activity in Egypt in the middle of the second century (to mention only two, Basilides who was active in the reign of Hadrian and Valentinus who flourished a little later were both Egyptians, the latter being born in Arsinoc),³ but can also argue that whereas we have no reliable data for the existence of orthodox Christianity at this time, the Gospel according to the Egyptians, thought to have been written about A.D. 100, is certainly Gnostic in tendency.⁴ To strengthen their case we might add that in P. Fay. 2 we possess a Gnostic papyrus of the second century while what is probably the earliest certain Christian letter (P. Harr. 107) is also Gnostic. Against this view it may be urged with W. Bardy⁵ that there is something topsy-turvy in assuming that heresy arrived on the scene first and was followed by orthodoxy, and that the Gospel according to the Egyptians, while Gnostic in tendency, also evinces knowledge of the canonical Gospels. More substantial objections are that

¹ For a list and discussion of early Christian literary texts see Bell, op. cit. 199 ff.; for a list of biblical texts either second century or on the border between second and third centuries, see Roberts, op. cit. 157, n. 1 (from this list the earliest, the Rylands St. John, was accidentally omitted); for their distribution, ibid. 167. For this argument the texts that are important are those that can be assigned to the early or middle part of the century—P. Ryl. iii, 457, P. Bad. iv, 56, the Chester Beatty Numbers and Deuteronomy (provenance uncertain) and, of the non-Biblical texts, P. Lond. Christ. 2.

² W. Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei (Tübingen, 1934), 46–64; W. Till, 'Die Gnosis in Ägypten', in La Parola del Passato 12 (1949), 230 ff.; J. N. Sanders, The Fourth Gospel, 41. H. Lietzmann (op. cit. 362 ff.) is more cautious, but would appear to accept the same position. Bauer will admit the existence of individual non-Gnostic Christians ('gewiß hat es auch schon früher [i.e. before A.D. 180] dort Rechtgläubige gegeben'), op. cit. 53, but not that of organized orthodox communities. His argument (op. cit. 52) that in Alexandria and Egypt of the second century there was no clear frontier between orthodoxy and heresy, or at least that the dividing-line was much less sharp than elsewhere, has much in its favour.

³ For a detailed statement on second-century Gnosticism in its relation to Egypt, see Bauer, op. cit. 53 ff.

⁴ Bauer makes the point that it would not have been given this title unless it was the dominant version of the Gospel in Egypt; he regards this as being the gospel of the native Egyptians (or Graeco-Egyptians) who were converted to Gnostic Christianity and the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the corresponding authoritative work for Gnostic Christians of Jewish antecedents. In the state of our evidence this seems highly speculative.

⁵ In Vivre et Penser, 2 (1942), 84, n. 2. For a persuasive statement of the contrary view see J. N. Sanders, loc. cit.
the story in Justin, *Apol. 1*, 29 of the young Alexandrian who applied to the Prefect, L. Munatius Felix, for permission to castrate himself, implies the existence of an orthodox church in Alexandria in *c.* A.D. 150, and, secondly, that, though some early Gnostic papyri have been found they are greatly outnumbered for the second and early third centuries by ordinary biblical texts. There was, of course, nothing to prevent Gnostics reading and owning ordinary texts of the Bible but in the absence of any evidence to the contrary it would be perverse to assume that they were not written for and used by regular Christian communities.

Here we may properly appeal to the witness of Christian texts other than the biblical. The existence of the Unknown Gospel in the British Museum is as good evidence of the diffusion of Christianity in the second century as is the Rylands St. John, and Sir Harold very rightly draws attention to the historical significance of this and other early texts; we may note in passing that with the exception noted above none of them shows any Gnostic tendency. One text which Sir Harold classifies among the papyri ‘for which a date round about A.D. 200 is probable’, is one described by him as ‘a scrap from a theological work’, which in this context deserves more attention than it has received. It was so described by Grenfell and Hunt in their original publication (P.Oxy. III, 405) who remarked that ‘this fragment is not later than the first half of the third century and might be as old as the latter part of the second’ and go on to comment that ‘it is probably the oldest Christian fragment yet published’. Few palaeographers would hesitate to place this hand near the end of the second century; in their dating of Christian texts Grenfell and Hunt can now be seen to have been ultra-conservative. Now in the appendix to Part IV of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (p. 264) Grenfell and Hunt briefly noted that 405 had been identified as part of the lost Greek text of Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses*; no further comment was made then or, to my knowledge, has been made later on its date or significance. Irenaeus’ work was written at Lyons about A.D. 180 and in this scrap we should recognize not only the first fragment of a manuscript of Christian literature contemporary with its author but evidence of the immediate circulation of this powerful attack on Gnosticism among the Egyptian churches and yet another witness to the close relationship subsisting between the church of Alexandria and the West. We need not accept the extreme position that Catholic Christianity was unknown in Egypt until the close of the second century; but that Gnosticism was influential and

---

1 This is discussed by Bauer, but hardly, I think, given its proper weight: ‘Auf den Boden der Orthodoxie führt uns schwerlich jene Geschichte’ (op. cit. 53), particularly as Justin refers to the young man as τις τῶν ἡμετέρων.

2 See p. 93, n. 1.


4 On this see Bell, op. cit. 201, and Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, 6. The reason why they occasionally went against their feeling for the palaeographical evidence (for a clear case of this see their introduction to P. Oxy. 1, 30 and J. Mallon’s discussion in *Emerita*, 17 (1949), 1 ff. of the date of this hand which he would place in the first half of the second century—an ascription in which Dr. E. A. Lowe concurs) was that they did not recognize that the codex form could be and was used as early as the second century. As P.Oxy. III, 405 was written on a roll, this reason did not operate.

5 The identification of this papyrus (which Bauer does not mention) tends to support rather than undermine his view of the development of Egyptian Christianity. For the relations between Rome and Alexandria see most recently E. R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt* (Oxford University Press, 1952), 11–12, also Lietzmann, op. cit. 81.
widespread is certain, that Catholic Christianity was numerically insignificant and throughout the first century and a half of its existence on the defensive, not at all unlikely.

II

Sir Harold’s analysis of the private letters leaves BGU 1, 246 in the place of honour as the earliest private letter which may be Christian (I must confess that its claim to the title seems to me very doubtful), dated second—third century, and P.Harr. 107 the earliest letter which we can definitely ascribe to a Christian writer, if we may reckon Gnostics as Christians.1 There are only two other Christian letters which can with certainty be placed in the third century, and one of these is the famous letter from Rome first published as P.Amh. 3 (a). Its content, no less than its early date, demand attention for it, and it is remarkable that though it has often been republished the original has never been re-read, though no less a scholar than Ulrich Wilcken remarked in 1912 ‘eine genauere Revision des Originales wäre sehr erwünscht’.2 This letter, with the rest of the Amherst papyri, is now in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York and when I was there in the winter of 1951–2 I was enabled by the courtesy of the Librarian to examine the original. Grenfell and Hunt, as was their way, have left little enough to the gleaners; but it may be thought worth while both to print what survives of the first column (omitted by them in their transcription as being too fragmentary), and in the second and third columns to note where a new reading is desirable or where a change of reading already proposed can be confirmed. For this purpose I have taken Wilcken’s (W) text as the basis for my collation both because it incorporates a number of improvements and because it is easily accessible.

Col. i (broken at the top). 1. [αυ 2]. 3. [ελ. 4. β...[0...]]. 5. [νονε 6. Αίωνυσίου τοῦ ε. 7. ἀμφοτέρων. (before ρ perhaps τ) 8. [αργ...ε...]. 9. [στ...νότον or- ου: it is not likely that the name Primitinus stood here) καὶ 10. ]...ειλατο (before ε possibly ν τ unlikely) II. [σμα...].

Col. ii 2. init. [W: ...ει] 3. τετῳ W; τοῦ. (For [καὶ] before μή I suggest [τιά].) 4. [...ο W; δ[π...] 8. αυτ[ο...] W; αυτ[...]. 9. ταῦτα [διά] αὔτος ν [τεφρονικέα W; ταῦτα...]. 10. αὔτος ν [τεφρονικέα W; υμβηκών W; περισσότερον καὶ τετελει]. 14. [ν διὰ μ[ε] κρόν W; αἰθ...ρον (before αι, ρ or τ) 15. Νίκων W; Νίκων 17. a...τ...κ...α W; αθ[...].

Col. iii. 6. [ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ W; this supplement is certainly too long; perhaps [ἐν τῇ πόλει]. 11. ἐπιθυμίᾳ W; ἐπιθυμίᾳ. 13. παρακ[4 W; παρακ[λε... W; παρακλησία. 22. πα...[22] τύπον πάπα καὶ τούς κατὰ [...]. W; πατεί]. [...[...] πάπα καὶ τούς συν α[τάφ...]. What was read as a ἐ is a stroke of erasure; the oblique stroke goes in a direction opposite to that of a σ. παλμίς πατείν might be read were it not that this part of the letter does not seem

The rapid circulation of this text in Egypt suggests that the estimate sometimes given (in any case very speculative) of fifty years as the interval between the writing of the Fourth Gospel and its use in Egypt, as evidenced by P.Ryl. III, 437, is too large.

1. On its Gnostic character see G. Ghedini, Aeg. 17 (1937), 98.
2. Christeomachie, introduction to his text of the letter (no. 126). His view is echoed by Deissmann, Licht von Osten, 172.
to be concerned with business arrangements. 23. τατοὺς προ[εστῶσι] τεισ...[ W; τατοὺς πρῳ.ε.[.]στεισῳ αὐ]. Cf. editio princeps. The π is written over τῥ. 25. γαθοβοσ[λῳ Ἐρρ]όθᾳ ταϊ W; γαθοβοσ[ῳ].[. . . .].θαϊ. Traces do not suggest ω before θαϊ; it is possible that there was another column to the right, l. 26 being a marginal addition. 26.[. . . . . . . θ]αλα. [ W; προλατ[ ; possibly ἐγράφῃ διά] Προλατ[.]

III

In his catalogue of the literary papyri Professor Pack\(^1\) lists twenty tachygraphical texts; of these nine are assigned to a definite provenance and for eight out of these nine texts the source was Antinoopolis. One is ascribed to the third century, one to the fourth, two to the fourth or fifth, two to the fifth, one to the fifth or sixth, while the eighth is not dated at all. In his *Ecclesiastical History*\(^2\) Theodoret gives an account of the disturbances at Edessa in A.D. 372 occasioned by the persecution of the Catholics by the Arian emperor Valens. One upshot of the troubles was that two of the leading Catholic priests were banished to Antinoopolis, a city which the two exiles discovered on their arrival was largely inhabited by pagans. Protogenes promptly set himself up as a teacher of young men (we may admire the innocence of the times which allowed ideological exiles to teach) and combined instruction in shorthand with the exposition of the scriptures—καὶ κατὰ ταῦτων γράφειν ὑπὲρ τὰς ἐκδιδασκαλίας καὶ τὰ θεία ἐξετάζειν λόγια. It would be pleasant to think that some of the shorthand manuscripts excavated at Antinoopolis were the work of Protogenes or his pupils; for if we may believe Theodoret his success as a teacher was considerable.

Oxford

---

2. *Iv, 18.*
PARABALANI

By W. SCHUBART

Dieser seltsame Name, der zuerst im Anfange des 5. Jahrhunderts bezeugt ist und später zu allerlei Ableitungen Anlaß gegeben hat, darf auch heute, seit der Deutung von Grégoire und dem Aufsatz von Philipsborn, noch nicht als endgültig geklärt gelten. Die beiden Fragen, was für Leute die Parabalani seien, und wie sich der Name verstehen lasse, hängen zwar zusammen, können aber doch bei der Untersuchung getrennt werden; man beginnt am besten mit der historischen und schließt die philosophische an. Unter den geschichtlichen Zeugen stehen zwei Erlasse des Kaisers Theodosius II. fast allein, aus den Jahren 416 und 418, im Codex Theodosianus XVI, 2, 42, 43. Justinian hat sie in seinem Codex Justinianus im Jahre 529 aufgenommen und den Umständen gemäß leicht geändert.

Dem dam der Leser die Quellen vor Augen haben, drucke ich beide Texte ab. Was nur im Codex Theod. steht, ist in eckigen Klammern [ ] eingeschlossen; in runden ( ), was sich nur im Codex just. findet; was beiden gemeinsam ist, außerhalb der Klammern. Beide Erlasse gingen von Konstantinopel aus, der frühere am 29. 9. 416, der spätere am 3. 2. 418. Beide betrafen Alexandrien, soweit von den Parabalani die Rede ist; ob diese anderswo bestehen, bleibt offen.

I. [Quia inter cetera Alexandrinae legationis inutilia hoc etiam decretis spectat et, ut reverentissimus episcopus de Alexandrina civeitate aliquid . . . non exire, quod quidem terrae eorum, qui parabalani nuncupantur, legationi insertum est], placet nostrae clementiae, ut nihil commune clericum publicae actibus vel ad curiam pertinentibus (cuius corpori non sunt adnexi), habeant. Praeterea eos, qui parabalani vocantur, [non plus quam quingentos esse praecipimus, ita ut non divisus et qui hunc locum redimant, sed pauperes a corporatis pro rata Alexandrini populi praebeant, eorum nominibus viro spectabili praefecto Augustali videlicet intimatis et per eum ad vestram magistrum referendis. Quibus] neque ad quodlibet publicum spectaculum neque ad curiae locum neque ad iudicium ascendentis licentiam permittimus, nisi forte singuli ob causas proprias et necessitates iudicem adierint, aliquem lite pulsat vel ab alio ipsi pulsat vel in communi totius corporis causa syndico ordinato, sub ea definitione, ut, si quis eorum haec violaverit, et brevibus parabalamin eximatur et competenti supplicio subiugeretur nec unquam ad eandem sollicitudinem revertatur. [Loco autem mortuorum viro spectabili praefecto Augustali subrogandi dedimus potestatem sub ea conditione, quae superius designatur.]

II. Parabalani, qui ad curanda debilibum aegra corpora deputantur, (quingentos esse ante praecipimus. Sed quia hos minus sufficere in praesenti cognovimus, pro quingentis) sescentos constitui praecipimus, ita ut pro arbitrio viri reverentissimi antiquitatis Alexandrinae urbis de his, qui ante fuerunt et qui pro consuetudine curandi gerunt experientiam, sescenti parabalani ad huiusmodi sollicitudinem eligantur, exceptis videlicet honoratis et curialibus. Si qui autem ex his naturali sorte fuerit absuntus, alter in eius locum pro voluntate eiusdem sacerdotis exceptis honoratis et curiali-

1 Grégoire, Byzantion, 13 (1938), 283. Philipsborn, ibid. 20 (1950), 185.
2 Die kleinen Abweichungen der Texte untereinander und anderer Handschriften übergehe ich, da sie für unsere Frage ohne Belang sind.
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bus subrogetur, ita ut hi sescerti viri reverentissimi sacerdotis praeceptis ac dispositionibus obsecundent et sub eius cura consistant; reliquis, quae dudum latae legis forma compлектitur, super isdem parabalanius vel de spectaculis vel de iudiciis ceterisque, sicut iam statutum est, custodiendis.


*terror* ist wohl so zu verstehen.
Vermutlich sind sie die weiterhin genannten Corporati, die das Recht haben, gemäß der Zahl der Alexandriner, wohl der Einwohner, nicht der Bürger, eine Vorschlagsliste aufzustellen.


ist nicht mehr die Rede. Es sieht so aus, als sei die Gefahr, der im Jahre 416 begegnet werden sollte, überwunden und die ursprüngliche Ordnung hergestellt.

Als Justinian 529 beide kaiserlichen Befehle aus dem Theodosianus in seinen Codex übernahm, strich er den sowieso unklaren ersten Satz, der den Anlaß enthielt, fügte aber der Deutlichkeit halber hinzu, daß die Parabaloni mit der Korporation der Kurien-Angehörigen nicht verknüpft seien. Ferner ließ er nur die allgemeinen Verkehrsbeschränkungen und ihre Geltung für die Parabaloni bestehen, tilgte aber die Anordnung über ihren Ersatz. Im zweiten Erlaß fügte er nur den geschichtlichen Anlaß ein, den er im ersten gestrichen hatte. Was stehen bleibt, gilt für die Dauer, während die Schriftstücke des Theodosianus einer augenblicklichen Lage entsprechen.

Nun der Name. Die Handschriften bieten weit überwiegend Parabaloni, aber Zeugen aus dem Mittelalter schreiben Parabolani, das geradezu eine geläufige Nebenform wird, obwohl beide sprachlich nichts miteinander zu tun haben. Denn die eine enthält balaneús, die andere paraboló oder parábolos, wovon dann mit lateinischem Endung parabolanus gebildet wird. Im Jahre 1700 gab der berühmte Jurist Thomasius eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift heraus unter dem Titel Observationum selectarum ad rem litterarum spectantium, tomus I ff.; der zweite Band bringt unter No. 11 eine Abhandlung über die Parabolani. Der Verfasser, Jakob Thomasius, setzt die Form mit o voraus, sammelt Zeugnisse, bespricht die möglichen Deutungen und will erinnern, ob die Parabolani Ärzte oder Gehilfen des Arztes waren. Das ist für uns ziemlich belanglos, während seine Versuche, das ihm selbstverständliche Parabolani zu erklären, auch heute noch Wert haben. Er sagt z. B.: quia similes se praebeat Samaritano illi in parabola evangelica. Mittelalterliche Stellen bauen eine Brücke von paraboló zum medicus; die parabolani seien geschwächt, prahlerisch wie die wandernden medici; auch der Philosoph Avicenna wird so genannt. Aber auch im guten Sinne heißt Christus so, weil er paraboló braucht. Daneben steht die Bedeutung proiectus, schonungslos, tollkühn, die nicht auf paraboló sondern auf paráboleisai zurückgeht und z. B. in ψυχήν paráboleisai zu Tage tritt, sodaß parábola gleich periculosus, ἔργον paráboλα gleich facinus audax wird. Der Verfasser der Observatio führt viele Stellen an und entscheidet sich für: ita dictos ait a negotii periculositate, cum qui se periculos exponunt, Graecis vocentur parábolai.¹ Unabhängig davon haben die geschichtlichen Quellen gezeigt, daß die Parabaloni gelegentlich zur Gewalttat neigten und deshalb wohl parábolai genannt werden durften, zumal wenn ihr Beruf sie zwang, täglich ihr Leben daran zu setzen; um so leichter mißachten sie auch Sitte und Gesetz. Dem alexandrinischen Volke, dessen Spottlust und Witz bekannt sind, darf man gewiß den Vergleich der ‘Badgehilfen’ mit den proiecti, den ‘Draufgängern’ zutrauen; aus der Änderung eines Vokals ergab sich fast von selbst ein Witz. Parabalani griechisch parábalaneís, führte auf parábola, das eine lateinische Endung bekommen mußte, weil parabalana eine solche zu haben schien. Aber die Alexandriner stellten gewiß nicht diese grammatische Überlegung an, sondern ließen sich vom Gehör leiten. Das Ergebnis wäre demnach: Etwa im Anfang des fünften Jahrhunderts wurden die Parabalani in

¹ Auch das Lexikon von Heumann–Seckel schreibt parabolanus und erklärt ‘wer sein Leben aufs Spiel setzt’.

¹ Hübner, Der Praefectus Aegypti, München, 1952.
RECTO AND VERSO

By ERIC G. TURNER

A DISCERNING connoisseurship of handwriting and a sure eye for dates and styles are among the many qualifications for which Sir Harold Idris Bell is distinguished. One therefore who is proud to call himself a pupil ventures to hope that he will not be uninterested in some notes on a matter of first importance to palaeographers. They deal with one aspect only (and indeed a particular case of that aspect) of the relation between recto and verso in Greek papyrus texts, namely, the time interval to be allowed between writing on the recto and writing on the verso when the recto consists of an official document.

The 'rule' is formulated as follows by Schubart, *Einführung*, 62: 'steht auf Rekto eine amtliche Urkunde, so wird man nach Preisigke, P. Strassburg 79 ff. die Lagerfrist der Urkunde auf 50 bis 100 Jahre schätzen und daher den literarischen Text um so viel später datieren dürfen, ohne daraus ein Gesetz abzuleiten. Private Aufzeichnungen veralteten wohl schneller.' To the formulation of this rule-of-thumb Schubart's palaeographical experience has contributed a caution which successors should have imitated; but its substance rests on generalizations of Preisigke's made on the basis of a few texts1 carrying dated documents on both recto and verso. Official documents, it is claimed, were retained either in the bureau originally concerned or in official repositories for a fixed period, the length of which is not known but is assessed at the figure given, 50–100 years. When this time had elapsed, they were 'released' and treated as scrap-paper.

On general grounds these generalizations are open to question. Preisigke, a member of a government service unsurpassed for methodical procedure, postulated a similar methodicalness in both the theory and the practice of Egyptian official administration. Whatever may be the truth about its theoretical side,2 however, the practice of the latter was often lax, especially in record offices and bureaux in the country, the source of most extant documentary papyri. The protracted and complicated lawsuit set out in P.Fam. Teb. 14, 15, 17, and 24 shows a 'most admired disorder' in the public record office of the Arsinoite nome (and elsewhere) during the 50 years between A.D. 72 and 124, the supposed best years of the Roman administration. The mixture of slackness and savagery shown towards the defendants in this case makes it hard to believe that discipline was better at other times and places. The fact that copies of missing documents could be obtained from the central record office in Alexandria, though it may vindicate

1 In op. cit. and Girowesen, 495, he mentions six such texts. Four appear as nos. 27, 28, 27, 40 in my tabulation. His fifth example, the case of P.Strash. 22 and 23, is to be rejected, for on the basis of his 'Schriften' the recto hard (P.Strash. 22) is to be assigned to the middle or late second century, not to the first. His sixth example, BGU 1072, is an unverified hypothesis.
3 P.Fam. Teb. 15, 52, and 84.
the integrity of the system, has little bearing on surviving papyri of provincial origin. Moreover, a number of instances can be cited, apart from those appearing in the tabulation below, where official documents were neither sent in to the official depositories nor put on file in the offices themselves. For instance, in A.D. 221 the strategus Sarapion also called Apollonianus failed to send in papers of his period of office;¹ about a century later, Theophanes, an official on the prefect’s staff, used as scrap-paper more or less recent petitions to the Roman Emperor, which were not forwarded to Rome, and not even put on the files.² Frequent reminders, in prefectorial edicts and letters from high authorities,³ that papers must be put on record suggest a casual attitude on the part of local officials. It is not hard to understand why that should be so. The price of new papyrus was relatively high, and one may feel sympathy for harassed officials who regarded ‘salvage’ of official papers, so that the back might be re-used, as a justifiable perquisite. Elsewhere I have pointed out that retention by Oxyrhynchites serving in other nomes as strategi or royal secretaries is the most plausible explanation of the discovery in Oxyrhynchus of official documents compiled in and relating to other nomes.⁴

Preisigke’s hypothesis is, however, best checked by a wider collection of cases in which both recto and verso texts bear a date, and this I have attempted to provide in the following tabulation. I wish to emphasize that this list is not exhaustive:⁵ I have omitted many examples, but none, to the best of my knowledge, where the time interval is ten years or more. The first line throughout refers to the recto of a papyrus, the second line to its verso. Numbers 1–29 are unconnected instances, while numbers 30–40 carry versos from the Heroninus archive.

1. BGU 891
   Oath addressed to strategus, 9/4/144
   A similar oath, same strategus, 1/5/144
   3 weeks

2. P.Oxy. 584
   Registration of property, 129
   A similar registration to same addressee
   Same year

3. P.Oxy. 1525
   Report from Sitologi, Mesore, 216
   Account of corn due, 215/16
   "

4. P.Oxy. 988
   Loan of corn, 224
   Memorandum, ‘soon after 224’

¹ JEA 38, 89.
² P.Ryl. iv, 617–22.
³ Mettius Rufus, P.Oxy. 237, viii, 27–43; Sulpicius Similis, ibid. 21–27. Flavius Titianus, P.Oxy. 34 verso.
⁴ JEA 38, 89–90. Similarly soldiers are on the look-out for perquisites. A soldier in P.Mich. 468, 18 sends various objects to his father, including chartas scholares duas, which I should guess to be rolls with a clean verso discarded from the quartermaster’s office. P.Fior. ii, 278 (no. 37 below) I should guess to have been obtained for re-use in this manner.
⁵ Editions of papyri, especially the older ones, often fail to give adequate diplomatic information.
⁶ These two instances may be sufficient reminder of the not uncommon procedure of using both sides of a roll for a single transaction or related aspects of the same transaction. See, for example, P.Cairo Zen. 59011 (letter-book), 59326 (accounts), P.Ryl. 71 (sitologus account); P.Mich. 121 (recto has abstracts of contracts written at the Tebtunis grapheion, verso a short title-list of the same contracts); P.Bouriant, 42 (cadastral roll); C.P.Herm. 119, a composite roll formed in the offices of the council of Hermopolis mainly from bids made in Nov. 266, to lease or buy council property, and re-used in 267 (cf. verso col. iii) for copies of official letters to the council. Cf. also P.Amh. 68, P.Oxy. 708, P.Ryl. 595. Examples of both official and private letters which continue on the verso are too numerous to quote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>P.Oxy.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>Marriage contract, 127</td>
<td>Same year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of edicts, ‘soon after 127’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Report of unproductive land, 112 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of official letter about visit of a senator, 112 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Land-survey list, Kerkeosiris, 119/118 B.C.</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal decrees of Euergetes II, 118 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Land-survey report, Kerkeosiris, 118 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of report on official abuses, 22/3/117 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Petition to strategus, 29/12/247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Fragment of document dated “Year 5 Pachon”’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Minutes and enclosed official letters, latest date 22/6/192</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft offer of lease, copy of petition, 20/5/194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ross-Georg. II, 23</td>
<td>Extract or draft of strategus’ official minutes, 156-91</td>
<td>2–3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brux. E  7616</td>
<td>Composite roll, numbered census declarations, June–July 174</td>
<td>c. 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(= P.Lugd. Bat. v)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ined., ‘recapitulatory account’, latest date 177/178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>Long roll, taxation return for pastophori, 147</td>
<td>c. 6–9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>Similar register for village taxes, 153–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>Report of abatements of taxation, 107/8</td>
<td>c. 8–9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Copy or draft of undertaking, 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>Proceedings in Senate of Oxyrynchus, 270–5</td>
<td>Max. 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Money payments, either 273/4 or 279/80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Account, c. 270 B.C.</td>
<td>Bet. 10 and 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postal register, c. 255 (ed.), certainly before 246 B.C.</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Two declarations concerning sureties, 260/1</td>
<td>12 or 16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>List of money payments for trades tax(?), 272 or 278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Receipt for seed corn, 197</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private receipt for rent, 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>Land survey, after 119</td>
<td>17 plus years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report of legal proceedings, after 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>Census return made in Antinoopolite nome, 188</td>
<td>18 plus years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Copy of prefect’s circular of 206, found in Oxyrhynchus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>List of official persons, ‘Probus’ (276–80)</td>
<td>20 plus years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>Proceedings in Senate of Oxyrynchus, 299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vat. Grec. 11</td>
<td>Land registers of Marmarica (190/1(?), not later than 193)</td>
<td>Max. 25 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For the date see Henne, *Stratigies*, p.14.

2 See Nors–Vitelli, ibid., p. viii. This is the only case where the interval between documentary recto and literary verso is clearly dated. PSI 1176, with Menander on the verso, would be a second if the recto accounts admitted a precise date.
23. P.Vind. 25824 + P.Amth. 651
   Minutes of legal proceedings, latest date 17/2/114
   Accounts, entries for 12th year = 148/9?
   Max. 34 years

24. P.Lond. 1171, III, p. 177
   Accounts of agricultural expenditure, 8 B.C.
   c. 50 years
   III, p. 105
   Copy of prefect's decree and drafts, after A.D. 41/42

25. P.Oxy. 2111
   Report of judicial proceedings, after 135
   Taxation account, assigned by ed. to 205/6
   c. 70 years

26. P.Oxy. 2199
   Petition(?) 123(?)
   Account, 'early third century'
   70 plus years

27. P.Fior. I, 97
   Registers of property titles, latest date 162/3
   Offer to lease land, 239
   77 years

28. P.Teb. 8
   Official correspondence on taxes in Aegean, 201 B.C.
   Receipt given by Menches, 119 B.C.
   82 years

29. P.Bouriant 41
   Various official lists, 197
   Christian homilies of fifth century
   Christian homilies of fifth century
   More than 200 years

30. P.Fior. I, 9
   Petition to dekadarch, 17/1/255
   Account, 22/10/255
   9 months

31. P.Fior. II, 154
   Letter to Alypios, no date
   Letter from Alypios to Heroninos, 11/12/268
   Letter from Alypios to Heroninos, 11/12/268
   15 years

32. P.Fior. I, 5
   Census declaration 244/5
   Letter (probably to Heroninus), 259
   Letter (probably to Heroninus), 259
   21 years

33. P.Lond. 948, III, p. 219
   Contract for river transport, 236
   Letter from Heraclides, 14/2/257
   Letter from Heraclides, 14/2/257
   19 years

34. P.Fior. I, 98
   Orders of royal secretary, 238
   Letter to Heroninus 26/8/257
   Letter to Heroninus 26/8/257
   23 years

35. P.Fior. I, 100
   Accounts, 231
   Letter to Heroninus, 254
   Letter to Heroninus, 254
   30? years

36. P.Lond. 1170, III, p. 92
   Revenue register, 'first half 3rd century'
   Heroninus accounts, 258/9
   Heroninus accounts, 258/9
   55 years

37. P.Fior. II, 278
   Military letter-book, 203–45
   Accounts, 258
   Accounts, 258
   c. 55 years

38. P.Fior. I, 91
   Petition, middle of second century
   Letter from Alypius, 266
   Letter from Alypius, 266
   c. 100 years

---

1 Metzger, *Mus. Helv.* 2 (1945), 54 ff., and Kränzlein, *TJP* 6 (1952), 195 ff. Of course the copy on the recto may not have survived complete (i.e. it may originally have included events later than 114), and it need not be contemporary with the proceedings it records. Whenever one is dealing with copies, there must in fact be a residue of doubt. A posterior copy on the recto would require the time interval to be shortened, a posterior copy on the verso would lengthen it. These considerations apply especially to nos. 5, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26 of this list.

2 An interesting case of a private account being kept for more than 50 years.

3 This letter may be taken as representative of many others in which both recto and verso, though carrying different texts, alike belong to the archive, and the time interval is not long. See, for example, P.Fior. II, 140, 167, 275. P.Ryl. 237, 238.

4 See P.Fior. II, 185.

5 The document can be securely dated from the mention (col. iv, 20–21) of Norbanus as Arsinoite strategus and Diogenetus as procurator, cf. P.Ryl. 596, 12 n.
This tabulation contains instances of long single rolls and of composite rolls as well as smaller pieces, and the second users of the papyri seem to be almost equally divided between official and private persons. Though not exhaustive, it may therefore be taken as representative, and certain general conclusions drawn from it. After the freak case of No. 29 has been set aside,\(^1\) it offers 28 examples (a total that could be increased) of re-use within 25 years to set against 11 examples of longer intervals (up to 100 years). If, then, there was any general rule that documents should be kept for 50 years before being released for re-use, in practice that rule was not observed; but the figures make the existence of such a rule doubtful. Other reasons, for instance private hoarding,\(^2\) can be suggested to account for the longer intervals.

To help the palaeographer, two conclusions may be formulated: (1) when the writing on the recto consists of an official document, the time interval to be allowed before its verso was utilized lies between 1 and 100 years; (2) inside the 100-year limit, there is a slight balance of probability in favour of re-use within 25 years, as in the case of P.Vat. Grec. 11 (No. 22). In certain cases, special reasons can be suggested\(^3\) for supposing the interval to be longer; but there will certainly be other cases\(^4\) where no special reason is available, and yet the interval is 100 years or more.

LONDON

---

1 Cf. Wilken in *Archiv*, 8, 304.
2 Cf. the family papers in P.Lugd. Bat. vii, apparently kept together for more than 130 years.
3 The fact that writers of the Heroninus archive had documents over 100 years old available as scrap creates a presumption in favour of a similar age in their literary scrap. The beautiful 'biblical uncial' of P.Ryl. 16 (verso, P.Ryl. 236, letter of Syrus, A.D. 256) may therefore be confidently assigned to about 150. A date within the second century may also be allotted to P.Ryl. 57, Demosthenes, *De Corona* (verso, P.Ryl. 240).
4 In the following two cases the interval between documentary recto and literary verso appears to be of the order of 75–100 years: (1) PSI 921, recto bank ἄγγραφαί 143/4, verso psalter, early third century (cf. plate in *New Pal. Soc. I*, 182); (2) Recto P.Oxy. 985, private account of first century, verso P.Oxy. 852, Euripides, *Hypsipyle*, c. 200.
THE PREFECT VALERIUS EUDAEMON AND THE INDIGENT LITURGIS

By WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN

For many years Sir Harold Bell has been a stout defender of the good intentions, on the whole, and the good will of the Roman imperial administrators who ruled the Egyptians. He has mentioned by name three of the prefects who in their edicts and by their actions displayed both understanding and genuine sympathy with the plight of this exploited people. These three are: Aemilius Rectus, ruling Egypt under Claudius, M. Petronius Mamertinus, an appointee of Hadrian, and Subatianus Aquila, prefect under the principate of Septimius Severus. As the papyri from his prefecture of Egypt in A.D. 142–3 amply prove, Valerius Eudaemon, appointed by Antoninus Pius, earned a place in this distinguished list and may well be included in it.

Below I present an unpublished papyrus from the University of Wisconsin collection which has its slight value in this connexion. It was deciphered in 1922–3 and presented with other papyri for a Ph.D. degree at the Wisconsin State University by a student named John W. Logan. In 1925 Dr. Logan met a tragic death in Epirus, by an assassination still unexplained, while travelling with other young scholars of the American and British Schools at Athens upon an archaeological survey.

Through the courtesy of Dr. Clifford Lord, Director of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, and Dr. Samuel A. Ives, a photostatic copy of this papyrus was sent to me, with permission to publish it. That part of Dr. Logan’s thesis which included his reading and brief analysis of the Eudaemon document was also made available to me. The thesis is preserved in the library of the University.

P. WISCONSIN No. 23.

Provenance unknown. 5⅓ × 9 inches. 11 February, A.D. 143.

(ἔτους) ἐκτὸς Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, Μεχελ ἐπτακαιδεκάτη.
παρερχομένων Καλλιεργείου γενομένου κωμογραμματέως, προσ-
ειπότος τε Καλλιεργείου, μεθ’ ἐτερα Εὐδαίμων Καλλιεργείῳ εἶ."πν-"
πεν ἡδίκησας. ἀπορον ἀνθυμον ἔδοξας εἰς λιτουργίαν. αἰτίων
5 ἀ[δικίας] ταύτης ἐγένοι αἰτίων τοῦ πραθηκαὶ τὰ ὄντα αὐτῷ. ἐνέχη
ἐ[πειράματι] τιμώσ. ἐν τῷ ταμιείῳ τὰ τεμαχία ἀπὸ δῶς σείς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτῳ
ἀν ἰδίῳ τετραπλάσεσσι η ὄους πέπρατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῷ.

1 E.g., H. I. Bell, JRS 28 (1938), 2–3, in which he takes exception to a statement of Rostovtsev regarding the complete lack of sympathy for the Egyptian population displayed by the Roman prefects. See also Bell’s article ‘Philanthropia in the Papyri of the Roman Period’ in Collection Latomus, 11 (in honour of Joseph Bidez and Franz Cumont), 1949, 31–37.

2 A brief account of the attack and the death of Dr. Logan appears in Louis E. Lord, A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 179.
Notes upon the Text

3. Where I suggest προς-ἐπίφροτος Logan had read προς-ἐπιθρόντος, unnecessarily repeating the idea already expressed by παρερχομένου. For παρερχομένου followed by καὶ εἰπόντος compare P.Greec. Vind. inv. 25824a, col. ii, lines 3-4 in *Jour. of Juristic. Pap.* VI (1952), p. 196, where the document is republished and discussed by Arnold Kränzelein. At the end of l. 3 the scribe started to write the letter π of εἱ[π]τεν but did not complete it. The letter is clear at the beginning of l. 4. 4. Read ἐδώκας in place of the scribe’s ἐδόκας. 5. Logan’s αὐτοὶ | [ἀγα]ροῦς, with the demonstrative standing alone, may be suspected and the restoration fails to fill out the required space by two or three letters. The first ταυ and the upsilon of ταυτής are, I think, certain, even upon the photostat. 6. Beginning the line Logan reads as follows: ...τα ὑπερτημίου, correctly referring, however, to the same phrase with ἐπιτήμιος in a decision of Eudaemon himself delivered in A.D. 142, in P.Oxy. II, 237, viii, 18: τοὺς τεταγμένους ἐπιτήμιους ἐνεχόμενοι. My thought of restoring δὰν | ήμαρτην, in the sense of ‘you are convicted of wrong doings’ (see BGU iv, 1061, 25) is ruled out by its length and by the ink indications of the letters marked as doubtful. 7. At the beginning of this line Logan read: [.....τε]πραπλάσεων. The natural suggestion of ἀπόρως is rejected because of the two broad letters, πι and ομέρα. The letters λη of ἀπόρως do not appear at all upon the photostat. There is no room for the article τοῦ, whatever word one might insert.

Translation

Year six of Antoninus Caesar, our Lord, Mecheir 17. When Callinicus, former village scribe, came forward and addressed the court, after other matters Eudaemon said to Callinicus: “You have done a wrong. You gave in an indigent man (an *aporoς*) for a liturgy. Being the cause of this injustice, you (thereby) were the cause of the selling of his possessions. You are subject to penalties. In the treasury bureau you will pay the fines, but, also, to this man four times as much as that for which his property was sold.”

The document is a brief extract culled out of the record (*ὑπομηνματισμός*) of a trial, held in the court of Valerius Eudaemon, prefect of Egypt, of a village scribe named Callinicus. The hearing occurred on 11 February, A.D. 143, that is, in the sixth year of the principate of Antoninus Pius. Heretofore there has been no proof that the span of the prefecture of Eudaemon extended beyond the fifth year.¹ The new dating in A.D. 143 narrows the gap between the dated papyri from the prefectures of Valerius Eudaemon and his successor, Lucius Valerius Proculus, to about fifteen months.²

The circumstances of the action against the village scribe were these. He had compelled a man in the jurisdiction of his village district, who was listed as an *aporoς*, a poor man, to undertake a liturgy. The nature of this compulsory service is not disclosed in the extract which we have; but it is clear that the *aporois*, as a recognized class, were exempted from whatever service it was. I would assume that it lay in the field of the collection of some tax payable in money. There must have been a deficit in the amount collected on this occasion. The plaintiff was then made responsible for a part, at least, of this deficit. Not being able to make up the discrepancy, whether in part or in its total amount,³ out of his current resources, his meagre property was confiscated and sold to meet, or to help meet, the difference. It is not open to doubt, as Logan pointed out, that he had served as liturgist contrary to the then existing law on the immunity

² Ibid. 76-78, 192.
³ Because the plaintiff was officially recognized by the presiding judge, the prefect Eudaemon, as an ‘indigent’ man (*aporois*), I would assume that he was liable in this case for a part, only, of the deficit. This cannot be proved however.
of indigent persons. It was after the public sale of the possessions of this *aporos* that the suit for redress was entered against the *comogrammateus*, Callinicus. In his decision the prefect, Eudaemon, separated the case into two parts. The first was that of having broken the law upon the immunity of the class of the ‘indigent’. The second was the question of recompense to the plaintiff for the loss of his property.

P. Wisconsin 23 supplies, inadvertently, an additional bit of information of a chronological kind. In a thorough study of the class of the *aporoi* published two years ago, Roger Rémondon, with surprising accuracy, had placed at about the middle of the second century the passage of the law establishing these *aporoi* as an officially recognized economic group. This extract from the trial of and sentence passed on Callinicus places the fact of this recognition *before* February A.D. 143. How much earlier than that year cannot be determined with the evidence now at hand. A fragmentary papyrus published long since by Sir Harold Bell and Sir Frederic Kenyon had made it clear that lists of the *aporoi* in a certain town, of which the location is unknown, were already available in year twelve of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 149).

Valerius Eudaemon

We have three sources from which the career of this imperial public servant, and some hint of his social attitude as Roman politician, can be gleaned. Two honorary inscriptions, one from Ephesus, the second from Syria, give his *cursus honorum* up to, but not including, his Egyptian prefecture. His name is also mentioned in a reading of the Nile rising during his service as prefect. There are, also, two bits of information in the literature of the later period.

It is the information supplied by the papyri which breathes a little life into the figure of the man and invests him, in some degree, with personality and character. These are:

1. P. Oxy. II, 237, viii, 7, 18, dated Epiph 24 of year 5 of Antoninus Pius, which is 18 July, A.D. 142. It gives an edict (δύταγμα) of Eudaemon denouncing debtors who use trickery and threats of countersuits to frighten off persistent creditors.

2. P. Oxy. vi, 899, 22–29 (= W., Chr. 361). Another edict of Eudaemon, dated year 5 of Antoninus without day or month. The advocate in this case, which came to court in A.D. 200, cited three edicts in support of the plea of his client that women were not subject to impressment for cultivation of Crown lands. The edict of Eudaemon was one of the three to that effect.

3. P. Cattaoui, iv, 16–v, 26, dated Epagomenos third of year 5 (26 August, A.D. 142). Valerius Eudaemon rejected a petition that a son of a Roman soldier who held Roman citizenship should automatically receive recognition as an *Alexandrian* citizen. The

---

1. Roger Rémondon, Ἀπορικῶν καὶ Μεραγμὸς Ἀπόρων, Ann. Serv. 51 (1951), 234.
2. P. Lond. III, 911, 6–7: εὖτε ὅ ἐν ἀποροσ Περοπαραμυς Πεναυτος (then broken off).
4. BCH 2, 253–4 and Cagnat et Lafaye, IGR 3, 1077. For all the sources see A. Stein, op. cit. 75–77, and Rudolf Hauks in PW, s.v. Valerius, no. 149.
basis of the rejection was that children born of soldiers while they were in active service were not regarded as offspring born in legal wedlock.¹

4. P.Oxy. 1, 40. Part of the record of a hearing before Eudaemon upon a petition brought by a physician that, being a doctor, he was legally exempt from a liturgical service demanded of him. The decision of Eudaemon was probably favourable to the petitioning physician.²

5. P.Wis. 23, dated Mecheir 17 of year 6 of Antoninus, 11 February, A.D. 143.

6. P.Harr. 67, 5–12. Month Phamenoth, year lost. Fragmentary extract from the record of a trial before Eudaemon. Part of the speech of the defendant or the plaintiff, it is unclear which, and the decision by Eudaemon in favour of the speaker—'it appears to be so'.

The second of the two edicts of Eudaemon cited above, P.Oxy. vi, 899, 22–29, is a reinforcement act of edicts promulgated by previous prefects. It is the first, P.Oxy. ii, 237, viii, 7–18, which has challenged much attention. It presents the case of Dionysia, a daughter who in A.D. 200, introduced a plea against her father, Chaeremon. The action arose out of questions based upon the dowry rights of Dionysia and subsequent financial difficulties between her and her parent. The edict (διάταγμα) of Eudaemon was introduced into the case because it established legal penalties for debtors who threatened their creditors with countersuits as a method of frightening them off from insistence upon pressing for payment. The terms which Eudaemon applied to this practice are πανοφρία ('trickery')³ and ῥοδίωφρία.⁴ In an exhaustive analysis of this edict Paul Collinet equates this latter word with the concept underlying the modern word 'blackmail'. Collinet advances the hypothesis that in this edict of Eudaemon lay the provincial origin of a plea in Roman law which is mentioned in Justinian, Institutes, 4, 13, 2, as the querela pecuniae non numeratae.⁵

From the point of view of the revival of the personality of Eudaemon the four extracts from the hypomnematismoi of trials held under his jurisdiction are more important. The quotation cited in P.Cattaoui, iv, 16–v, 26 displays his strict adherence to the existing law on Roman soldiers’ marriages. His social attitude is exhibited in his defence of the 'indigent' man, the ἀπόρος, of P.Wis. 23, again following the line of a strict interpretation of the existing law, and in the heavy punishment meted out to the petty official who oppressed the poor man.

P.Oxy. 1, 40 seems to me to have come down as an exhibit of the shrewdness of his questioning in search of the truth. He showed signs of a sense of humour when he said to the physician claiming exemption from a liturgy that he might have treated ineptly the patients who now appeared against him. The decision, which was to be based upon

¹ The text of this important document was republished by Grenfell and Hunt with a commentary (in German) by Paul M. Meyer in Archiv, 3 (1906), 55–100.
² See the similar petition of a physician for release from a liturgy addressed to the immediate predecessor of Valerius Eudaemon in the prefecture of Egypt, named C. Avidius Heliodorus, prefect in A.D. 138–141, in P.Fay. 106, 6–25.
³ P.Oxy. iii, 237, viii, 7.
⁴ Ibid. viii, 15.
the physician's ability to name the solvent used in mummification, displays a commendable shrewdness in his method of investigation. Though the problem involved in P.Harr. 67 is not clear, the extract was certainly intended to exemplify the good judgement shown by Eudaemon in his decisions.

Through the knowledge of him obtained from these papyri Valerius Eudaemon has assumed personal qualities as a governor of some distinction. There is no reason, therefore, why the Eudaemon cited by Marcus Aurelius, To Himself, viii, 25, as one of three keen minds (δρυεῖς) who were ephemeral and had passed out of life and out of memory, should not be identified as the prefect Valerius Eudaemon,¹ who now takes on shadowy outlines as a living person.

NEW YORK

¹ Arthur Stein, op. cit. 208, n. 246, thought that there was nothing to warrant the identification.
TEXTUAL NOTES ON PAPYRI
By HERBERT C. YOUTIE
I. P. Bon. 24

This papyrus, which comes from Tebtunis, consists of copies of three related documents, all of them written on 10 February, A.D. 135: (a) a deed of sale by which a certain Tephorasaiq transfers to Alys, daughter of Belles, a wool-beater's shop which she, Tephorasaiq, inherited in A.D. 103-4 from her brother Epimachus, who had himself purchased it on 5 March, A.D. 98, from Petesuchus, son of Pausis; (b) a declaration from Alys to the keepers of property records reporting her purchase of the shop; and (c) a declaration from Tephorasaiq to the same officials reporting for the first time her acquisition of the property by inheritance from her brother.

The deed of sale contains, as is usual in such instruments, a topographical location of the shop by reference to its neighbours on the south, north, west, and east, in that order. On the south (l. 11) and east (l. 12) lie properties which are described as having been formerly in the possession of a single owner:

(11) /tou proxe[graam]enou] Proktrpou Pe[......]
(12) tou proxe[graam]enou Proktrpou [........]

The name Proktrpou is otherwise unknown, and the editor is disturbed by the use of tou proxe[graam]enou in l. 11, because no person of this name is mentioned in the preceding lines. On the assumption therefore that the copyist drew the phrase from l. 12, where of course it properly belongs, these words are cancelled in l. 11 and left intact in l. 12.

There is, I believe, a demonstrably better solution of this difficulty. If we shift our attention from Proktrpou to the name of his father, we see that the only letters preserved are Pe, which are also the first two letters of Pe[tesouxo] (l. 8), the name of the former owner of the shop which Tephorasaiq is selling to Alys. Since proktrpou is precisely the word for 'former owner';

(11) /tou proxe[graam]enou proktrpou Pe[tesouxo]
(12) tou pro[graam]enou proktrpou [Pe[tesouxo]]

2 A late word, still of infrequent occurrence. Both Freisinge-Kiessling, Wörterbuch, and Liddell-Scott-Jones, Greek-English Lexicon, cite it only from P.Oxy. xiv, 1636 (A.D. 249), 24, and to this may be added P.Cairo Boak 3 (Ét. de Papy. 2 (1934), 12-14, A.D. 298), 14. The feminine proktrptra is also known from a few papyri (2nd-3rd cent.), which are listed by Freisinge.
3 The property to the west of the shop (11-12) is said to be in the possession of tēs Ἑρμ[......]s Ἀλω[το]. The second name is identical with the name of the purchaser to whom Tephorasaiq has sold her shop (4, 5). If the mutilated name which precedes it were genuine, the property might belong to a daughter of Alys, but there is good reason to think that it may not be genuine since out of six legible letters it has four in common with πραμένη. Alys is in fact the πραμένη. Furthermore, e and σ look remarkably alike in a second-century cursive, and the left half of μ will naturally resemble λ. Consequently, it is not inappropriate to suggest that the papyrus be re-examined for τῆς πραμ[έρης]s Ἀλω[το].
The declarations (b, c) submitted by Tephorsais and Alys to the keepers of property records are addressed to four men described as former gymnasarchs:

(b, 4) δοθ(είσων) εἰς κληρ(ονόμων) βιβλι(αθήκης) ἑνκτ(ήσεων)

(c, 4) δοθ(είσων) εἰς κληρ(ονόμων) βιβλι(αθήκης) ἑνκτ(ήσεων)

As the editor notes, the βιβλιαθήκη ἑνκτήσεων is nowhere else qualified as κληρονόμων. This resolution of the abbreviations seems to be inspired by the occurrence of κληρονομία in (a) 6 and (c) 13, and the editor is tempted to infer from it the existence of a special section of the registry office devoted exclusively to inherited property.

The abbreviated word is indeed a part of administrative terminology, but it is purely routine and adds nothing significant to the obvious meaning of the phrase. This comes out clearly in P.Amh.114 (A.D. 131), 5, δοθ(είτων) εἰς κληρ(ον) πρ(ακτορίας) δ[ρυ(υρικῶν)]. This resolution of the critical word is confirmed by W., Chr. 392 (2nd cent.), 7, πεμβεῖς εἰς κλήρον πράκτορίας ἀργυρικῶν, and 10, ὤν ἐν κλήρῳ πράκτορίας. The expression ἐν κλήρῳ is familiar from tax receipts.

These parallels justify us in revising the text of the Bologna papyrus to read as follows:

(b) δοθ(είσων) εἰς κληρ(ον) βιβλι(αθήκης) ἑνκτ(ήσεων)

(c) δοθ(είσων) εἰς κληρ(ον) βιβλι(αθήκης) ἑνκτ(ήσεων)

The officials to whom the declarations are addressed had been 'assigned to duty in the archive of property registers'.

In (b) Alys reports her purchase of the wool-beater’s shop from Tephorsais 'of the village of Tektunis' (l. 11). In her description of the property she uses the following phrase (ll. 13–14): ἀ[δε]λφικός ν ἔναυτῆς [ ] ἀπὸ τῆς κόμης.

The entire context gives ἀδελφικόν the meaning ‘inherited from a brother’. The word seems not to have occurred with this sense before, but no doubt is possible in the Bologna papyrus. Rather striking also is the completion of the phrase with ἀπὸ τῆς κόμης since this normally follows the name of a person. It is only a short step from these considerations to restoring the name of Tephorsais’ brother in the lacuna: ἀ[δε]λφικός ν ἔναυτῆς [Ἐπιμάχου] ἀπὸ τῆς (αὐτῆς) κόμης,5 'inherited from her own brother Epimachus of the same village'. The curious syntactical conception which permits ἀδελφικόν to be supplemented by the genitive of a personal name, is illustrated and confirmed by other examples in which the adjective is μητρικός: Archiv., 5, 393, No. 308 (A.D. 131), 7 f.: τὸ ὑπάρχον μο[ι] ν Μενουκέα Θερμοντλα[ρίου . . .] οἰκίαν; M., Chr. 87 (c. A.D. 141), 23 f. (= Frisk, Bankakten, 2, verso, 5 f.): ἐπὶ ὑποθήκη [μ]ητρικῶν αὐτοῦ Τασσαχαρίου.6

1 On ἐν κλήρῳ see P.Mich. vi, 387, 4 n.
2 Also possible is βιβλιαθήκη.
3 In this connexion κληρός has undergone a semantic development from 'allotment' through 'assignment' to 'duty' and 'office'. See n. 1.
4 Cf. (a) 6–7, (c) 13–15. Two other words of this class, μητρικός and πατρικός, were in common use as designations of inherited property.
5 Cf. (c) 15.
6 A few minor remarks on the text of No. 24 may have some interest for the reader. In (a) 5 I prefer α[δ]ιτῆς Ἀλπης (cf. 5, 7); (a) 6 κληρονομ[ίας] with the meaning of ἀπὸ κ., cf. (c) 13; (b) 12 ἀπογεγρα[σμ[ένως]] in agreement with Tephorsai[τος] in l. 10, cf. (c) 8 f.; (b) 14 f. ἀπογεγρα[σμ[ένος], with διεσχισμένον taken as an error for -μένον, both participles in agreement with [Ἐπιμάχου], cf. (c) 15–17 for διεσχισμάτων with personal subject see B 3784.
In this edition of an unusually impressive series of census returns, M. Hombert and Mlle Préaux once again examine the hypothesis that polygamy was practised in Egypt during the period covered by the Greek papyri. It is a troublesome problem which has been kept alive by a basic contradiction in the literary records. Herodotus states categorically that in Egypt each man had one wife, whereas Diodorus Siculus distinguishes between the priests, who had but one wife, and other Egyptians, who might take as many as they chose. Since the bulk of Greek texts from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt give no hint of a polygamous society, scholars have naturally been keen to uncover any text which might betray another state of affairs. Their success has been most limited, and the very few papyri from which it was hoped that support might be drawn for Diodorus, remain of doubtful significance. Their number is far too small especially when they can all be explained quite reasonably in other ways. The evidence of the demotic papyri, as Edgerton has warned us, makes the practice of polygamy in Egypt during this period seem so improbable that we ought not to assume it without the very strongest evidence. This caution is in effect repeated by Hombert and Préaux: ‘Ces quelques cas — tous douteux — sont trop peu nombreux pour que nous puissions fonder sur eux une doctrine. Nous croyons néanmoins que, si la polygamie avait été

M., Chr. 196, 11 f.; op. cit. 200 (= St. Pal. 20, 26), 36; P.Oslo, III, 107, 11, cf. note ad loc.; (c) 13 {δή}; (c) 20 διεγραμμένος, cf. (b) 17.

If (c) 22 f. is correctly read and reconstructed, a census return was filed in the third year of a census period. Cf. the most recent study of this question by M. Hombert and C. Préaux, Recherches sur le recensement dans l’Égypte romaine, Papyrologia Lugduno-Batava, v. 1952, 79: ‘Il est surprenant de constater qu’aucune déclaration n’est remise après le dernier jour de la deuxième année.’ They are inclined to doubt (79, n. 2; 81, n. 2) the revised date of BGU 1, 26 = II, 447, which places this declaration also in the third year of a census period.

1 Hombert and Préaux, op. cit.
3 Herod. II, 92; Diod. I, 80.
4 This is also the judgement of Hombert and Préaux, op. cit. 169, who cite and discuss UPZ 1:18; P.Mey. 9; BGU I, 117. They come close to making an exception of UPZ 1:18, ‘qui paraît clair’. However clear it may be, it is certainly not a clear demonstration of polygamy, and I still see no reason to modify my own discussion of the papyrus (Aeg. 13 (1933), 89 ff.). Taubenschlag, loc. cit., following Edgerton (n. 5 below), infers from a provision in Greek marriage contracts, e.g. P.Eleph. I, 8 f.: μὴ ἔχετε δὲ Ἡρακλεῖδης γυναῖκα άλλην ἐπισκευάζειν κτλ., that polygamy was not legally forbidden to Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt; but Hombert and Préaux have seen that the words need not have a formal legal sense. At any rate, they do not demonstrate the practice of polygamy among the Greeks. Edgerton recognizes that even if polygamy was not contrary to law, ‘monogamy was maintained among Greeks by public opinion, by the first wife’s power to leave a husband who married another, or by other social forces’. J. J. Rabinowitz (‘Marriage Contracts in Ancient Egypt in the Light of Jewish Sources’, Harv. Theol. Rev. 46 (1953), 94 ff.) has suggested that the clause in question was borrowed from contemporary Jewish marriage contracts written in Greek after the pattern of those written much earlier in Aramaic at Elephantine. In view of Jewish marriage customs, which did not forbid polygamy, this clause as used by Jews at Elephantine was intended to exclude the husband from the exercise of a generally recognized legal privilege. On the other hand, when it was borrowed by Greeks, it may have been applied to quite another set of social relations. What lends verisimilitude to Rabinowitz’s argument and makes it most attractive, is the fact that the Aramaic documents and the earliest of the Greek documents, although separated by more than a century, both come from Elephantine.


légalemente admise, il s'en trouverait plus de cas et on ne manquerait pas d'en apercevoir les effets dans la structure de la société. These methodological considerations are basic even though the temptation to neglect them is strong. Not a single text from Ptolemaic or Roman Egypt gives positive or incontrovertible support to Diodorus.

If Hombert and Préaux nevertheless raise the question again, they do so because col. v of their roll presents a curious situation. The text is a census return in which the following persons are reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pantbeus</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>His wife Taapollos</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Their children:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Taaronnnesis</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Phibis</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thermuthis</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Isidorus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Son of Pantbeus by Thaësis:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pkuthis</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wife of Pkuthis:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Thermuthis</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thermuthis (l. 23) is a member of the family by marriage only and so may be disregarded for our purpose. Her husband Pkuthis is a son of Pantbeus, not by Taapollos, the mother of his other children, but by Thaësis. If the age of Pkuthis is correctly given, he is three years older than his half-sister Thermuthis (l. 27) and five years younger than his half-brother Phibis. Taapollos had already borne two children to Pantbeus before the birth of Pkuthis, whose mother was Thaësis, and again bore him two children in later years. Since Thaësis is not reported among the members of Pantbeus' household, the editors allow for the possibility that she was living elsewhere. They then conclude: ‘S'il n'y a pas d'erreur matérielle, l'explication la plus rationnelle est d'admettre la polygamie. Il n'est pas nécessaire toutefois de tenir celle-ci pour légal.’

It is entirely natural, perhaps even compulsory, to infer from the facts as given that Pantbeus had two wives simultaneously, but since these facts run counter to all previous experience of papyri, we may take advantage of the photograph provided by the editors to check the age of Thermuthis. He as well as his wife Thermuthis are reported to be 16 years old. When we inspect the numerals on the papyrus, we find that Thermuthis’ age (l. 24) is undeniably 16. The numeral is clearly written and characteristically formed. By comparison Pkuthis’ age (l. 22) immediately raises a question. The *ductus literarum* does not correspond to that in l. 24. My own reading is λε.

If Pkuthis was 35 years of age, as I believe he was, when his father made this return, he was the eldest of the children of Pantbeus, and eleven years separated him from Taaronnnesis, the eldest child born of Taapollos. The simplest explanation, then, is that Pantbeus was first married to Thaësis, who died or was divorced before his subsequent marriage to Taapollos. P.Brux. Inv. E.7616 thus offers nothing to confirm the hypo-

---

thesis of polygamy in Graeco-Roman Egypt, and the passage in Diodorus remains as perplexing and suspect as ever.¹

3. P.BRUX. INV. E.7616, I–II

As cols. III–XVIII are all census returns from Thelbthonh Simpha in the Prosopite nome, so cols. I and II are similar returns from Theresis in the same nome. In these, the subscriptions (I, 24 ff.; II, 25 ff.) have been written for the declarants by scribes who share the name Eros and may be identical.² The statement attributed to the declarants in both returns is ἀπογράφομαι ὡς ἀριστον. The editors correct the last word to ἀριστον and render the clause: 'je fais ma déclaration le mieux possible.' Then come the scribes' signatures, which are written so rapidly that a uniform reading for both could not be obtained. The problem of transcription is further complicated by a lacuna in I, 27. The pertinent lines are the following:

II, 26 ff. ἀπογράφομαι ὡς ἀριστον. "Ερως Ἀποτήριος ἔγγραφα κτλ.

If we now consider the correction of ἀριστον to ἀριστον, there is first the objection that ἀρίστα, not ἀριστον, regularly carries the adverbial force with or without ὡς.³ Another fact, however, is perhaps more significant. The papyri have many subscriptions appended to census returns and declarations of other kinds, but none of them has ever had the phrase ὡς ἀριστον (-τον). In this position, after ἐπιδεέδωκα as well as ἀπογράφομαι, other census returns sometimes have ὡς or καλὸς πρόκειται.⁴ Indeed, every one of the returns from Thelbthonh Simpha (cols. III–XVIII) has ἐπιδεέδωκα or ἀπογράφομαι ὡς πρόκειται.

But there is more to say about ἀριστον. It is an obviously correct reading of the papyrus; it stands in these texts at a point where it could readily function as the scribe's name; and Ἀρίστον is a well known name both in and out of the papyri. We may therefore ask whether ὡς is not in fact an abbreviation of ὡς πρόκειται. Remaining within the limits of the Brussels roll, we find the clause abbreviated as ὡς πρόκειται in five of the returns. While the example in VIII, 22 is not clear on the photograph, the others offer no obstacle to inspection. In X, 58; XV, 35; and XVII, 29, the scheme of the abbreviation is a couple of open loops resembling an omega followed by a curve which runs out to the right, then turns down toward the left. This is the typical treatment of πι when it is

¹ This is a convenient place to record a few minor preferences in the reading of col. v: 14 θασαγυ ( ) for θασαγυ ( ); 23 Νεκυάτος for Πειμάτος; 39 Πεισίρες for Πεισίρες (so also III, 47 and VI, 24). Cols. III–XVIII, all from Thelbthonh Simpha in the Prosopite nome and all submitted on the 19th and 20th of July A.D. 174, have an identical notation below the return. The editors present with some hesitation these alternative readings (op. cit. 39): δι' Ἀρτοκ ( ) σελέ β and δι' Ἀρτοκ ( ) ἐπι β (μιαθήδης;?). After the personal name the hand tends to become very rapid. The best examples (cols. XIII, XIV, XVIII) show σε surmounted by ε, then μυ. I propose σε (μιαθής) μυ. The photograph provided by the editors is so clear that readers ought to have no difficulty in testing this suggestion.

² The editors are inclined to regard them as identical while remaining uncertain on this point. They attribute the subscription in col. I to m. 7, in col. II to m. 7 (t). In Index IV, s.v. "Ερως, the two occurrences of the name are kept distinct, but the second is said to be 'peut-être le même que le précédent'.

³ See Stephanus, Thes. Gr. Ling., s.v. ἀριστα. Either singular or plural is used after prepositions (Preisig-Kiessling, Wörterbuch, s.v. ἀριστα).

⁴ Hombert and Préaux, op. cit. 128.
used to close an abbreviation. Only in χιλ., 30 are omega and sigma clearly distinguished before the final curve, which starts above sigma and is carried down to the line.

In ρ, 26 the photograph does not permit an exact observation, but in II, 26 the formation follows closely the description given above. If there is any difference at all, it is in the size of the final curve, which appears to be smaller because it lacks the full extension downward and to the left so noticeable in most of the other examples. The effect on the eye is nevertheless the same, and we may take it as assured that the declarant’s statement is couched in the following terms:

I, 25 f. ἀπόγρα(φομαι) ὴς π(ρόκειται)
II, 26 ἀπόγρα(φομαι) ὴς π(ρόκειται)

This is followed in both subscriptions by the scribe’s name:

I, 26 f. Ἀρίστων Ἐρως [. . .] . . .
II, 26 f. Ἀρίστων Ἐρως Απωτήρις

The photograph offers very little help with the series of letters after the name of Ariston’s father Eros, and the edition shows that the papyrus cannot be much if at all superior to the photograph. The editors take their reading in II, 27 to be a personal name and so identify Apotes as the father of Eros. This suggests for I, 26 f. the reading Ἀρίστων Ἐρως τοῦ Ἀ[.] . . ., with all of the names in the nominative case as sometimes happens. Whatever the true reading may be, and it may not be ‘Apotes’ at all,¹ its bearing is certain. It is either the name of the father of Eros and grandfather of Ariston or some word describing in some way either Ariston or his father Eros.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

¹ I am unable either to confirm or to reject the reading.
GRABGEDICTION AUS HERAKLEOPOLIS

By FRIEDRICH ZUCKER


1. Αὐτῆς Ναυκράτεως Μενελάου πατρός, ὡδίτια, ἔκεινην εὐχειν σῶν ἔχει Ὑρακλέος, ὦμοιτάκοισι ὡδίτια πάνωκαΐων λοιχείς δύνασθαι Μοῖρων νῦμασιν οὐκτροτάτους, εἰκοσί καὶ τρίς πέντε ἑτέρων χείρεσιν δ’ ὀμενοῦν Ἀρμόδιος κερίσας τούδ’ ἐπέκρυψε πάκιον, Ἀρσινόη, Μάτρωνα, Θεμιστω τέκνα λυποῦσαν, οὗ εὖτε λυπαροῦ γήρασα ἄχρι μολεῖν.
2. Ἀλλὰ σὺ "χρηστή, χαῖρ', Ἀμμωνία", ὡς ἔθος εἰς ποὺς σῶλον τὸν σαύτον πρὸς δόμον ἀβλαβέως.
3. Ἀλλ’.

4. Πάτρις καὶ γονέων σο’ οὖμός πόθος ἡλλοτρίωσεν’ σοῦ δ’ ἐμὲ τῆς μελέτης ἐστέρεσεν βάνατος πένθος ἐμοῖς δόμοις καὶ δάκρυα λυγρὰ λυποῦσαν

2. ΧΘΩΙ litterae N linea obliqua omissa. 9. ΘΩΣ in lapide. 14. l. λυποῦσε, editor casum ab auctore ad σ(ε) v. 12 accommodatum esse sentit fortasse v. septimi memoria ducto; equidem lapicidam erravisse malim, eiusdem v. memoria captum.

2 Mir zugänglich gemacht durch die große Freundlichkeit des Herrn Herausgebers. Das Nachfolgende zugleich Rechtfertigung meiner ihm eroffneten Bedenken gegen seine Beurteilung des Gedichts.
GRABGEDICHT AUS HERAKLEOPOLIS

15
téknov τ' ὀρφανικῶν νήπιον ἡμικάνην.
Λυπῶν ἐδι βιοτᾶς, Ἀμμωνία, ἔστι τὸ λαοῦν
Ἀμμωδίων τι δ' ἐγὼ σοῦ δίχα φῶς ἔθν' ὅρω;
ἀλλα.

20
Αὖξεν στερνοτύπου γόνων παῦσαί με δακρύων,
ὦ πόσι: μὴ κωφῶι τῶμβωι ἐπιστενάχει.
Σῶν ψάλται λεγέων Ἀμμωνίαν οὐκέτ' ἐφικτόν,
Ἀμμωδίας στυγνοίς γάρ με κέκευθ' Ἀδης·
οικία μου νεκύων ἀνεπίστροφα πρὸς φῶς Ἰωθς
ταῦτα: μάτην λυπρῶς πένθες ἐνδέχεσαί.

25
στέργε τὰ μέχρι τέλους μοιρῆς, δόσων οὖ τινιν νοῦν
ἀνθρώπων πάσιν δ' ὧδ' υπόκειται ὄδος.
Ἀμμωνία, χρηστή, χαίρε.
(ἐτους) γ' Ἐπειφ ἰα.

22. ἀνω στιγμῆν posui. 25. et initii et finis litteras recte distinxit A. Oguse; interpuncti.


Die drei Teile der Inschrift, durch zweimaliges ἀλλα getrennt, bieten nicht, wie meist in solchen Fällen, Variationen desselben Gedankens, sondern zuerst fortlaufende Mitteilungen und dann ein Gespräch. Der erste Teil stellt dem Wanderer die Inhaberin des Grabes und ihre Familie vor, gibt die Todesursache an und entläßt mit üblichem Wunschgruß; im zweiten richtet der Witwer trauernde und sehnsüchtige Worte an die Tote; im dritten hält ihm diese die Unerbittlichkeit des allgemeinen Todeschicksals vor, den Gedanken in einer Reihe von Sätzen variierend.


1 Über solche Epigrammserien L. Robert, Hellenica, 4, 81 f.

2 Dagegen ursprünglicher Gebrauch, X, 490 ἕμαρ ὅρφανος.

Orthographie einwandfrei: iota adscr. regelmäßig im Dativ der o- und a- Dekl., dazu in σώζων v. 10;1 beachte auch Μοιρᾶς v. 4.


Kein trockäischer Einschnitt im 4. Fuß, was unzulässig wäre, aber 14, 25 im 2. Fuß, was gemieden wird, aber hier gemildert durch die Zusammengehörigkeit der Worte. In 19 Wortschuß nach Hebung des 5. Fußes (με gehört zum folgenden δακρύων), was verpönt, außer unter hier nicht erfüllten Bedingungen.

Gegen die Regel strenger Technik, daß Hiatkürzung nur in daktyleischen Versformen auf -αυ gestattet ist, wird in 2, 20, verstoßen; in 9, 16, 21, entschuldigt der Eigenname.

Also leicht fließende Verse von überwiegend guter Technik.

Sprache. In der Sprache kann von 'mélange de dorismes et d'ionismes', wie der Herausgeber meint, nicht die Rede sein. Das ion. η wird festgehalten mit Ausnahme von ἄμμωνία, Μάτρων und v. 16 βιοτάς. Begreiflich, daß Ι., einer der gebräuchlichsten Namen in Ägypten, nicht geändert wird. Von den vielen mit Μητρψ gebildeten theophoren Namen begegnen einige wie Μάτρων, Ματρέας, Μάτρψ überhaupt, soviel ich sehe, überwiegend mit Α. Übrigens könnte in 7 auch die Klangfolge der Vokale bestimmend gewesen sein, und das gilt natürlich auch für βιοτάς, aber vielleicht wirkt im letzteren Fall auch mit, daß das überwiegend der poetischen Sprache angehörige Wort in der Tragödie in den lyrischen Partien vorkommt.

Stil. Der Stil zeichnet sich durch Vermeidung von Breite und durch sparsame Verwendung von Beisprüchen aus. Als wirklich ungewöhnlich im Wortschatz können nur gelten (s. auch zu 19) ὀνεπιστροφός 23 im aktiven Sinn und δοσίς in der Bedeutung 'Aufgabe'. Aufs Ganze gesehen halten sich mit den gedanklichen Motiven Wortschatz und Phraseologie in der gewohnten Sphäre der Grabepigramme.3 Doch dieses Gewohnte hat nichts Leeres; und eigene Prägung zeigen v. 12 (s. o. meine Bem.), 24 πένθεσις ἐνδεξαμαι und die eben angegebenen Ausdrücke. Wenn 'Rhetorisches' nur in den bereits hervorgehobenen Erscheinungen in vv. 2, 13, 17, zu finden ist, so entspricht das der stilistischen Sparsamkeit des Ganzen, wie sie sich uns bisher ergeben hat. Einmal

1 Mayser, Gramm. d. ptolem. Pap. 1 132, 134.
2 O. Knauer, Asklepiades von Samos, 63 f.
3 Aus Raumersparnis habe ich nur ganz wenig Parallelstellen anführen können.
verrät sich ein Mangel an Beweglichkeit darin, daß in 7 und 14 ἀποδεῖν, resp. in 14


dlπούης, am Versschluß erscheint.

Aus der Gesamthaltung spricht ein eigener Stilwille. Am deutlichsten aber spricht
die Bewußtheit und das Können des Verfassers aus zwei verschiedenartigen Gestal-
tungsmomenten, im deren ersten teilweise Künstlichkeit sich aufdrängt. Dieses erste
ist die Verteilung der Namen. Herkunftsort und Name des Vaters eröffnen die Angaben
über die Verstorbenen, die Namen des Mannes und der Kinder stehen etwas nach der
Mitte, der der Verstorbenen selbst erscheint erst im letzten Dichtichon, und zwar im
Gruß des Grabbesuchers; solche Verteilungskunst war schon längst geübt. Dann aber
kommt das Künstliche: Ἀμμονία steht jedesmal, 9, 16, 21, vor der diaer. buc. und
zweimal mit Ἀρμόδιος in einem Satz in folgender Weise: 16–17 Ἀμμονία voc. — Ἀρμο-
δίω am Versanfang, umgekehrt 21–22 Ἀμμονία — Ἀρμόδιος am Versanfang (Chiasmus
der Kasus).

Das andere Moment ist die gegensätzliche stilistische Gestaltung des 1. und 3.
Gedichts. Das 1., rein berichtende, besteht, vom Schlußdistichon abgesehen, in
8 vv. aus zwei ausgedehnteren Sätzen. Dagegen bestehen die 8 vv. des 3. aus 10 kurzen,
mit zwei Ausnahmen asyndetisch aneinandergereihten Kola, von denen nur zwei
einen ganzen Vers umfassen, über den sie mit einem Wort hinausreichen, während die
übrigen unter dem Umfang eines Verses stehen. Und zwar folgen auf drei asyndetische
Imperative1 sieben Variationen der Feststellung — eine in imperativischer Form —
der Unerbittlichkeit des Todes, unter der alle Menschen stehen.

Dies führt uns sofort auf den Gedanken- und Gefühlsgehalt. Das erste Gedicht ist
durchaus in objektivem Berichtsstil gehalten, nur daß mit dem Wunsch für langes
Leben der Kinder abgeschlossen wird; kaum kann man von einer Gefühlssanduertung
in dem gewohnten ὀκτόρατας (4) sprechen. Im zweiten spricht der Gatte seine Trauer
im Mittelstück (13–15) in Wendungen aus, die sich in keiner Weise über das Geläufige
erheben. Stärker redet das Gefühl in 12 — mit dem prosaischen ἐλλειψαν — und in
16 f., wo er die Tote mit ihrem Namen anredet, aber auch ganz zurückhaltend, schlicht
und ohne große Worte. Der abschließenden Frage (17) nimmt die Gesamthaltung
das Verzweifelte, das im Grunde darin liegt.

Und nun ist es merkwürdig, wie die Gattin alles Gefühl zurückdrängt oder geradezu
ausschließt — nur darin, daß sie in der schmerzlich an das Intime ruhenden Fest-
stellung ihre beiden Namen vereinigt (21), wie es der Gatte getan hat (16–17), zittert
das Gefühl. Wollte man es grob ausdrücken, so spricht sie zum Gatten in einer Reihe
von Gemeinplätzen, in dem üblichen Nacheinander von λόγου παρανειπτικοί, teils
mahnend teils feststellend.2 Auch hier ist nicht der Versuch einer auffallenden For-
mulierung gemacht, auch hier ist die Sprache einfach und schlicht, aber den vv. 23–25
ist, wie wir gesehen haben, der Stempel eigener würdiger Prägung aufgedrückt.
Merkwürdig, — und doch wieder nicht. Ist es nicht typisch griechisch, den Affekt
durch die Gnome in Schranken zu weisen, im Grunde zur göttlichen Ordnung
zurückzuführen?

1 Sehr nahe kommen im Ausdruck die vier Verse von A. P. vii 667, woran der Herausgeber erinnert.
2 Der Herausgeber hat mit Recht an die ersten 6 vv. der Cornelia-Elegie des Properz erinnert.
Niemand wird die künstlerischen und Gefühlswerte der Grabinschrift verkennen, die mit vornehmer Zurückhaltung, mit überkommenem und mit eigener Gestaltung innigem Gefühl Ausdruck zu verleihen weiß.


Jena

¹ So richtig J. und L. Robert, a. O.
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GREEK INSCRIPTIONS (1952–3)
By P. M. FRASER

I. Bibliography
(1) Two surveys of Greek epigraphy by J. and L. ROBERT appeared in 1952–3: RÆG 65, 124–202, and 66, 1–100 [offprint]. They are referred to, where necessary, in the following report, as ‘Bull. 1952’ and ‘Bull. 1953’, followed by the serial number of the entry.
(3) A consolidated Index des communications et mémoires publiées par l’Institut d’Égypte, 1859–1952, has appeared, giving full references to all authors and the articles published by them.

II. Corpora
(4) The second volume of J.-B. FREL’S Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum (CIF) appeared in 1953. The volume was partially completed by F. before his death in 1939, subsequently revised and continued by TH. KITTEL, who died in 1949, and seen through the press by D. G. SPADAFORA. Inequities are therefore inevitable. This fascicule contains the inscriptions of Asia and Africa, including a large section with the Jewish (Greek and Aramaic) inscriptions of Egypt (nos. 1424–1538). This provides lengthy bibliographies, and in some cases the first photographs of the inscriptions. The texts are mostly at second hand, and call for little comment. But the work is badly planned. The provision of (typographically most inaccurate) majuscule copies when a photograph is provided is wholly unnecessary, and the space thus used might have been devoted to further explanatory notes, which as they stand are mostly quite inadequate. Equally, the large, uncritical bibliographies should have been cut, and, at the same time, modernized (e.g. the literature on the Jews in Egypt rarely goes further than SIR HAROLD BELL’S Juden u. Griechen (1926) and BEVAN’S History of Egypt under the Ptolemies (1927)). I note some points of detail. 1424–31 contain the early Hellenistic inscriptions from Ibramiyah, two of which have the interesting formula KNEM, which has been regarded as Hebrew of unknown meaning, and (unconvincingly) as an abbreviation of καυχός ἐσθήθη μνημεῖον καὶ ηὐτοῖς νῦν ἐν μακραίοις. 1430: the name Συμοτῆρα is found elsewhere, and there is a wide range of proper names in Σμ.—: see BECHTEL, HP pp. 490 f. 1432, reference to BRECCIA’S catalogue is omitted, where it is no. 41. This gives a more detailed discussion, and (pl. 11, no. 29) an excellent photograph (though BRECCIA’S brackets in the printed text are all wrong). 1440–1538 are the inscriptions from elsewhere than Alexandria. On 1440 see the discussion of VOGLIANO, Riv. Fil. 67, 250. The synagogue inscription from Crocodilopolis published by VOGLIANO (ibid. 247–51) does not appear in the present collection at all. It also belongs to the reign of Euergetes I. 1441–2 provide photographs, not hitherto available, of SB 5862 and SEG VIII, 366 (SB 7454), the dedicatory inscriptions of the synagogues at Xenephry and Nitria respectively. (It may be here noticed that in his valuable list of synagogues in Ptolemaic Egypt, BEVAN, op. cit., p. 112, note 1, wrongly places Xenephry in the Fayyum: it is in the western Delta, near Damanhûr.) 1451–1530 are the large and important collection of late Ptolemaic and early Imperial Jewish tombstones from Tell el-Yahûdiyâh (Hill of the Jews), the ancient Leontopolis, in the south-eastern Delta. It is very useful to have these collected. 1452: Μίκρος is claimed as a Greek form of the Hebrew name Mikah. It is also a common Greek name. 1467: the rather surprising laudatory epithet κομψός occurs also in SEG I, 1467, from Terenuthis. 1489: considerable confusion here. The inscription was originally published by EDGAR, BSA Alex. 15, 38, and repeated as SB 6235. Subsequently PEAK republished it, regarding it as previously unpublished, in an improved form, BSA Alex. 27, p. 57, no. 3, whence it appears as SEG VIII, 374 and (without reference to its earlier publication in SB) as SB 7804. It appears in CIF in the form originally published by EDGAR, with no reference to its later history. 1490 pays no heed to some of the improvements introduced into the text by WILHELM and PEAK. 1508, on the other hand, gives the texts of Wilhelm and Peak side by side, even though Wilhelm showed in detail that many of Peak’s restorations could not stand, and Wilhelm’s remarks are largely repeated here. 1509 reproduces a bad text in lines 1–3 of this pleasing poem. 1531–2 represent the
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meagre epigraphical record of Jews in the Fayyum. 1533 is from Minia and 1534 from the Necropolis at Antinoopolis, which has yielded many Christian inscriptions. From Upper Egypt we have two pieces (1537-8) from Edfu, OGIS 73 and 74.

(5) A. Bataille, Les Inscriptions grecques du temple de Hathepsout à Deir-el-Bahari (Publ. de la société Foud F d'épigraphie, Textes et documents X, Le Caire, 1951) contains the Greek graffiti from the temple, consisting mainly of expressions of thanks to Ammonites-Akhepios. I have given a very brief account of this already, JEA 39, 131. The reading of any of the graffiti is very uncertain. I note here only details: cf. Bull. 1953, no. 240. Nos. 7-11, correctly dated by B. to the Ptolemaic period, probably belong to the latter part of the third century. 22, the hand suggests rather Euergetes I. The name Πανικος is very frequent in Egypt, notably in the Thebaid where Min, identified with Pan, was particularly worshipped: see Perdrizet and Lefebvre, Memnonion, 75, note, and Hoffner, Arch. Orientální, 15, 36, no. 41. In Greece it is rare: Sittig, De graec. nomin. theoph. 140-1. 44, cf. Bull. loc. cit. 63 offers a new text of IGR 11, 1228. B.‘s version differs considerably from the previous texts, based on a copy of Salt, and the condition of the writing is now such that Salt’s copy has equal, or greater, validity. 65: written by an Egyptian doctor. In line 1 perhaps read Ψοτακαβον, ὁ καὶ Λυκ[μ]ίονος. 114/5: see Bull. loc. cit. 126, a long and extremely difficult text, contains an account of a miracle, recorded by a tesserarius of a vexillatio stationed at Koptos. 131, τὸ προσκόνημα Ὀλυνος ἷμιρινον σπαστον καὶ τοῦ νιου αὐτοῦ. Op spastou B. says ‘nom propre? nom de métier?’ The reading is clear. Could it mean ‘ruptured’? 182 has a formula unique in this series, ὑποὺ ἀνέδομεν ... ἐς χώραν εὐδοκιας. 187: the opening letters of Anth. Pal. IX, 538, which contains all the letters of the alphabet.

(6) In Analecta Bollandiana, 70, 116 ff., F. Halkin continues his account of hagiographical inscriptions (cf. ibid. 67, 87-105, 69, 67-76) published within the last twenty years; 117-18 contain references to the material from Egypt. H.’s account is largely a repetition, without discussion, of the inscriptions in Lefebvre mentioned in those volumes of Leclercq’s Dictionnaire which have appeared in that period, reproducing the text as there given.

(7) R. M. Cook and A. G. Woodhead, BSA 47, 159-70, and pls. 34-35 (good photographs), give a corpus, including many unpublished sherds, of ‘painted inscriptions on Chiot pottery’, mainly from Naukratis. There is an analysis of the various aspects of the inscriptions, which, according to the authors (162), cover only a few years. The pottery is said to belong to the first half of the sixth century (159, 163). To the epigraphical criteria for date there cited add the Samian stele now published by Klaffenbach, Mitt. Inst. 6, 15 ff., who also has a useful discussion of the dates of the pieces invoked by Cook and Woodhead, who speak of the texts as ‘generally dated’ and ‘vaguely dated’. The article ends with a list of the 231 pieces, in which the letters on each sherd are recorded in minuscule. This is a useful article, but the study of the names is trivial.

III. New texts

(8) A. Fakhry, Ann. Sod. 51, 425 ff., publishes three Greek inscriptions from Gebel el-Ter in Kharga Oasis; two of these have been published previously (see below, no. 31), the third is new. It is a graffito of two lines, of which F. gives a facsimile (fig. 96) but no transcription. No obvious sense attaches to the legible letters, which I read as τὸ προ (in the form Ἐ: perhaps τὸ προ[σκόνημα]) αμμωνιτιφικομεν | θαυμ.

(9) G. Mantegnoff, Tell Edfu, 1939 (Fouilles franco-polonaises, Rapports III, 1950), 363 (and pl. 52), publishes three Greek fragments from houses in the northern part of the excavated area. 1, given by Mantegnoff in the form ζυκε- | προ[σκόνημα], with the comment ‘d’une date ancienne; le II avec ses deux hastes inégaless, dont la deuxième est un peu arrondie, remonte peut-être au iv° siècle av. J.-C.’ The photograph on pl. 52 shows that the inscription is, as one might expect, far later: the hand is a normal, badly written one of the Graeco-Roman period. 2 is a meaningless fragment. 3, a Byzantine stela, should probably be read thus: μη λαμ, ὀφεια δοσις, [i.e. ὀφεις? Tod] ἀθικοντως ἐν τῷ σο[και]? ἐμοι, followed by alpha and omega.

(10) J. Leclant, Orientalia, 20, 456 and pl. 40 (L’An. ép. 1952, 48-49, no. 159), records and translates a dedication found by Z. Ghoneim in the season of 1949/50 at the Serapeion at Luxor (its discovery is also recorded briefly in Arch. Orientální 16, 165 and Aph 56, 43). It is dated to Tybi 29 of the tenth year of Hadrian’s reign, i.e. 24 Jan. 126 (not 127). The text is of considerable interest. It reads:
The erased prefect is identified by L. as T. Flavius Titianus, prefect in the years 126–33 (Stein, Präfekten, 65 ff.). The inscription is two months earlier than the earliest known reference to this prefect. A full publication of this important piece is announced by L. Cf. also below, no. 21.

(11) *Annuaire du musée gréco-romain*, 3 (1940–9) (Municipalité d’Alexandrie, 1952), published by A. Adriani, contains new material from excavations at various sites, particularly at Hadra, the isle of Pharos (Ras et-Tine), and Abušir. From Hadra we have (p. 23, fig. 18, and pp. 25 ff., and pl. viii, 1) a painted funerary stela of a horseman and page, with the inscription *Nikánoò Make...io[?] and a six-line epigram, evidently of early Hellenistic date (p. 27, and pl. 4, 5):

Πάτριν Ἀρακλάδιν ὁδοπόρος
ἦν τοις ικτηταῖς, ἐπείτεν ὁδίνες παι-
δα Πολυκράτειος ἔγηγαγον εἰς Ἀθ-
δὴν Ἀγαθόκλειον οὐ γὰρ ἔλα-
φραί | ἐπὶ θεσμοὺ τέκνου
πρὸς φαος ἐρχομένου

At Kôm el-Nougous (probably anc. Plinthine), a point c. one mile east of Abušir (Taposiris Magna), A. excavated a Hellenistic necropolis, and publishes (p. 145, tomb no. 13) a limestone funerary stela with the inscription Δώτιμος Νυκτόνος Περγαῖος, (p. 147, tomb no. 22) a Hadra vase with inscription painted on the neck *Meraç...io[?]*, (p. 150) a loculus-cover bearing the name Δημητρία.

(12) R. Bruyère, in *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Medineh* (années 1935–40) (Fouilles de l’Inst. franç. du Caire, vol. xx, 2), 1952, 20 ff., publishes finds of the Graeco-Roman period. They include numerous Graeco-Roman amphorae, of which he records here the inscriptions of three Rhodian pieces (cf. fig. 92): Ἀνδρικός, Διοδότος (for the reading, which B. gives here as Διοδόης, see below); ἐπὶ Νακ—; and finally, one given by him as ΡΑΤΟΥΣΜΙΝΟΤΟΥΚΕΙΠΕΙΣΙ, which should be read as ἐπὶ Πειν[α]ράτου Σμύβου. In his account of the excavations of 1945–6 and 1946–7 (Fouilles etc., xxi, 1952) he publishes, p. 51 and fig. 38, a facsimile of Rhodian stamps with the names Λυστοκλείς, ἐπὶ Πειν[α]ράτου Σμύβου (same piece as above? see his note p. 51, note 1. The reproduction, fig. 38, shows that there is no room for ΛΤ between Σ and Ρ), Ἀνδρικός (fig. 38, 3, as above), ἐπὶ Ν. . . . Φρύ[ xmax. e.g.] *Υαυ[κό]λου (38, 4, as above), Διοδότου (38, 5, see above), and a name in reverse which I cannot read (38, 6) and two stamp-marks (38, 36, and 37) Κ and ΠΤΟ.

(13) P. M. Fraser and A. Rumpf, *JEA* 38, 65–74, ‘Two Ptolemaic Dedications’, publish two identically worded dedicatory inscriptions of a temple of Poseidon Hippios belonging to the reign of Philometor, of unknown provenance and now in the British Museum. The second bears a relief commented upon by Rumpf. For evidence for Poseidon in Egypt add now the papyrus from Tebtunis published by A. Vogliano, *Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz*, 2, 517, in which a deity (Sarapis, according to V.) is described as δ σύναρχων Δίως και Ποσειδόνων. V. does not give any indication of date.

(14) D. Meredith continues to publish material from the Eastern Desert (cf. *JEA* 38, 119, no. 14) with commendable speed. (a) In *Chron. d’Égypte*, 28, 126–41, ‘Eastern Desert of Egypt: Notes on Inscriptions’, he publishes twenty-one inscriptions from Mons Porphyrites, of which eight (nos. 14–21) are unpublished; for 1–13 see below, no. 20. The new pieces are mostly unimportant fragments containing isolated words (no reproductions), but 14 is of interest as recording a dedication to σ[ε]ρχως Θεολ by persons possibly connected with the quarries, [--λαρο] μας. (b) In (i) *JEA* 38, 94–111, and (ii) ibid. 39, 95–106, ‘The Roman Remains in the Eastern Desert of Egypt’, he gives a detailed survey of the northern part of the area. It is mainly concerned with buildings, but contains references to numerous inscriptions, published and unpublished. In (i) he refers to inscriptions recently published or republished by himself, Tregenza, and Scaife (cf. *JEA* 38, 119, no. 14). In (ii) M. deals with the southern region, on the Leukos Limen and
Berenike roads. He starts with a brief but formidable account, in technical language, of ancient gold-mining, and then records in general terms the nature of the Greek and Latin προσκυνήματα of Hammāmāt, mentions OGIS 30, the dedication by Satyros to Arsinoe Philadelphus, at Bīr 'Abbād, near Edfu, and fragments of Ptolemaic and Imperial inscriptions seen by, or known to, Wilkinson at Berenike itself. One such fragment, CIG 4841, now lost, forms the left part of Breccia, Iscr. 38, of which there is a clearer text in SB 2039, since Breccia got his brackets muddled up. From near Philoteras, at a site provisionally identified as 'Aenum', M. reports three Ptolemaic inscriptions found by Tregenna, and from near Bīr Wasif, a little farther inland, we have a corrected text of the graffito Bull. Soc. Roy. Géog. du Caire, 11 (wrongly given by M. here and elsewhere as Bull. Inst. fr. 11), p. 122 (non vidi), Ἕλειος Κλεομένου Θεός. M. gives a brief account of the Mons Smaragdus area, lying north of the Berenike road, and questions whether OGIS 132 can support a Ptolemaic date for the working of the mines. The epigraphical material used is not always very carefully designated, and it is at times difficult to discover what is already published and what is not, but the whole is of fundamental importance, and contains a great deal of useful (and some not so useful) bibliographical material.

In JRS 43, 38-40, 'Annusio Plocamus: Two Inscriptions from the Berenice Road', Meredith publishes a bilingual inscription of considerable interest at a cave-shelter, Wādi Menīh on the Berenike road (marked on map, JEA 39, 96), from the note-books of the late H. A. Winkler. It records the visit of one Aνoς Ποσιλος Άννου Πλοκάου, and the Greek text is dated 2 July a.d. 6. M. naturally connects this with the story in Plin. NH vii, 84, regarding a libertus of Annusio Plocamus, a farmer of the Red Sea vectigal, who was sailing round Africa, and was carried by storm to Ceylon, and an embassy from Ceylon which visited Rome in the reign of Claudius. It appears as if Annusio Plocamus had been active in some capacity or other at a far earlier date than that hitherto been suspected.

I may also note here, though it falls outside the scope of this survey, the Nabataean inscriptions from the area, based on material provided by M., published by Littmann, Bull. Sch. Or. Afr. Stud. 15, 1-28. M. contributes a few general remarks, 26-28.

(15) J. Schwartz, Bull. inst. fr. 50, 89-98, 'Inscriptions et objets de l'époque romaine et byzantine, trouvés à Tōd' (near Arment), publishes two fragmentary Christian tombstones (no reproductions or copies), one piece with the words τοποθετατε(?) and a fragment of a Latin Imperial titulature which S. daringly dates to the twentieth trib. pot. of Marcus Aurelius (between 164 and 166). Of the titulature all that remains is - - - - - - EP - - - - NEPO - - - - TRBP - - - -.

(16) A. Fakhry, in The Necropolis of El-Bagawat in Kharga Oasis (Government Press, Cairo, 1951), publishes the notable Christian remains of the site. The walls of the various 'chapels' are decorated with biblical scenes and characters (some now damaged) with descriptive titles in Greek (those of the 'Chapel of Exodus' have already been studied by J. Leibovitch, Bull. Soc. arch. copte, 5, 62-68, 'Hellénismes et hébraïsmes dans une chapelle chrétienne à El-Bagawat'). The plates (esp. 20-25, 36-46) show the innumerable, largely indecipherable, graffiti, Greek, Coptic, Arabic, and modern, on the walls of the chapels.

(17) L. Castiglione, Acta Antiqua, 1, 471-93, 'A Terracotta Box from Roman Egypt', publishes a small sarcophagus-shaped box in the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest, a broken duplicate of a complete piece in the Collection Fouquet (Perdrizet, Les Terres-cuites, Collection Fouquet, 1921, i, 94-95, no. 239, pl. 36, below). The relief on the sides, when restored from the whole piece, represents a funeral banquet with Dionysiac motifs. A flat plaque, identified by C. as the lid of the box, contains a crude relief of Aphrodite Anadyomene, and underneath it the badly carved inscription ἡ χάρας in a rough tabula ansata. C. publishes photographs of other similar boxes in Bonn and Hildesheim, discussing the latter in detail. He discusses the use of the word χαράς for 'sarcophagus' and the existence of vat-shaped sarcophagi, publishing a photograph (fig. 8) of one such from Roman Egypt, now in Budapest. He understands the inscription on the lid, ἡ χάρας, as 'an abbreviated magical-religious formula' referring to the favour of the goddess. He prefers Syria to Egypt as the provenance of the sarcophagi, in view of the comparative rarity of sarcophagi in Egypt.

See also nos. 46, 83, 90.

IV. Studies of previously published inscriptions

(18) H. Brauern, JDAI 65/6, 231-63, 'Auswärtige Gäste am Ptolemaierhofe', discusses in detail the dipinti on Hadra vases. This is the fullest account which has appeared for a long time, but is antiquated
in many ways, and takes us back rather than forward. There is much in the use and historical interpretation of the inscriptions with which I disagree, and there is little error of fact. I have already had occasion to refer to some items elsewhere (see no. 25 below). I may note here, in the strictly epigraphical field, that his list omits SB 2110 (cf. L. Robert, Coll. Froehner, p. v, note 1), and 6226, for the full publication of which see below no. 25. The reading given by him of SB 1685 (his no. 8) takes no heed of the re-reading of the vase by Edgar: see SEG 11, 880. Of his no. 19 he says ‘Fundort unbekannt’, but it is from Ibrahimiah (see Breccia, BSA Alex. 9, 88).


Some of the statues are inscribed, of others the identity can only be conjectured. In (a) P. dates the whole group to the reign of Ptolemy I on the basis of the statue which he identifies as that of Demetrius of Phaleron, and which, he claims, was erected before that individual’s expulsion from Egypt in the reign of Philip of Thrace. This date corresponds with the generally accepted priority of the Memphian over the Alexandrian Serapeion, though P. seems to regard it as the first indication of such priority. However, in fact, the identification of the statue with Demetrius is conjectural: Wilcken, JDAI 32, 165 says of it, ‘Beispielhalber könnte man an Demetrios von Phaleron denken’. Whether indeed the statues do support an early date must remain uncertain, since the contemporaneity of the statues with the persons they are claimed to represent cannot be demonstrated; it is assumed by P. (see (c), p. 20, n. 3), and cf. Wilcken, loc. cit., p. 163; Schefold, Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, 191, n. 1, says of the whole group: ‘man wird sie jedoch frühestens in spätellenischer Zeit datieren können, denn die betterhaltene Figur, die des Pindar, ist nur als klassizistische Rückstabilisierung einer hellenistischen Zeit zu verstehen’.

In (b) P. discusses what he calls the Hesiod fragment. The piece, as now rediscovered, is woefully damaged; of the features only mouth and beard remain, and there is no inscription. In (c) P. tackles the statue of Pindar, the identity of which is assured by the painted inscription, seen by Mariette, now vanished. Of the inscription on the back of the throne of Pindar, read by Mariette as Διονυσάιοις ἔροις Ως only Ce remain (lunate sigma and iota, as Ψ; or part of omicron and iota?). In (d) P. claims that unpublished plans of the Serapeion, made by Mariette, confirm the conjecture of Rousse, that the Serapeion C at Delos had some features in common with the Memphian Serapeion. P. gives a plan of the Delian Serapeion, but not, unfortunately, of Mariette’s version of the Memphian one. In (e) J.-P. Leuer gives a general account of the discoveries of Mariette in 1850 and of his own recent ones. His interpretation adopts many of P.’s speculations. He publishes a head from his excavations, which he originally proposed to identify with one of the later Ptolemies entitled Dionysos, but P. stopped him, and told him it was the head of Demetrius of Phaleron.

The features of the head are wholly absent. After reading these articles one returns with great satisfaction to Wilcken’s admirable paper on the subject.

(20) In Chron. d’Égypte, 28, 126 ff. nos. 1-13 (cf. above, no. 14), D. Meredith republishes, from notes of Tregenna and from other sources, inscriptions from Mons Porphyrites. (1) Text (with photograph of right half) of CIG 4713f. There is confusion in M’s account of the history of the inscription. M. gives it as L’An. ép. 1936, no. 61, but it does not appear there, nor in the article of Scaife’s from which L’An. ép. derives. The confusion is apparently with (2) below. The text, based on T’s field-notes, as given by M. differs from earlier publications only in giving ‘Ελικων for ‘Ηλικων, which must surely be an error either of T. or M. In the last line M. takes P as equivalent to δ or χ, and is doubtless right (though it is hardly correct to say that earlier scholars ‘all read correctly ἐνι [ἐκακοντάρχου], since the stone, as M. himself testifies, has only ρη, which obviously can be e.g. ‘Π(οθου)’. (2) SEG VIII, 645. (3) CIG 4713b = SEG VIII, 646, of which M. gives an almost useless photograph. In A, line 5, the regnal year is difficult, but at the end we now have a month, ἐκάλης, (already suggested by A. H. M. Jones in 1933). The regnal year was read by Wilkinson as KB, and this is doubtless correct; documents dated by Hadrian’s twenty-second year are not uncommon in Upper Egypt; I do not understand M.’s comment ‘Hadrian’s reign lasted just under 21 years’. Of B the reading is now given as ἐνι Αἰγυπτικὸς τῶ ἐντρόπτης. (4) SEG VIII, 647, the dedication of
a Melitian church. This stone is lost, and M.'s copy is based (apparently) on Wilkinson's MS; it does not differ from earlier versions. He discusses the meaning of καθολικός in this inscription. (5) SEG viii, 648. (6) SEG viii, 644, where M. wrongly reads φιλανθόρας (see the copy in Scaife, loc. cit. in SEG). (7) SEG viii, 649. (8) SEG viii, 650. (9) SEG viii, 651. (10) Quarrymen's marks, some unpublished. (11)–(12), Bull. Fac. Arts, 11, 2, 1949, 144–5. (13) Schneider, Naturwissenschaftliche Beiträge, 1883, 107, incomprehensible. The total gain from the republication of these pieces is negligible, and one has to refer to Scaife's articles for facsimiles. Space and time might have been saved by simply listing them, or recording corrections.

(21) J. Schwartz, Chron. d'Égypte, 27, 254–6, 'Un Préfet d'Égypte frappé de "damnatio memoriae" sous le règne d'Hadré' seeks to determine the erased name of the prefect in the new Hadrianic inscription from Luxor (above, no. 10). The inscription is of Jan. 126 (not 127, as Leclant said), and Leclant identified the prefect with T. Flavius Titianus. S. points to the apparent lacuna in the sequence of the prefects between T. Haterius Nepos, not attested after 13 Apr. 124, and T. Flavius Titianus, not attested before 20 Mar. 126, and inserts in the gap a Vibius Maximus, whom he assumes to have been a prefect of Egypt like his father, C. Vibius Maximum (pref. 103–7, Stein, Pröfekten, 50–53), whose name is found erased in four inscriptions. S. concludes that it was the son whose memory was officially damned (the proceeding P. Oxy. 471 is referred to him by S.), and that the memory of the father suffered 'par ricochet'. This seems wholly fantastic. All that we know of any son of C. Vibius Maximus is that he was born (Stat. Syria, iv, 7, 31–32: o diem laetum! venit ecce nobis Maximum alter). The prefect of the inscription cannot be determined; he may have been either Haterius Nepos or Flavius Titianus or neither.

(22) In Bull. Inst. d'Égypte, 33, 215–8, J. Doessse writes on 'Cryptographie copte et cryptographie grecque', and publishes a good photograph (pl. 1) of the remarkable Byzantine leather writing-case from Antinoopolis, now in the Musée Guimet, previously published in Bull. Soc. nat. ant. France, 1898, 331 (whence Leclercq, Dict. Arch. Chrét. ii, 2, 1582). Below is an incomprehensible collection of Greek and Coptic letters, in which D. sees (216, n. 2) 'un cryptogramme ou peut-être une table mathématique'. He refers to other Greek and Coptic cryptograms and discusses in particular the lines inscribed on a piece of wood found in the ruins of the monastery of Epiphanius at Sheikh Abd el-Kurna (Crum and Evelyn White, Mon. of Epiphanius, ii, no. 616) consisting of Anth. Pal. ix, 538, which contains all the letters of the alphabet (see also above, no. 5, ad fin.), and a second line which may be a cypher-equivalent of the first.

(23) In Bull. 1952, 190–6, no. 180, J. and L. Robert comment at length on the Ephebic inscription published by M. N. Tod, JEA 37, 86–99. They shed valuable light on much which had remained obscure to T., and criticize many of his remarks. They provide a detailed account of the Antinoeia of Antinoopolis, on the basis of papyri mainly of Oxyrhynchus, and explain the phrase Ἡλεος Ἀεώτιος (sc. ἀυτός) as deriving from the cult of an Egyptian deity, 'qui était à la fois lion et soleil'. They (convincingly) suggest that the stone is from Leontopolis (Tell Mokdam) in the Delta, where the lion-cult is well established. They give a valuable collection of material, inscriptions, etc., concerning Leontopolis.

(24) In Chron. d'Égypte, 28, 121–5, 'Notes sur quelques prêtres et prêtresses épónymes', R. Rémondon discusses SEG iv, 871 (SB 6664), the dedication of the Boeotian πολίτημα, of the reign of Philometor and Cleopatra II, in connexion with a P. inv. R. Weill, in which the same Boeotian, Καθαροδόρος Καθαροδόρος, appears as priest of Alexander and the Theoi Soteres. R. claims that the inscription can be dated after 164 B.C. on account of the association of the royal children with their parents. The children are absent from SB 1435 of the joint reign of Philometor and Euergetes II, and probably present in a document of 164 (UPZ 110, ii, 1–3). At the same time it is probably earlier than 153/2, when Eupator was associated with Philometor. The papyrus is difficult to date. R. proposes to supply [εὐκατηφού] in l. 2, which gives a calenderequation for this year (156/5), 12 Xandikos = 12 Phaophi, which appears to contradict a previously known equation of the same year, 1 Xandikos = 25 Thoth. R., however, prefers this solution, because, among other reasons, we know of the priests of 160/5, the other alternative date (supplying [δικατηφού]), and they are different from those named here. This argument seems decisive.

(25) In JEA 39, 84–94, 'A Hadra Vase in the Ashmolean Museum', T. Rönné and P. M. Fraser republish a Hadra vase incompletely published previously (SB 6226), treating respectively the archaeological and epigraphical aspects of the matter. F. discusses the general chronology of the vases (cf. above, no. 18).

(26) In Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz, 11, 508–9, A. Vogliano discusses the interesting inscription
published by him in *Primo Rapporto, Scevi di Madinet Madi* (1936), 52, no. 4 (SB 8158, SEG VIII, 568), and rightly rejects the fanciful restoration proposed by Crönert in the apparatus to SEG.

(27) In *Latomus*, 10, 471–7, ‘À propos des Préfets d’Égypte d’Arthur Stein’, H.-G. Pflaum discusses some of the problems in Stein’s book. He publishes the important discovery that in the inscription on a bronze vase, first published by L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner*, no. 75, in which the prefect Gaius Laterius Fronton is named (for the first time), the year of Vespasian is not, as Robert read, a, but ia. The prefecture of Fronton thus lasted in A.D. 78–79.

(28) G. Klaffenbach, in *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, 11, p. 290, no. 2, proposes a new restoration of the inscription published by H. Kortenbeutel, *Mitt. Deutsch. Inst. Kairo*, 7, 55–56 (pl. 18b). He points out that the inscription is complete to the right, and that it must be reconstructed as a dedicatory inscription, which he proposes to restore as [e.g. Παν(α) δώ(να)] — ως (patronymic) [πατέρας Ερμοπολέτ[ης]]

(29) W. Schubart, *Aegyptus*, 31, 154–5, no. 9, discusses the interesting epigram from Hermopolis Magna, originally published by W. G. Waddell, in S. Gabra, *Fouilles de l’Université Fouad El Atwal à Hermopolis Ouest*, Cairo, 1941, 107–9, and pl. 50 (not referred to by Schubart), and republished by T. C. Skeat, *JE A* 28, 68–69. In l. 7 the stone has οσικαρφεσικο, which Waddell interpreted as ισα κάρφει κόρο (ποιόν) ‘as it were splinters from a log’. Skeat preferred to take it as ισοκάρφει κορμος, ‘with poles thin as matchsticks’. Schubart proposes to understand ισα κάρφα (wrongly written as κάρφια) κόρος: ‘Harpalus geht mit den Felsblöcken um wie Knaben mit Spänen, und damit wurde sich ergeben ισα κάρφα κορος, wozu als Verbum ein έγγονος, aus έγγονης der folgenden Zeile entnommen, gehört.’ This is a puzzling problem. Should we perhaps read ρωκο[ις] or ρωκο<ις> ‘like bent straws’, or (as Dr. Maas suggested to me) κο[ις]<φις>οι[ις]?

(30) J. Bingen, *Aegyptus*, 32, 399 ff., ‘Deux inscriptions grecques du Delta’, re-edits the two inscriptions of the third century A.D. referring to Bouleutai of Alexandria, *Breviarium, Iscr. 151* and 130. His new readings are based on the photographs in *Breccia* (pl. 37, nos. 89 and 90). The corrections that he makes to the first piece seem acceptable; l. 1 he reads [Λούκ. Σεπτύμνου Περακόν κα[λι] Aυτοκύρειοι] for earlier editors’ [Λούκ. Σεπτύμνου κα[λι] — Αυτοκύρειοι]; l. 5 for [Δρ]μοίοι he reads [τ]ο[ς] οίκους; l. 8–10 he reads [λατομούσιν Αμφορακίων τού κα] — [Τι... χι... Αμφορακίων Ιαρδανίων Θυτατρος] for [λατομούσιν τού κα] — [Τι... χι... Αμφορακίων Ιαρδανίων Θυτατρος]. He establishes what is evidently the true stemma of the various persons mentioned. The second piece offers fewer corrections, reproducing, with one exception, the text as given by Breccia, with a few more letters won. In l. 7 for the previous Αμφορακίων τού θυτατρος B. reads Αμφορακίων τού Διοσκόρου. This is no doubt correct, though it does not seem evident from the photograph.

(31) A. Fakhry, *Ann. Serv. 51*, 425 ff., republishes two Greek inscriptions from Gebel el-Teir (cf. above, no. 8). (a) De Bock, *Matériaux*, 38, no. 51. He does not seem to have understood either the text itself or de Bock’s reproduction of it. Of l. 1, which he reads as ΕΙΑΙΑΔ he says ‘De Bock read this word as ΕΤΡΑΧΑ’, but in fact de B. gives what is quite clearly (and rightly) έργασα. In l. 3 he seems to have misunderstood the ligature, and in l. 4 de B. preserves a better text. In any case the inscription is partly incomprehensible. (b) is incomprehensible, and de B. said cautiously of it ‘qui parait être grecque’.


V. Religion

(33) C. Picard, *RA* 1952, 110–11, gives an addendum to his article on the oenochoe found at Glanum (cf. *JE A* 38, 122, no. 42), in which he points out, after re-examination of the vase, that the Ptolemaic queen carries a δικεφαλος, attested elsewhere as carried by Lagid queens, and thus confirms his original attribution.

(34) In *Chron. d’Égypte*, 28, 39–59, ‘Recherches sur le rôle des “gardiens des portes” (deir-(ti) dans l’administration générale des temples égyptiens’, E. Jelinková-Reymond discusses the function of these officials on the basis of a late-fourth-century hieroglyphic text, and examines the activity of the παστοφόροι (54 ff.), who probably correspond to the Egyptian officials in question.

misprints) the second hymn of Isidore (SEG viii, 549), which provides evidence for the assimilation of Isis and Hermouthis.

(36) In Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt (Liverp. Univ. Press, 1953), Sir Harold Bell provides a popular account of a subject to which throughout the years he has devoted much attention. I discuss this in a forthcoming volume of JHS.

(37) In Mus. Helv. 10, 222–37, 'Graeco-Egyptian Religion', Sir Harold gives a more detailed sketch of the influence of Egyptian religion on Greek. A good deal of this is contained in the book noticed above.

(38) J. Tondrau, Aegyptus, 33, 125–30, 'Quelques problèmes religieux ptolémaïques', discusses some further aspects of his favourite topic: (1) He asks why Philadelphus did not include Ptolemy Soter and Berenike I when he established the cult of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi. He claims that the cult was not yet dynastic, but that Philadelphus established a 'mixed cult' of the founder of Alexandria with the reigning monarchs as sónaco. But the κύστής-cult remained separate from the dynastic cult, and I see nothing which associates them. (2) 'The deification of Arsinooe II', adds nothing to our knowledge. (3) 'The Ptolemaia', gives a list of celebrations of this festival. He still does not know that the Phoenician inscription, JEAS 26, 57 ff., is irrelevant.

(39) In Πανελληνικά (Mélanges Grégoire), iv (Ann. de l'inst. phil. or. et slav. 12), 441–66, Tondrau returns to the attack with 'Dionysos, Dieu royal: Du Bacchos taurotomorphe primitif aux souverains hellénistes Neos Dionysos'. Much of this already contained in previous articles of the same author on kindred subjects. On 457 ff. he lists the epigraphical and other evidence in which the Dionysiac titles of the Ptolemies occur.

(40) Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, in The Dramatic Festivals of Athens (1953), 286–309, gives a useful account of the artists of Dionysus. He quotes in full and discusses (289–91) the two relevant inscriptions from Egypt, OGIS 50 and 51 (there is some confusion in his references, and the inscription referred to, 290, n. 2, is OGIS 50). He also quotes the texts of the Dionysiac inscriptions from Cyprus, given by him as CIG 2620 and JHS 9, 250, no. 105. The latter is, in fact, OGIS 164 and the former ibid. 166. On these two inscriptions and the organization of the Cypriot Dionysiac artists see Mitford, no. 90 below, p. 136, n. 4.

(41) In TLZ 1952, 470–6, G. Dilling discusses the evolution of the phrase μόνος θεός, and makes particular use of the Isis aretalogies, and quotes in this connexion the Medinet Madi aretalogy, SEG viii, 548, ll. 23 f., μόνη ε'ς συν ἀγαθῷ | α.argsort των θεν ονομαζόμενοι θεοί ἄλλοι.

(42) M. du Buisson, Bull. Soc. nat. ant. France, 1943/4, 444–50, discusses the Roman lamp from Alexandria in the British Museum, BM Cat. Greek and Roman Lamps, p. 143, no. 946, fig. 188, on which a figure interpreted by Walters as Isis is represented embracing Sarapis. The inscription given in the Catalogue as 'παραρηγώνος[?]') is read by du B. as παρά Βασιλεύος. Du B. claims that the figure is not Isis but the Sun, and he discusses the significance of the connexion between Sarapis and the Sun.

(43) In Archaeologia, 95, 85–105, 'The Temple of the Imperial Cult at Luxor', U. Monneret de Villard claims that the building in the middle of the temple of Amun at Luxor is not, as has been almost universally supposed, a Christian church, but a temple of the Imperial cult, in the centre of a Roman camp. His important and convincing re-interpretation is largely based on previously unpublished drawings made by Wilkinson, which du V. reproduces. These clearly show on the walls scenes from a military procession. Latin inscriptions on blocks at cross-roads in the ancient roadway to east and west of the temple, identified by de V. as the axis of a Roman camp, show that the camp is of the period a.d. 300–308/9.

(44) F. C. Grant's Hellenistic Religions, the Age of Syncretism (Library of Religion, Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1953) contains translated texts illustrative of the main aspects of Hellenistic religion. Much of the material consists of inscriptions; those from Egypt include OGIS 50 (p. 14) and 90 (pp. 67–69), while on pp. 124 ff. the author gives a collection of translated texts concerning Egyptian cults (P.Oxy. 1380–1; PSI 433, the Isis-hymns, the Karpokrates-aretalogy). This book contains a very valuable collection of material, epigraphical and otherwise, and it is only to be regretted that the Greek texts are not given, understandable though the omission is.

(45) The interesting thesis of A. Bataille, Les Memnonia, Recherches de papyrologie et d'épigraphie grecques sur la nécropole de la Thèbes d'Égypte aux époques hellénistique et romaine (Publications de l'Inst. franc. d'arch. orient., Recherches d'archéologie, de philologie et d'histoire, tome xxiii), 1952, is naturally based mainly on the material contained in UPZ 11, but also makes full use of relevant epigraphical
records. It is to be noted that, though the title-page bears the date 1952, the preface is dated early in 1948, with a postscript late in 1951, while on p. 297, n. 1, it is stated that the Conclusion was already written in June 1947. Addenda to some extent bring the work more up to date. I note here a few general and particular points regarding the epigraphical material. This first becomes of importance in connexion with the deities of the Left Bank (86 ff.), though a good deal of the material here is Egyptian and not Greek. On p. 91, n. 2, for OGIS 194, II. 25 ff., see Wilhelm, Altorientalik (SB Wien. Akad. 224 (1), 1946), 31–32. On p. 94 B. discusses SB 1530, a dedication by Milesian of a column, on which the inscription is engraved, to Apollo Διόνυς. The stone was re-examined for B. by O. Guéraud, who dates the text on the basis of the lettering to the late second or early third century A.D., comparing the hand with that of Breccia, Iser. pl. 33, no. 80, and pl. 36, no. 87. On p. 105 B. is perhaps rather unfair to Milne. Speaking of Milne, Cairo Inscrips. p. 46, no. 9236, which Guéraud has re-examined for him, he says, 'le plus important, c’est que, pour M. Guéraud, la stèle ne présente rien de spécifiquement funéraire'. Milne himself had already separated the stone from the funerary stelae, and classed it as a votive stela. On pp. 105–6 B. points out that SB 4022–3, two graffitis of the ουκολογής Παμφύλου, come from the temple of Isis at Dér esh-Shehweit, and are not, as Lepsius (followed by SB) said, engraved on the colossus of Memnon. On p. 111 B. raises the question whether the late bronze statue of a bearded figure, Edgar, Cairo Cat. Greek Bronzes, p. 17, no. 27697, and pl. 4 (the inscr. SB 5989), may not represent a deified deity. In that case one might expect some reference to the fact in the inscription, which is a simple dedication. Page 143, the inscription referred to by B. as 'Strack, Inschrift, 95, p. 15–16' (i.e. II. 15–16), is OGIS 111. Pages 153 ff. contain the main epigraphical section, with a good general discussion of the inscriptions on the colossus of Memnon. B. well emphasizes (163) that these inscriptions are not graffitis, but are cut carefully by trained lapicides, and record largely the visits of the haute élite from Hadrian downwards. This is the best general discussion since Lebrun's fundamental La Statue vocale de Memnon (1813). Page 166, top, the poems of Iulia Barbellus are most conveniently consulted in SEG VIII, 715–18; cf. also JEA 38, 123, no. 50 (where, for '1. 3' read '1. 17'). Pages 168 ff. contain a discussion of the visitors to the tombs of the Valley of the Kings, on the basis of the graffitis. Page 172, on the graffitis of the δαυσοίος Nicagoras see Bull. 1953, no. 239. Page 193, on ἀεροφαῖρα see Bull. ibid. In his conclusions B. considers the evidence for the reciprocal influence of Egyptian and Greek ways of life, and comes to the conclusion that the Hellenism of the Egyptian was skin-deep. To be noted are pp. 299–312, the valuable prosopography, and pp. 313–17, the addenda and corrigenda. To these latter I may add: on p. 40, for the topography of Thebes, the work of E. Otto, below, no. 75; on p. 111, cf. above, nos. 10, 21. Page 230, for those dead by drowning see also Michaelides, Bull. inst. Egypt., 32, 294 ff.

(46) E. R. Goodenough's work in three volumes (in progress), Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (Bollinger series 37, 1953), contains in II, 61 ff. notes on symbols used in Jewish burials in and near Alexandria. Two false doors on tombs are regarded by G. as significant for his purpose, since 'doors will appear extremely important in all Jewish symbolism'. But such doors are very common in Alexandria (see in general Pagenstecher, Nekropolis, 85 ff.) and these instances, if they show anything, probably indicate Greek influence. On p. 63 he publishes a new inscription in the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria, a slab bearing a representation of the menorah, shofar, and palm branch or lulab, with, above them, the word 'Ἰοδά. On pp. 84–88 his account of the synagogues of Egypt is very incomplete and unsatisfactory on the epigraphical side. He has a chapter, 121–50, 'Judaism in the Inscriptions' which is an interesting, if rather discursive, general survey of Jewish tombstones.

VI. Political and social history, constitutonal law

(47) In Archives d'hist. du droit orient., Revue intern. des droits de l'antiq. 2, 1953, 251–67, 'Notes sur la chancellerie des Lagides', E. Bickerman discusses the definition of the terms ἑστιατηρία, the administrative letter to one or more persons, the ἐντολή, or circular letter, and the πρόσταγμα, or proclamation. He modifies in some respects the definition of ἑστιατηρία given by Wilcken (UPZ 457, Archiv, 11, 148), and emphasizes that the πρόσταγμα was a direct communication: 'le prostagma (écrit ou verbal) enjambait ces étapes bureaucratiques'. These contentions are supported by a valuable collection of evidence. The Cypriot amnesty of Euergetes II (cf. below, nos. 84, 85), which is an open circular letter of the entole-type, is described there as (I. 18) ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τοὺς βασιλέως προσταγῆς ἑστιατηρίας. This suggests that the distinction was less clear than B. alleges. The use of πρόσταγμα in a general sense is probably inaccurate, and certainly leads
to confusion, but it appears to have ancient authority (cf., for example, βασιλέων προστάγματα), and it may be unwise to be over-precise.

(48) In JFP 5, 187-206, L. J. Modzelewski writes on ‘The προστάγματα in the papyri’, covering a wider field than Milie M.-T. Lenger’s articles (notably Chron. d’Égypte, 19, 108-46) since he includes the Roman and Byzantine periods. The first part, on Ptolemaic προστάγματα, reproduces all the evidence from Milie Lenger, which was surely unnecessary. (He complains that she has omitted OGIS 761 from her collection, but it is there in detail, loc. cit., pp. 133-4, no. 9.) Like Milie Lenger he uses προστάγματα in its widest sense of ‘an instruction’. His list of documents includes many inscriptions, but he has nothing of significance to say of them. In general he maintains (196-206) the validity of Wilcken’s definitions against the objections of Milie Lenger (Rev. intern. des droits de l’antiq. 1, 125 f.). This whole very complex matter is still far from clear, and needs reconsideration in the light of Bickerman’s article (above, no. 47). On pp. 201-3 M. discusses the prostagmata of magistrates of the Roman period (ground again covered by Milie Lenger, Rev. intern. des droits de l’antiq. 3, 69 ff.) and, 203-5, those of the Byzantine period.

(49) In Παγκόσμιος (Mélanges Grégoire), III, 185-94, ‘Les Préfets d’Egypte pendant la persécution de Dioclétien’, J. Lallemand gives a new list of the prefects of this period. The last list, that of Cantarelli, gave three names, L. gives six. Valerius Victorianus, given by Cantarelli (328) as doubtful, is made probable (May 306-Sept. 308) by P. Lond. ined. 2226, to which L. had access. A recently published papyrus (see L. 101) determines the precise date of Sossianus Hierocles (307), and the same B.M. papyrus determines the prefecture of Aelius Hyginus (Sept. 308). An unpublished Vienna papyrus gives a new prefect of c. 310, Titinnios Clodianos, and an Aurelius Ammonios appears as prefect on 17 Aug. 312.

(50) H. Hübner, Der Praefectus Aegypti von Diokletian bis zum Ende der römischen Herrschaft, München-Pasing 1952 (Erlanger Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte, III 4, Beiträge zur antiken Rechtsgeschichte), gives a detailed analysis of the evolution (ch. 1) and functions (chs. 2-5) of the prefecture from Diocletian onwards, followed by a chronological list of the prefects to A.D. 642. The work thus provides a continuation both of Reimhurst’s and of Stein’s works. He gives some indication of the evidence for the prefects, but the work is on a far smaller scale than that of Cantarelli.

(51) W. Kunkel, Herkunft u. soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen, Weimar 1952 (Forschungen zum römischen Recht, 4. Abh.), provides a useful, though by no means exhaustive, discussion of this topic. In regard to Egypt K. gives, 260-70, the names of eleven νομικοί all known from papyri. The list of Taubenschlag, Festschrift Schulz, II, 188 ff. differs slightly. T. adds PSI 1126 and 1127, where there is an Αϊφνῆς Συμφράτης νομίκος, which seems right, but he also includes W. Chrest. 41, col. iii, 48, where νομίκος is a questionable supplement; while K., for his part, has Σαραϊκός, P. Ross.-Georg. II, 20, 7 f. not given by T. (T. includes the Byzantine νομίκος, 192, so he should have mentioned WO 1606, Ἀθανάσιος νομίκος.) On pp. 354 ff. K. analyses the various meanings of the term νομίκος in Egypt. Among the inscriptions quoted in this connexion are (45) OGIS 718, 722, 723, CIG 4693, but he has little to say of them.

(52) In Chron. d’Égypte, 27, 218-46, ‘Contribution à un Corpus de législation ptolémaique’, Milie M.-T. Lenger gives a study, with a new edition, of W. Chrest. 450 (P. Petr. III, 20) containing a series of προστάγματα concerned with billeting. Her text differs from that of Wilcken in several minor respects, and by the substitution of [Ἐπικαδόνος for [Διο]δοροὺς] in verso col. i, l. 1 (based on a P. Hib. ined.). Her detailed commentary refers to most of the relevant inscriptions and papyri concerned with billeting.

(53) In Studi in onore di V. Arangio-Ruiz, I, 1483-99, ‘La Notion de “bienfait” (philanthropia) royal et les ordonnances des rois lagides’, Milie Lenger continues her onslaught on Ptolemaic προστάγματα. She here discusses the use of the term φαλάθρωμα. Much of the material derives from inscriptions, and she gives a long list of sources, which would be a great deal more useful if some attempt had been made to indicate the context of the inscription as a whole.

(54) K. C. Atkinson, Aegyptus, 32, 204-14, ‘Some Observations on Ptolemaic Ranks and Titles’, propounds the view that the court-titles originated in the third century (on the basis of two Zenon papyri); that the Ptolemaic φύλοι represent advisers ‘personally chosen by the King from among all ranks of society’ while συγγενεῖς, etc., are a (probably hereditary) rank, and ἀρχηγομεταφύλακες are officers. She further maintains that the συγγενεῖς were introduced by Ptolemy I on the model of Alexander’s cavalry-συγγενεῖς, and suggests that the reason for their sudden appearance after 200 is that Ptolemy IV rewarded mercenary
captains with that title after Raphia. In this paper A. naturally refers to many Ptolemaic inscriptions. The theses here maintained are of uncertain value. They cannot in the nature of the evidence be readily proved or disproved. It has long been recognized that some of the titles existed in the third century (see already Wilcken, Grundzüge, 7, and, in particular, Corradi, Studi Ellenistici, 269, n. 1, Kortenbeutel, RE s.v. Philos) though they quite clearly had not been elaborated or formalized by then. At the same time, I find her version of the origin of the ὀργενεῖς very hard to accept. A. knows nothing of the large modern literature on the subject, particularly Corradi’s fundamental study, and the valuable tabular analysis of the second-century material in Peremans’s article in Symbolae van Oven (Leiden 1946), 126–59. (M. Trindl, Ehrentitel im Ptolemäereich, Diss. Münch. 1942, I have never seen.) Also to be noted are Henne’s article in Mélanges Radet, 172–86 (strategoi) and Kortenbeutel’s article ‘Philos’ in RE (1941).

(55) In the general field of political history I may call attention to an important new work, that of F. K. Kienitz, Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7 bis zum 4 Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1953). This is the first detailed work in this field since Wiedemann’s Ägyptische Geschichte, 1884, and is thus very welcome. The work appears less satisfactory, in so far as the Greek evidence is concerned, for the earlier period than for the fourth century, where the complex picture is given in full. K. adds a series of appendixes on particular topics, chiefly chronological. He also gives a valuable analysis of the evidence, mainly monuments, for the Pharaohs of the fourth century, and has a detailed account of the Demotic Chronicle.

(56) 1952 saw the completion of H. Bengtson’s massive Die Strategie, with the publication of the third volume, devoted to the strategoi of Ptolemaic Egypt. The evidence concerning the neme-strategoi is almost entirely papyrological, but for the sections on the ἐπιστράτης (121–7), the ἐπιστράτης πόλεως and ἐπι στρατηγός πόλεως (128–33), and the ἐπιστράτης ἐπὶ τὴν θρίαμβον τῶν ἐλεύθερων (133–6) the evidence is largely or wholly epigraphical. The most important section of the book is probably that dealing with Ptolemaic possessions overseas, and based largely on epigraphical material (see below, no. 88). On 207–41 there is a valuable list of all Ptolemaic strategoi.

(57) In Epigraphica, 11, 115–46, ‘Die rechtliche Stellung der Metropoleis im römischen Ägypten’, E. Schönbauer examines the implications of the inscription of Ptolemaios from Panopolis (for recent bibliography see Bull. 1953, no. 238, where S.’s argument is summarized), mainly from the viewpoint of the legal status of Ptolemagios. He has much of interest to say regarding the sequence and structure of the poems, which he arranges in a different order both from Wilhelm and from Guérard and Welles. He prefers a date between Antoninus Pius and the Constit. Ant. One cannot help feeling that the early date (beginning of the first century A.D.) proposed by Milne and supported by Wilhelm is palaeographically more suitable; and also, as Wilhelm noted, the sculpture might be more natural at the earlier date. In the line (4, 1 Milne) Ἀγνωστοὶ ἑτοίμας κατ’ ἔτος δίς δήμων ἄπαντα S. claims (127–9) that δήμων ἄπαντα refers not to the entire population of Panopolis, but ‘nur die welche zu Archontenstellen berufen werden können’ (i.e. oi ὄρθροι γεμεναί). This reduces the extent of Ptolemaios’ otherwise rather fabulous benefactions, but I find it hard to accept.

(58) In Bull, inst, fr. 50, 157–207, S. Sauneron and J. Yoyotte discuss ‘La Campagne nubienne de Psammétique II et sa signification historique’. On 187 ff. they deal with the familiar inscriptions of the mercenaries on the colossi of Ramesses II at Abu Simbel (Syll. 31; Tod, GHI 4), and discuss the meaning of the phrase ως ὁ πολιτικός ἀντιπόλεος, which, they claim, refers not to the region of the Second, but to that of the Fourth, Cataract, and which they propose, on the basis of a hieroglyphic text, to identify with the Gebel Koulkei, in the neighbourhood of Dongola. The effect of this identification, which they admit to be speculative, would be to turn the expedition of Psammethicus into a major operation into the Sudan. We are promised a further treatment of the inscriptions by the named-to the first of the two authors (S. Sauneron, Les Graffitis grecs d’Abu Simbel et l’organisation de l’armée de Psammétique II: ‘en préparation’).

(59) E. van ‘t Dack continues his studies on Ptolemaic administration in Ägyptus, 32, 437–50, ‘Notes concernant l’épistragéti potémaique’. A small part of the material is epigraphical (esp. OGIS 111), the bulk of it papyri. He gives a list, 442 ff., of the epistragéti and strategoi of the Thebaid (cf. above, no. 56).

(60) I. Calabri, Ägyptus, 32, 406–24, studies ‘L’archoikastos nei primi tre secoli della dominazione romana’. She gives, 410–18, a list of known ἀρχοικασταί, Ptolemaic and Roman, of which a few come
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from inscriptions of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (OGIS 136, Ptolemaic; CIG 4734 (A.D. 130); SB 7027 (first half of ii A.D.); CIG 4755 (unknown date)).

(61) H. Volkmann’s *Kleopatra* (München, 1953) gives, (219), a survey of the meagre epigraphical sources for the reign of Cleopatra VII.

(62) In *Camb. Hist. Journ*. 10, 235–53. A. G. Woodhead discusses 'The State Health Service in Ancient Greece'. He treats the Ptolemaic evidence, 241–2, and apart from the papyri he makes use of *OGIS* 104. He makes no reference, however, to the important inscription, *BRECCIA, Iser.* 16, which is a dedication by Euergetes I in honour of his own doctor (see Wilcken, *Archiv*, 4, 238, for the interpretation). His description of the activity of doctors in Egypt is wholly based on Diod. 1, 82, and he expresses no doubts as to the historicity of what is there recorded. The article ends, 250–3, with a list of testimonia.


(64) Cl. Préaux, *Mus. Helv.* 10, 203–21, 'Les Raisons de l’originalité de l’Égypte', makes considerable use of epigraphical material. She quotes (206) the decree in praise of Aelius Aristeides, *OGIS* 709, and the Hermoupolis poem (*SEG* viii, 621 = SB 7871) expressing disgust at mummification, as evidence for the assimilation of common cultural traditions in Egypt and the rest of the Empire, and quotes the Edict of Tib. Iul. Alexander (*OGIS* 669, etc.) as evidence for Roman policy in regard to Egypt.

(65) In *Vestnik drevnei Istori* (1951, 53–64, N. N. Pikis writes on 'The Critical Period in the History of Hellenistic Egypt: the End of the Third Century B.C.', and discusses, among the relevant texts for this period of upheaval, the Canopus decree, *OGIS* 53.

VII. Prosopography, etc.

(66) In *Ann. Serv.* 51, 219–20, 'Is Chalbas a Greek Name?', J. G. Griffiths disputes the claim of Ranke that Χάλβας, which occurs in Phercydes, *F. Gr. Hist.* 3, F 17, as the name of Pharaoh's herald, is an Egyptian name. He points to its occurrence in *CIG* 4668d, from Sinai, μηνθή Αδρήλος Βόρας Χάλβας, where the name could be Greek or Semitic. It seems to have been established as Semitic by Lidzbarski, *Eph.* ii, 10, no. 1 (cf. Wuthnow, s.v. Χάλβας and the cognates given there); cf. *Bull.* 1953, no. 39.


(68) *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, ii (1825–4983) contains the prosopography of 'L'Armée de terre et la police'. The volume is more competently carried out than its predecessor, though the eccentric system of arrangement makes it no more useful. The introduction describes at length categories of persons who might be expected to appear in the volume but do not. The exclusion of these individuals, whatever its basic justification, depends in many instances on the interpretation of individual texts (see, for example, pp. xvi ff.). It is in such cases that one wants the help of a prosopography with detailed references; here, however, one must first know the detailed references regarding a man's career—in fact precisely what one might fairly ask a prosopography to provide—before knowing whether the individual will be included or not. The authors continue to find new and ingenious ways of making their *Prosopographia* unusable. Furthermore, they have been victimized by the pretensions of the epigraphical volume of *SB*, which is their main reference: 'Ainsi la plupart des références à l'OGIS ou au CIG iii sont remplacées par celles au cinquième volume du Sammelbuch (SB), qui d'ailleurs renvoie lui-même dans ses “lemmata” à l'OGIS ou au CIG' (p. xxxiv). The lists themselves are based on those at the back of Lesquier, though of course the material is now far more bulky, largely owing to the material accruing from the great Hermoupolis inscriptions, which form a large part of the evidence. A few individual points: 1847: is Apollonios, commemorated in this long epigram, Milne 9205 (p. 71), eponymous? 1880: again I do not see what there is to suggest in this poem, *SEG* viii, 497, that Diazelmis was eponymous. 2046: the authors here follow *SB* 626 *add.* in giving Schubert's conjecture (λαδρυχής) for the [ι]λαδρυχής of de Ricci, but the latter seems correct (see de Ricci's copy, *BSA* Alex. 9, 336, no. 13), so the entry should be removed from the list of laarcha and added to that of ilarcha. The analysis of 'specialist troops', 4284–4523, is also based predominantly on epigraphical evidence, in
part individual dedications, in part from the Hermoupolis dedications (e.g. the ἐγκυκλισθήμενοι μοχαιροφόροι 4343 ff., of which 17 names out of 24 come from SB 4206). 4419-4519 contain the list of κυνηγοῖ. The short second part, 4524-4983, contains the names of the various police officials. The evidence here is largely from papyri.

VIII. Lexicography and language

(69) In Les Moyens d’expression du grec et de l’égyptien, comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis (Ann. du Service, Supp. Cahier, 16), 1952, F. DAUMAS gives us a work of considerable interest and importance for the study of the trilingual texts, and one which illuminates the Greek texts at several points. The time-lag between submission of the work to the printer, 1946 (see p. xii), and publication, 1952, is to be noted. D.'s aim is to establish 'la mentalité linguistique' of Greek and Egyptian. He proceeds from the assumption, with which few will quarrel, that the original language of the inscriptions is Greek, and his task is therefore essentially to determine how the Egyptians translated the Greek, and what linguistic characteristics they revealed in so doing. The greater concreteness of the Egyptian is visible at every point. I note here a few details which may be of importance for the study of the Greek text (references to which are to OGIS 53, the Canopus decree, and 90, the Rosetta decree). I am grateful to Professor J. Černý for answering my questions about Egyptian renderings of the Greek text.

Page 87, Rosetta l. 12, ὅπως δὲ τα λάος καὶ οἱ ἀλλοι πάντες, κ.τ.λ. D. claims here (note 1) that 'les deux textes égyptiens exéquent que l'on donne ici à λάος son sens ancien d'armée'. On p. 277, under the influence of Greek evidence, he modifies this view. It thus appears that the exigencies of the Egyptian text are not absolute. Černý tells me that the demotic in its Coptic form means 'multitude', so the question of interpretation does not arise. Page 88, Rosetta, l. 44, εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸ ἐν Μεμφ[ε]ι ιερὸν ὅπως ἐν αὐτῶι σαν[τα]λεσθή τα νομιζόμενα, κ.τ.λ., raises an interesting point. D. shows—and Černý confirms—that the Egyptian text here is unequivocally temporal in sense. So we must therefore either assume an error on the part of the translators, or discover a different supplement. However, a temporal clause—the obvious alternative—in past time in the subjunctive is impossible, so an error appears probable. Page 105, n. 2, Canopus, l. 59 ὅν ὁ προ-φήτης ἡ (τις) τῶν εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον εἰρημένων. D. comments: 'Nous avions été arrêté par la forme jusqu'ici attestée εἰρημένων, qui paraissait venir de εἰρημα, ce qui est impossible pour le sens. Dittenberger n'expliquait grand'chose en mettant “εἰρημένων πρὸ ἡμημένων”, dans OGIS, p. 107 note 109. Dorénavant la forme correcte ἡμημένων est attestée par un fragment très court du même décret publié par O. Guérard, ASA, t. xlvi, p. 375.' D. has misunderstood Dittenberger's note here, which he does not appear to have read to the end. This note makes the difficulty perfectly clear (at sic quoque male habet εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον non relatum ad verbum undi), and suggests a (possibly unnecessary) correction: to suppose an error in the archetype and to emend to εἰσπορευμένων. In any case it is clear that the translators translated εἰρημένων in the sense of 'chosen'. Page 137, in his note on the equivalents of ἀντί D. points out, following Sethè's text, that in Rosetta, l. 44, init., the Egyptian phrase demands ἀντί at the beginning of the line; the same Egyptian phrase is used for ἂντι in Canopus, l. 19, ἃνθ' ὅν οἱ θεοὶ διδάκασιν αὐτοῖς, κ.τ.λ., and ibid. 29, ἂντι δὲ τῶν εἰκόνωι βουλευτῶν ἱερῶν, κ.τ.λ. This seems unavoidable, and surely necessitates a new restoration of the Greek text at the end of line 43. Pages 169-70, D. has an interesting note on the equivalent of ἐν τῷ ἐπιθαυμαστῶς τόσῳ. Page 171, his note on the architectural meaning of δρόμος is insufficient: see OGIS 178, n. 11. Page 173, on the meaning of ἀγοῦλα see now Bataille, Memnonia (above, no. 45), 150-1. Pages 179-85 have a good discussion of the Egyptian equivalents of Greek terms for Egyptian priests. Page 219, the note on βασιλικοῦ is inadequate. The meaning 'royal treasury' is normal in Ptolemaic texts. Page 247, 'quatre-vingts': I make it forty-five. Pages 253 ff. contain a convenient list of all known bilingual and trilingual texts from Egypt. The information about them is confined to the stones themselves, their place of discovery, present whereabouts, etc. There are some monstrous misprints in Greek in the book (I say nothing of accents). I note: p. 41 νοημεία, p. 73 μετάλλαξεν, p. 86 ὅρμεν, p. 90 παρεγένηθε, p. 98 ἀποκατέστησεν, p. 111 στόματα (i.e. στόμα, not στρόματα), p. 134 μέθη (i.e. μηθέν), p. 205 μεταπτ･οστ･αι, p. 224 πορευκολάθ･τ･αι, ibid. ἐξενεγένθα, p. 243 χαλκῆν, p. 265 ἔλλεινοις. The addenda correct many minor errors, but none of these classic pieces.

(70) The fourth edition of W. Bauer's valuable Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament was completed in 1952: cf. JEA 38, 125, no. 65.
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(71) In his brief survey of the Greek of the papyri, *Mus. Helv.* 10, 248–63, 'Das Griechisch in Ägypten', S. G. KAPSOMENOS discusses, 251–2, alleged Copticisms in the inscription of Silco (OGIS 201, etc.), interprets them as vulgar Greek, and concludes that the attribution of the text to a Coptic author is 'nicht bloß unsicher, sondern, ich möchte sagen, unmöglich'.

(72) R. CAVENAIGE, *Aegyptus*, 32, 191–203, 'Quelques aspects de l'apport linguistique du grec au latin d’Égypte', gives a useful list of Latin words, forms, and terminations found in Greek. The evidence is almost entirely from papyri.

(73) In *Mnemos.* 1952, 94–107, A. G. WOODHEAD denies the meaning 'travelling-expenses' given to *πορεία* by LS², s.v. II, iv. Among the instances of the word which he examines is that in the Koptos tariff, *OGIS* 674, II, 23–25. He concludes that the word there refers to the journey itself.

IX. Geography, Topography, etc.

(74) Three articles of A. L. FONTAINE relating to the Canal Zone may be noted, though only the third is concerned with inscriptions: (a) *Bulletin de la Société d’Études historiques et géographiques de l’Isthme de Suez*, 1 (1947), 41–56, 'Daphnae', (b) ibid. 2, 57–79, 'Heracleopolis Parva', which he identifies with BALL’s Tell Belim, and (c) ibid. 4, 17–80, 'Enquête sur Péluse'. The last article contains a general account of the area and its remains, followed by a lengthy, derivative, and quite valueless, history of the varied fortunes of Pelusium from the Assyrian period until the Middle Ages. Finally, and not without interest, is an appendix which contains the publication of (all?) the contents of Ismaïlïyyah Museum. Epigraphical material is represented by *SB* 7015 and 7016, of which the author gives photographs but no text, and which he makes no attempt to identify (7015, I. 4 should of course be completed as *οὐδὲν*).

(75) E. OTTO gives a detailed analysis of the topography of the Thebaid in the light of both Egyptian and Greek sources in *Topographie des thebanischen Gaues* (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte u. Altertumskunde Ägyptens, Bd. 16, 1952). In so far as the Greek evidence for west Thebes is concerned, his work overlaps with the early part of Bataille’s work, no. 45 above. He refers to the relevant epigraphical material, not always at first hand.

(76) In *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, II, 450–8, 'Latopolis, Latopolites', A. CALDERINI collects the sources in which this Upper Egyptian nome is mentioned. He quotes (452) the relevant epigraphical material attesting the unification of the Latopolite and Pathyrite nomes, and that of the Roman period for the unification of Latopolite and Hermouthite, and (456) gives a list of officials of the region.

(77) G. W. MURRAY, *Bull. soc. roy. géogr. Égypte*, 24, 107–14, 'The Christian settlement at Qattara', discusses the site (otherwise Kattar) in the Eastern Desert near Mons Porphyrites (see MEREDITH's map, *JEA* 38, 95, and cf. p. 108). The identification of the church there rests on the inscription referring to the καθολική ἐκκλησία republished by TREGENZA in 1949 (see *JEA* 38, 119, under no. 14, where the reference to Delbrück should be deleted). In an appendix J. DRESCHER discusses the inscription, and gives a drawing of it.

(78) An article by the experienced hand of H. KEES, in *RE*, s.v. Porphyrites should be noted. He was not, unfortunately, able to take account of the recent research of D. Meredith and his collaborators (see above no. 14).

X. Nubia and Ethiopia

(79) In *Chron. d’Égypte*, 27, 257–81, Cl. PREAUX writes on 'Les Communications de l’Éthiopie avec l’Égypte hellénistique'. She discusses the general implications of the main groups of graffiti found along the ancient routes and at Wadi Halfa, notably (263) *SB* 302, the Wadi Hammamât group (273), *CIG* 47161–47169, the Redesiyeh group (OGIS 70–74, etc.; in fact at El-Kanäis), and the significance of the title ἀπεσταλμένος ... ἐπὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς πολεμεῖσας λαθέας in *OGIS* 132.

(80) In *Bull. soc. roy. géogr. Égypte*, 25, 103–10, L. P. KIRWAN writes on 'The Ballānia Civilisation: A Note on the Historical Geography of Lower Nubia', attributing the royal tombs at Ballāna and Kustol to the Nobadic settlers of the region. In fixing the boundaries of the Nobades he makes use of the inscription of their King Silco, *OGIS* 201, etc.

(81) In *Mélanges Beyrouth*, 29, 69, R. MOUTERDE calls attention to the cryptogram *XΠΘ* found on monuments and in manuscripts from Nubia (cf. GRIFFITH, *JEA* 10, 181), which he suggests may be *Χ(ρωτός) π(αθῶν) θ(εός)* on the analogy of *Χ(ρωτός) π(αθῶν) γ(άννα)* found, among other places, on an inscription from Ser’in, published by him, ibid.
XI. The Ptolemaic Empire
(a) New and republished texts.

(83) In Skrft. utgiv. av svenska inst. i Athen, 4th, 2, 130–70, T. B. Mitford analyses exhaustively the careers of Seleucus and Theodorus, the father and son who governed Cyprus for Euergetes II. The work contains a republication of all, or almost all, the relevant material, along with many new inscriptions, and excellent photographs. This will clearly remain the fundamental work on this difficult topic, and I note here only the most important new texts and readings, joins, etc. due to Mitford’s patient and meticulous researches. Page 132, no. 3, from Salamis, a new dedication to Seleucus (defaced but legible) by οἱ ἡγεμόνες τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ταυσσομένων Κέτου καὶ οἱ ἄναρχοι τούς ταῖς τάξεωι αὑτῶν, κ. η. λ., the first occurrence of Cens in Ptolemaic service. For ἄναρχοιμενοι in the sense of ‘those seconded’ M. can find no Hellenistic parallel. Page 134, no. 7, associates JHS 9, 248, no. 98 and 251, no. 108, from Old Paphos. Page 135, no. 9, provenance unknown, a new dedication to Theodorus, evidently by a city. Page 135, no. 10, corrected text of SEG vi, 813 (Seyrig), based on a copy in Cyprus Museum. Page 139, no. 15 restores JHS, ibid., 235, no. 30. Page 139, no. 16 joins OGIS 158 and 156 (cf. Dittenberger ad num. 156: ‘a sinistra hic lapis quidem integer est, sed attingebat eum alius qui perit.’). Page 141, no. 20, restoration of JHS, ibid. 245, no. 82. Page 142, no. 21, associates JHS, ibid. 229, no. 126, and 238, no. 45. Page 143, no. 22, from Old Paphos, a new dedication, apparently to Aphrodite Paphia by a hegemon Chairias, in honour of Demonic and another daughter of Leonnatos and Olympias. On page 148 M. refers to an unpublished dedication from Old Paphos by two persons describing themselves (uniquely) as ἐπαρχοὶ τῶν κατὰ τῇ τῆς νήσῳ ἄποικῶν. Ibid., n. 45 another ineditum, at Larnaka, containing a reference to a festival in celebration of a royal birthday of the reign of Philometor. On pp. 153-6 he discusses the office of ἐπί τῆς πόλεως. On pp. 156 ff. he gives the evidence for the strategia of Kroko: OGIS 147, with important changes (cf. Hill, Cyprus, 1, 197, n. 2) which give ὑπέρμαχον in l. 2, which removes the ‘unparalleled and colourless’ ὑπέρ [tαυτ] of OGIS 140 (cf. most recently Bencsony, no. 88, below, pp. 151-2); JHS 9, 247, no. 92; JHS 37, 36, no. 11; OGIS 140; JHS 9, 244, no. 71, where M. introduces ὑπέρμαχον again ([ὑπ][ἐρμα][χο]) again). Page 159, n. 133 in OGIS 154 he restores the reading of the stone, altered by Dittenberger. I have no space here to assess the detailed reconstruction of some aspects of the history of Ptolemaic rule in Cyprus, undertaken by M. in this most valuable article.

(84) Annuario della Scuola Arch. di Atene, 27-29, 319-45, ‘Documenti di storia ellenistica da Cipro’, is an unfinished article by the late M. Segre, in which he discusses three important inscriptions. In I, ‘Sul regime fiscale di Cipro nel III secolo’, he analyses and restores Le Bas 2783 = , with improvements, Oebersheimer, SB Bayr. Acad. 1888, 318, no. 8, now in Munich. S. was supplied with a squeeze and copy by the late A. Rehm. On the basis of the word ἀπόμοιον in l. 2 he recognizes the text, which both editors took as a sacrificial tariff, as a document dealing with taxation, and reconstructs the passage relative to the ἀπόμοιον as referring to the payment of that tax, as in Egypt, to Arsinoe Philadelphia. The document is evidently a letter of a king (or governor?), and S. dates it to 260-50 (after 264, in any case, because of its reference to the apomoria), regarding Philadelphia as the author (see, however, below, no. 90) and the city of Arsinoe, where the stone was found, as the addressee. He discusses in general the little we know of the fiscal arrangements of the external possessions of Egypt. In II he discusses the inscription published by Mitford, Actes du Vth Congr. Intern. de Papyrologie, 29, and subsequently treated by A. Wilhelm, Griech. Königsbriefe, pp. 49-50 (unknown to S.), the dedication by Andromachos ὑπὸ τῶν διαδόχων. He proposes to read in l. 2, instead of Μ. [στοιχειοθη] θεός, which gives an attested title for Artemis and a highly poetical expression, διὰ[δεκα] θεός, which he joins with the following καὶ τὸ βασιλέως as forming a single cult of the Twelve Gods and the king. I find this most improbable: even if Alexander demanded, according to Aelian, that the Athenians should make him τρισκαδεκάτων θεόν, such a collocation never in fact occurs in the whole range of Hellenistic ruler-cult. He finds another reference to the cult of Artemis in the lost Paphian inscription, JHS 9, 244, no. 71, where, in place of the accepted Μ. [στοιχειοθη θεός άν] αὐτοκράτορα τῆς Θεβαίδος, he restores Πτολεμαιόν Μ. [στοιχειοθη θεός άν] αὐτοκράτορα τῆς Θεβαίδος, but restores Πτολεμαίον Μ. [στοιχειοθη θεός άν] αὐτοκράτορα τῆς Θεβαίδος, but restores Πτολεμαίον Μ. [στοιχειοθη θεός άν] αὐτοκράτορα τῆς Θεβαίδος.
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Ἀρέμιδος. (This stone is now republished by MITFORD, no. 83 above, p. 160, no. 28, where he refers to the relevant words as 'doubtful testimony' for the use of the word ἀντοκράτωρ.) But, unusual though the title may be, and whatever the explanation of it (see MITFORD, 160–1), it is found in OGIS 147 (Mitford's no. 24). I see no reason to prefer S.'s suggestion on this point, though it is certainly possible. In regard to the persons involved, S. maintains that the [Πτολεμαῖος Ἀνδρόμαχος] [is Ptolemy Macron, by whom Cyprus was handed over to Antiochus IV, and claims, on the basis of this restoration, that, by way of reward, Antiochus bestowed on him the priesthood of the cult of Artemis, popular in Seleucid circles. His grandson will be the Ἀνδρόμαχος ὁ ἀνήζω of the main dedication studied by S. There are many difficulties in this reconstruction, as S. himself saw (337) and as he freely admitted, 'la nostra interpretazione si fonda evidentemente su una serie di congetture'. He further discusses (336–7) the origin of the high priesthood of Cyprus, and denies the evidence for a borrowing from Seleucid practice. III consists of some (unfinished) observations on the famous Cypriot amnesty published by MITFORD, and subsequently studied by many, including WILHELM. In 1. 10, τοὺς δὲ στρατευόμενος διῳδοῦσα[ὶ προςαφεῖται], he prefers διῳδοῦσα[ἰ εἰς τὰς ἐκάστων τάξεις] vel sim. προσαφεῖται he regards as padding. In ll. 11 ff. he rejects Mitford's notion of the two groups of troops (τοὺς τοῖς ἐκάστων καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄδελφον) διαδεδομένων οὐ... and suggests, for the general sense of the passage, τοὺς τοῖς φεύγοντας (e.g.) and τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πρότερον αὐτοῖς διαδεδομένον φθοράν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα φεῖλε[ὶ ἡμας καὶ πάσας] τὰς τιμίας τοῦ διαδοχοῦ. In l. 17 for Mitford's μεγίθα ἐπὶ τῶν πλείων ἡμῶν he proposes (as did WILHELM) μεγίθα, εἶ δὲ νῦν, ὑπὲρ τῶν ζημίων. This article was unfinished at the time of SEGUE's death, and it bears no signs of work later than 1939. One wonders, in view of the studies devoted by other scholars to the second and third of these inscriptions, whether S. might not have altered it considerably.


(86) In Weihinschriften aus dem Nypphenheiligtum des Kafisini Hügels, Kypros (Det kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Ark.-Kunsthist. Medd. 4, 1, 1953), K. F. Johansen publishes one complete vase and some fragments from this site, now in Copenhagen. (For Kafizin see in particular MITFORD, CQ 45, 97–105.) The inscriptions are excellently illustrated. Two fragments in particular call for comment. No. 2 (fig. 8), below the dedication and the date has two broken lines: — ἀφαίρεσον — | — σμο (?) κοινα— ἀφαίρεσιν looks as if it links up with the syllabic sherd recorded by MITFORD, op. cit., p. 103, and rendered by him γραεῖς ἐφ ὑπάκου (sic) ἀφαίρετο τὸ λίνο καὶ τὸ στέρματος. It might perhaps be ἁντι-ἀφαίρεσιον (i.e. -σως) 'in return for sums taken in taxation'; the syllabic sherd seems to ensure some such meaning for ἀφαίρεσις. The reading of the second line seems uncertain: μόριος is possible, but I do not know where that gets us. No. 3 is longer and far more puzzling, and I can make nothing of it. It is to be hoped that a corpus of this Kafizin material will soon be made available.

(87) A second, revised edition of the Government of Cyprus's (Department of Antiquities) Guide to the Cyprus Museum, by P. Dikaios (1953), contains a new section on inscriptions (182 ff.). He gives texts and translations of several familiar Ptolemaic inscriptions without references to publications. I give the necessary references here: 11–13 = SEG vi, 830–32; 14 = OhnFalsch-Richter, Kypros, Bible and Homer, p. 85 (Peristanes, p. 819); 144 = JHS 9, 261, no. 6 (cf. JHS 66, 38, note 49, no. (4)); 15 = LBW 2779; 16 = no. 84 above, no. 2 (note that Mitford, who provided D. with the text, still reads δεμαβοτας;); 17 = JHS 57, 33, no. 8 (cf. JHS 66, 25, note 5); 18 = OGIS 172 and Archiv, 13, 37, no. 18; 19 = Archiv, 13, 34, no. 16. He also gives the text of some inscriptions of the Roman period.

(b) Discussions, etc.

(88) Of general interest is the important section of H. Bengtson's Die Strategie (cf. above, no. 56), in which he treats of the administration of the Ptolemaic Empire, pp. 136–88: Cyprus 138–53, Caryste, and Kyrenaica 153–65, Syria and Plocinca 166–71, Asia Minor and Thrace 172–83, and special commands abroad, 183–8. This is the most detailed recent account of the Ptolemaic administration outside Egypt we
possess, and it shows important advances in this field since the work of D. Cohen. The section on Cyprus must naturally be checked in the light of the more detailed and expert researches of Mitford (no. 83).

(89) J. Machu, Rev. Hist. 205, 47–55, writes on ‘Cyrène: la cité et le souverain à l'époque hellénistique’, making considerable use of epigraphical material. He discusses (43–45) the ‘Charter of Cyrene’, SEG IX, 1, for which he accepts the earliest possible date, 322/1, and emphasizes the control exercised by Ptolemy (which is, indeed, self-evident), analyses the obscure events of the next seventy-five years, and the role of Magas, and the later period down to the end of Ptolemaic rule. He does not enter into detailed discussion of the many difficult problems connected, for example, with the date of the charter and the chronology of Magas, but the article gives quite a useful general survey of the relations between the city and the Ptolemies.

(90) Mitford publishes an interesting article in Aegyptus, 33, 80–90, ‘The Character of Ptolemaic Rule in Cyprus’. In connexion with the development in civic life in the island under the Ptolemies, he refers to unpublished material including a fragmentary decree of the third century B.C. from Curium (found by the Princeton Expedition to Curium), and at least one honorific decree, and a bronze ring inscribed with the names of four archons followed by that of the γραμματεύς. In the letters TOYΛΕΔΡΙΟΥ on an inscribed sherd from Kafizin he sees an ethnic, ‘but the context is as yet obscure’. That it is indeed an ethnic is demonstrated beyond doubt by the Karnak graffito, SB 6698, Βαλασιαών Φιλοδήμου Λέδρος. He gives new readings of the Latin inscription, L'An. ÉP. 1928, no. 62. He publishes (85, n. 4) a plaque of the second century B.C. referring to an estate with its bonded cultivators: Σωφάντης [τοῦ δείκτη] | Αρχαίος, ἤρ[εμιν ἐπ’ αὐτόν], Ζάτωνος Τ[αυλίας καὶ οἱ παῖδες] οἰκίας, ἑδρεγόντων, ἑκατέρας] | ἐν οἷς Τ[αυτώι]s. (in that note for ‘FURTER’ read ‘further’). He has interesting statistical remarks on the possible survival of non-Greek language in the Ptolemaic period (for which the most important evidence is provided by the Kafizin inscriptions). He also discusses in general the content of the ἀπολλούμενη inscription from Arsinoe-Marion treated in detail by Segre, no. 84 above, I. He dates this considerably later than S. (‘which from its lettering may be assigned to the reign of Philopator, or even the first Euergetes’). He dates the inscription JHS 12, 170, no. 4, not, with its previous editors, to Roman and even Byzantine times, but to the second century B.C., and derives from it a curious glimpse... of a bureaucratic hierarchy’. He stresses the peculiar absence of Cypriots from Ptolemaic Egypt itself.

(91) In Actes du iième congr. épigr. (1952), 1660–75, ‘The Status of Cypriot Epigraphy’, Mitford gives a valuable survey of the epigraphical material of all periods from the island. Much of this is concerned with the syllabic texts, and on pp. 170–1 he discusses the finds at Kafizin (see no. 86 above). On pp. 171 ff. he gives a general account of the unpublished Hellenistic and later material, and describes the method in which he proposes to publish the complete material from the island.

(92) D. Magie’s article, AJA 57, 163–87, ‘Egyptian Deities in Asia Minor on Inscriptions and Coins’, is, as might be expected, a very full and useful collection of sources, with valuable bibliographical material, and though it does not reach new conclusions, it gives a clear picture of the evidence, and should form the basis of further study. In connexion with the worship of Sarapis along with other gods (185–6) I may refer again here to the interesting papyrus fragments just published by the late A. Vogliano (see above, no. 13).

(93) R. G. Goodchild, PBSR 20, 94–110, publishes a geographical study on ‘Ajax Philaenarum and Automalax’, in the course of which he tentatively proposes to identify the latter site (mentioned in Ptolemy I’s charter of Cyrene, SEG IX, 1, l. 3, in the form Ἀδρίτης Aμαλαζις, which Goodchild rightly regards as preferable to the later form Automalax) with Ras Bu Sceefa, 8 km. west of the fort of El-Aghila.

(94) In JRS 43, 65–76, Goodchild writes on ‘The Roman and Byzantine Limes in Cyrenaica’. This article, though strictly it falls outside the scope of my survey, may be noticed since it contains (76) some unpublished Greek inscriptions, varying from rough, hardly legible, graffiti, to reasonably well-cut capitals; put up by soldiers at the watch-tower at Zwaiyet Mus, in the hinterland some 120 km. south-east of Berenike. Goodchild compares the script with that of the Agedabia inscriptions, SEG IX, 773–95, and says ‘a first century [sc. A.D.] date is probable’.

From less closely attached parts of the Ptolemaic Empire and spheres of influence overseas I note:

(95) M. Segre’s posthumous corpus of inscriptions of Calympnos, Annuario d. Scuola Arch. di Atene, 22–23, which contains two already known texts bearing witness to relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and the island. Of particular importance is p. 9, test. xii, concerning the ϕίλία and συμμαχία with King Ptolemy;
the correct interpretation of this text is, I think, not that of S., but that of KLaffenbach in his review of S., Gnomon, 25, 456.

(96) In CRAI 1951, 345–6, Picard records the discovery, in the French excavations at Xanthos in Lycia, of an oenochoe of Berenike, bearing the inscriptions θεών ἐφεργετῶν, βασιλίσσης Βερενίκης, ἀγαθῆς τίχης (cf. Breccia, Iscr. 21).

(97) The publication by R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach of Asylieurbenden aus Kos (Berl. Abh. Klasse für Sprachen etc. 1952 (1)) contains the full text of the reply of Ainos (no. 8), attesting Ptolemaic authority in that city in 242 B.C.
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In this big book, M. Aymard (setting the pace for the six following parts which are to bring the story down to the present day) describes separately, in their chronological order, the ten civilizations which succeeded each other in the Near East between the Old Stone Age and the Christian era. His collaboratrix adds those of India and China during the same period. Historical narrative is dispensed with. In the case of each civilization (in danger of appearing too homogeneous and coherent when it is presented outside the process of events) political, social, and economic forms are analysed, religious, artistic, and intellectual creation appraised, and then sentence is passed. To set a single individual at so long a span of time has advantages as well as obvious disadvantages. The writer can put to early history questions suggested by later events, and carry forward to subsequent ages a balance of experience from the earlier. Moreover, in what is bound to be a personal summary, if only in its selection of material and distribution of emphasis, familiarity with other contemporary cultures offers a certain guarantee against omissions. Both these traits are to be observed in the thoughtful hundred pages on Egypt with which the book opens. M. Aymard is a fair-minded man, has a lucid style, broad in flow but precise in reference, and a flair for suggestive generalization: it would not be in place in such a series to expect novelty as well. Real imagination, however, is shown in the selection of plates, full-page (7 by 9 inches) in size and magnificently reproduced, in which the ancient monuments speak as directly to the reader as does the tombstone in a Greek epigram. Seventeen of them are devoted to Egyptian subjects.
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